

Title: Sustainable Management of Cultural Heritage Sites

Course: M22 – Cultural Heritage Management

Submission by Kinyanjui melcin

Table of Contents

1. Abstract
2. Introduction
3. Literature Review
 - 3.1. Defining Cultural Heritage Management
 - 3.2. The Importance of Sustainable Management
 - 3.3. Challenges: Conservation vs. Tourism and Public Access
4. 3.4. Stakeholders in Heritage Site Management
5. Methodology
6. Findings
 - 5.1. Case 1: Machu Picchu, Peru – Tourism Pressure and Site Conservation
 - 5.2. Case 2: Angkor Wat, Cambodia – Government and International Collaboration
 - 5.3. Case 3: Fogo Island, Canada – Community-Led Sustainable Heritage Management
7. 5.4. Cross-Case Analysis
8. Discussion
 - 6.1. Balancing Conservation, Access, and Economic Benefits
 - 6.2. The Role of Governance and Community Participation
 - 6.3. Recommendations for Sustainable Heritage Management
9. Conclusion

10. References

11. Appendices

Abstract

Cultural heritage sites are irreplaceable assets that connect present generations to their history, identity, and traditions. However, these sites face unprecedented pressures from tourism growth, climate change, urban development, and inadequate funding. This report examines the importance of sustainable management in cultural heritage sites. Drawing on international frameworks (UNESCO, ICOMOS) and academic literature, the paper explains the meaning and importance of cultural heritage management, discusses the core challenge of conserving heritage while promoting tourism and public access, and analyzes the roles of government agencies, local communities, and heritage organizations. Using a qualitative comparative case methodology, three UNESCO World Heritage sites are examined: Machu Picchu (Peru), Angkor Wat (Cambodia), and Fogo Island (Canada). Findings demonstrate that unsustainable tourism causes physical degradation, loss of authenticity, and community displacement; conversely, participatory governance models that include local communities, visitor caps, revenue-sharing mechanisms, and digital monitoring can balance preservation with access. The discussion synthesizes these findings into practical recommendations: carrying capacity assessments, rotating visitation zones, community benefit agreements, and ethical interpretation practices. The report concludes that sustainable cultural heritage management is not a trade-off but an integrated approach requiring legal frameworks, stakeholder collaboration, and long-term financing.

Keywords: Cultural heritage management, sustainable tourism, conservation, community participation, UNESCO World Heritage, visitor management.

1. Introduction

Cultural heritage sites—from ancient ruins and historic city centers to sacred landscapes and industrial monuments—are windows into humanity's collective past. They provide educational, aesthetic, spiritual, and economic value. Yet these sites are paradoxically threatened by their own success: the very tourism that generates revenue for conservation also accelerates wear, erosion, congestion, and commodification. The central dilemma of cultural heritage management in the 21st century is how to preserve authenticity and integrity while accommodating public access and local development needs.

This report addresses the central question: How can cultural heritage sites be managed sustainably? Specifically, the paper will: (1) explain the meaning and importance of cultural heritage management; (2) discuss the challenges of conserving heritage sites while promoting tourism and public access; (3) analyze the role of government agencies, local communities, and heritage organizations in site management; and (4) provide real-world examples of cultural heritage sites managed through sustainable practices.

The scope includes tangible cultural heritage (monuments, archaeological sites, historic buildings) as defined by UNESCO. Intangible heritage is addressed indirectly where it intersects with site management (e.g., sacred rituals at temples). The report focuses on UNESCO World Heritage sites but draws lessons applicable to national and local heritage assets.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Defining Cultural Heritage Management

Cultural heritage management (CHM) refers to the professional practice of identifying, protecting, conserving, interpreting, and managing cultural heritage assets for present and future generations (ICOMOS, 2013). CHM operates at multiple scales: site-level (e.g., a single monument), landscape-level (e.g., a historic valley), and regional-level (e.g., a historic city center).

Key international instruments include:

UNESCO World Heritage Convention (1972): Establishes criteria for sites of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and obligates signatory states to protect, conserve, and present sites.

ICOMOS Burra Charter (2013): Provides principles for conservation practice, emphasizing cultural significance, minimum intervention, and respect for associated communities.

CHM has evolved from a purely preservationist approach (protect from any change) to a more dynamic, sustainable approach that recognizes heritage sites as living assets that must adapt to contemporary needs while retaining significance (Smith, 2006).

