

**INDEPENDENT EXPERT REVIEW
OF THE
MOUNT LOFTY RANGES
WORLD HERITAGE BID**

Duncan Marshall & Dr Jane Lennon AM

for
Adelaide Hills Council

2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2011-12 a consortium of Councils across the Mount Lofty Ranges has been exploring the potential for World Heritage listing of the agrarian and cultural landscapes of the region. This independent expert review has been commissioned to consider the work undertaken to date to achieve World Heritage listing, to inform the next steps, the strength of the bid and future project stakeholders.

The review has considered a range of issues including the:

- existing rationale for seeking World Heritage listing;
- the current draft Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), proposed criteria, and criteria statements;
- attributes and areas that most strongly reflect the potential OUV in the landscape; and
- research gaps and additional work required.

The review was to involve consultation with other recognised and respected experts as necessary.

Perhaps the key question underlying this independent expert review is whether there is a good case for seeking World Heritage listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges? The brief answer is – yes, there is a good case. However, to realise this potential, a number of issues will need to be addressed.

With regard to the **rationale** text, this begins to present the core justification for World Heritage listing in terms which resonate with the purpose, scope, criteria and threshold of the World Heritage List. But this text is, of course, only the start of the justification needed, or rather, it is a brief summary of research already undertaken. The World Heritage nomination would present an extended justification of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value.

Importantly, the core of the current rationale for pursuing a World Heritage listing for parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges reflecting the 19th century model of systematic colonisation appears quite sound at this stage.

The core **narrative** previously developed is helpfully structured according to the World Heritage criteria and contains key text which also speaks clearly to the possibility of World Heritage value or Outstanding Universal Value. While at this stage such text looks promising, again much depends on the supporting and detailed justification that can be provided. For example, there is a need to develop text on:

- the broader theme of migration, into which the South Australian example and systematic colonisation can be contextualised;
- the character of non-systematic colonisation;
- the Enlightenment/post-Enlightenment, and the impact on the development of model societies;
- a refined description of the characteristics of systematic colonisation;
- an overview of the authoritative historical assessments of systematic colonisation, including whether there is a prevailing consensus about its importance;

- the comparative analysis, especially regarding other examples of systematic colonisation in the world and what landscape evidence survives of these; and
- the analysis related to agricultural innovation.

Brief draft text for two of these aspects is included in the body of the report below.

While the analysis and commentary undertaken presents a generally positive view of the possibilities for World Heritage, albeit with qualifications, it is also worth highlighting there are potential weaknesses and difficulties that may be encountered.

A review of the potential **World Heritage criteria** found:

- the stronger criteria relevant to the proposed property are (ii), (iv) and (vi);
- weaker or more difficult criteria are (iii) and (v), or at least parts of claims that could be made under criterion (v). In the case of (ii), one aspect of the use of this criterion might also be weak – related to the influence on non-British immigrant communities; and
- the criterion which is clearly not relevant is (i).

The report considered the question of the possible **name for the property**, and proposes the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia.

Previously, brief draft **justification text** or criteria text had been developed against four criteria – (ii), (iv), (v) and (vi). Based on further analysis, this justification text has been revised and is the core of the current draft Outstanding Universal Value for the property. Based on this draft OUV, related attributes have been identified. However, refining the mapping of attributes beyond a broad scale becomes difficult because of the lack of detail about the exact location of attributes. Some general comments about the qualities present in the landscape of the likely property area are provided.

One of the project tasks related to the question of whether the property should be considered a **historic site or cultural landscape**. The technical context is that:

- sites and cultural landscapes can both be large or small in area;
- sites and cultural landscapes can both be single component World Heritage properties or serial properties with multiple components, and, at a practical level, a serial property can contain both sites and landscapes even though it may get classified as just one or other; and
- in formal terms, sites include cultural landscapes because sites are a higher order definition of cultural heritage under the World Heritage Convention.

In this case, the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is clearly a cultural landscape because at its heart it displays the interaction of humans with the environment – an Aboriginal landscape evolved from the natural environment which was then modified by European settlers. The adaptation of an idealised settlement pattern to the local topography, such as the path of water courses, is a simple if clear example of this interaction.

However, it is not yet clear whether the property is best presented as a single component or serial property, and the scale of the property is also not yet established. Once the values and attributes are clear, and drafts of these are provided below, then these can be mapped, their integrity and authenticity assessed, and boundaries can be developed. The scale and character of the property (ie. single component or serial) will then emerge.

Initial work was undertaken regarding the **comparative analysis** for the property. Four suggested contexts for the comparative analysis were identified:

- Wakefield systematic colonisation;
- European free migration following the Age of Discovery;
- post-Enlightenment attempts to create a model society; and
- agricultural innovation.

Using this framework, an initial list of potentially comparable properties was identified and analysed, based on a limited review and research.

The **development of the nomination** may be broadly divided into the following stages:

- development of a Tentative List submission, to some extent drawing on the initial tasks below;
- development of the nomination – initial tasks – refine draft Outstanding Universal Value, develop comparative analysis, refine attributes and identify boundaries;
- development of the nomination – later tasks – ongoing refinement of Outstanding Universal Value, comparative analysis, attributes and boundaries, and development of the remaining parts of the nomination; and
- other important tasks (eg. development of a management plan or system which will be vital to support the nomination).

A preliminary **workplan** is presented structured according to these stages. Additional comments are also provided regarding the development of a Tentative List submission.



CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
1. Introduction	1
2. Rationale and Core Narrative for World Heritage	3
3. Strength of the Narrative and Associated World Heritage Attributes	13
4. Research Gaps, Additional Work & Work Plan	30
5. Conclusions	40
6. References	43



1. INTRODUCTION

Since 2011-12 a consortium of Councils across the Mount Lofty Ranges has been exploring the potential for World Heritage listing of the agrarian and cultural landscapes of the region. The basis of the bid is the region's association with a transformational shift in the four-hundred-year history of modern European colonisation. The project to date has been funded on the basis that there is a World Heritage case.

