

CENTRE FOR APPLIED ARCHAEOLOGY



**CAA**

**HADRIAN'S WALL WHS  
CONSULTATION 2014**

**REPORT**

**Kirsty Norman and Sarah May**

## Contents

<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 COMMISSIONING.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3 DESIGN .....</b>	<b>2</b>
3.1 The brief.....	2
3.2 Rationale.....	4
3.3 Timetable.....	4
3.4 Staffing.....	5
<b>4 CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>6</b>
4.1 The model.....	6
4.2 The plan.....	6
4.3 Timing of the consultation.....	7
4.4 Preparation for the Key Stakeholder Panel consultation.....	7
4.5 The Key Stakeholder Panel meetings.....	8
4.6 Preparation for the Public Stakeholder consultation (meetings and online survey)...	9
4.7 The Public Stakeholder workshops .....	12
4.8 The online survey.....	13
4.9 Email responses.....	13
<b>5 THE WINDING UP OF HADRIAN'S WALL TRUST .....</b>	<b>13</b>
5.1 Announcement.....	13
5.2 Effect on the consultation.....	14
<b>6 RESULTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 Prioritisation of 30 practical objectives for the next Plan period .....	15
6.2 Other messages.....	21
<b>7 ASSESSMENT OF THE METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>24</b>
7.1 Timing.....	24

7.2 Stakeholders.....24

7.3 The priorities-based approach.....26

7.4 Policies v. Actions.....26

7.5 Attendance of HWT staff.....27

7.6 Breakout groups.....27

7.7 The meetings generally.....27

**8 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONSULTATIONS ..... 29**

**9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... 31**

**SEE SEPARATE DOCUMENT FOR APPENDICES:**

- Appendix A: Specification for consultation facilitator
- Appendix B: Key Stakeholder consultation briefing papers
- Appendix C: Assessment of Key Stakeholder consultation
- Appendix D: Public Stakeholder consultation briefing papers
- Appendix E: Online survey questions
- Appendix F: Assessment of Public Stakeholder workshops
- Appendix G: Online survey and email feedback report

## **1 Executive summary**

As a preliminary to the revision of the 2008-2014 WHS Management Plan, the Centre for Applied Archaeology at University College London was commissioned by Hadrian's Wall Trust at the request of the Management Plan Committee to undertake a wide public consultation. The consultation was tasked with eliciting feedback via meetings with selected Key Stakeholders and with Public Stakeholders, and via an online survey. The objective was to clarify and streamline the priorities for management in the next plan period, and specifically, to identify a fairly short list of priorities - approximately 30 - which would form the core of the next plan.

The consultation process resulted in meetings attended by 170 people over two rounds of workshops, and a widely disseminated online consultation which received 126 responses.

A set of 30 Priorities has been developed from a synthesis of the results. Overall, the issues which most preoccupied participants can be grouped under the themes of management, transparency, communication, and access. Although the announcement of the folding of Hadrian's Wall Trust (between the Key and Public Stakeholder consultation weeks) may have exacerbated some of these concerns, it was clear from the (pre-announcement) Key Stakeholder meetings that these were already long established.

Feedback from participants regarding the consultation process has been very positive: they valued the opportunity to speak to each other, as well as the sense of being heard in the planning process.

## **2 Commissioning**

In June 2013 Hadrian's Wall Trust, on behalf of the Hadrian's Wall WHS Management Plan Committee, put out to tender a contract for a public consultation, to be the first stage in the preparation of the 2015-19 WHS Management Plan. The Centre for Applied Archaeology (CAA) at UCL was commissioned to undertake this by the Trust in July 2013.

The CAA is a research and support division of the Institute of Archaeology at UCL, which aims to build links between commercial practice, academic research, and local communities. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/about/applied>

The CAA had carried out work for Hadrian's Wall Trust previously, when Kirsty Norman co-edited the 2008-2014 WHS Management Plan.

### **3 Design**

#### **3.1 The brief**

The brief specified that the consultation was to build on lessons learned from preparing the current (2008 – 2014) Management Plan and from the approach taken in the construction of the new Antonine Wall Management Plan.

<http://www.historic-scotland.gov.uk/index/about/consultations/antonineconsultation.htm>

As such, it was to be

- focused and structured, working towards the development of clearly formulated questions
- transparent and unbiased
- encouraging participation and dialogue, including a facility for online feedback.

The task was to consult on progress against the third Hadrian's Wall WHS Management Plan (2008-14), and aims for the future, in preparation for the fourth Plan. Key themes were to be taken from the current Management Plan, and priorities were to be drawn from Hadrian's Wall Trust's assessment of progress on work, and the aim was to test these, and to produce a revised and shortened list of priorities for the WHS over the next Plan period.