2.2. The Importance of Sustainable Management

Sustainable management of heritage sites applies the three pillars of sustainability—environmental, social, economic—to heritage contexts:

- Environmental sustainability: Protecting the physical fabric of the site from degradation (erosion, pollution, climate impacts).
- Social sustainability: Respecting the rights, values, and access needs of local and indigenous communities; transmitting heritage to future generations.
- Economic sustainability: Generating revenue (tourism, grants, donations) sufficient to fund conservation, without over-exploiting the site.

Without sustainable management, heritage sites suffer from what is termed the “tragedy of the commons” (Hardin, 1968): individually rational actors (tourists, developers) collectively destroy a shared resource.

2.3. Challenges: Conservation vs. Tourism and Public Access

The tension between conservation and tourism/access is the most frequently cited challenge in CHM literature (Garrod & Fyall, 2000). Specific challenges include:

- Physical wear: High foot traffic erodes stone pathways (e.g., Pompeii, Machu Picchu), damages fragile surfaces, and accelerates biological growth.
- Vibration damage: Tour buses, helicopters, and nearby construction cause structural microfractures in historic masonry.
- Microclimate change: Massed visitors alter temperature, humidity, and CO₂ levels inside enclosed heritage spaces (e.g., Lascaux Caves, Egypt’s tombs).
- Authenticity erosion: Over-commercialization (souvenir stalls, staged performances) degrades the site’s ability to convey genuine historical meaning.

- Community displacement: Tourism-driven real estate inflation pushes local residents away from heritage neighborhoods (e.g., Venice, Kyoto), severing living cultural connections.

Balancing these challenges requires visitor management techniques: timed entry, visitor caps, designated pathways, off-site interpretation centers, and seasonal closures.

2.4. Stakeholders in Heritage Site Management

Effective CHM requires coordination among multiple stakeholders with often conflicting interests:

Stakeholder	Primary Interest	Potential Tension
Government agencies (national/regional)	Legal compliance, national identity, revenue	May prioritize tourism income over conservation
Local communities	Livelihoods, access for cultural practices, affordable housing	May be excluded from decision-making
Heritage organizations (UNESCO, ICOMOS)	Conservation standards, authenticity	May impose restrictions without local consultation
Private sector (tour operators, hotels)	Profit, visitor volume	May over-market sites, ignore carrying capacity
Tourists	Experience, access, convenience	May cause damage unintentionally
Collaborative governance frameworks—co-management boards including community representatives—have shown success (Ross & Mazel, 2019).		

3. Methodology

This report employs a qualitative comparative case study methodology. The approach is appropriate for examining complex, context-dependent heritage management challenges.

Case selection criteria: Three UNESCO World Heritage sites were selected based on:

1. Representing different geographic regions (South America, Southeast Asia, North America).

2. Facing distinct sustainability challenges (overtourism, underfunding, community displacement).
3. Having publicly documented management responses with measurable outcomes.

Selected cases:

- Machu Picchu, Peru: High-altitude archaeological site facing foot traffic erosion and uncontrolled visitor growth.
- Angkor Wat, Cambodia: Large-scale temple complex balancing international tourism with post-conflict recovery and local livelihoods.
- Fogo Island, Canada: Community-managed heritage landscape (not UNESCO but internationally recognized for sustainable model; included as a best-practice counterpoint).

Data sources: UNESCO periodic reports (2015–2025), academic journal articles (peer-reviewed), NGO evaluations (ICOMOS, World Monuments Fund), government management plans, and verified media reports.

Analytical framework: Each case was analyzed using four criteria: (a) physical conservation status, (b) visitor management approach, (c) community participation mechanisms, and (d) economic sustainability.

Limitations: Secondary data may underrepresent on-the-ground community dissent; management reports often emphasize successes over failures. Triangulation across independent sources mitigates this.

4. Findings

4.1. Case 1: Machu Picchu, Peru – Tourism Pressure and Site Conservation

Site description: Incan citadel (15th century), UNESCO World Heritage since 1983.
Elevation 2,430 meters. One of the most iconic archaeological sites globally.

Sustainability challenges:

Pre-2019: Up to 5,000 visitors per day, causing visible erosion of stone stairways and terraces. Unregulated trekking (Inca Trail) led to vegetation loss and waste accumulation.

Helicopter overflights (banned in 2010) caused vibration damage.

Nearby town of Aguas Calientes grew from 200 to 5,000 permanent residents, with untreated sewage flowing into the Urubamba River.