After seven years of research and discussion, the consortium considers it is time to assess the strength of that case, particularly as a related National Heritage nomination has so far been unsuccessful in being accepted by the Commonwealth for evaluation. The project has therefore reached a point where an independent expert report with a considered review, and consolidation of where the project bid is at, would greatly assist in informing both the next steps, the strength of the bid and future project stakeholders.

On behalf of the consortium, the Adelaide Hills Council has commissioned this review project to undertake the following tasks:

- Review of existing rationale for seeking World Heritage listing.
- Assessment and comparison of the strength in progressing a nomination as either a historical site or cultural landscape listing, including initial assessment against comparative sites.
- Review of the current draft Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), proposed criteria, and criteria statements and suggest refinement of the statements including the identification of both the strong and weak criteria.
- Identification of the attributes and areas that most strongly reflect the potential OUV in the landscape.
- Identification of research gaps and additional work required to develop the draft OUV, criteria statements and development of World Heritage nomination, including recommended processes and realistic timeframes for preparing Tentative Listing documentation and a nomination document.
- Consultation, discussion and review with other recognised and respected World Heritage experts.

This review was constrained by a number of factors including modest resourcing, the available research and access to certain expertise. None the less, where further research or expertise is needed, this is identified in the body of the report below as part of future work planning.

The consultants for the review project are Duncan Marshall B.Arch(Hons) BA MICOMOS and Dr Jane Lennon AM MICOMOS.

The consultants are grateful to the following people for their assistance.

Melissa Bright	Adelaide Hills Council
Divya Bali Dogra	City of Onkaparinga
Dr Douglas Bardsley	University of Adelaide
Kristal Buckley AM	World Heritage expert
Stephanie Johnston	Urban and Rural Planning Consultant

Paul Mahoney Department of Conservation (NZ)
Dr Susan Marsden Historian
Emeritus Professor Erik Olssen ONZM University of Otago
Dr Elisa Palazzo University of NSW

2. RATIONALE AND CORE NARRATIVE FOR WORLD HERITAGE

2.1 REVIEW OF EXISTING RATIONALE FOR SEEKING WORLD HERITAGE LISTING

World Heritage listing is a wonderfully ambitious objective for any community. It brings global recognition for the listed property and represents an offering and a commitment by a local community to protect and present a property of World Heritage value, or formally, of Outstanding Universal Value. But it is also the most difficult listing to achieve, requiring sound research, considerable time and effort, and persistence.

In the case of the Mount Lofty Ranges, the current summary rationale for seeking World Heritage listing is as follows.

What is the Mount Lofty Ranges World Heritage Bid?

The Mount Lofty Ranges World Heritage Bid spans the world-renowned food, wine and tourism regions of the Clare and Barossa Valleys, the Adelaide Hills, McLaren Vale and the Fleurieu Peninsula. The Adelaide Hills, Alexandrina, Mount Barker, Barossa, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Mid-Murray, Mitcham, Onkaparinga and Yankalilla councils are collaborating with Regional Development Australia Barossa and the Centre for Global Food Studies and Resources at the University of Adelaide to pursue National Heritage listing of the region's agricultural landscapes as a precursor to World Heritage nomination. The council consortium are in ongoing discussions with the South Australian government and the Australian federal government around developing a nomination for World Heritage listing in tandem with the National Heritage Listing nomination.

The World Heritage list seeks to encourage the identification, protection, preservation and promotion of cultural and natural heritage around the world considered to be of outstanding value to humanity.

What are the grounds for World Heritage listing of the agricultural landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges?

We are pursuing listing for the heritage values associated with a ground-breaking 19th century model of colonisation. South Australia was the first place in Australia to be planned and developed by free settlers without the use of convict labour, and the first place in the world to apply the 'systematic colonisation' model developed by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, John Stuart Mill, Jeremy Bentham and members of the British-based 'National Colonization Society.' According to Wakefield, it was 'the first attempt since the time of the ancient Greeks to colonise systematically'.

The region's links to this unique philosophical movement of universal significance, and the continuing reflection of those original utopian ideals in the contemporary landscape and contemporary land management practice form the basis of the World Heritage bid.

The potential World Heritage area is yet to be defined but is based on the early South Australian survey areas in a series of landscapes stretching from the Fleurieu Peninsula in the south to the Clare Valley in the north. A feasibility report and economic impact study presenting the argument and rationale for World Heritage listing can be accessed at the link below while an interactive online map and original survey map can be found at the Maps section of this website. (www.mountloftyranges.org/about.html, accessed 28 March 2019)

The crucial parts of this rationale are:

- the presence of heritage values associated with a ground-breaking 19th century model of colonisation or systematic colonisation; and

- the links to a philosophical movement of universal significance, and the continuing reflection of those original utopian ideals in the contemporary landscape and land management practices.

This text begins to present the core justification for World Heritage listing in terms which resonate with the purpose, scope, criteria and threshold of the World Heritage List. There is reference to a ground-breaking model of colonisation, and to a philosophical movement of universal significance. This initial conclusion is informed by the authoritative views of the late Professor Eric Richards in his earlier contributions to the overall World Heritage bid project (for example, Richards 2017).

But this text is, of course, only the start of the justification needed, or rather, it is a brief summary of research already undertaken. The World Heritage nomination would present an extended justification of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. Other chapters of this report will consider in more detail issues related to the justification.

