BRITISH COUNCIL

Cultural Heritage for Inclusive
Growth Collection

Governance principles for inclusive heritage

James Doeser

October 2023

Acknowledgements

The Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth Collection

Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth (CH4IG) is a British Council action research programme which, since 2018, has been exploring how local culture can improve the lives of individuals around the world. The essays in this collection were originally commissioned by the British Council and Nordicity as independent thematic studies during the pilot phase of the programme. They have since been updated by their authors and edited for the British Council by Inherit.

The essays are published as part of the British Council's What Works Cultural Heritage Protection programme, which is designed to support better outcomes for heritage protection and local communities by bringing the best available evidence to practitioners and other decision-makers across the international heritage protection sector.

Together, the essays explore the role of cultural heritage in bringing about the change which is needed to secure a sustainable future for people and the planet. The collection explores the relationship between heritage and sustainable development from different geographical, topical and philosophical perspectives. The diverse essays are bound by common themes, namely that cultural heritage is at the heart of human development; that cultural relations create conditions in which human development can occur, and; that human development is enabled by people-centred approaches and transparent, accountable and participatory governance.

The author

Dr James Doeser is a freelance researcher, writer and consultant based in London. Until 2013 he was a senior researcher at Arts Council England where he led a variety of research projects to inform policy and strategy across the cultural sector. His background is in archaeology and his PhD examined the evolution of archaeology public policy in England. He now works with clients in the UK and beyond at the intersection of higher education, public policy and the cultural sector.

The editors

The collection was edited by Dr Chris Dalglish (series editor) and Skye McAlpine Walker (copy editor and proofreader) of Inherit.

Inherit – the York Archaeological Trust's Institute for Heritage & Sustainable Human Development – supports community development through cultural heritage (https://www.inherit-institute.org). We help people to safeguard, sustain and transmit their heritage. We provide practical support to communities so that they can fulfil their cultural rights and use their heritage for the collective good. We carry out purposeful research and advocate evidence-based policy change which enables people to care for their heritage and achieve their development goals. We help other organisations to improve their programmes and services for the benefit of the communities they work with. We collaborate with communities, non-profit organisations, public institutions and experts around the world.

The York Archaeological Trust (https://www.yorkarchaeologicaltrust.co.uk) has been safeguarding heritage and making a difference to people's lives since 1972. The Trust is a self-funded educational charity which discovers and protects archaeology and built heritage and enables people to enjoy and benefit from this heritage in its home city of York, elsewhere in the UK and internationally.

The British Council

The British Council supports peace and prosperity by building connections, understanding and trust between people in the UK and countries worldwide.

We work directly with individuals to help them gain the skills, confidence and connections to transform their lives and shape a better world in partnership with the UK. We support them to build networks and explore creative ideas, to learn English, to get a high-quality education and to gain internationally recognised qualifications.

Copyright and DOI

This essay was commissioned by the British Council, edited by Inherit and authored by James Doeser.

Suggested citation: Doeser, J (2023) *Governance Principles for Inclusive Heritage*. British Council. Available online: doi.org/10.57884/7wxh-hv33

Contents

UN-Habitat Lebanon field team assessing buildings for cultural restoration projects in Beirut.

Front cover photograph © UN-Habitat

Introduction

The premise of this essay is that the UN-Habitat's New Urban Agenda (NUA) is widely unknown and poorly understood in the world of cultural heritage professionals, yet it provides the key principles for embedding cultural heritage in sustainable development.

This essay takes seriously the desire to achieve sustainable development for the benefit of the communities involved in projects sponsored by the British Council. It is designed to be useful to the British Council by finding commonalities and synergies between their work and the terms, concepts and debates that are occurring elsewhere at the global level.

A review of the documentation produced by UN-Habitat and other global governance institutions reveals a high level of potential synergy between contemporary discourse around sustainable development and recent trends in the governance of cultural heritage.

A deeper review of that documentation and a close reading of the British Council's principles and ways of working,[1] and of the NUA, suggests that a practical policy synergy of these two strands of work is possible via the following set of draft governance principles:

1. Undertake work at the invitation of a local partner;

2. Promote cultural rights;

3. Develop goals and processes that are built from informed and deliberate participation;

4. Maintain an agnostic definition of cultural heritage;

5. Establish and maintain transparent lines of accountability, both individually and institutionally;

6. Ensure power and resources are held as locally as possible;

7. Collect, analyse and publish data that is relevant to the agreed goals;

8. Leave no one and no place behind.

The adoption of these principles will have the following consequences for communities, practitioners, institutions and policymakers:

*   At the community level: greater, deeper and fairer community impacts from cultural heritage projects undertaken by the likes of the British Council;

*   At the individual practitioner/professional level and institutional level: a need to conduct business differently; to establish and implement new forms of corporate governance; to recruit people with different skills from those currently at their disposal; and to allocate resources to the establishment and maintenance of channels of communication and accountability;

*   At the policy/decision-maker level: a truly inclusive and participatory approach to cultural heritage would mean a radically different way of doing business. It would probably mean doing less but doing it better.

Context

The British Council's Conceptualisation of Cultural Heritage and Inclusive Growth

This thematic study was initiated by sentiments expressed in the British Council's 2018 report on *Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth*:

> Inclusive growth means working with and for all levels of society in order to reconcile the divide between economic growth, and rising poverty and inequality. By working inclusively with communities and wider society, growth can be achieved that benefits a far wider cross-section of that community, and works to reduce the gap between rich and poor … investing in a people-centred approach to heritage, that benefits all levels of society, will bring social cohesion and economic growth to emerging economies and developing countries.[2]

These noble sentiments feel very familiar to observers of the global discourse on topics like development, urban governance and cultural rights, although the British Council's report does not make much reference to this wider context. However, since the report was published in 2018, the British Council has increasingly addressed this missed opportunity for synergies and integration through its programme of work around culture and sustainable development.

One way to integrate different programmes is through a common vocabulary, and a good starting point for building that vocabulary would be through a set of governance principles, an approach which has previously demonstrated a way to integrate culture into these broader agendas.[3]

The *Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth* report outlines eight 'principles and ways of working' which only go so far as a guide to policy and programme design. There remains the need for principles that would adequately provide a starting point for the governance of investment, projects, partnership brokerage, delivery, evaluation and the oversight of activity seeking to use cultural heritage to foster inclusive growth and sustainable development.

