

Construction of World Heritage Candidacy Processes: Key Elements for a Systematic Framework

Ivan Blečić[1], Maria Carla Saliu[1(✉)], and Salvador Anton Clavé[2]

[1] Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Architecture, University of Cagliari, Cagliari, Italy
mariacarla.saliu@unica.it

[2] Department of Geography, University Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain

Abstract. A set of two categories of key operational elements which can be used to construct a framework for analysing how value is constructed in World Heritage candidacy processes is described. The purpose for focusing on the two identified categories is to (1) condense UNESCO World Heritage candidacy processes into a few categories; and (2) provide a systematic basis for the development of a framework for reconstructing and interpreting the value constructed in World Heritage nomination processes.

Despite the numerous practical examples in the literature of how value is built during the bidding procedures, little is known about how to analyse the construction of this value and how value can be read and narrated in sites inscribed or nominated on the UNESCO World Heritage List. The paper provides meaningful insights through: (1) the analysis of UNESCO's constitutive documents; and (2) the data collected from the direct involvement in different candidacy processes. The approach adopted in this study encompasses a dialogue among restoration theories developed by Cesari Brandi and key concepts related to the storytelling practices used for the design of content-oriented visitor attractions.

The findings from this study demonstrate that we have two categories of key elements we can focus on for building an approach or a framework that let us read the value of World Heritage as a social construction in a systematic manner.

The elements presented in this paper should be extended so that a more general model of reading these processes can be carried out.

The paper's contribution is rooted in its interdisciplinary approach to the subject of cultural heritage, whereby the candidature process and the definition of the value are represented as a social construction that enables the creation of meaning and the making of significant value in the UNESCO context.

Keywords: Candidacy process · Value construction · World Heritage

1 Introduction

UNESCO's goal of protection of cultures and their valued past is possible by means of protocols, declarations of universal principles, statement of Outstanding Universal Value and compilation of inventories (Askew, 2010). To determine whether a cultural heritage

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2026
O. Gervasi et al. (Eds.): ICCSA 2025 Workshops, LNCS 15894, pp. 159–171, 2026.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-97648-3_11

is expression of an Outstanding Universal Value, means to have a convincing, validated, proved value, recognised, recognizable and sythetised thanks to a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value fitting criteria provided by UNESCO's key texts and constructed in an institutional system of formalized routines, beliefs and practices (Turtinen, 2000). In the domain of World Heritage, different definitions of *heritage* are provided to describe such a recognition process of the value of cultural phenomena: (1) heritage described as "a socially ascribed, therefore constructed category but placing things and practices in it based on factual claims about their provenance, age, continuity and authenticity" (Brumann, 2014); (2) a process of meanings' regulation and negotiation (Gfeller, 2013). World Heritage system has become a bureaucratic machinery (Brumann and Berliner, 2016) and being part of it means face processes of naming and framing (Shön and Rein, 1994) to fulfill protocols on the ground of state parties and check international standards.

In this big picture, we must account for the multiplicity of criticism about the concept of authenticity applied to heritage, which has been at the center of a debate over the past decades as Boccardi (2019) states, determining that authenticity of a heritage "is not about judging its significance, rather the internal coherence of the statements made by a certain community about that significance" and recognises heritage as a *cultural construct.* The value of the construct concept is defined in particular social and intellectual circumstances, it is time-specific and thus its meaning(s) can be altered (Graham et al., 2010); it is a way of *packaging* and choosing cultural phenomena stating their value and authenticity by aleatory criteria (Brumann, 2017), which make heritage value or significance being mutable (Titchen, 1995). The Statement of Value, Outstanding and Universal, labeled by UNESCO, is in this framework, a social and cultural construction. While we can read the statement in the official documents every Site which is part of the World Heritage List must delivery to be published in the official website of the List, we have no traces about how the process of "construction" of that statement was conducted.