The rationale also notes that the likely boundary for a World Heritage property is yet to be defined however, the early survey areas are a likely starting point. These seems a reasonable conclusion at this stage. Many factors will be taken into account in finally determining boundaries, including the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, attributes which convey this value, their authenticity, integrity, protection and management.

Other parts of the rationale are background information or descriptive, but are not part of the core argument. For example, the reference to the ‘world-renowned food, wine and tourism regions’. While such text sounds impressive, it is not, as yet, clear that such statements are part of the World Heritage justification, although they do provide background to the continuity of farming and viticulture in the region.

The rationale also notes the link to the National Heritage nomination submission. It is important to note that governments in Australia have made a procedural link between National Heritage and World Heritage. That is, National Heritage should be achieved before World Heritage is attempted. However, given the quite different criteria for National Heritage and World Heritage, it is not necessarily a helpful link in terms of justifying World Heritage. There is also the problem of the different provisions regarding the possibility of serial nominations – they are possible under World Heritage but not currently under National Heritage. Accordingly, the National Heritage step is worth noting in terms of the ideal process, but ultimately it may not prove helpful in framing the World Heritage justification and nomination.

In summary, the core of the current rationale for pursuing a World Heritage listing for parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges reflecting the 19th century model of systematic colonisation appears quite sound. If it continues to be useful, this rationale should be revised in the light of continuing research and analysis, and its strength or weakness may change as a result.

2.2 THE CORE NARRATIVE FOR THE MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WORLD HERITAGE PROPOSAL

The current core narrative is defined in the following table, along with an analysis of the narrative. Concluding comments are offered at the end of the section.

Table 1. Analysis of Core Narrative	
Current Core Narrative	Analysis/Commentary
NARRATIVE UNDERPINNING THE NATIONAL AND GLOBAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AGRO-PASTORAL SETTLEMENT LANDSCAPES OF THE MOUNT LOFTY RANGES (Version of 28 February 2018)	The purpose of this narrative is understood, encompassing National Heritage as well as World Heritage. This current review is focused only on World Heritage. It is also worth being very clear that World Heritage is not the same as global or international significance. Many places might be of international significance in some way, but World Heritage has a higher threshold of Outstanding Universal Value, and World Heritage places will be a small subset of places of international significance.
National and global themes: Migration; The Enlightenment; Planned settlement; Multiculturalism; Agriculture and Viticulture	These themes flow from the proposed heritage values.
WHC = World Heritage Criterion NHC = National Heritage Criterion	
WHC 6: Associations with events and ideas of universal significance NHC a: Events and processes; NHC h: Significant people	
The agro-pastoral settlement landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges are the tangible product of a transformational shift in European migration history in the second half of the second millennium. Purposefully linked to the sale of the town surveys of colonial Adelaide, the rural surveys and settlements established in the ranges between 1836 and 1856 correspond with the second main wave of Australia's settlement history, when the focus shifted from penal colonies to agricultural development through free settlers. In a global context the Preliminary District and Special Survey areas represent the earliest and most outstanding manifestation of Edward Gibbon Wakefield's inspired contribution to the systematic colonisation movement of the 1820s.	Two parts of this text speak clearly to possible Outstanding Universal Value: - the transformational shift in European migration history in the second half of the second millennium; and - the earliest and most outstanding manifestation of Wakefield's inspired contribution to the systematic colonisation movement of the 1820s. The transformational shift idea has a grand breadth, focused on a major theme in world history (European migration), across a major period of time, and representing an important change (Richards 2017). If this can be fully justified and demonstrated by attributes, then it is a powerful argument for World Heritage. Migration is already a theme recognised in various ways in the World Heritage List (eg. the Statue of Liberty, Colonial City of Santo Domingo, Melaka and Georgetown, indeed all colonial settlements probably have a degree of migration, the Island of Gorée (related to slavery – unfree migration) and the Australian Convict Sites (related to convictism – unfree migration)). The early and outstanding manifestation of systematic colonisation is the important detail supporting the transformational shift.

Table 1. Analysis of Core Narrative	
Current Core Narrative	Analysis/Commentary
	This text also starts to identify possible attributes: agro-pastoral landscapes, town and rural surveys, and settlements.
The Wakefield model rejected prevailing colonisation strategies involving prisoners and low-income, mostly unemployed male settlers with a revolutionary approach that aimed for the establishment of a self-sustaining, prosperous agricultural economy settled by young, middle-class couples operating commercially viable farms concentrated close to urban markets. The model was debated, shaped, influenced and promoted by the Philosophical Radicals, an enormously influential group of nineteenth century politicians, social scientists and philosophers. Through the London-based “National Colonization Society” they articulated a progressive political economy model for the South Australian province that became known as the “Wakefield Plan”. The model encompassed Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism, Adam Smith's economics, John Austin's jurisprudence and John Stuart Mill's rationale for democracy and universal suffrage, ideas that evolved from the Enlightenment and that are central to the concept of modern democratic societies. The same group championed gender equality, the secret ballot, Aboriginal rights and the abolition of slavery.	This text really just expands upon the first paragraph and provides more detail. However, it does introduce the link to the Enlightenment, which was a major intellectual and philosophical movement in the 18th century. This is important for World Heritage criterion (vi). The link to the Enlightenment also adds substantial weight to the claim for OUV, because of the importance of this movement at that time and through to the present day. Attributes that demonstrate the application of the Wakefield model will be important for this part of the core narrative.
WHC 2: Important interchange of values (Influences) NHC b: Rarity; NHC h: Significant people	
The Wakefield Plan for South Australia advocated an agriculture-based, unregulated market economy founded on the planned migration of free settlers selected according to demographic profile, and the carefully managed survey and sale of town and country landholdings. The model was developed on principles of a secular, self-governing democratic society that recognised the legal rights of Aboriginal people and purposefully designed policies to encourage long-term income equality.	This text is background.
The implementation of the Wakefield Plan established a historical inflection point nationally and globally. The successful adoption and subsequent adaption of the model to the South Australian landscape can be measured in the spectacular diversion of thousands of young, free emigrants in a way that appeared inconceivable in prior decades. It engineered a revolution in human capital, as the new colony received extraordinarily high-quality migrants, and in the process designed its own demography as no other society had ever done before. In addition, the settlement process, religious freedom and social ideals associated with the colonisation system fostered the establishment of culturally distinct townships and rural communities of British, German and Polish origin that are seminal and enduring elements of today's multicultural Australian society, and of our globally	This text is background.