The need for governance principles arises from the desire to make growth 'inclusive', but the concept is not without its ethical complications (inclusive of whom, for whom, by whom? etc). Furthermore, these questions are necessary to prompt reflection on whether 'cultural heritage' (however defined) has any *a priori* legitimate role to play in its fulfilment.

> In its broadest sense, governance is concerned with holding the balance between economic and social goals and between individual and communal goals. The governance framework is there to encourage the efficient use of resources and equally to require accountability for the stewardship of those resources. The aim is to align as nearly as possible the interests of individuals, of cultural heritage, and of society.[4]

This essay takes seriously the desire to achieve inclusive growth for the benefit of the communities involved in projects sponsored by the British Council. However, the governance principles in this paper are completely agnostic about the value of identifying, preserving and engaging with the material or immaterial cultural heritage. Principles of this kind also help set some 'rules of the game' for processes which can be zero-sum: where the preservation of one person's material culture is at the exclusion of another's, where growth that seeks to be inclusive can come with downsides. In keeping with the broader global discourse, these principles are primarily concerned with the development of growth through the enhancement of people's capacities led by *their* goals and values, *their* protocols and *their* approaches to culture.

Global Conversations and Local Power

This essay is designed to be useful to the British Council by finding commonalities and synergies between its work and the terms, concepts and debates that are occurring at the global level. Specifically, it teases out synergies between the British Council's Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth programme (CH4IG) and the New Urban Agenda (NUA), which is where the crossover is both most apparent and has the greatest potential to expand the relevance and impact of the British Council's work.

The NUA is the primary unified framework for urban planning and development around the world and it places a premium on civic participation and inclusive growth. It 'represents a shared vision for a better and more sustainable future. If well-planned and well-managed, urbanisation can be a powerful tool for sustainable development for both developing and developed countries.'[5]

Before exploring the NUA in greater depth it is necessary to appreciate that it sits within a wider set of work delivered by a network of agencies. They are described in brief below.

UN-Habitat

In its *2020-2023 Strategic Plan*, UN-Habitat has set out its position with respect to the global discourse and agenda on sustainable urban development. The plan sets out that UN-Habitat is directly concerned with enhancing the strength and quality of inclusive urban governance, recognising that it 'can deliver sustainable development when it is environmentally friendly, participatory, accountable, transparent, effective, equitable and inclusive, both in law and in practice.'[6] On cultural heritage, the plan states that:

[The] protection and revitalisation of cultural heritage must be central to [efforts to establish inclusive governance arrangements that promote socially cohesive urban communities] and can also contribute to strengthening identities and providing a sense of belonging, integrating both host communities and newcomers, including migrants, refugees and

internally displaced persons. The New Urban Agenda identifies culture as a priority component of urban plans and strategies ...[7]

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

The UNDP works around the world 'helping to achieve the eradication of poverty, and the reduction of inequalities and exclusion' and helping 'countries to develop policies, leadership skills, partnering abilities, institutional capabilities and build resilience in order to sustain development results'.[8] It is deeply engaged with organising multilateral agencies, NGOs and nation states to achieve the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and oversees the funds, programmes, specialised agencies, departments and offices of the UN system that play a role in sustainable development. It has a set of six 'signature solutions':

- Keeping people out of poverty;

- Governance for peaceful, just and inclusive societies;

- Crisis prevention and increased resilience;

- Environment: nature-based solutions for development;

- Clean, affordable energy;

- Women's empowerment and gender equality.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)

UNESCO was founded at the same time as the UN itself – after the Second World War - and seeks to build peace through international cooperation in education, the sciences and culture. It oversees a number of global heritage governance instruments including the World Heritage Convention. Through these mechanisms it seeks to promote cultural heritage and the equal dignity of all cultures, thereby strengthening bonds among nations.

United Cities and Local Governments (UCLG)

UCLG is an umbrella international organisation for cities, local and regional governments, and municipal associations throughout the world. It represents the interests of local governments on the world stage.

UCLG ... is committed to representing, defending, and amplifying the voices of local and regional governments to leave no-one and no place behind. Together we are the sentinels of the hopes, dreams, and aspirations held by individuals in communities around the world – searching for a life in which the ideals of the SDGs are a lived reality.[9]

The UCLG has taken a lead in overseeing the dissemination and implementation of the NUA at the municipal level around the world.

Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Each of the agencies above is currently concerned with how to achieve Agenda 2030 and its 17 SDGs. Few of the SDGs directly touch upon the development of heritage policy and, because 'culture' wasn't granted specific or special status in the SDGs, agencies like UNESCO have scrambled to legitimate their work in terms that suit the 2030 Agenda. In doing so they often reference the NUA and the principles that inform it.[10]

The SDG that most concerns this essay is SDG11: 'Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable', and specifically

target 11.4: 'Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage'.[11]

The location of cultural heritage inside SDG11 has two important ramifications for this essay:

- It positions cultural heritage as an urban issue;

- Cultural heritage needs to speak in ways that align with the SDG (and NUA) principles of participation and inclusion.

In recent years it has become increasingly apparent that all of the SDGs are interlinked and need to be addressed in an integrated manner. Since 2017, the cascading of the SDGs through national and municipal policy (what is called 'localisation' in the language of these agencies) has led to the establishment of a Global Taskforce, which convenes the World Assembly of Local and Regional Governments, the joint voice of local and regional leaders from around the world. To give a sense of the rich potential of joining the agendas captured in this essay, the Outcome Document,[12] from the assembly in Durban in 2019, uses language that fits perfectly with the British Council's Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth programme.

It is worth noting that the SDGs and NUA build upon a tradition of global governance that is becoming increasingly participatory. Before the NUA was the primary framework for discussing the governance of cities and urban development, UNDP had always prized 'decentralised governance' as a benchmark for good practice – placing power and decisions as closely as possible in the hands of those who would be affected.[13]

About the New Urban Agenda

The NUA was adopted at the UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (more commonly known as 'Habitat III') in Quito, Ecuador, in October 2016. It was endorsed by the

UN General Assembly in December 2016, and was accompanied by an explanatory positioning statement '*The Quito Declaration'.*

5.   http://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda/

6.   UN-Habitat, 2020, p 58

7.   UN-Habitat, 2020, p 7

8.   https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/about-us.html

9.   https://www.uclg.org/en/organisation/about

10. Culture 2030 Goal Campaign, 2019

11. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/cities/

12. https://www.global-taskforce.org/sites/default/files/2019-11/WALRG%20Outcome%20Document%20Durban%202019%20November%20full%202019_0.pdf

13. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/DLGUD_PN_English.pdf

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon attends the opening of the Second World Assembly of Local and Regional Governments. Participants include over 400 Mayors, representatives of local authorities and urban partner organisations in Quito, Ecuador, 2016.