This article tackles the need to provide evaluators and other researchers a set of (operational) elements which can be used to construct a framework for analysing how (the statement of) value is constructed in candidacy processes and how that value can be read and narrated in sites inscribed or nominated on the UNESCO World Heritage List. In doing so, written official documents of UNESCO are a key source of information in this contribution, but they yield virtually no insight into actual policy and decision-making processes (Gfeller, 2013). This paper is a contribution to filling that gap by providing ground information about a few actual candidacy processes. They refer to different Italian cases, which have been documented as part of a e PhD thesis research or thanks to a direct involvement in technical teams working of the candidacies. Specifically, they include insights from the ongoing candidacy process of the *Nuragic monuments of Sardinia*; from the construction of *The system of Italian-style condominium theatres in central Italy between the 18th and 19th centuries*; and from the updating process of the Management Plan of the World Heritage Site *City of Vicenza and Palladian Villas of the Veneto region.*

In this contribution we want to discuss the relevance of the processes of construction and maintenance of the value of cultural heritage which are already World Heritage Sites or are candidates for the UNESCO World Heritage List. To provide the key elements

for structuring a framework describing such processes, in this paper we discuss the following:

1. in section "On value", we present on a general approach applicable to cultural heritage sites with different features and different candidacy processes such as the more than one thousand World Heritage Sites;
2. in section "Two categories of key elements", we discuss a set of key elements that can be operational in a future possible constitution of a general framework for the evaluation of the value construction process of World heritage Sites.

2 On Value

This study is an attempt to be part of the debate about the symbolic meaning of value of heritage in the framework of World Heritage system.

At first sight, the question of what is, and how to describe the value of a specific cultural heritage site can appear as a neutral question about "objective facts" (Shön and Rein, 1994). Actually, the definition of the value, and its potential "outstanding universal value" as World cultural heritage – as our observation of actually candidacy processes show again and again – entails a process of social and cultural construction (Boccardi, 2019), is socially framed, and is deeply intertwined with actually policy processes. If we define a social construction as something produced by historical events, social forces, and ideology (Hacking, 1999), the central point in analysing a candidacy processes at the World Heritage List becomes determining which historical events, social forces, ideologies and, more in general, conditions for framing are in place from case to case. In this context, following Shön and Rein (1994), who referred to, our reference to "frames" here refer to "a set of readinesses to distinguish some aspects of the situation rather than others and to classify and value these in this way rather than that". Hence, in this contribution the term "frames" is used to have a specific point of view on the candidature processes by analysing conditions present in these processes not only with what is reported in the candidature dossier, which is itself a set of frames defining the phenomenon described, but rather by reconstructing how the process took place and evolved.

Before focusing on framing, some key documents of UNESCO used in this study are presented, such as the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (World Heritage Committee, 2002) which provide, among others, (1) information about the process for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List; and (2) a list of sections and chapters that should be written in the nomination dossier, or candidacy dossier, in order to have all the required information about a heritage worthy of the World Heritage label. This written document, together with supportive manuals such as the *World Heritage Manual: Preparing World Heritage Nominations* (UNESCO-WHC et al., 2011), represent key sources of information about standards required in the WH arena and provide information that is useful for the purposes of this paper, which questions specific aspects and stages that characterise a cultural heritage site and the process of recognition of its value. According to the Operational Guidelines (2002), the nomination dossier format includes the sections reported in Table 1.

The first section is about clearly defined boundaries of the nominated property. The second section gives information about the history and development of the nominated

Table 1. Sections of the format nomination dossier (World Heritage Committee, 2002).

1	Identification of the nominated property
2	Description of the nominated property
3	Justification for Inscription
4	State of conservation and factors affecting the nominated property
5	Protection and Management
6	Monitoring
7	Documentation
8	Contact Information of responsible authorities
9	Signature of behalf of the State Party(ies)

property and is supposed to describe "facts needed to support and give substance to the argument that the nominated property meets the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity and/or authenticity". The third section describes and "must make clear why the property is considered to be of Outstanding Universal Value". The fourth section is about the "present" state of conservation of the nominated property and gives information about threats and factors affecting the property; the factors described in this section is based the monitoring process of the property which is the subject of the sixth section. The fifth section provides information about legislative, regulatory, contractual measures relevant to the protection of the nominated property and about an "appropriate" management system. The last three sections are related to materials that must be submitted with the nomination dossier. All sections described must be completed for a nomination dossier to be completed. Missing or incomplete parts of the information could result in being excluded from the candidacy procedure, and hence of not being included on the List.