Objectives of the consultation were to be:

- Motivate stakeholders to engage with the process of preparing and delivering the new Management Plan
- Identify specific issues and opportunities, focused objectives, and measurable actions for the plan period.
- Identify mechanisms and responsibilities for delivery.
- Identify appropriate indicators by which the progress in delivering the new Plan can be monitored.

(See Appendix A)

## 3.2 Rationale

The rationale of the consultation was based on the following guidelines agreed with Hadrian's Wall Trust:

- We were not starting with a blank canvas: Hadrian's Wall was already well advanced in its planning, and experience of management issues.
- Time was limited, as the process aims to complete the new Management Plan by the end of 2014
- The process should be streamlined and focused, rather than broad and general.
- Meetings for both key stakeholders and the public should be workshops rather than open meetings, in order to focus discussion and gain maximum high quality and recorded input.
- The online survey should produce as much quantitative data as possible.
- Discussions with Hum Welfare during the initial planning stage confirmed that there were to be no "no-go" areas for discussion. The CAA came into the project aware that the role of Hadrian's Wall Heritage and subsequently Hadrian's Wall Trust had been controversial, and felt strongly that in order for the consultation to be credible, all aspects of management had to be open for comment.
- It was agreed that the report on the results of the consultation would be published on the Hadrian's Wall Trust website, and that the detailed documentation would be archived with HWT (and passed on to whichever organisation takes over.)

Nine Product Descriptions were produced by the CAA in order to clarify the content, timescales and lines of responsibility for delivery.

## 3.3 Timetable

The original timetable: July – November 2013

The timetable as implemented: Jan 15<sup>th</sup> – May 30<sup>th</sup> 2014.

### 3.4 Staffing

Centre for Applied Archaeology UCL:

- Kirsty Norman (lead) and Dr. Sarah May: Consultants
- Dr. Hilary Orange: Online survey design
- Isa Benedetti-Whitton: Project Assistant

We were fortunate also to have the support of the following staff from Hadrian's Wall Trust in setting up the consultation, and running the consultation meetings themselves:

- Nigel Mills: Head of World Heritage Access and Interpretation
- John Scott: World Heritage Site Coordinator
- Emma Nelson: Assistant Projects Officer



## 4 Consultation methodology

### 4.1 The model

As requested, the methodology followed the model of the recent Antonine Wall WHS consultation. This was seen to have been efficient and effective at elucidating key themes for the management of that World Heritage Site. The Antonine Wall consultation utilised a visioning exercise to lay out key themes, followed by two rounds of consultations, first with Key Stakeholders and then the public, to refine those themes.

### 4.2 The plan

It was decided that consultation would be carried out in three stages:

#### Stage 1: Discussions with Hadrian's Wall Trust

These would, together with the Trust's documentation of progress against aims in the current Management Plan, produce a preliminary (but still quite long) set of proposed priorities for discussion, within a fairly detailed background document.

#### Stage 2: Key Stakeholder meetings

These meetings would test those proposals, add/delete, and from analysis of results, a list of the 25-30 top priorities would be put together. Selected participants were also asked to respond by email or telephone.

#### Stage 3: Public Stakeholder meetings, and concurrent Online Survey

The meetings would examine a shorter, more focused list of 25-30 proposed priorities, add/delete, and from analysis of results, a revised list of the 25-30 top priorities would be put together.

The online survey would be designed using the same more focused list as its basis, and would be made available to all: attendees at all meetings (as a vehicle for wider comment), plus the wider public.

The Survey was to be designed in such a way as to produce as much quantitative data as possible, though it was important to include the opportunity also for qualitative comment. This would provide the opportunity for more statistical analysis than in the other two stages, complementing them.

### **4.3 Timing of the consultation**

Commissioning meeting: January 15<sup>th</sup>  
Key Stakeholder Consultation Panels, March 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>  
Interim meeting, March 26<sup>th</sup>: Hum Welfare and John Scott  
Public Stakeholder meetings, April 7<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup>  
Online consultation, April 7<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup>  
Presentation to the MPC: April 29<sup>th</sup>  
Submission of Draft Final Report to the MPC for comment: May 14<sup>th</sup>  
Submission of Final Report: May 31<sup>st</sup>

### **4.4 Preparation for the Key Stakeholder Panel consultation**

Identification of stakeholders: 300 Key Stakeholders were identified by staff at Hadrian's Wall Trust, using a stakeholder spreadsheet that they maintain.