Table 1. Analysis of Core Narrative	
Current Core Narrative	Analysis/Commentary
significant food and wine industries. These include the Barossa family dynasties of Gramp and Sons (Jacob's Creek), the Seppelts family (Seppeltsfield), the Henschkes (Hill of Grace), the Paech family of Hahndorf (Beerenberg) and Thomas Hardy and Sons in McLaren Vale.	
Wakefield's innovative model for providing access to agricultural land and regulating land markets influenced global debates and global practice for more than a century. Chapter 33 of Karl Marx's <i>Das Kapital</i> focuses on Wakefield's colonisation theory. The Wakefield model was a direct and powerful influence on new societies in Darwin, New Zealand and Canada and shaped land laws and development policies elsewhere in Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, India, New Zealand, South Africa, Sri Lanka, and the United States. The central role played by land administrators in the new colony led to the innovation of the Torrens Title, a land registration system adopted in countries across Asia, North America, Russia and Europe, while the practice of assisted migration endured in Australia and New Zealand through to the late 19th century.	This text presents the core argument for the important interchange of human values – which must be in terms of landscape design given the character of the property. The criterion does not explicitly relate to the influence on creating new societies or land registration systems – it must be tied back to an influence in the landscape and be demonstrated by specific attributes. The geographic scope of influence also appears impressive enough, but this needs to be tested. What was the actual influence on the ground in these other places? Was it a landscape influence? Was it an important and lasting influence, or just a minor and short-term influence? By way of example, the rural landscape around Christchurch in New Zealand strongly reflects the influence of the 80 acre farms (sections) as found in South Australia. There is also the suggestion, made in the context of the New Zealand examples of systematic colonisation, that they were precursors of the Garden City movement (Olssen 1997, p. 207). There is also another form of interchange not explicitly referred to in this text although it is obliquely mentioned above. This is the influence of systematic colonisation on non-British immigrant communities, who adapted their settlements within the overall colonisation model. It is not yet clear how important such an interchange would be within the context of Outstanding Universal Value. There is the outline of a possible justification in this text, but it needs to be tied closely to the actual criterion, and as with all criteria, it also needs to go beyond apparently persuasive words to be supported by solid justification text.
WHC 4: Outstanding example of a type of landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history (Typology)	
The radical principles on which the Mount Lofty Ranges agro-pastoral landscapes were settled are evident in the founding documents of the Province of South Australia, including King William the Fourth's Letters Patent recognizing Aboriginal rights; in 80-acre rural sections that were originally allocated to Aboriginal ownership; in the continuing agro-pastoral and viticultural land uses; in the autonomous adaptation, innovation and creative	This text is more descriptive rather than clearly explaining what type of landscape is involved, why it is outstanding, and what significant stage in human history is illustrated. It hints at why it might be outstanding (eg. radical principles) but goes no further. The text is helpful in terms of identifying potential attributes.

Table 1. Analysis of Core Narrative	
Current Core Narrative	Analysis/Commentary
achievements of generations of family farming enterprise; in the enduring success of the 80-acre section proposed by Wakefield; in the survey markers, grid patterns, section boundaries and minor road systems; in the early survey maps and title descriptions still in existence in the South Australian land title system; in the location, layout and extraordinary diversity of religious and cultural infrastructure of the numerous colonial villages and townships augmented by mining and secondary industry; in the connecting cultural and historic routes; in surveys adapted to water courses in ways that ensured equal access for all; in surviving and revitalized rural estates and agricultural infrastructure; in heritage vineyards (amongst the oldest in the world) that predate Europe's phylloxera epidemic of the late 19th century; and in Aboriginal and European archaeological sites.	This part of the narrative needs to be re-focused to present a summary justification against the actual criterion, which can then be embellished with such descriptive text if needed. The justification needs to make clear why the property is the/an outstanding example, and this might be framed in terms of it being the first, the fullest and the most intact of the Wakefield settlement landscapes, assuming such qualities can actually be demonstrated. In addition, the justification needs to make clear why such landscapes as a category are of Outstanding Universal Value. In relative terms, the size of the migration to South Australia does not seem sufficient justification, as noted below, and the question of its wider influence is dealt with under criterion (ii). Instead, the justification might rest on the property reflecting a substantially different settlement system from that which prevailed at the time, that it was a successful system (if this can be supported, noting such problems as the 1841 land sales collapse and resulting bankruptcy, and doubts about the viability of 80 acre farms (sections)), and that it reflected the Enlightenment ideals of the period. One particular point deserves comment. The recognition of Aboriginal rights was an important aspiration expressed through the Letters Patent, and reflects progressive social ideals related to the Enlightenment. However, it is understood there was little real impact from the aspiration. While some reserves were created, this stands for little given the widespread dispossession which took place. The recognition of Aboriginal rights should be part of the systematic colonisation story, but it requires a balanced treatment and the positive aspects should not be over-stated.
WHC 5: Outstanding example of a land use representative of human interaction with the environment under threat (Land use) NHC d: Principal characteristics of a class of places or environments	
The agro-pastoral landscapes, built environment, social attributes, economic activities and land policy processes of the Mount Lofty Ranges are inextricably linked to the core ideas and founding principles of their radical settlement plan, which in turn took advantage of the pre-existing Aboriginal-managed landscape. Like many other Australian settlement landscapes, the Mount Lofty Ranges are filled with Aboriginal peoples' sacred sites and their ancestral connections to creation stories, oral histories and pre-colonisation memories, and present a shared post-colonisation history filled with broken promises, missed opportunities and evolving reconciliation.	This is largely background text, introducing the radical settlement plan related to land use.