Photograph © UN-Habitat

The three overarching principles of the NUA are:

- Inclusivity: 'leave no one behind';

- Economic sustainability: 'ensure sustainable and inclusive urban economies'; and

- Environmental sustainability: 'ensure environmental sustainability'.

It commits signatories to 'readdress the way we plan, finance, develop, govern and manage cities and human settlements, recognising sustainable urban and territorial development as essential to the achievement of sustainable development and prosperity for all.'[14]

The presence of culture and heritage in the NUA is framed specifically around its potential to be a catalyst for empowerment and inclusion, as well as recognising that the past holds lessons for our sustainable future:

... culture and cultural diversity are sources of enrichment for humankind and provide an important contribution to the sustainable development of cities, human settlements and citizens, empowering them to play an active and unique role in development initiatives ... culture should be taken into account in the promotion and implementation of new sustainable consumption and production patterns that contribute to the responsible use of resources and address the adverse impact of climate change.[15]

The declaration goes on to recognise the need to treat cultural heritage in a sustainable way, and that it can be subject to exploitation and erasure in the usual (sometimes destructive) processes of urban development:

We commit ourselves to the sustainable leveraging of natural and cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, in cities and human settlements, as appropriate, through integrated urban and territorial policies and adequate investments at the national, subnational and local levels, to safeguard and promote cultural infrastructures and sites, museums, indigenous cultures and languages, as well as traditional knowledge and the arts, highlighting the role that these play in rehabilitating and revitalising urban areas and in strengthening social participation and the exercise of citizenship.[16]

It recognises that cultural heritage is something that helps make places distinct from each other, and that it can provide the raw materials for industry and enterprise that continue to make places special:

We commit ourselves to developing vibrant, sustainable and inclusive urban economies, building on endogenous potential, competitive advantages, cultural heritage and local resources, as well as resource-efficient and resilient infrastructure, promoting sustainable and inclusive industrial development and sustainable consumption and production patterns and fostering an enabling environment for businesses and innovation, as well as livelihoods.[17]

It acknowledges that culture needs protecting and that until now it has been neglected in the pursuit of economic growth, demographic expansion and extractive industries:

We will include culture as a priority component of urban plans and strategies in the adoption of planning instruments ... that safeguard a diverse range of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and landscapes, and will protect them from potential disruptive impacts of urban development.[18]

Finally, it acknowledges that cultural heritage is a living thing which needs integrating with other aspects of community development, providing renewal and nourishment rather than stasis, and that it might be an important ingredient in making real the participation of certain communities in other civic processes:

We will support the leveraging of cultural heritage for sustainable urban development and recognize its role in stimulating participation and responsibility. We will promote innovative and sustainable use of architectural monuments and sites, with the intention of value creation, through respectful restoration and adaptation. We will engage indigenous peoples and local communities in the promotion and dissemination of knowledge of tangible and intangible cultural heritage and protection of traditional expressions and languages, including through the use of new technologies and techniques.[19]

The World Urban Forum (WUF) has been the mechanism by which the NUA has been developed and implemented since its launch. In February 2020, the tenth WUF met in Abu Dhabi and the place of cultural heritage in urban development was a major topic of debate, highlighting the momentum that had built up behind this issue and forcing a recognition of the need to reconcile conservation and preservation with the forces of development and growth. It concluded that the NUA provided an entirely suitable mechanism for the resolution of these tensions. The final declaration from the meeting included the following statement:

... culture is an integral part of the solution to the challenges of urbanisation and achieving the New Urban Agenda. The urban environment, in turn, has an influence on culture. Culture is a core component of local identity including heritage, creativity and diversity and urbanisation need to be planned, designed and managed to enhance this. Culture is considered by some constituencies as the fourth pillar of sustainable development and must be a stronger strand of global solidarity. Culture and heritage are essential in the context of peoples' empowerment as well as their universal access to services, and ownership of regeneration and social cohesion strategies. Urban heritage— both cultural and natural—is an asset and enables sustainable urban development.

14.   Article 15a, UN-Habitat, 2016

15.   Article 10, UN-Habitat, 2016

16.   Article 38, UN-Habitat, 2016

17.   Article 45, UN-Habitat, 2016

18.   Article 124, UN-Habitat, 2016

19.   Article 125, UN-Habitat, 2016

Tree planting ceremony at the World Urban Forum 10 in Abu Dhabi.

Photograph © UN-Habitat

Revitalising cities whilst respecting urban heritage allows us to celebrate the past while embracing a sustainable future. It limits the negative impacts of city sprawl while also reducing waste, infrastructure needs and transportation costs. Strategic integrated urban planning provides the tools to ensure the integration of urban heritage, culture, local economic needs, environmental considerations, biodiversity, low carbon development and climate resilience to ensure the creation of sustainable, prosperous, liveable communities. Attention to the urban rural continuum and to nature in cities is essential. Participatory community engagement and innovation are key means to achieve this.[20]

Following this, progress in the adoption and implementation of the NUA stalled, not least because of the COVID-19 pandemic and associated

suspension of industrial activity and travel. Nonetheless, the NUA still provides the most effective framework for addressing systemic challenges in ways that take account of the fullest range of stakeholders in any city.

A 2022 high-level meeting at the UN[21] has reaffirmed the theoretical strengths of the NUA but also highlighted its practical limitations – including the inability of local municipal governments to finance the reforms needed to fulfil the agenda when the resources and power within cities remain disproportionately with developers and their financial backers and beneficiaries.

A report to support this high level meeting states the importance of culture and heritage and acknowledges that the potential for gaining insights into the role of culture in sustainable

urbanisation through implementation of the NUA but also that, to date, there had been 'limited consideration of culture'[22] in the implementation process, although this is beginning to shift.