Planning of meetings: the following was agreed

8 meetings at 4 venues along the WHS  
Dates: March 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup>  
Meeting length: 2.5 hours  
20-30 people per meeting  
2 per day at each venue (2-4.30, and 5-7.30)

Choosing venues: Maryport, Carlisle, Hexham and Newcastle were chosen, in order to provide a good geographic spread. It was felt to be particularly important to reach

stakeholders along the Cumbria Coast, who have not been much involved in earlier consultations.

The drafting of the briefing document: Progress, Opportunities and Challenges. Nigel Mills and John Scott reviewed the spreadsheet which had been maintained to record progress against policies in the current Management Plan. They summarised progress issue by issue and identified the priorities as they saw them. This formed the basis of a shorter consultation document, finalised by Kirsty Norman. This was arranged by issue to allow for cross-referencing with the Plan, and each Issue concluded with proposed Urgent and Important Priorities as a basis for discussion. It was made clear that these could be challenged.

The Progress, Opportunities and Challenges document can be found in Appendix B.

Issuing invitations: 300 people were invited by email to take part in the first round of consultation. Several rounds of emails were sent out, and all stakeholders who had not replied were then telephoned: 120 accepted. These people were sent a copy of the *Progress, Opportunities and Challenges* document to prepare for the meetings, and were offered access to the spreadsheet if they wanted further detail.

Publicity: the consultation was advertised on the HWT and CAA websites, but as this stage was to be “by invitation only”, no further publicity was used.

## 4.5 The Key Stakeholder Panel meetings

Seven meetings were held in the first week of March, with 95 people in attendance. Only one meeting was viable in Maryport because acceptances were low. Meetings ranged from six to twenty two participants and followed a similar format in all locations. We explained to participants that the purpose of the consultation was to prioritise objectives for a new streamlined, usable Management Plan. An introductory presentation was followed by small group work on specific issues and the meeting was concluded by a plenary discussion.

The composition of small groups was intended to encourage discussion between specialists in different areas. The methods for choosing the groups varied depending on the size and composition of the meeting. Each small group was given a set of Issues from the briefing document (Progress, Opportunities and Challenges) and was asked to discuss and comment on them. The number of Issues varied according to the number of groups it was possible to form. They were also offered access to the background spreadsheet, on laptops.

Although the basic layout and methodology of the meetings was always the same, each meeting was planned and run slightly differently according to its composition. In particular, some breakout groups were arranged by specialisms, with matching Issues, and some were not, in order to have cross-cutting results. Also, it only became apparent once the consultation started, which Issues were going to attract the most attention, so that it was necessary to adjust the sets of Issues dispensed in order not to overburden one group at the expense of another.

Participants were encouraged to make notes and amendments on the copies of the document provided at the meeting. After approximately 45 minutes each group was asked to choose three 'top priorities' to bring back to the plenary discussion. In this way we collected comments on all of the Issues in the current Plan, and an indication of which Issues were most important to the stakeholders represented. The notes were collected and the plenary discussion was typed simultaneously and projected on screen.

After the meetings, the notes of each meeting were transcribed and combined with the notes from the plenary discussions. The top priorities from each group were compared with the other groups. These priorities were edited to clarify overlapping priorities, and mapped back to the Issues in the original paper. This formed the basis of Appendix C Priorities 2015-2019. This document formed the basis of the both the Public Stakeholder Workshops and the Online Consultation.

#### **4.6 Preparation for the Public Stakeholder consultation (meetings and online survey)**

Identification of the stakeholders: some 2000 individual Public Stakeholders were identified, using the rest of the stakeholder spreadsheet maintained by Hadrian's Wall Trust.

Planning of meetings: the following was agreed

10 meetings at 5 venues along the WHS  
Dates: April 7<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup>  
Meeting length: 2.5 hours  
20-30 people per meeting  
2 per day at each venue (2-4.30, and 7-9.30)

Choosing venues: Maryport, Carlisle, Hexham, Newcastle were once again to be used, and Segedunum was added at the request of North Tyneside Council.

Issuing invitations: Participants were once again invited individually, by email. The wording of the invitation was changed from that of the Key Stakeholder invitations, to become more informal and welcoming. Key Stakeholders and organisations were also contacted to encourage them to publicise the workshops. Press releases were issued and there was good newspaper coverage, especially in the Journal. Workshops were also promoted on the Hadrian's Wall Trust website and through Twitter.

The drafting of the briefing document: this document was drawn from the results of the Key Stakeholder Panel meetings. Once again it was arranged according to the Issue headings in the current Management Plan, but now, the proposed priorities had been refined down to 25. This meant that some Issues had no priorities attached to them. The document (Priorities 2015-19) was much shorter, but access was also offered to the Progress, Opportunities and Challenges document.

Priorities 2015-19 can be found in Appendix D.