The final product of the compilation of these various sections is a readable and comprehensible text that tells the history and "facts" that identify the nominated property, its exact boundaries and coordinates, the parties responsible for its conservation and maintenance, and those responsible for monitoring its state of conservation. The final document therefore tells and identifies all the aspects necessary for a cultural site to be considered as a World Heritage Site with proved Outstanding Universal Value. These aspects, documented and validated through in-depth studies of experts during the candidacy process, are then placed in an established format with well-defined technical criteria. The information of the dossier describes features of the cultural heritage, and it is comprehensive of the Outstanding Universal Value statement, which is a synthesis of the narrative constructed and elaborated to justify and demonstrate the value of the heritage in question. The big picture of these different sections is about different types of information related to the current moment while the candidacy is being built, but also to future evolution and management of the site, for example this is the case of the monitoring section and of the one related to the state of conservation. This different information, referred to different moments of the process of candidacy, makes it clear

that such processes, to be clearly explained and described, should be analysed in different moments, because what happens and the conditions that are created during the application process are different at different steps of the application process.

The research question of this contribution is how to identify, understand and describe the social construction of value which is embedded in World Heritage candidacies. In answering this question, and to construct a robust approach for answering such a question, it would require (1) the identification of a set of key elements that define in a rigorous way aspects of the candidature process that are present in the final written candidacy dossier in a fragmented and not always identifiable way, and (2) the determination of logical links between these key elements in order to have an comprehensive description of such processes.

These elements are identified from the information required in the nomination dossier. They can be clustered into two categories:

– The first category pertains to a transversal aspect embedded in the concept of "process": *temporality.* Key elements of temporality are the *different stages* present in the dossier and through which the process of nomination and of maintenance of World Heritage unfolds;
– The second category refers to elements that can be analysed and framed at different stages of the process (first category) and can be identified as *triggers.* These key elements of the second category are (1) *agents*, (2) *technical requirements*, and (3) *narrative.*

These two categories of elements provide a defined and complete picture of the different aspects that made the whole process possible.

3 Two Categories of Key Elements

Key elements are now presented in a general overview in the following table (Table 2) before focusing on each of them.

Table 2. Overview of key elements clustered into two categories.

Category	Key element
Temporality	1. First stage
	2. Second stage
	3. Third stage
Triggers	1. Agents
	2. Technical requirements
	3. Narrative

3.1 First Category: Temporality

The elements described above have a common feature: each of them should, to be analysed, be considered and framed in a specific stage of the candidacy process because conditions (key elements of the second category) can vary in a significant way in different moments of the process itself. Hence, what we need to elaborate is a category, a transversal one, which should be used for framing during time the key elements of the second category. This transversal category is temporality; and its key elements are stages of the process, defined as follows.

Table 3. Stages of the process of candidacy and monitoring, elaboration of the authors on Operational Guidelines (World Heritage Committee, 2002).

First stage	Second stage	Third stage
Process for the inscription of properties on the World Heritage List	Decision of the World Heritage Committee to (or not to) inscribe a property on the World Heritage List	Process for monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and Periodic Reporting on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention

First Stage. "Process for inscription of properties on the World Heritage List" include every action made from the very initial moment of promotion of a candidacy, to the inscription to the national Tentative Lists of States Parties, until the preparation of the nomination of a property for inscription on the List. The "complete" nominations submitted to the Secretariat are examined by the World Heritage Committee which is the decision-maker about the inscription (or not) of a property on the World Heritage List.

Second Stage. "Decision of the World Heritage Committee to inscribe a property on the World Heritage List" takes place after the evaluation of nominations by the Advisory Bodies. They evaluate whether the properties have Outstanding Universal Value, and whether they meet the conditions of integrity, authenticity and the requirements of protection and management (World Heritage Committee, 2002: par.143).

Third Stage. "Process for monitoring the state of conservation and Periodic Reporting on the implementation of World Heritage Convention" occurs after a property is inscribed in the World Heritage List and is about protection and management of the property which must be guarantee over time (World Heritage Committee, 2002: chapter IV, chapter V).