Table 1. Analysis of Core Narrative	
Current Core Narrative	Analysis/Commentary
Today the agro-pastoral settlement landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges continue to be shaped by their intimate and dynamic relationship with the city of Adelaide, and export markets. Rising as a well-watered “green island” from a largely flat and arid continent, they remain a bio-culturally diverse and highly productive landscape of ongoing importance to Australia and the world. This is evident in the diversity of primary production and in the use and appreciation of the landscape’s natural resources, including the innovative ongoing management of its water resources and nationally significant biodiversity. One of 15 national biodiversity hotspots, the ranges are a site of convergence for animal and plant species from Australia’s east and west coasts, and from xeric and mesic environments.	This text is also background. It introduces the relationship to the city of Adelaide, which is a reminder that attributes might be found in the city itself. Some parts of the text introduce ideas that do not look closely related to the criterion – the ‘productive landscape of ongoing importance to Australia and the world’ and the biodiversity aspect.
The level of legislative protection afforded to the cultural landscape’s primary production values and environmental values is unique in a national and global context in terms of the size of the area protected (984,009 hectares), and the nature of the protection. In a framework of global uncertainty, the agro-pastoral and viticultural attributes of the protected landscape and its primary production components remain largely intact, despite their close proximity to an urban centre. A 175-year-old heritage of forward planning, adaption to new conditions, agricultural experimentation and innovative farming practice is enabling a process of effective adaptation to a future increasingly shaped by global climate change, financial volatility, agricultural intensification and accelerating urbanisation.	The strongest part of this text relevant to the criterion seems to be the ‘heritage of forward planning, adaption to new conditions, agricultural experimentation and innovative farming practice is enabling a process of effective adaptation to a future’ (drawing on ideas from Bardsley & Palazzo 2018). In terms of the criterion, this would be best characterised as a human interaction with the environment. As with the stronger looking statements under other criteria, while at this stage such claims may hold some promise, much depends on the supporting and detailed justification that can be provided. The doubt is that it may be very hard to prove that the property is an outstanding example of such land use, given the evolution in agriculture has presumably occurred for thousands of years and in most inhabited parts of the world. There is also the possibility of justifying value in terms of a traditional land-use related to systematic colonisation, although this is not raised in the narrative text. The unique protection system does not seem to be an aspect relevant to the criterion, unless the argument is turned around to stress the vulnerability of the landscape. If so, the sense of vulnerability does not come through clearly. Rather, planning and adaptation make it seem like vulnerability has been avoided.

In summary, the core narrative is helpfully structured according to the World Heritage criteria and contains key text which speaks clearly to the possibility of World Heritage value or Outstanding Universal Value. While at this stage such text looks promising, much depends on the supporting and detailed justification that can be provided, and the identification of relevant attributes.

However, the narrative for World Heritage becomes a little obscured by aspects more

strongly related to National Heritage, realising the narrative was an earlier attempt to address both. One aspect that could be strengthened is to tie the text closely to the World Heritage criteria – assuming a single focus for this narrative. In particular, the text against criterion (iv) needs revision to present a summary justification against the criterion. In addition, perhaps not all of the background or descriptive text is needed in the overall narrative. The purpose of the narrative needs to be clear, and would guide such decisions.

If this narrative is to have a future role in the bid project, consideration should be given to tying the text more closely to the short criteria statements considered in the next chapter. While these short statements were used in the development of the narrative, their strength may have been reduced by the dual-purpose of the narrative, and the length of some of the background text.

The narrative might also benefit from some additional contextual information to place the European settlement of South Australia in the broader picture of migration, such as the following text.

Migration is a major and enduring theme through much of world history from ancient times to the present day. European emigration coupled with colonisation from about 1500 CE was itself of great historical importance marking the beginning of globalisation, and it arose as a result of the explorations in the Age of Discovery. From 1500-1783 CE there were 1.4 million migrants, and from 1815-1930 CE there were 60 million migrants. The Americas were the major destination, with 32 million people travelling to the USA in 1821-1932 CE. In the same period, Australia received 2.9 million migrants. These migrants could be either free or indentured (contracted).

The systematic colonisation of South Australia saw the arrival of 110,000 people [to be updated – this is a population figure not arrivals] in the initial period of the settlement scheme from 1836-1857 CE.

The migrations to other places prior to South Australia tended to involve a number of problems related to land acquisition, labour shortages and the consequent reliance on unfree labour such as convicts or indentured labour. Previous Australian colonisation efforts were characterised by an unstructured approach. Wakefield's systematic colonisation was informed by Enlightenment ideals and was designed to avoid these problems and result in a superior colony based on free settlement, the sale of land at a sufficient price, funding to assist emigration, and the careful selection of migrants to create a viable colony. (Wikipedia, 'European migration', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_emigration and 'European colonization of the Americas', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_colonization_of_the_Americas, accessed 8 April 2019; 'Migration', <http://sahistoryhub.com.au/subjects/migration-0>, accessed 8 April 2019; Richards 2017)

This text relies on a range of readily available secondary sources, some of which may not be entirely reliable, and it needs to be more closely checked and better referenced to ensure accuracy.

The text also highlights one of the challenges for the justification of the property for World Heritage – how can the property be of Outstanding Universal Value in the overall migration theme when the number of migrants was very small compared to other European emigration such as to the Americas.