Issuing invitations to take part in meetings, and the online survey:

Email:

A flyer was designed by the CAA and sent to:

2000 individuals on the HW Trust stakeholder list (2 rounds of emails)  
individuals at City, Town, Borough and Parish Councils for their websites: Cumbria Coast:  
16/ West: 14/ Central: 27/ East: 17  
Tourism organisations: VisitEngland, English Heritage Marketing, Northumberland  
Tourism, Visit County Durham.

Press releases:

The public were invited via a press release designed by HWT and the CAA, and sent out by HWT. Two rounds of press releases were sent to:

The Journal/Evening Chronicle

Northern Echo

Shields Gazette

News Guardian

Hexham Courant

News & Star

Cumberland News

Times & Star

Whitehaven News

Westmorland Gazette

Evening Mail

Radio Cumbria

Radio Newcastle

ITV Border and Tyne Tees

BBC Look North

cumbria24

cumbriacrack

Websites and social media used were:

Hadrian's Wall Trust website

Northumberland Tourism website

The Journal

ITV Tyne Tees

Local historical and archaeological societies

UCL/CAA website

Facebook HadriansWallCountry

Twitter @EmperorHadrian

Twitter via various colleagues at the IoA  
UCL Institute of Archaeology staff and student internal email  
LinkedIn

Television:

Border Television attended and filmed one of the Public Stakeholder meetings

Twitter: Tweets by Hadrian's Wall Trust (twitter@emperorhadrian) reached a total of 62,400 recipients.

#### **4.7 The Public Stakeholder workshops**

Publicity resulted in 75 people attending 10 meetings, with a similar geographic distribution to that of the Key Stakeholders.

These meetings were conducted in a very similar fashion to the Key Stakeholder Panels. Once again there was an introduction, followed by small group work, followed by a plenary discussion. Participants were encouraged to make notes on the meeting documentation, and further notes were typed simultaneously and shown on a screen during plenary discussion.

The introduction for the public meetings included much more information about World Heritage, the World Heritage Site and its Management Plan than was given in the Key Stakeholder meetings. This was followed by each participant introducing themselves and the key issue that had brought them along to the meeting. Like the plenary discussion at the end, this was simultaneously typed and projected. Once again the notes from the small group work for each meeting were transcribed and combined with the plenary notes.

The briefing papers for these meetings can be found in Appendix D.

The notes from the meetings were synthesised for analysis and this report can be found in Appendix F.

## **4.8 The online survey**

The last element of the consultation process was an online survey that could be accessed via a link URL, which was released through various social media platforms (e.g. Facebook; LinkedIn; Twitter) organisational websites, and e-mail. The link was live between the 7th and 28th of April. Participants from the live meetings were encouraged to promote the survey amongst friends and colleagues who could not attend.

The online survey was organised thematically according to the different priorities that had been identified by the live consultations and was presented as a list of statements to which individuals could apply a 'priority' (Very high / High / Medium / Low / Very low / Don't know). A free text comments box followed each thematic questionnaire, with a request to respondents to identify any missing priorities.

The Survey can be found in Appendix E.

Analysis of the Online Survey results can be found in Appendix G

.

## **4.9 Email responses**

Finally, at every stage, participants were encouraged to contact us by email if they had any further thoughts or concerns. We received eleven such emails and they are considered alongside the results of the online survey in Appendix F.

Analysis of the email responses can be found in Appendix G.

# **5 The winding up of Hadrian's Wall Trust**

## **5.1 Announcement**

On March 24<sup>th</sup>, the Trustees of Hadrian's Wall Trust announced the winding up of the Trust because of "ever increasing pressure on public funding". This is to be completed by September 2014. Although we had been informed that this was going to happen, we were



not told that it would happen during the consultation itself. We were not provided with a press release, and the Hadrian's Wall Trust website had not been prepared, nor was it changed for several days.

The announcement resulted in a Twitter storm of comment, followed by a series of news articles in local newspapers, and as neither the Management Plan Committee nor Hadrian's Wall Trust had been prepared in order to carry out damage limitation, much of the comment was sadly ill-informed. Some saw it as an opportunity to fill what they perceived to be a complete vacuum in management; others speculated about the future of the WHS itself; yet others argued over the pros and cons of the work of the Trust, correctly or incorrectly. There was no response from the Trust.

## **5.2 Effect on the consultation**

The announcement fell between the two rounds of meetings (March 10<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> and April 7<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup>), and therefore in the core period when we were advertising both the Public Stakeholder consultation meetings and the Online Survey. As a result, we felt that it was necessary to send out a further round of emails to all 2000 stakeholders to explain what had happened, and that both the consultation and the resultant writing of the Management Plan were unaffected, and would go ahead as normal. The same information was put on the CAA website. This information was not available on the Trust website at the time.