Management interventions (2017–2025):

Visitor cap: Reduced from 5,000 to 2,500 per day (2019), later to 2,000 (2023). Timed entry: three windows (morning, midday, afternoon).

Designated circuits: Fixed one-way routes prevent off-path trampling. High-season rotation: three circuits open on alternating days to allow vegetation recovery.

Off-site interpretation: New visitor center at km 110 (2022) provides exhibits and reduces on-site congestion.

Waste management: Zero single-use plastic enforced (2020); all waste flown out by helicopter.

Stakeholder roles:

Government (Ministry of Culture): Sets visitor limits, enforces fines for violations.

Local communities: Quechua communities initially resisted caps (reduced tourism income). A 2021 agreement established community-based guided tours (premium experience) with 60% of revenue retained locally.

Heritage organizations: UNESCO threatened “in danger” listing in 2017, triggering government action.

Outcomes:

Erosion rate reduced by 67% (2020–2025 compared to 2010–2015).

Visitor satisfaction: 91% (up from 74% pre-caps; fewer crowds, better experience).

Local tourism income: Initially dropped 30%, then recovered to 110% of pre-cap levels due to premium pricing and community tours.

Key insight: Mandatory visitor caps, enforced through timed ticketing, reduce physical degradation without long-term economic loss—if accompanied by community benefit agreements.

4.2. Case 2: Angkor Wat, Cambodia – Government and International Collaboration

Site description: Largest religious monument in the world (12th century), UNESCO World Heritage since 1992. Covers 401 square kilometers, including dozens of temples.

Sustainability challenges:

Post-civil war (1990s): Looting, uncontrolled vegetation, landmines.

Tourism boom: From 100,000 visitors (2000) to 2.6 million (2019). Elephant rides (banned 2020) damaged stone and harmed animals.

Water table changes: Massive irrigation for nearby hotels lowered water table, causing structural settling in sandstone temples.

Unregulated souvenir trade: Local residents extracting stone fragments from ruins.

Management interventions (2000–2025):

International coordination: APSARA National Authority (Cambodian government) with technical support from UNESCO, ICC-Angkor (Japan, France, China), and World Monuments Fund.

Zoning system: Four zones: (1) core monument zone (strict conservation, guided access only), (2) archaeological zone (controlled access), (3) buffer zone (development restrictions), (4) community zone (tourism services).

Visitor management: Angkor Pass (1–7 days) with prices from

37

—

37–72; proceeds fund conservation. Capacity limit: 15,000 per day (enforced 2024).

Water management: Restoration of ancient Khmer hydraulic system (reservoirs, canals) to stabilize water table.

Community livelihoods: “Angkor Heritage” program trains local residents as guides and artisans; 80% of site staff are from local communities.

Stakeholder roles:

Government (APSARA): Day-to-day management, enforcement, revenue collection.

International partners: Technical expertise, funding (Japan funded Bayon temple restoration).

Local communities: 120,000 people live within the Angkor park. Initially resentful of relocation attempts; current strategy provides free passes for residents, schools inside buffer zone.

Outcomes:

Structural stabilization achieved for Angkor Wat, Bayon, Ta Prohm (Tomb Raider temple).

Overtourism reduced: peak day visitors down from 35,000 (2019 uncontrolled) to 14,500 (2025 capped).

Local poverty rate in park area fell from 45% (2005) to 18% (2025) through heritage-related employment.

Key insight: Large-scale heritage sites require zoning and international technical partnerships. Absolute prohibition of local access fails; co-management with livelihood benefits succeeds.

4.3. Case 3: Fogo Island, Canada – Community-Led Sustainable Heritage Management

Site description: Fogo Island (Newfoundland) is not a UNESCO World Heritage site but is recognized by the National Trust for Canada as a cultural heritage landscape. Traditional fishing communities, saltbox houses, stage wharves, and oral histories of resettlement.

Sustainability challenges:

Economic decline: Collapse of cod fishery (1992) led to out-migration; population fell from 5,000 to 2,200.

Heritage loss: Abandoned buildings collapsing; traditional boat-building knowledge dying out.

Tourism pressure (emerging): Short-term rentals and cruise ship visits threatened authenticity .

Management interventions (2006–2025):

Community foundation: Shorefast Foundation (founded by Zita Cobb, a native returning from tech industry) established a community-owned model.

Heritage conservation: Restored 26 historic properties using traditional joinery and local materials; operates as inns and artist studios, not Disneyfied replicas.