A longer though still brief description of the Wakefield system might also be helpful to include or append. For example,

The central features of Wakefield systematic colonisation were related to activating free emigration to Australia:

- the commitment by the colony to massive financing to generate migrant inflows; and
- the recruitment and selection of specific immigrants for a very long-distance destination.

It aimed for long-term sustainability and resilience, rather than a short-term profit for its founders, and the colony was to be self-funding from the sale of land.

Detailed aspects included:

- minimum land pricing to concentrate settlement, and not land grants;
- use of funds from land sales which were synchronised to subsidise immigration of free settlers/labour for the colony, avoiding the need for government support;
- the transfer of colonial labour supply from the private sector to the government;
- prescribing the composition of the population according to age and gender – meaning the recruitment of younger families, to ensure a balance of sexes, and from the lowest occupational strata but still a more literate population than the average;
- recruitment of free rather than indentured labour, that is free settlement, and certainly no convict labour;
- detailed surveying of town and country landholdings ahead of sale;
- containing urban and rural settlement within surveyed districts;
- town acres within the city of Adelaide and a framework of Preliminary Districts and Special Surveys (the latter criticised by Wakefield himself) in the rural areas with 80 acre farm units (sections) in order to promote intensive forms of farming rather than pastoral activities;
- linking 1 acre town block and 80 acre rural land purchases as part of the preliminary land order system;
- generally locating towns near the middle of hundreds (a land area initially of 100 sections), with smaller sections closer to the township;
- settlement policies to avoid unemployment; and
- an Arcadian ideal of a self-supporting society of agriculturists, as well as the founders' utopian principles including egalitarianism, religious freedom and a recognition of Indigenous rights.

The initial system contained aspects which were not supported by Wakefield, such as the Special Surveys, although it has been argued that in reality these also helped achieve the social goals and aspiration of the system. There were also changes made during the implementation of the system which departed from the original intentions (ie. a temporary lowering of the minimum price of country land, and developing land remote from the capital in the southern Preliminary Districts). (Richards 2017; 'Systematic colonisation', <http://boundforsouthaustralia.com.au/historical-background.html>, accessed 8 April 2019; Pretty 1967, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/wakefield-edward-gibbon-2763>, accessed 8 April 2019; Wikipedia, 'Land administrative divisions of South Australia', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lands_administrative_divisions_of_South_Australia, accessed 18 April 2019; Mount Lofty Ranges National Heritage nomination, Appendix 3, National Heritage values analysis; Herraman 2017).

As above, this text relies on a range of readily available secondary sources, some of which may not be entirely reliable, and this brief description should be confirmed with scholars of systematic colonisation. In addition, the concept of utopianism deserves further scrutiny or contextualisation. At least one scholar portrays Wakefield's scheme as partly a rejection of utopianism, presumably in the sense of it being naïve and unrealistic (Olssen 1997, p. 201).

The story of the size of sections (or farm units) needs further clarification. While 80 acre sections are commonly referenced, it is understood that other sizes were also used, perhaps more commonly (eg. 134 and 200 acre sections).

As part of any nomination dossier, a glossary would also assist to understand some specific terms.

While the above analysis and commentary presents a generally positive view of the possibilities for World Heritage, albeit with qualifications, it is also worth highlighting some of the potential weaknesses or difficulties that may be encountered:

- the colonial settlement theme may broadly be considered problematic, although there does not seem to have been a general antipathy to such properties in the World

Heritage system to date;

- the historical assessments of the importance of Wakefield's systematic colonisation have been mixed with some positive and others negative (see for example Olssen 1997; Woollacott 2015; Ballantyne 2014). There is also a related question about the extent to which Wakefield should be the sole focus of attention, and how much the contributions of others such as Bentham, Mill and Owen should be acknowledged;
- there are inconsistencies between the theory and the practice of the system in the range of countries, such as regarding free settlement yet the involvement of indentured labour in some cases, and the formal recognition of indigenous rights yet the actual dispossession of indigenous peoples, and their exploitation, including open warfare in New Zealand (Woollacott 2015; Ballantyne 2014);
- the difficulty in applying the theory of systematic colonisation in Australian landscapes that varied greatly in productive capacity;
- suggestions that the South Australian experiment failed or at least displayed significant difficulties (Woollacott 2015); and
- suggestions that some parts of South Australian settlement were underpinned by British financiers with links to the slave trade (Wikipedia, 'History of South Australia', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_South_Australia, accessed 8 April 2019; 'Slavery in Australia', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery_in_Australia, accessed 2 May 2019).

Some of these points may lead to criticism of any nomination, especially if there is any sense of glossing over aspects now viewed as important or important to recognise as part of the overall history. Key responses to such points include:

- any portrayal of Wakefield's systematic colonisation and the history of the South Australian property should be a balanced and contextual portrayal, recognising the characteristics of the period, the positive and negative aspects of the story, the strengths and the weaknesses of systematic colonisation, and the differences between theory and practice; and
- the range of authoritative views about Wakefield's systematic colonisation should be presented, but with a focus on the prevailing consensus, if one exists.

3. STRENGTH OF THE NARRATIVE AND ASSOCIATED WORLD HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

3.1 REVIEW OF THE CURRENT DRAFT OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE, PROPOSED CRITERIA AND CRITERIA STATEMENTS

To achieve World Heritage, a property needs to meet at least one of the criteria defined in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2017). The summary justification against any criteria which are met can be referred to as criteria statements, and these statements form a core part of the Outstanding Universal Value.

One of the outcomes of a workshop in November 2017 was the identification of four World Heritage criteria, (ii), (iv), (v) and (vi), along with draft justification text for each.