In the European Union, the Urban Agenda for the EU (established in May 2016) helped to instigate a 28-city culture and cultural heritage partnership (which met between 2019 and 2021). The recommendations to the EU which have come out of this partnership align perfectly with an integrated approach to heritage and the NUA.

Parts of the global cultural sector are also increasingly in step with the core elements of the NUA: sometimes through intention; other times through coincidence. This convergence has resulted in tangible efforts such as Heritopolis[23] – an informal gathering of experts who see symbiosis in the NUA and emergent best practice in sustainable approaches to managing cultural

A Place for Cultural Heritage

There are primarily two reasons to focus on the potential for synergies between the role of heritage in the British Council's work and the NUA:

• Because heritage policy is not shaped by heritage professionals. The most impactful policy decisions to affect the material condition of cultural heritage (and how people engage with it) come not from within the narrow disciplinary or policy worlds of cultural heritage, but are influenced by greater concerns such as infrastructure (transport, housing etc), land management (biodiversity, food security etc) and economic development (tourism, labour etc);

• Because heritage policy is set at a local level. The geographical resolution at which the most impactful policy decisions affecting cultural heritage occur is at a regional, local or municipal level rather than at a national or federal level.

heritage. The declarative statements discussed above – the *Quito Declaration* and those emanating from the NUA and the WUF – are aligned with the spirit of contemporary cultural heritage thinking and therefore provide no barrier to integrating the two discourses.

The following concepts can be derived from the NUA and WUF to inform the draft governance principles:

• Sustainable consumption and production;

• Protection of cultural heritage from harm;

• Development processes that are participatory.

These factors thrust the British Council's work beyond the confines of heritage and play into the work of the many international agencies and advocates who, like their colleagues in the broader cultural and creative sectors, have been eager to demonstrate how they can be part of the collective mission to achieve the SDGs.[24]

There is a great deal of experience and expertise in the cultural heritage sector (especially those working globally) which already has policies and frameworks that are completely in sync with the aims and ethics of the NUA. A concept note produced by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) in response to the NUA, is one of many documents that highlight how SDG target 11.4 sits comfortably within the emerging practice derived from the Burra Charter, the Paris Declaration, the Valletta Convention, the Faro Convention and other overarching multilateral frameworks for the management of cultural heritage.[25]

20. https://www.urbanagendaplatform.org/sites/default/files/2021-01/WUF%2010%20final%20declared%20actions%20-%20FINAL.pdf
21. https://www.un.org/pga/76/high-level-meeting-on-the-implementation-of-the-new-urban-agenda/
22. https://www.globalfuturecities.org/sites/default/files/2022-02/NUA%20Implementation_Europe%20single%20word%20version.pdf
23. http://heritopolis.org/
24. See the statements from ICCROM and others: https://www.iccrom.org/iccrom%E2%80%99s-commitment-sustainable-development-goals
25. See https://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/, https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/GA2011_Declaration_de_Paris_EN_20120109.pdf, https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/valletta-convention and https://www.coe.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/faro-convention

Sustainable community development through the use of heritage, whether through tourism, attracting inward investment or developing/reviving craft industries, has been a concern of UNESCO[26] and world heritage professionals throughout the 2010s[27] and sometimes those pieces of work address the topic of governance. A concern with 'people-centred' approaches goes even further back and calls for growth in historic districts (for example) to take an interdisciplinary, democratic path.[28]

UNESCO has already adopted a commitment to sustainable development within its World Heritage Convention. In 2015, at its 39th session in Bonn, Germany, UNESCO adopted a policy that the World Heritage Convention should include a commitment to sustainable development – one component of which is this statement:

World Heritage properties, as cultural and natural heritage in general, offer great potential to alleviate poverty and enhance sustainable livelihoods of local communities, including those of marginalised populations. Recognising that poverty eradication is one of the greatest challenges facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, the Convention should therefore contribute to promoting sustainable forms of inclusive and equitable economic growth, productive and decent employment and income-generating activities for all, while fully respecting the [Outstanding Universal Value] of World Heritage properties.[29]

This integration of sustainable development into the World Heritage Convention coincided with the adoption of the SDGs and the early phase of their implementation in the global development sector, although the language is different the concepts are completely aligned.

ICOMOS also has relevant policies for an integration with the NUA. The ICOMOS Valletta Principles for the Safeguarding and Management of Historic Cities, Towns and Urban Areas (adopted by the 17th ICOMOS General Assembly on 28 November 2011), have a section dedicated to governance:

Good governance makes provision for organizing broad orchestration amongst all stakeholders: elected authorities, municipal services, public administrations, experts, professional organisations, voluntary bodies, universities, residents, etc. This is essential for the successful safeguarding, rehabilitation and sustainable development of historic towns and urban areas. Participation by the residents can be facilitated through distributing information, awareness raising and training. The traditional systems of urban governance should examine all aspects of cultural and social diversity, so as to establish new democratic institutions to suit the new reality. Procedures for urban planning and safeguarding historic cities must provide sufficient information and time for residents to give fully informed responses. Safeguarding needs to be encouraged and financial measures put in place, in order to facilitate partnerships with players from the private sector in the conservation and restoration of the built environment.[30]

From the above, the following concepts can be derived to inform the draft governance principles:

• Equitable economic benefits;

• A broad range of stakeholders involved;

• Accountability through information sharing.

This essay is not the first to recognise the potential synergy of contemporary discourse around sustainable development and recent developments in the governance of cultural heritage. New work by Petti et al[31] has found coherence to the policy discourse around heritage and the SDG vocabulary, specifically in target 11.4. These authors recognise that there is a political and governance dimension to the way that people valorise heritage, which needs mechanisms that are inclusive. The specific challenge they identify is:

To facilitate discussions and understanding of the different valuing processes at play in heritage conservation toward the development of methodological approaches for the SDG

indicators, thus bringing new considerations to the discussions about what to conserve, how to conserve it, where to set priorities and how to handle conflicting interests.[32]

In order to systematically highlight the potential for the integration of these parallel discourses, this thematic study looks at the output from the main global governance entities and derives a simple set of draft governance principles for use by the British Council and others in their CH4IG work.