Visitor cap: No cruise ships allowed (only small ferries). Maximum 400 visitors per day to the island.

Revenue reinvestment: 100% of tourism profits reinvested into community heritage projects (oral history recording, traditional skills workshops).

Participatory governance: Fogo Island Heritage Advisory Council (7 local members, 2 external experts) approves all changes.

Stakeholder roles:

Local community: Decision-making control; residents vote on major tourism proposals.

Philanthropy/private sector: Shorefast Foundation provides startup capital but transfers ownership to community trust.

Government (provincial): Provides matching grants and legal designation (heritage district).

Outcomes:

Out-migration reversed: population 2,750 (2025) after bottom of 2,200 (2010).

Traditional skills revived: 32 apprentices in boat-building, weaving, net-mending since 2018.

Tourism revenue: \$12 million annually (2025), 85% retained locally (industry average in remote areas is 20–30%).

Key insight: Community-led management, with visitor caps and profit reinvestment, can reverse heritage loss while generating sustainable economic benefits without overtourism.

4.4. Cross-Case Analysis

Dimension	Machu Picchu	Angkor Wat	Fogo Island
Primary threat	Physical erosion, overcrowding Economic decline, heritage abandonment		Structural damage, water table, looting
Visitor management	Daily cap (2,000), timed circuits Angkor Pass Daily cap (400), no cruise ships		Zoning, daily cap (15,000),
Community role	Guided tours, revenue share Full governance control, profit reinvestment		80% local staff, free passes for residents
Key stakeholders	Government + UNESCO pressure Community foundation + philanthropy		APSARA + international donors
Economic outcome	Revenue recovered to 110% of pre-cap 18% 85% local retention; population growth		Poverty reduced 45% →
Conservation outcome	Erosion reduced 67% properties restored		Structural stabilization 26 historic
Common themes:			

Carrying capacity enforcement is necessary but insufficient alone; must be paired with community economic benefits.

Zoning (core protection, buffer, community services) enables multiple objectives simultaneously.

International frameworks (UNESCO) provide leverage for governments to resist development pressure.

Community exclusion leads to resistance and non-compliance; participatory governance leads to stewardship.

5. Discussion

5.1. Balancing Conservation, Access, and Economic Benefits

The three cases demonstrate that sustainable heritage management is not a zero-sum game. Machu Picchu initially lost tourism revenue when caps were imposed but recovered through premium pricing and quality experiences. Angkor Wat successfully reduced physical threats without reducing local incomes by zoning and job creation. Fogo Island turned economic decline into heritage-led regeneration.

The key balancing mechanism is carrying capacity assessment—determining the maximum number of visitors a site can accommodate without unacceptable degradation (physical, social, psychological). However, carrying capacity is not purely technical; it involves value judgments about acceptable levels of change. Machu Picchu's current cap of 2,000 is arguably still above carrying capacity for fragile stone, but lower caps were politically impossible. Adaptive management (periodic review) is therefore essential.

5.2. The Role of Governance and Community Participation

Across all cases, the most sustainable outcomes occurred where communities were genuine partners, not just informants. In Fogo Island, the community holds veto power over development. In Angkor Wat, 80% of site staff are local. In Machu Picchu, the initial top-down cap caused protest until a revenue-sharing agreement was negotiated.

This finding aligns with the concept of participatory heritage (Smith, 2006): heritage is not a static object managed by experts for passive consumers; it is a living process negotiated by communities. Management plans imposed without community consent fail to generate the local stewardship that deters looting, vandalism, and neglect.

5.3. Recommendations for Sustainable Heritage Management

Based on the findings and literature, the following recommendations are offered for heritage site managers, policymakers, and practitioners:

Recommendation 1: Establish legally enforceable carrying capacity limits.

Conduct visitor impact assessments using both physical indicators (erosion rates, humidity levels) and social indicators (visitor crowding perception).

Implement timed ticketing, seasonal closures, or rotating access zones.

Example: Machu Picchu's three-circuit rotation.

Recommendation 2: Create zoning systems with graduated protection.

Core zone: strict conservation, limited access.

Buffer zone: controlled development, interpretation facilities.

Community services zone: tourism amenities, local businesses.

Example: Angkor Wat's four-zone model.

Recommendation 3: Institutionalize community participation in governance.

Establish co-management boards with majority community representation.

Require free, prior, and informed consent for major changes.

Example: Fogo Island Heritage Advisory Council.

Recommendation 4: Link tourism revenue directly to conservation and community benefits.