In terms of the criteria identified, and other possible criteria, the following table presents a brief updated analysis of each of the World Heritage cultural criteria and their possible relevance for the Mount Lofty Ranges proposal. While such an analysis has been undertaken previously, such as at the 2017 workshop, an updated review at this stage seems worthwhile.

Table 2. Analysis of World Heritage Cultural Criteria and their possible application to the Mount Lofty Ranges Proposal		
No.	Criteria	Analysis/Comments
(i)	represent a masterpiece of human creative genius	This criterion is not relevant to the Mount Lofty Ranges proposal. There is no apparent sense of any creative genius within the meaning of the criterion, which is often applied to great works of architecture and the like.
(ii)	exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design	This criterion is relevant to the proposed property. As noted in the narrative above, the systematic colonisation first developed in South Australia appears to have been influential in other parts of the world. This is exactly the kind of influence or interchange which is found on the World Heritage List in many different forms. The possible influence on the Garden City movement might be another dimension to consider, although it would need to be an important or indeed outstanding influence. The other use of this criterion relates to the influence on non-British immigrant communities in South Australia. As noted in the preceding chapter, it is not clear whether this would be regarded as an important interchange within the context of Outstanding Universal Value.
(iii)	bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared	This criterion is not strongly relevant to the Mount Lofty Ranges proposal. The systematic colonisation is not a cultural tradition within the meaning of the criterion, and it is highly unlikely

Table 2. Analysis of World Heritage Cultural Criteria and their possible application to the Mount Lofty Ranges Proposal

No.	Criteria	Analysis/Comments
		that it would be regarded as exceptional testimony of British civilisation. There are many possible examples of such testimony, and it is by no means clear that systematic colonisation would be regarded as exceptional in this context. Further exploration of this criterion is not recommended because of the apparent weakness.
(iv)	be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history	This criterion is relevant to the proposed property. As noted in the narrative above, the property is an outstanding example of a landscape reflecting a new type of settlement illustrating a significant stage in human history – the transformational period in European migrations.
(v)	be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change	This criterion does appear relevant to the proposed property in two ways: because it is a human interaction with the environment and it might now be regarded as a traditional land-use. As noted in the previous chapter, it is suspected that it may be very hard to prove that the property is an outstanding example of such human interaction, given the evolution in agriculture has presumably occurred for thousands of years and in most inhabited parts of the world. In addition, the current landscape might now be considered a traditional land use related to systematic colonisation. However, the property would not be regarded as a traditional land use at the time of settlement, given it was an innovation at the time rather than part of a continuing and longstanding land use practice. Previous World Heritage nominations which have sought to use this criterion for the first or innovative example which went on to become a tradition have not generally been successful. The possible weaknesses are that the tradition might be considered relatively short-lived and limited to a small number of examples worldwide. This criterion could be further explored however, there are doubts about parts of the justification.
(vi)	be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria)	This criterion is strongly relevant to the proposed property. The strong link to the Enlightenment and broad progressive social ideas, leading to systematic colonisation, provides a sound basis for continuing to develop its use. Although it is noted that Enlightenment influences are many throughout the world and the key will be demonstrating the outstanding qualities in this case.

Accordingly:

- the stronger criteria relevant to the proposed property are (ii), (iv) and (vi);

- weaker or more difficult criteria are (iii) and (v), or at least parts of claims that could be made under criterion (v). In the case of (ii), one aspect of the use of this criterion might also be weak – related to the influence on non-British immigrant communities; and
- the criterion which is clearly not relevant is (i).

The remainder of this section considers the draft justification text or criteria statements developed at the November 2017 workshop.

In all of the following text, the question of the name of the property to be nominated needs to be decided. As suggested in the existing draft justification text, and otherwise, there are various options:

- Mount Lofty Ranges;
- Colonial Settlement Landscape of South Australia;
- Wakefield Settlement Landscape of South Australia; and
- Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia.

The last two options would seem the most appropriate in terms of providing a descriptive characterisation of the property, with the latter being the most clear and recommended. Shorter versions of the last option might also be suitable, for example either Systematic Colonisation Landscape of South Australia or Settlement Landscape of South Australia.

Criterion (ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design

The draft justification text previously developed for this criterion is as follows.

The Mount Lofty Ranges (Colonial [or Wakefield] Settlement Landscape of South Australia [might be a better name]) is the outstanding example of the 19th century Wakefield systematic settlement model for a progressive society and free migration. Within the context of the major European migrations in the second half of the second millennium, it was a radical and influential departure from the prevailing Atlantic and forced migrations.

The Colonial [or Wakefield] Settlement Landscape of South Australia was the powerful model for the development of new colonial societies in many other countries from the 19th century. Based on an ideal model developed in the United Kingdom, the landscape also demonstrates the vital adaptation of the model to the real and local conditions of South Australia, including significant adaptation by immigrants of different cultural groups within the overall settlement enterprise.

Based on the analysis and comments provided above, this justification text has been revised.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is the outstanding example of the 19th century Wakefield systematic colonisation model for the creation of a viable settler community based on free migration and a progressive society. Within the context of the major European migrations from about 1500 CE to 1914 CE, it was a radical and influential departure from the prevailing Atlantic and forced migrations, and was the first example of systematic colonisation.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia was the powerful model for the development of new colonial societies in several other countries from the 19th century. Based on an ideal model developed in the United Kingdom, the landscape also demonstrates the vital adaptation of the model to the real and local conditions of the recipient colony, including significant adaptation by immigrants of different cultural groups within the overall settlement enterprise.

Criterion (iv) be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history

The draft justification text previously developed for this criterion is as follows.

The Colonial [or Wakefield] Settlement Landscape of South Australia is the outstanding example of the implementation of the 19th century Wakefield systematic settlement model, which in part took advantage of the pre-existing Aboriginal managed landscape. This model marked a major change in European colonisation towards a progressive society and free migration to the far-distant lands of Australia.