The different stages of the candidacy cycle within the World Heritage processes are closely related to the different significances given to heritage in obtaining the 'World Heritage' label. We identify three different conditions in such an evolution of significance of heritage:

1. *Heritage,* which corresponds to the first stage described above. This condition is about a specific heritage becoming the focus around which various territorial forces address a strategic perspective of promoting the heritage itself through a World Heritage candidacy;

2. *World Heritage Site*, which corresponds to the second stage described in Table 2. It is the condition of recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of a specific cultural heritage;
3. *Management cycle* ensuring that Outstanding Universal Value of the labeled Heritage Site is maintained over time, which corresponds to the third stage described in Table 3 (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. Representation of the three conditions corresponding to the stages of the process.

These three different passages in which heritage takes on different *values* occur during the process of recognition of the (Outstanding Universal) *Value* itself. In his restauration theory, Cesare Brandi (1963) identifies the recognition of the work of art (in terms of its historical and artistic significance) as itself as an essential element. In his conceptualisation of the process of restoration, he proposes the following definition: "The methodological moment of recognition of the work of art, in its physical consistency and in its dual aesthetic and historical polarity, with a perspective of its transmission into the future." The act of restoration, in Brandi's theoretical framework, is part of the process of transmitting the work of art into the future, it is a historical event, something that evolves over time. In this conception, it is only at the moment when a work of art is recognised as such, and not only as an object of common use, that it is possible to talk about 'restoration'. According to Brandi, restoration is the moment in which the observer realises the value of the object. In other words, Brandi identifies two temporally asynchronous facts:

1. The moment of recognition of an object as a work of art;
2. The restoration of the work of art necessary for preserving it for future generations (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2. Temporally stages of the restoration theory of Cesare Brandi

Let us now try to follow the Brandian approach with respect to the heritage identified as World Heritage as the central object. The logical order would remain the same.

1. the period of construction of a validated narrative that proof that a cultural phenomenon has an Outstanding Universal Value which makes it recognizable as a World Heritage. An example of this concept is represented by the ongoing case of the Nuragic monuments of Sardinia, a candidate serial site present in the Italian Tentative List since the 2021. After four years since the inscription, this site is still in the process of construction of nomination text, facing Italian Ministry of Culture site inspections while working on the adequate strategy for the definition of an appropriate nomination text;
2. the management of the cultural phenomenon over time so that its Outstanding Universal Value is preserved and passed on to future generations. Elsewhere (Blečić et al., 2024) we have attempted to describe the updating process of a case of the World Heritage City of Vicenza and Palladian Villas of the Veneto.

3.2 Second Category: Triggers

Now that we have defined a basic scheme that allows us to divide the process into different moments, we can define further elements that can be expressed in the different steps just described. These elements fall into a second category that we can call *triggers*. Among the triggers we have the following key elements: (1) agents; (2) Technical requirements; and (3) narrative.

Agents. Each candidacy process comes to light because someone takes up the case. The UNESCO international system works because candidacies are proposed by State Parties, but on the local level actors involved can be of different types. This is a fundamental aspect of these kinds of processes: agents who vehicle the process itself, the promoters and the involved or co-opted ones, with different interests, capacities, and at different stages. The agents capable of driving candidacies or maintenance processes of World Heritage are decision-makers during those processes. The type of agents can be diverse, as may be the conditions that render them capable of driving the nomination or maintenance processes. The motivations of these agents are diverse as well. The following table shows different types of agents, their possible interests and the capacities they have during processes (Table 4).

Political Agents. They promote this kind of process in the general interest of communities and can be moved by electoral interests. When political agents are government bodies, at different institutional levels, they have capacities and appropriate conditions for structuring such a process. This is the case of "The system of Italian-style condominium theatres in central Italy between the 18th and 19th centuries", in which promoter and referent for the candidacy at the ground level (Brumann and Berliner, 2016) is one of the regional government involved in this trans-regional Italian candidate serial site.

Intellectual Agents. They can have local prestige at the territorial level, and this is the reason they are capable of creating consensus regarding the process they can promote. This is the case of the candidate of the "Nuragic monuments of Sardinia", included in the Italian Tentative List, and of its association of promoters, "Sardegna verso l'UNESCO", composed of former politicians, intellectuals, and former members of the governing class at the regional level.