26. eg UNESCO, 2018

27. eg Albert et al, 2012

28. UNESCO et al, 2008

29. http://whc.unesco.org/en/sustainabledevelopment/

30. https://www.icomos.org/valletta-principles-english-french/

31. Petti et al, 2020

32. Petti et al, 2020, p 19

Analysis

This essay is based upon a literature review of the output of the UN and other multilateral international agencies concerned with governance of place and culture. In analysing this material, the following questions were asked:

- What does it say about governance?

- What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

- What does it say about cultural heritage and sustainable development?

UN-Habitat/UNESCO, 2008, Best Practices on Social Sustainability in Historic Districts

Although the NUA was devised and launched at Habitat III, there had been work underway for years to refine the approach to sustainable growth and participatory forms of governance and decision-making. This compendium of best practices comes from the 2004 UN-Habitat World Urban Forum II held in Barcelona, during which some best and worst practices were shared for 'enhancing social sustainability in urban revitalisation projects in historical districts'.

What does it say about governance?

In thinking about common challenges and constraints from all 14 case studies, the report authors state that 'policy and legal frameworks to guide conservation are lacking in many places but some successful restoration projects have led to formulation of relevant national policy guidelines.'[33] It is telling that many case studies talk about the practical work and its impact – its beneficiaries and outcomes – but do not delve deep into the most fundamental underlying motivations or the sources of their legitimacy. It is these aspects that governance structures and governance principles are designed to reveal, interrogate and resolve.

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles for cultural heritage and inclusive growth?

Using the city of Quito as a case study, the report draws out the idea that:

The concept of sustainability must go beyond preservation. The rehabilitation of historic centres should not focus on the preservation of monuments. The primary goal of renewing these centres should be to maintain their habitability, accessibility and diversity intended to guarantee living, working and leisure conditions that serve to encourage the stability of its residents. At the same time the effort must encourage the exchange of services, business and information, preserving their architectural and symbolic qualities and diversity of the centres, that is the elements that give the city its historic value and identity.[34]

Concepts from UN-Habitat/UNESCO to inform the draft governance principles:

- Maintaining livability, accessibility and diversity;

- Keeping businesses to sustain character.

View over Beirut in Lebanon. UN-Habitat has had a country office in Lebanon since 2006, which responds to emerging issues through reconstructing housing, shelter provision, upgrading of basic services, and laying the foundation for long term sustainable solutions (https://unhabitat.org/lebanon-projects).

Photograph © UN-Habitat

UNDP, 2016, Sustainable Urbanisation Strategy

What does it say about cultural heritage and sustainable development?

The idea that cultural heritage and creativity are linked to local places and communities is emulated in SDG 11 to 'make cities and human settlements inclusive safe, resilient, and sustainable', and in the New Urban Agenda, adopted in October 2016. They both play an enabling role in achieving urban sustainability and facilitating a closer alliance between the goals of urban development projects. The emphasis on context-based solutions and local resources also promotes sustainable development.[35]

What does it say about governance?

UNDP's urban governance approach is defined by a paradigm shift from urban public administration to urban democratic and participatory governance, with a focus on participation, inclusion, transparency and accountability, rule of law, subsidiarity, equity and risk management … The Integrated Framework for Local Governance and Local Development developed by UNDP, UN Capital Development Fund and UN Volunteer recognizes cities as economic, social, political, ecological and cultural constructs that evolve over time. For example, the local economic development approach is focused on the key

33. UN-Habitat/UNESCO, 2008, p 6

34. UN-Habitat/UNESCO, 2008, p 83

35. UNDP, 2016, p 30

36. UNDP, 2016, pp 34-35

role of subnational authorities and actors in development and promotes dialogue and consensus-building platforms where the public and private sectors, civil society, academic and research institutions are actively engaged in planning and using local resources in a sustainable manner. The six interlinked elements of the approach are:

- Effective multilevel governance for territorial development

- Equitable, effective and sustainable delivery of goods and services

- Inclusive decision-making processes involving women and men

- Secure, stable and peaceful environment for development where rule of law prevails

- The sustainable use and management of natural resources

- Increased economic opportunities and jobs for women and men

- Design of resilient, low-carbon economic activities to reduce emissions and adverse effects of climate change.[36]

Concepts from UNDP to inform the draft governance principles:

- Participation

- Inclusion

- Transparency and accountability

- Rule of law

- Subsidiarity

- Equity

- Risk management

UNESCO, 2019, Culture 2030 Indicators

This document builds on the UNESCO Culture for Development Indicators (devised in 2014), which included an indicator for 'civil society participation in cultural governance' – the language of these indicators chimes perfectly with the spirit and detail of the NUA.

What does it say about cultural heritage and sustainable development?

'Prosperity and livelihood through culture and heritage' is a 'thematic dimension' in this document, which:

Provides a framework for assessing the contribution of culture in driving and enabling more inclusive and sustainable economies, in line with the 'prosperity' pillar of the SDGs, by generating income and employment, as well as stimulating revenue through cultural goods, services, and enterprises. The seven proposed indicators within Dimension 2 are expected to assess the contribution of culture to key aspects of the economy (GDP, trade, employment,

businesses, household expenditure). As the institutional structures and frameworks to govern culture sector activities in each country are different and play an important role in culture's contribution to inclusive economic development, an indicator on governance of culture is also included in this dimension. This indicator provides evidence of the governance structures in place to support a thriving role for culture in local and national economic development and livelihood generation.[37]

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

Indicator 2 is 'sustainable management of heritage' which includes measures such as the existence of management plans, especially those which further gender equality and managed tourism (in which the benefits are shared and the cultural rights of people respected). It also mentions the existence of 'specific measures to involve civil society and/

or private sector in heritage protection, safeguarding and transmission.'[38]

Indicator 12 is 'governance of culture', including a whole subsection on 'broadening participation in cultural governance' and is comprised of:

- Evidence of policies to promote a gender-balanced contribution and participation;

- Existence of participation in policy formation by: culture sector professionals, local communities, and disadvantaged groups;

- Evidence that a number of cultural responsibilities are decentralized to regional/provincial/local/municipal authorities, which have a budget for this area (locally allocated or decentralised);

- Evidence of programmes/measures to advocate and raise public awareness on

culture's contribution to well-being and sustainable development;

- Evidence for the use of Destination Management Organisation(s) to manage the impact of tourism on cultural values;

- Delivered a cooperation programme with at least one country (cultural policy design and implementation, cultural micro and SME development, artists and creation) in the last three years.[39]