It is possible that this period of confusion may have impacted engagement with the process of consultation. Two effects may be present: some people may have disengaged with the process under the perception that it was futile; others may have been more passionate and critical because they were concerned that the future of the WHS was at risk. Certainly it was more difficult to get people to come to the Public Stakeholder Workshops than we had anticipated, although once there, the engagement at the workshops themselves was very good indeed. It is not possible to gauge what impact it may or may not have had on take-up of the online survey, but again, many of those who responded did so in the light of the announcement, criticising or supporting the Trust perhaps more vocally than they might have done.

## 6 Results

### 6.1 Prioritisation of 30 practical objectives for the next Plan period

These Priorities are synthesised from feedback provided at Key Stakeholder and Public Stakeholder meetings; in email responses, and from the Online Survey. They also include some priorities (in green) which have been proposed by the consultants as a result of the experience of the consultation.

#### Issue 1 Management

1. Employ centralised, sustainably funded staff to carry out coordination and facilitation roles for the World Heritage Site.
2. Clarify the role, composition and functions of management of the World Heritage Site: ie
  - the Management Plan Committee (to be reduced in size, with clear articulation of responsibilities of members)
  - the key stakeholder bodies funding management
  - staff paid to implement the Management Plan
3. Use partnership working to achieve projects, with one lead partner per piece of work in order to increase accountability.
4. Involve private sector involvement in delivery, and recognise them as key stakeholders.
5. Reassess how management of the World Heritage Site can best serve communities (both local communities and communities of interest), and clarify the costs and benefits of management.
6. Manage relationships with and between stakeholders more actively:

- Identify and manage a more representative stakeholder list which makes wider use of local knowledge, and recognises more “grass roots” groups, stakeholders in education, amenity societies, other organisations, and minority ethnic groups.
- Work to raise awareness of the WHS, and involvement in its management along the Cumbria Coast
- Convene regular general stakeholder meetings to inform both stakeholders and management
- Demonstrate an understanding of stakeholders’ financial limitations and strategic priorities, and communicate benefits of specific projects and the WHS generally.
- Facilitate collaboration with and between all relevant agencies e.g. Local Authorities regarding Local Plans, Natural England regarding biodiversity; other WHSs (and candidate World Heritage Sites) and bodies such as the AONBs concerning their management plans and marketing.
- Ensure good transparent communications throughout projects, and assessments of results. Responsibilities of partners and stakeholders need to be well understood.

7. Develop a centralised communication plan, to include:

- creation of a separate website for the WHS, with clear, personal lines of communication for stakeholders, and regular updating of the website.
- encouragement of feedback.

8. Develop a funding plan to:

- identify funding streams
- engage in coordinated fundraising.
- provide guidelines so that funding applications are developed on a clear project basis.

**Issue 2: The World Heritage Site and Buffer Zone**

9. Work with UNESCO partners to:

- finalise the new Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and Attribute Statements.
- clarify provisions and procedures for including new sites within this section of the WHS.

10. Improve public understanding of the nature of the World Heritage Site and its Outstanding Universal Value:

- Explain how the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value relates to fabric/archaeology/management.
- Draft a short public facing statement explaining how Hadrian's Wall fits into the Frontiers of the Roman Empire WHS and what its value is.
- Clarify and promote the extent of the WHS from Ravenglass to South Shields.
- Provide clear maps and explanation of the Buffer Zone and its role.

**There are no top priorities for Issues 3 (Legislative review), 4 (Protection of archaeology in urban areas), 5 (Metal detecting), and 6 (Risk preparedness and disaster management).**

#### **Issue 7 Conservation**

11. Develop and implement an agreed integrated conservation management framework within the scope (broadly interpreted) of the WHS.

12. Ensure timely and appropriate conservation of the sites and monuments of the World Heritage Site.

13. Use Heritage at Risk methodology to develop robust systems for monitoring and recording the condition of archaeological sites and monuments. In particular:

- make clear when the results of monitoring should trigger action
- make clear what sort of action is required as a baseline and ensure that this is feasible in terms of budget and staff.

#### **Issue 8 Rural land management**

14. Develop good relations with the farming/land management communities, by demonstrating an understanding of the economic viability and vulnerability of farming in the area, and creation of appropriate lines of communication.

15. Monitor the strategies of bodies with responsibility for rural land management (such as DEFRA). Lobby to ensure that the needs of the World Heritage Site are included in schemes to follow Higher Level Stewardship, potentially referred to as NELMS and other initiatives.

### **Issue 9 Research**

16. Whilst recognizing that the Roman archaeology is the principal factor in the SOUV, activity should also take full account of the context of the WHS. Develop an integrated research framework that brings together all strands including archaeology, conservation, the natural environment, geology, the local economy, tourism, and local communities and their traditions and ways of life, in order to provide a wider resource for management.