Table 4. Types of agents identified by interests and capacities.

Agents	Interests	capacities expertise
Political	Electoral interests and community interests	Capacities and conditions for promoting candidacies
Intellectual	Local prestige	Ability to build consensus around the process
Institutional	Preservation of the institutional position and prestige	Authority, responsibility and resources to promote processes
Technical	Work/ Vocation and interest on heritage	Expertise in World Heritage praxis and procedures and in World Heritage wording
Other	Valorisation of heritage worthy of recognition	Capacity to influence local level, promoters of a bottom-up process

Technical Agents. They are experts that make the process operational, they make evident, by preparing the submission materials, which is the value of heritage, how to describe it and to make a complete dossier, both for candidacies, and for monitoring stages. This technical and scientific apparatus include operators specialised in (i) heritage issues; (ii) specific heritage objects of the nomination; and (iii) World heritage procedures and wording. The nomination process of "The system of Italian-style condominium theatres in central Italy between the 18th and 19th centuries" was led by an Italian Foundation of experts in candidacy procedures. The same Foundation led the updating process of the Management Plan of "The City of Vicenza and Palladian Villas in Veneto".

Institutional Agents. Which role is to guarantee the maintenance and protection of heritage recognised as World Heritage, where the institution is identified as being responsible for this role. This is the case of the World Heritage Site "The City of Vicenza and Palladian Villas in Veneto", which addressed in 2023 an updating process of the Management Plan led by the Municipality of Vicenza.

Other Agents. Moreover, there are other agents that can be promoters or protagonists at different stages of the candidacy processes, such as people organising a mobilisation around the valorisation of heritage worthy of recognition that can be capable of influencing other people at the local level and of promoting bottom-up processes.

Technical Requirements. Despite criticism of the World Heritage system for its lack of clarity in defining concepts such as authenticity, it does produce a *homogenizing effect* (Brumann and Berliner, 2016) at the procedural level of this system, made by standardised documents such as management plans, impact assessments and standardised procedures which require the involvement of the above described experts as providers of scientific knowledge to the system. These kinds of documents are technical requirements embedded in the nomination and maintenance processes. According to the Operational Guidelines (World Heritage Committee, 2002), the technical required documents are the following: in the first stage (Table 2 on temporality), the format for being included in the Tentative List (World Heritage Committee, 2002: par. 62); in the second stage, the

nomination dossier (World Heritage Committee, 2002: par. 130); and during the third stage, the *periodic report format* (World Heritage Committee, 2002: par. 203).

Narrative. "The 981 inscriptions on the World Heritage List correspond to at least as many stories" (Brumann and Berliner, 2016). The findings of technical agents' studies, when sufficiently mature and based on rigorous scientific and historical analysis, are disseminated as a *convincing and validated narrative* at the territorial level and serve as the cornerstone for consensus-building processes. Making World Heritage by scanning and structuring the world through categories and criteria, and by imposing restrictions and obligations is not only a matter of preserving, but also of shaping and "constructing the world" (Turtinen, 2000). And this is the reason we now talk about the last key element: narrative. Narrative presented in the nomination dossier may be designed to "inculcate" value systems (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983) and make clear why heritage with a certain value becomes a World Heritage Site. Narrative is also a motive for legitimising the action being taken by agents during the process, and it is not predetermined. Narrative is constructed as well, together with the construction and validation of the candidate Outstanding Universal Value. The construction process serves to legitimise and produce the heritage story that defines its value. The shape of this narrative must adhere to the official UNESCO guidelines and must fit the structures, forms, inventories, and guidelines established by UNESCO.

The creation of value such as is presented in this contribution is a common communication practice related to objects beyond heritage and particularly in the case of content-oriented visitors attractions and also affects other types of territorial processes such as the practices of *worldmaking* and *narrative placemaking* (Freitag et al., 2023), being the two of them central concepts in storytelling discourse. This also refers to tourism, as praxis that does not reflect the world as it is but de-makes or re-makes destinations and heritages (Baker and Hover, 2024).