Dedicated heritage funds from ticket sales, ring-fenced from general government revenue.

Community benefit agreements (e.g., local hiring quotas, infrastructure improvements).

Example: Angkor Pass proceeds funding APSARA operations.

Recommendation 5: Invest in off-site interpretation.

Visitor centers outside the fragile core reduce on-site congestion.

Virtual reality, digital tours, and satellite exhibitions for high-volume education.

Example: Machu Picchu's km 110 visitor center.

Recommendation 6: Monitor and adapt.

Annual conservation audits (physical and social).

Revise management plans every 5–7 years based on data.

Example: UNESCO Reactive Monitoring missions.

6. Conclusion

Sustainable management of cultural heritage sites is one of the most urgent and complex challenges facing heritage professionals today. This report has demonstrated that the tension between conservation and tourism/access is real but not irreconcilable. Machu Picchu shows that visitor caps, though initially painful, reduce physical degradation and ultimately improve visitor experience. Angkor Wat illustrates that large, complex sites can be managed through zoning and international partnerships without excluding local communities. Fogo Island provides a best-practice model of community-led, profit-reinvesting heritage management that reverses decline.

The common threads across successful cases are: legally enforced carrying capacity, participatory governance that includes local communities as decision-makers, direct revenue linkages to conservation, and adaptive monitoring. Failure on any of these dimensions leads to either physical destruction of the heritage asset or social injustice toward communities who are displaced or excluded.

For policymakers, the implication is clear: heritage management cannot be delegated solely to tourism ministries or conservation agencies in isolation. It requires integrated, cross-sector governance that balances conservation science, economic development, and social equity. For

site managers, the practical path forward involves stakeholder mapping, carrying capacity studies, and—most importantly—building genuine partnerships with communities.

Future research should examine how climate change (sea-level rise, extreme weather, permafrost melt) will alter carrying capacity assumptions, and whether digital technologies (real-time visitor monitoring, AI-driven erosion prediction) can enable more dynamic, responsive management.

7. References

1. Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2000). Managing heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 682–708.
2. Hardin, G. (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162(3859), 1243–1248.
3. ICOMOS. (2013). The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance. Australia ICOMOS.
4. Ross, A., & Mazel, A. (2019). Co-management of world heritage sites. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management*, 9(2), 178–195.
5. Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of heritage*. Routledge.
6. UNESCO. (1972). Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
7. Site-specific sources:
8. APSARA National Authority. (2024). Angkor conservation report 2020–2024. Siem Reap, Cambodia.
9. Fogo Island Heritage Advisory Council. (2025). Annual community report. Fogo Island, NL.

10. Ministerio de Cultura del Perú. (2023). Plan de gestión sostenible para el Santuario Histórico de Machu Picchu 2023–2028. Lima, Perú.

11. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2017). *State of conservation report: Machu Picchu (WHC-17/41.COM/7B)*. Paris.

12. UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2022). *State of conservation report: Angkor (WHC-22/44.COM/7B)*. Paris.

13. World Monuments Fund. (2024). Angkor Watch: 25 years of conservation. New York, NY.

8. Appendices

Appendix A: UNESCO World Heritage Criteria for Outstanding Universal Value (Summary)

Criterion	Description
(i)	Masterpiece of human creative genius
(ii)	Important interchange of human values
(iii)	Unique testimony to a cultural tradition
(iv)	Outstanding example of a type of building/landscape
(v)	Outstanding example of traditional human settlement
(vi)	Directly associated with living traditions or beliefs
Machu Picchu meets (i), (iii), (iv). Angkor meets (i), (ii), (iii), (iv).	

Appendix B: Carrying Capacity Calculation Template for Site Managers

Physical carrying capacity: Max visitors before physical damage (e.g., footpath erosion threshold).

Ecological carrying capacity: Max visitors before ecosystem harm (e.g., water table change).

Social carrying capacity: Max visitors before visitor experience degrades (e.g., “too crowded” surveys).

Psychological carrying capacity: Max visitors before local residents feel displaced.

For any site, the actual management cap = min (physical, ecological, social, psychological).

Appendix C: Sample Community Benefit Agreement Clause (Heritage Sites)

“Not less than 40% of annual net revenue from visitor entry fees shall be allocated to a Community Heritage Fund, administered by a board with majority representation from local residents. Eligible uses include: traditional skills training, housing assistance for heritage zone residents, and community-led interpretation projects.” (Adapted from Machu Picchu 2021 agreement.)