- Draw together the considerable research already carried out in these various fields.

17. Disseminate summaries of and signposts to research results so that they can properly underpin other aspects of the WHS Management Plan.

### **Issue 10 Sustainable physical access**

18. Develop, advocate, and where possible implement an integrated transport strategy for the whole WHS, to include:

- the opening of Gilsland station
- signage from main roads crossing the Wall
- increased availability of train and bus timetabling information on the website
- time limited bus tickets to allow a “hop on hop off” facility
- expansion of walking and cycling routes particularly down the Cumbria Coast, and to connect with wider networks beyond the WHS
- a service which meets local needs across the WHS

19. Sustainable funding for the management of the Hadrian’s Wall National Trail, and retention of current experience held by managers, other employees, and Trail Volunteers.

### **Issue 11 The visitor experience**

20. Use much more digital media for interpretation, and websites/social media for communication.

21. Encourage and support improved interpretive signage:

- Create an agreed template for signage across the WHS
- Replace old information panels and provide additional information products at key locations.

22. Encourage the development of more diverse interpretive materials:

- Support the development of more complex stories, drawing on the diverse nature of communities of the WHS through time.
- Encourage interpretive materials to reflect the complexity of life on the Wall, both in terms of activities and ethnicities.

## **Issue 12 Economic development and regeneration**

23. Support Small to Medium Enterprises (SME's) and new entrepreneurs with:

- a strategic business framework in which enterprises could spot potential opportunities.
- information on best practice for entrepreneurs who want to set up businesses locally.
- information on the number of tourists, how long they stay, where they go
- the creation of information networks for specific businesses such as accommodation/food/cycle repair providers along a cycle route.
- links to the appropriate Local Enterprise Partnerships and local government regeneration networks.

## **Issue 13 Community engagement**

24. Fund a community engagement co-coordinator to plan and strengthen engagement and volunteering across the World Heritage Site (Policies 13a, 13b).

- Ensure that this remit is focused on developing interests and links to new audiences, not just supporting existing relationships
- Use the management plan as a call to action

25. Draft and implement a volunteering plan to co-ordinate the work of volunteers across different organisations:

- Link volunteering into different aspects of the Plan e.g. research, condition assessment.
- Engage with community generated 'grass roots' groups.

### **Issue 14 Marketing**

26. Use signage to increase awareness of the extent and boundaries of the World Heritage Site for travelers:

- Push to have motorway and major route signage using the UNESCO WHS symbol
- Where the remains of the Wall are not visible, and where appropriate, mark the route of the Wall (particularly relevant to urban areas).
- Emphasise the full extent of the WHS from Ravenglass to South Shields

27. Diversify marketing:

- Improve relationships with other marketing groups, especially in areas such as Newcastle and Cumbria where other strong tourism brands are already present.
- Market the WHS as a more complex longer term exploration; not just a single experience.
- Market the diversity of the experience as 'a window on the world' (our world, in keeping with WHS values, and the Roman World).

### **Issue 15 Education**

28. Realign education policies so that they are focused on wider learning as opposed to curriculum-focused delivery. Drawing on the expertise of the Education Forum:

- Develop an integrated learning plan which draws together key themes, key audiences and key mechanisms for delivery.
- Ensure that the plan addresses a wider range of audiences, e.g. lifelong learners, and staff at attractions in the WHS.

29. Develop a range of learning resources to decrease vulnerability to curriculum changes, and to draw in a wider audience e.g. periods of history other than Roman; the natural environment; World Heritage.

30. Fund a coordinated resource for learning to support this diversified offer, since learning providers are focused on delivery.

## 6.2 Other messages

### Appetite for engagement and partnership working

All of the participants at the panels and workshops were very engaged, worked hard at the discussions and offered expertise generously. People attending on behalf of employers and other organisations demonstrated the commitment of those organisations to the good management of the World Heritage Site. People attending in a personal capacity showed that passion and support for the World Heritage Site is alive and well. This good will is an important resource. It needs to be acknowledged and built upon in the next Plan period.

The key to this is good, targeted, two-way communication. This means that groups working on the Wall should be transparent in their dealings with one another.

### Nervousness around fragmentation

While participants were generally happy with partnership working, both rounds of consultation stressed the importance of coordination and even a coordination unit. While there was some criticism of the centralisation reflected in some the working practices of Hadrian's Wall Trust, there was a sense that someone needed to have Hadrian's Wall as their top priority to keep it on other agendas. There was a particular concern that some Local Authorities have a greater commitment to the World Heritage Site than others. There



were also fears expressed about the splitting of English Heritage and how that could impact the management of the World Heritage Site as a integrated whole.