Emerging from what we have presented, there is an outline of a tentative analytical framework of how the elements of the two categories (temporality and triggers) may be intertwined in actual candidacy cases. Time is the basis that gives shape and structure to all the steps of the application process. Agents are those who, at different stages and moments of the process, act as promoters, as supporters of the process, and as those responsible for the maintenance and future monitoring of the site. The technical requirements are those that must be observed in order to effectively carry out the application process and must be respected by the agents at the various stages of the process. The narrative that justifies and validates the value of the cultural heritage, both during the preparation of the dossier and at a later stage, must be adapted to the form and criteria dictated by the technical requirements. Technical agents shape heritage history, exclude and select information and construct the value of the heritage according to the global grammar that make World Heritage possible (Turtinen, 2000).

4 Conclusions

The primary purpose of this contribution has been to define some of the groundwork necessary in defining how the value is built in an institutional system of standardised procedures (Turtinen, 2000) within the UNESCO World Heritage. According to Meskell

and Brumann (2015), the public document within the World heritage arena are the results of "endless revisions and compromises". This is not only the case at the international level when candidacies from different countries are compared and assessed, but also the reality "on the ground" where each candidacy is constructed through a policy process. For this reason, for the purpose of this contribution, it was fundamental to document the evolution of actual cases on the ground, the way they unfolded and evolved,, to unearth the fact that very little of these processes is explicit once in the technical documents, once they are produces, and that and that policy processes (and political steps) are often hidden behind technical steps.

For that, we have drawn from our two-year long observation and in some cases direct participation in three candidacy processes: the first one is the updating process of the management plan and system of "The City of Vicenza and Palladian Villas of the Veneto"; the second one is the candidacy dossier of "The system of Italian-style condominium theatres in central Italy between the 18th and 19th centuries"; and the last one the ongoing process of the candidate site "Nuragic monuments of Sardinia".

Focusing on the standard sections that constitute an adequate nomination dossier, and the involvement of several World Heritage sites or candidates, has led to the preliminary identification of key elements that allow an extended understanding of the different moments of the "heritagization" processes. These elements are divided into two categories; (1) temporality (first, second and third stage); and (2) Triggers (agents, technical requirements, and narrative). These categories describe how the cultural production of World Heritage is constructed, through the operation of different agents which act in different moments driven by different interests, and the final result is a shaped narrative which fits the UNESCO technical requirements and satisfy different types of interests. The narrative we reflect on, hence, is a way of framing the cultural heritage, a way of presenting it to the world, a design process of sense-making, not far, as a concept, from values and worldviews represented and reflected in designing non-heritage-based but content-oriented visitor attractions (Freitag et al., 2023), which are *social constructed* places which meanings and functions are integrated "into present and future society" (Anton Clavé, 2005).

Going from here, we see a promising direction for future research and developments. It is strictly operational and is about structuring an approach or a framework capable of providing a systematic way of analysing World Heritage candidacy processes and key elements in their development. The collection of the information linked to the key elements described in this contribution allows for having a big picture of the processes; rather than focusing on individual aspects, it seeks to reconstruct the process through the interrelationships between information over time and at the various stages that form this type of procedure. The establishment of such a framework would allow us to re-understand aspects of the construction of a World Heritage Site that are as much, and much more, than the concept of heritage which "is not given, it is made" (Harvey, 2001), it is also essential in the phases following the recognition of World Heritage status, such as those of monitoring and cyclical management.

The key elements described in this paper can be the groundwork for an overall understanding of the process of framing, constructing, socially ascribing (Brumann, 2014; Turtinen, 2000) which is the starting point of a World Heritage conservation

and management process. A general overview of these processes can be reconstructed from the documentary data that only gain salience if researches have the necessary insights into the processes that produced them (Meskell and Brumann, 2015). The key elements presented in this contribution can contribute to this general reading framework, so that even if heritage candidacies are situated in particular social and intellectual circumstances, and even if they are time-specific and thus their meaning(s) can be altered (Graham et al., 2010), this possible framework could help in fixing meaning(s) over time, with specific contribution of defined agents, by respecting official requirements (of the UNESCO arena) and with a validated narrative.