Indicator 22 is 'participatory processes', which begins with a checklist on 'participation in heritage management and governance systems':

- Evidence of active participation of communities, groups and individuals in cultural policies and the definition of administrative measures integrating heritage (both tangible and intangible) and

---

37. UNESCO, 2019, pp 26-27

38. UNESCO, 2019, p 40

39. UNESCO, 2019, p 66

its safeguarding;

- Evidence of community involvement during the decision-making process of identifying and registering heritage elements (tangible);

- Evidence of community-led processes during inventorying of intangible heritage elements;

- Number of heritage properties with a Management Plan including a formalised framework for community participation;

- Number of training programmes targeted at communities, groups and individuals in the last year;

- Evidence of policies and measures that support diversity of the media by encouraging community programming for marginalised groups (indigenous peoples, migrants and refugees, etc.);

- Evidence that local communities undertake scientific, technical and cultural studies on

ICH (number of communities which actually do monitoring and research and examples of their work);

- Specific measures to promote the participation of minorities and/or indigenous groups in cultural life;

- Policies and measures promoting the diversity of cultural expressions elaborated in consultation with CSOs during the last 5 years;

- Actual expenditure by Civil Society Organisations to promote the diversity of cultural expressions (Amount of actual expenditure).[40]

Concepts from UNESCO to inform the draft governance principles:

- Gender-balanced outcomes;

- Respecting cultural rights;

- Active, informed and deliberative participation.

ICOMOS, 2016, Cultural Heritage, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and the New Urban Agenda

What does it say about cultural heritage and sustainable development?

We hold that urban development that integrates cultural heritage is more sustainable, more diverse, and more inclusive. Such approaches help create green economies that enhance sustainability; provide opportunities for employment that help in poverty alleviation. Furthermore, re-use and restoration of the Heritage contribute to promote circular processes that are a key characteristic of sustainable development, and of the next 'regenerative' urban economy that initiates the transition towards the de-carbonization of local economies. And finally, heritage conservation integrated with sustainable urban development has the potential to unite people in participatory processes and to further goals of social

cohesion and peace.[41]

… cultural heritage and particularly historic cities and settlements are a reference model for sustainable development. Historic cities demonstrate mixed uses, human scale, density and vibrancy. By their adaptation economically, environmentally and socially they also demonstrate resilience. In the evolution of historic cities, we see the lessons of adaptive reuse, which saves energy and maintains a sense of place. We also see the use of existing infrastructure which reduces the demand that sprawling urbanization of historic settlements places on budgets for new infrastructure.[42]

Concepts from ICOMOS to inform the draft governance principles:

- Adaptive re-use where possible;

- Learning from historic places and societies.

Shipley & Kovacs, 2008, Good Governance Principles for the Cultural Heritage Sector: Lessons from International Experience

Although this paper predates the NUA by eight years, it identifies five broad principles for good governance in the cultural heritage sector.

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

Legitimacy and voice:

- The existence of a supportive democratic and human rights context refers to the presence of democratic institutions based on a viable multi-party system, human rights, promotion of tolerance, respect for existing rights, and the absence of discrimination based on gender, race, colour, ethnicity or religion;

- An appropriate degree of decentralisation in decision-making necessitates that any devolution is through local bodies accountable to local people and that these bodies have the capacity to perform their functions;

- Collaborative management in decision-making requires the involvement of representatives of all affected parties;

- Citizen participation at all levels requires local levels of involvement and equal gender participation;

- The existence of civil society groups and an independent media is of importance in balancing the exercise of powers granted to political leaders and managers;

- High levels of trust require confidence amongst all stakeholders.

Direction:

- Consistency with international direction requires compliance with international

conventions and other guidance documents;

- The existence of legislative direction requires regulations that set out clear objectives, establish clear authority, provide viable administration, include citizen-participation and are available in written form;

- The existence of system-wide plans entails the presence of quantified objectives for management, established priorities for planning periods and citizen participation in their implementation;

- The existence of management plans requires that goals have formal approval by appropriate authorities, clear objectives consistent with legislation and measurable results within given time frames. The goals must also be reviewed and updated on a regular cycle and be implemented through annual work plans;

- Demonstration of effective leadership requires that politicians and managers provide consistent vision for the development of subject sites, mobilise support and provide resources for implementation.

Performance:

- Cost effectiveness refers to efficiency in the achievement of objectives;

- Capacity refers to the ability of the responsible agency to undertake required functions. It also refers to policy capacity and the adequacy and security of funding;

- Coordination is the ability to synchronise the efforts of players;

- Performance information access to the public requires provision of sufficient information for the public to assess progress;

---

40. UNESCO, 2019, pp 92-93

41. ICOMOS, 2016, p 10

42. ICOMOS, 2016, p 18

- Responsiveness refers to an agency's ability and inclination to deal with complaints and public criticism;

- Monitoring and evaluation is the capacity to undertake regular and comprehensive reviews of progress toward goals and to respond to findings;

- Adaptive management is the ability to learn and adjust management based on experience;

- Risk management is the capacity to identify key potential problems and to prepare for them.

Accountability:

- Clarity refers to unequivocal assignment of responsibilities and authority;

- Coherence and breadth is the degree to which wider concepts of responsibility to the global community, future generations and the environment are integrated with concepts of political accountability;

- The role of political leaders is the appropriateness of responsibilities assigned to elected representatives as opposed to non-elected officials. It also refers to the absence of corruption;

- Public institutions of accountability means open access to information and the capacity to analyse and report;

- Civil society and the media refers to the effectiveness of non-governmental bodies and the press in mobilising demand for accountability;

- Transparency is the capacity of citizens, civil society and the media to access relevant information.

Fairness:

- Existence of a supportive judicial context; a

legal system characterised by respect for the rule of law. The rule of law encompasses an independent judiciary, equality before the law, the requirement for government to base its actions on well-defined legal authorities and the right of citizens to seek legal remedies against the government and against their fellow citizens;

- Fair, impartial and effective enforcement of rules includes the transparency of the rules themselves, the absence of corruption among public officials and the right of appeal for those charged with transgressions;

- Fairness in the process for establishing new conservation sites includes respect for the rights, uses and traditional knowledge of local peoples, an assessment of other options for the use of the area, public participation in the process and appropriate balance among protected site objectives;

- Fairness in the management of conservation sites includes achieving a favourable balance of costs and benefits to local peoples; mechanisms for sharing or devolving management decision-making with local peoples; equitable human resource management practices for staff; and processes for recognising and dealing with past injustices resulting from the establishment of conservation sites.