### Geographic diversity of experience

One of the reasons given for the variability in commitment by Local Authorities is that some regions have competing commitments and identities. For example Cumbria has a substantial commitment to the Lake District, which may become stronger if that area succeeds in its World Heritage bid. Similarly, Newcastle has a complex identity and the Wall is not visible for much of its length through the city. In contrast, for people in the central section, the wall is a much more significant part of their identity. This means that people in the central section may have more invested in the WHS. While this diversity is an important feature of the WHS, it can undermine good management. It will need careful consideration as resource becomes more constrained.

### Importance of 'grass roots' approaches

One of the main difficulties that people expressed regarding the work of Hadrian's Wall Trust was that it was 'too top down'. Even community engagement initiatives were seen to come from the centre, rather than being developed from the communities involved. Because the communities of the WHS are so diverse, there may be many different groups ready to form, or indeed people with much to give who are not part of formal groups. There is also a long established network of local archaeological and historical societies with much to offer. Improved stakeholder management should reach beyond those with professional responsibility for management issues and draw on this broad base of support.

### Importance of World Heritage education

While participants were clearly proud of the World Heritage status of Hadrian's Wall, few of them had a full understanding of what this meant. There was confusion about the boundaries of the site, how the Site related to the Frontiers of the Roman Empire World Heritage Site, and even what the meaning and purpose of World Heritage itself is. Some participants, of course, were much better informed. For these people the international

cultural connections were very important resources for their own communities. World Heritage was seen as a tool to combat marginalisation and intolerance. While some Local Authorities focus on the tourism potential of the World Heritage Site, there is room for more education to help them to realise the social potential that it brings.

#### Importance of conservation and protection

One of the surprising outcomes of the Key and Public Stakeholder meetings was the lack of emphasis on conservation and protection of the monument, apart from by EH staff. We suspected that this was because participants assumed that this was a “given”. This was confirmed by the results of the online consultation. Here, participants were asked directly to rate its importance, and it ranked as the highest priority of all.

## **7 Assessment of the methodology**

### **7.1 Timing**

Four months proved to be a tight timescale. In particular it needs to be borne in mind that the planning and preparation stage is very time-consuming. Agreeing the rationale, product descriptions, stakeholders and venues for the consultation; starting the development of the documentation and issuing invitations all in the first 3-4 weeks, in order to run meetings after two months, required very intensive work. This was a “lesson learned” from the last Management Plan revision, but because the schedule for the consultation had slipped by 5 months, the time period was once again too compressed. The ideal would be a minimum of 6 months, not least in order to get invitations to busy professional stakeholders more than 4 weeks in advance. This needs to be factored into the schedule of both the consultants, and the Hadrian’s Wall WHS staff.

The delays in commissioning and the compression of the timetable also meant that the consultation ran through the lambing season which may have restricted engagement with farmers.

Ideally a Management Plan Committee meeting would be scheduled to coincide with the date for submission of the Draft Report, so that the consultants would be able to provide more completely analysed results than we were able to do.

### **7.2 Stakeholders**

The stakeholder lists held by Hadrian’s Wall Trust were found to be rather heavily biased towards clients whom they would have dealt with via Hadrian’s Wall Country; in particular bed and breakfast and hotel owners. While they are a very important part of the local economy, their numbers were disproportionate, while there was a lack of contacts for “grass-roots” organisations, amenity societies, educational organisations, and private sector organisations. More contacts also need to be made into councils and parishes, to make use of their networks, energy, and good will.

Generally, awareness of the WHS and engagement with it (and the resulting stakeholder list) was the poorest along the Cumbria Coast, so that it was harder to persuade people to come to meetings here.

### 7.3 The priorities-based approach

The brief from the Management Plan Committee for this consultation was heavily based on the concept of a gradual refining of priorities, starting with one set proposed by Hadrian's Wall Trust, refined as a result of discussion with Key Stakeholders, resulting in a set of 20-30 to be put to the public. Having implemented the process and had feedback, we feel that although this makes the task easier for the consultation, and although both the public meetings and the online survey encouraged wider input, this approach resulted in a perception by some members of the public that they were being presented with narrow, pre-digested choices. This is unfortunate, as it negates much of the value of the process.

We feel that in fact the process might have been more satisfactory had it been reversed, starting with a much wider and freer public consultation, and narrowing down from there, with the key stakeholders then understanding the public mood and needs, adding their knowledge and concerns, and working on the detail of implementation and monitoring.