For the purpose of the present study, the two categories of key elements represent as a multidimensional the concept of value of heritage, analysed in its symbolic meaning. Other embedded dimensions, such as the economic one, due to their importance in the policy processes of heritagization, will be part of future research and further contributions.

Acknowledgments. This study was produced while attending the PhD programme in Civil, Environmental Engineering and Architecture at the University of Cagliari, Cycle XXXVIII, with the support of a scholarship financed by the Ministerial Decree no. 351 of 9th April 2022, based on the NRRP - funded by the European Union - NextGenerationEU - Mission 4 "Education and Research", Component 1 "Enhancement of the offer of educational services: from nurseries to universities" - Investment 4.1 "Extension of the number of research doctorates and innovative doctorates for public administration and cultural heritage".

This study was carried out within the "Accordo di collaborazione Crenos-Glab per progetto Ecosistema Innovativo sull'Archeologia Protostorica (EIA)".

References

Anton Clavé, S.: Parques temàticos: màs allà del ocio. Ariel (2005)

Askew, M.: The magic list of global status: UNESCO, World Heritage and the agendas of states. In: Heritage and Globalisation. Routledge (2010)

Baker, C., Hover, M.: Leveraging historical hospitality in the national parks: Fred Harvey, Mary Colter, and the heritage of the American Southwest. J. Heritage Tourism **19**, 816–838 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2024.2379538

Blečić, I., Saliu, M.C., Borlizzi, P., Portinaro, A.: Introducing principles of antifragility in world heritage management evaluation tools: the case of city of Vicenza and Palladian villas of the Veneto. In: International Conference on Computational Science and Its Applications. Presented at the International Conference on Computational Science and Its Applications, pp. 406–420. Springer, Cham (2024)

Boccardi, G.: Authenticity in the heritage context: a reflection beyond the Nara document. Hist. Environ. Policy Pract. **10**, 4–18 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1080/17567505.2018.1531647

Brandi, C.: Teoria del restauro. Einaudi (1963)

Brumann, C.: How to be authentic in the UNESCO World Heritage System: Copies, Replicas, Reconstructions, and Renovations in a Global Conservation Arena. The transformative power of the copy: a transcultural and interdisciplinary approach, pp. 269–287 (2017)

Brumann, C.: Heritage agnosticism: a third path for the study of cultural heritage. Soc. Anthropol. **22**, 173–188 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12068

Brumann, C., Berliner, D.: World Heritage on the Ground: Ethnographic Perspectives, 1 edn. Oxford, England, Berghahn (2016)

Freitag, F., Carlà-Uhink, F., Anton Clavé, S.: Key Concepts in Theme Park Studies: Understanding Tourism and Leisure Spaces. Springer, Cham (2023).https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11132-7

Gfeller, A.E.: Negotiating the meaning of global heritage: cultural landscapes in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, 1972–92. J. Glob. Hist. **8**, 483–503 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1740022813000387

Graham, B., Ashworth, G., Tunbridge, J.: A Geography of Heritage. Oxford University Press (2010). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315824895

Hacking, I.: The Social Construction of What? Harvard University Press (1999)

Hobsbawm, E., Ranger, T.: The invention of tradition. Cambridge university press (2012)

Harvey, D.C.: Heritage pasts and heritage presents: temporality, meaning and the scope of heritage studies. Int. J. Heritage Stud. **7**, 319–338 (2001). https://doi.org/10.1080/13581650120105534

Meskell, L., Brumann, C.: UNESCO and new world orders. In: Meskell, L. (ed.), Global Heritage: A Reader. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, NJ, pp. 22–42 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781394261154.ch1

Shön, D., Rein, M.: Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies. Basic Book (1994)

Titchen, S.M.:On the construction of outstanding universal value: UNESCO's World Heritage Convention (convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage, 1972) and the identification and assessment of cultural places for inclusion in the world heritage list Australian National University Canberra (1995)

Turtinen, J.: Globalising heritage: on UNESCO and the transnational construction of a world heritage. SCORE (Stockholm center for organizational research), Stockholm (2000)

UNESCO-WHC, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IUCN: World Heritage Manual: Preparing World Heritage Nominations, 2nd edn (2011)

World Heritage Committee: Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World heritage Convention (2002)