Concepts to inform the draft governance principles:

- Legitimacy and voice

- Direction

- Performance

- Accountability

- Fairness

European Commission, 2018, Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage.

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

Participatory governance of cultural heritage seeks the active involvement of relevant stakeholders in the framework of public action – i.e. public authorities and bodies, private actors, civil society organisations, NGOs, the volunteering sector and interested people – in decision-making, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of cultural heritage policies and programmes to increase accountability and transparency of public resource investments as well as to build public trust in policy decisions.[43]

This report sets the cultural heritage discussion in the context of various heritage treaties but not broader governance discourse such as that from UNDP or UN-Habitat. The most useful parts, in devising a set of governance principles, are the process barriers that were experienced by the projects highlighted by member states as best practices of participatory governance:

For participatory governance to be successful it is vital to identify the necessary participants and then to balance the different stakeholders involved – politicians/decision-makers, professionals, citizens, volunteers, organisations, private actors, minorities, etc. A part of this is creating transparency for all parts of the project and explaining clearly:

i. What the actual goal is

ii. Why the project was initiated

iii. Who has the decision-making power at each step in the process.[44]

The report goes on to suggest the need for:

- Sharing of expectations of different parties;

- Developing trust and respect between experts and non-experts;

- Cultivating a willingness to participate;

- Using language which is appropriate and accessible.[45]

Also useful are the following prompts:

Questions to be considered before deciding to begin a process of participatory governance of cultural heritage include:

1. Are the organisations and the potentially involved professional(s) supportive and ready to change?

2. Have all relevant stakeholders, including civil society, formally indicated their expectations on the topic (letters, requests for meetings, organisation of public meetings, etc.)?

3. Do all the potential participants show a positive attitude to cooperation?

4. Is the initial understanding of the scope and the process the same for all participants?

5. Are the professionals open to embracing input from other participants and is it accepted by the other participants that professional expertise and knowledge might be required?

6. Do all the participants agree on the primary aim of the process? [46]

The report concludes that people should:

… always keep in mind that there is no participatory governance of culture model that provides a one-size-fits-all solution to modernise the governance framework, policy formation and management of cultural heritage. Each situation has certain characteristics that must be weighed carefully before deciding on the model and level of participatory governance appropriate for a specific project or initiative.[47]

---

43. European Commission, 2018, p 23
44. European Commission, 2018, p 40
45. European Commission, 2018, p 41
46. European Commission, 2018, p 48
47. European Commission, 2018, p 59

Concepts from the European Commission to inform the draft governance principles:

- Participation through active involvement;

- Clarity of goals;

- Avoidance of one-size-fits-all approaches.

Voices of Culture, 2015, Brainstorming Report: Participatory Governance in Cultural Heritage

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

This report (referenced in the OMC report above) makes the following observations:

Pre-Conditions for Participatory Governance in Cultural Heritage:

- Trust and respect between rulers, professionals, and citizens;

- A democratic starting point;

- Willingness to listen to each other and to act together in order to change things for allowing true participation;

- Ethics must guide participation;

- Respect for heritage;

- Need for more democratic storytelling;

- Need to identify and get to know the different community groups in order to establish better participation mechanisms;

- Need to generate an emotional link with, and interest in, culture;

- Organised civil society structures;

- Legal framework and long-term policy mechanisms which allow and encourage participatory governance in cultural heritage;

- Transparency and information - more available information ex post and ex ante;

- Structures and formats that support participation;

- Education and training for politicians, managers, and communities;

- Building capacity for advocacy work on these issues;

- Common understanding of the participatory process;

- Common understanding of participatory governance;

- Build and rebuild (where broken) engagement leading to active participation.[48]

The report goes on to say that participatory governance is about shared governance plus shared responsibility, which requires:

- Trust;

- Ethics and respect;

- Political will (no tokenism);

- Professional and social will;

- A legal framework;

- Transparency and access to information;

- Education/training for all the actors involved;

- Funds for promoting true participation.[49]

Concepts to inform the draft governance principles:

- Accountability of individuals and systems;

- Transparency of individuals and systems;

- Allocation of resources to support governance.

Ferguson, 2018, Governance for Sustainable Heritage Areas.

What does it imply needs to be in a draft set of governance principles?

Ferguson collates the following good governance principles from literature which are predominantly concerned with managing natural resources in a sustainable way:

UNDP (1997)	van Doeveren (2001)	Graham et al. (2003)	Lockwood (2010)	Lockwood et al. (2010)	IUCN (2013)	Prager et al. (2015)
participation	participation		inclusiveness	inclusiveness		participation
rule of law	rule of law					
transparency	openness & transparency		transparency	transparency		transparency
responsiveness		performance	performance outcomes		performance	
consensus orientation						conflict management
equity		fairness	fairness	fairness	fairness & rights	
effectiveness & efficiency	effectiveness & efficiency			capability		
accountability	accountability	accountability	accountability	accountability	accountability	
strategic vision		direction			direction	
		legitimacy & voice	legitimacy	legitimacy	legitimacy & voice	legitimacy
			resilience	adaptability		
			connectivity			communication
				integration		vertical & horizontal integration
						learning mechanisms

Concepts to inform the draft governance principles:

- Participation and inclusiveness

- Transparency

- Equity and fairness

- Accountability

- Legitimacy

48. https://www.voicesofculture.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2.Brainstorming_Report_Participatory_Governance.pdf

49. https://www.voicesofculture.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/2.Brainstorming_Report_Participatory_Governance.pdf

Conclusions and recommendations

The analysis of the documents above, and a close reading of the British Council's Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth 'principles and ways of working' and of the NUA, suggest the following draft governance principles could be deployed to better integrate the work undertaken by the British Council and others with broader global conversations around sustainable development.

1. Undertake work at the invitation of a local partner

This would mean that regardless of the mission or intent of a multilateral cultural organisation, they would not proactively arrange work in a country but would instead wait and listen and then they would deliberate. Planning, strategy and budget would be devolved to the local partner and not held within the outside agency.