### 7.4 Policies v. Actions

The brief required that the consultation should identify specific issues and opportunities, focused objectives, measurable actions, mechanisms and responsibilities for delivery, and appropriate monitoring indicators for the plan period. (HWT 2013)

The reality was that, such are the complexity and range of challenges and opportunities for Hadrian's Wall WHS that in 2.5 hour meetings, it proved difficult to go beyond identifying the core policies, and some actions associated with them. The alternative would be to hold half day meetings, in which case one could take discussion a step further into actions, responsibilities and monitoring. However, this might have resulted in fewer participants.

We feel however that this is more of a problem with the brief than with the results: the consultation produced excellent material, and easily enough to produce a focused approach for forward management.

## **7.5 Attendance of HWT staff**

Hadrian's Wall Trust's senior staff (Nigel Mills and Linda Tuttiett), and Hum Welfare, Chair of the MPC, had asked to attend meetings, but were asked by us not to do so, as we wanted to maintain as much neutrality as possible in the proceedings, to allow free discussion. It was however enormously useful to have the WH Site Coordinator John Scott there, both in order to help to facilitate, but also for his own information. Such a consultation provides a huge opportunity for face to face discussion which the Coordinator sadly does not always have time for, in a normal work schedule.

## **7.6 Breakout groups**

During the Key Stakeholder consultation meetings, the composition of the smaller breakout groups was organised in a variety of ways, in order to amass as wide a range of opinion as possible. This meant that although all meetings ended with a general discussion and review of priorities for all, in certain meetings, breakout groups were specifically given issues to comment on which were outside their normal area of expertise. This was not popular with some participants, though others accepted it as an interesting insight into other areas of management and opportunity to contribute to these, as had been hoped.

In retrospect it might have been better to allow all of the Key Stakeholder meetings to conform to a more conventional expertise-based format. Had we advertised this different approach in advance in order to deflect any dissatisfaction, some might not have come. Public Stakeholder meetings produce that wider view we were looking for, and as in fact many who could have been regarded as key stakeholders came to these, the object would have been achieved in these meetings.

## **7.7 The meetings generally**

Flexibility proved to be one of the most valuable attributes of the methodology adopted. It also relies on the character and relationship of the facilitators, and we were fortunate to

have a team that worked very well together and were able to make quick decisions and changes where they were needed.

Even at the Key Stakeholder Panel meetings, we found a surprising lack of awareness or understanding of the philosophy of World Heritage, the extent of the World Heritage Site, the function of the Site and the Buffer Zone, and the composition and function of the Management Plan Committee. As we had not expected this, the meetings had not been designed to include this information, and misunderstandings had to be dealt with as they cropped up.

## 8 Recommendations for future consultations

- Over the next Plan period, make clear to the stakeholders the value of Hadrian's Wall WHS, and involve them as much as possible in contributing to its conservation and enjoyment: this will prepare the ground. In particular, work on engagement along the Cumbria Coast.
- Reverse the sequence of consultation:
  - Public workshops /online consultation- both to share progress and to gauge priorities
  - Key Stakeholder panels to assess these against strategic goals and resources
  - MPC to plan how these can be co-ordinated and fit with existing frameworks
- Allow 6 months for the consultation process
- Carry out a major review of the stakeholder lists (this should be started immediately)
- Consider holding half day Key Stakeholder meetings in order to have time to deal more with the details of actions and delivery.
- Have at least three staff present per meeting: one to present, one to take notes/organise paperwork, and the Site Coordinator to help re: the venue, and provide information when needed in discussions.
- Have a car available to transport necessary paperwork and equipment; also a projector, and access to a photocopier throughout the meetings weeks.
- Preface both Key Stakeholder events and Public events with a brief and succinct presentation (10 mins) explaining:
  - the concept of World Heritage
  - what its aims and objectives are
  - the extent of Hadrian's Wall WHS
  - the difference between Site and Buffer Zone



- what the function of the Management Plan Committee is
- how management and funding of the Site works

## 9 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the staff at Hadrian's Wall Trust, with whom it was a great pleasure to work:

Nigel Mills for his input in getting this project underway.

John Scott supported us through the various stages of the planning of the project and the creation of briefing documents. John also accompanied us throughout the consultation meetings, providing succinct and objective input into discussions when needed, and stepping back where he felt he should. His combination of consummate diplomacy, good cheer, and slightly surreal sense of humour saw us all through some occasionally challenging times.

Emma Nelson was quietly invaluable in sorting out venues, logistics, and paperwork; taking notes in meetings, and like John, managing to be good humoured at all times.

We would also like to thank the Management Plan Committee of Hadrian's Wall WHS and in particular Hum Welfare, for his interest and involvement in the process as it developed, and for his timely use of the results.

We wish all involved with Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site, and particularly those who will carry on its management all the very best, in this next Plan period.

The consultation was funded by a grant from English Heritage.