2. Promote cultural rights

There already exists a suite of legislative and ethical codes determining the furtherance of cultural rights. These can sometimes come into conflict with the desires of NGOs and multilateral agencies who may wish to simply 'get stuff done' in order to satisfy their own goals. These codes can also come into conflict with the social or cultural norms of local communities.

3. Develop goals and processes that are built from informed and deliberative participation

It may be that local communities are lacking in the knowledge or resources to make good decisions about how to access resources and power, or how to shape and structure their activity to maximum effect. In such instances the intervening or sponsoring agency should be equipping local

communities to arrive at their own objectives with the support of others, rather than goals being set remotely or a priori by an outside agency who may be keen to sponsor activity locally.

4. Maintain an agnostic definition of cultural heritage

As a UK-based organisation, built out of a particular cultural and historical moment, the British Council's work is inevitably informed by anglocentric definitions of cultural heritage. Other agencies elsewhere in the world will have their own preconceived ideas. The notion of heritage itself may be contested within and between local communities. Outside agencies need to remain agnostic on what material or immaterial culture is valorised and instead be pragmatic in responding to local definitions and local values.

5. Establish and maintain transparent lines of accountability, individually and institutionally

Although resources and power should be deliberately devolved to the most local level possible, this must also come with a commitment to accountability. Any intervention, or the spending of any resource, needs to be accompanied by a clear and transparent commitment that states in whose interests the parts of a project are acting and how they intend to keep themselves to those commitments. This accountability chain cannot be shrouded in opaque bureaucracy or jargon.

6. Ensure power and resources are held as locally as possible

Every effort must be made to devolve and localise power and resources. This principle overrides the instinct of many organisations to hoard resources internally, to have internally mandated account

holders retain control of budgets or to direct resources in ways that serve the interests of the commissioning or instigating outside agency.

7. Collect, analyse and publish data that is relevant to the agreed goals

This principle serves the full functioning of the other principles. The goals and budget are to be determined by local partners but the maintenance of trust and transparency must run through all partners, regardless of the norms or constraints of local partners. The objective of this principle is to serve good governance and its universally beneficial impacts.

8. Leave no one and no place behind

All communities are unequal in one way or another and the goal of inclusive growth is to ameliorate those inequities. By blindly following the other governance principles in this set, it may be that local elites are emboldened or further empowered. A flattening of inequities should be a constant aim of the commissioning or instigating agency.

These eight principles have the following consequences for communities, practitioners, institutions and policymakers:

Community Level

It should be the case that the implementation of any governance principles derived from the NUA would lead to greater, deeper and fairer community impacts from cultural heritage projects undertaken by the likes of the British Council. For an illustration of the kind of benefits which are likely to accrue, see those illustrated in the UCLG/Culture21 best practice case studies.[50]

Individual Practitioner/Professional Level and Institutional Level

The adoption of these principles will mean that some individual practitioners and the institutions for which they work (or run) will need to conduct

their business differently. They will be required to establish and implement new forms of corporate governance. They may have to recruit people with different skills from those currently at their disposal. Some will need to cease operating altogether. Resources will need to be allocated to the establishment and maintenance of channels of communication and accountability which are commensurate to the programme of activity they desire to undertake. This resource will increase from the current levels.

Policy/Decision-maker Level

For organisations like the British Council, a truly inclusive and participatory approach to cultural heritage would mean a radically different way of doing business. It would probably mean doing less but doing it better. It would reorient the narrative and advocacy functions of the organisation away from telling a story that justifies its activities and impacts, and instead waits to be responsive to the stated impacts from the communities in which it is operating, at their invitation and in their modes of communication.

---

50. Of particular relevance are Caguas, Esch, Izmir and Seonguk: http://obs.agenda21culture.net/index.php/en/nueva-grid

References

Albert, M, Richon, M, José Viñals, M & Witcomb, A eds., *Community Development through World Heritage*, UNESCO, 2012

Culture 2030 Goal Campaign, *Culture in the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda*, UN SDG Summit, 2019

Doeser, J, & Marazuela Kim, A, *Governance Models of Cultural Districts*, Global Cultural Districts Network, 2018

European Commission, *Participatory Governance of Cultural Heritage. Report of the OMC (Open Method of Coordination) working group of Member States' experts – Study*, European Commission, 2018

Ferguson, L, *Governance for Sustainable Heritage Areas. Sustainable Heritage Areas: Partnerships for Ecotourism*, European Union, 2018

Gunningham, N, 'The New Collaborative Environmental Governance: The Localisation of Regulation', *Journal of Law and Society*, 36:1, 2009

ICOMOS, *Cultural Heritage, the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and the New Urban Agenda*, ICOMOS, 2016

Lewis, R with Arthurs, K, Berker, M, Bishop, A, Louis, T, Slack, J, Stenning, S, Thomas, H & Thomas, I, *Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth*, British Council, 2018

Petti, L, Trillo, C & Makore, B N, 'Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development Targets: A Possible Harmonisation? Insights from the European Perspective', *Sustainability*, 12, 2020

Shipley, R & Kovacs, J F, 'Good governance principles for the cultural heritage sector: lessons from international experience', *Corporate Governance*, 8:2, 2008

Singh, J P, *Culture and International Development: Toward an Interdisciplinary Methodology*, British Council, 2019

Singh, J P, *The Cultural Turn in International Development: Participatory Infrastructures and Value in the Arts*, British Council, 2020

UNDP, *Sustainable Urbanisation Strategy,* UNDP, 2016

UNESCO, *Historic Districts for All*, UNESCO, 2008

UNESCO, *Culture Urban Future: Global Report On Culture For Sustainable Urban Development*, UNESCO, 2018

UNESCO, *Culture 2030 Indicators*, UNESCO, 2019

UN-Habitat/UNESCO, *Best Practices on Social Sustainability in Historic Districts*, UN-Habitat, 2008

UN-Habitat, *New Urban Agenda*, UN-Habitat, 2016

UN-Habitat, *2020-2023 Strategic Plan*, UN-Habitat, 2020

Voices of Culture, *Brainstorming Report: Participatory Governance in Cultural Heritage*, Goethe Institut, 2015

Wijesuriya, G, Thompson, J & Young, C, *Managing Cultural World Heritage*, UNESCO, 2013

To find out more about the Cultural Heritage for Inclusive Growth Collection, please visit:
https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-insight/cultural-heritage-inclusive-growth-essay-collection