Based on the analysis and comments provided above, this justification text has been revised.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is the outstanding example of the implementation of the 19th century Wakefield systematic colonisation model, which in part took advantage of the pre-existing Aboriginal managed landscape. Key features of the model included land sales synchronised to subsidise immigration of free settlers/labour for the colony, the recruitment of younger families as ideal settlers, concentrated settlement, 80 acre farm units (sections), and broader utopian principles such as religious freedom.

This model is reflected in the landscape and marks an important change in the period of major European migrations and associated colonisation towards a progressive society and free migration to the far-distant lands of Australia. The property is the original and most enduring expression of systematic colonisation.

Criterion (v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change

The draft justification text previously developed for this criterion is as follows.

The cultural landscapes are novel agricultural ecosystems that demonstrate the heritage of innovation which is both colonial and modern in adaption to irreversible change. Initially the Wakefield system was constantly being adapted by emigrant communities in responses to the environmental and climatic conditions, strongly influenced by the settlement traditions of British, German and Polish colonising, expressed in the land use and township patterns that included the 80-acre sections and 45 towns.

Modern farming practices are enabling a process of effective adaptation to a future increasingly shaped by global climate change, financial unpredictability, agricultural intensification and urbanisation.

The autonomous adaptation by farmers and latterly by vigneron continues to be assisted by the types of planned adaptation that has led to the region being an outstanding example of agrarian learning and experimentation.

Based on the analysis and comments provided above, this justification text has been revised.

The cultural landscapes of the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia are novel agricultural ecosystems that demonstrate the heritage of innovation which is both colonial and modern in adaption to irreversible change. Initially the Wakefield system was constantly being adapted by immigrant communities in response to environmental and climatic conditions, strongly influenced by the settlement traditions of British, German and Polish colonists, expressed in the land use and township patterns that included the 80 acre farms (sections).

Modern farming practices are enabling a process of effective adaptation to a future increasingly shaped by global climate change, financial unpredictability, agricultural intensification and urbanisation.

The autonomous adaptation by farmers and latterly by vigneron continues to be assisted by the types of planned adaptation that has led to the region being an outstanding example of agrarian learning and experimentation.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is also the outstanding example of a traditional land-use expressing the Wakefield systematic settlement model, representing an important change in European colonisation during the period of major migrations. Taking advantage of Aboriginal managed lands, European colonists settled on systematically surveyed land based around 80 acre farms (sections). The history of settlement is still reflected in the landscape and its land use patterns, and in the presence of early surviving land uses including vineyards and orchards.

Criterion (vi) be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance. (The Committee considers that this criterion should preferably be used in conjunction with other criteria)

The draft justification text previously developed for this criterion is as follows.

The Colonial [or Wakefield] Settlement Landscape of South Australia is the supreme realisation of the transformational shift in European colonisation in the second half of the second millennium. The unprecedented colonisation strategy was based on a progressive political/economic model which evolved from the Enlightenment and championed free settlement and the abolition of slavery, assisted free migration, free markets, gender equality, the secret ballot and Aboriginal rights, in order to create a secular, self-governing, democratic and modern society. The Colonial [or Wakefield] Settlement Landscape of South Australia and its associated ideas were highly influential in the creation of other new colonial societies in the period, and these ideas have become central to the concept of modern democratic societies.

Based on the analysis and comments provided above, this justification text has been revised.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is the supreme realisation of the transformational shift in European colonisation in the period from about 1500 CE to 1914 CE. The unprecedented colonisation strategy was based on a progressive political/economic model which evolved from the Enlightenment and championed free settlement and the abolition of slavery, assisted free migration, free markets, gender equality, the secret ballot, religious tolerance and Indigenous rights, in order to create a secular, self-governing, democratic and modern society. However, in practice these utopian ideals were in some cases not fully realised, and some proved a failure, especially in the case of Aboriginal rights.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia and its associated ideas were highly influential in the creation of other new colonial societies in the period, and these ideas have become central to the concept of modern democratic societies.

3.2 IDENTIFICATION OF THE ATTRIBUTES AND AREAS THAT MOST STRONGLY REFLECT THE POTENTIAL OUV IN THE LANDSCAPE

Attributes are those tangible or intangibles aspects of a place that embody or convey heritage values, including Outstanding Universal Value in the case of World Heritage. Tangible aspects might include buildings, land patterns or plantings, whereas intangible aspects might be uses and activities associated with the place.

The starting point to identify attributes is the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, as presented in the previous section. In the following table, key text from the draft Outstanding Universal Value is presented along with the related attributes.

Table 3. Analysis of Draft Outstanding Universal Value and Related Attributes	
Draft Outstanding Universal Value	Attributes
Wakefield systematic colonisation... key features of the model included land sales synchronised to subsidise immigration of free settlers/labour for the colony, the recruitment of younger families as ideal settlers, concentrated settlement, 80 acre farm units (sections), and broader utopian principles such as religious freedom	• Surveyed town and country landholdings – town acres within the city of Adelaide and a framework of Preliminary Districts and Special Surveys in the rural areas with 80 acre farm units (sections) • Concentrated settlement – contained urban and rural settlement within surveyed districts • Surveyed towns and villages generally located near the middle of rural hundreds, with smaller sections closer to the township • Linked 1 acre town block and 80 acre rural land purchases as part of the preliminary land order system • Survey markers, roads, fences and other markers of section, hundred, county, Preliminary District and Special Survey boundaries • 80 acre farm units (sections), including those with surviving original farmhouses and rural buildings • An area of McLaren Vale representing the purest grid form of the Wakefieldian survey system • Original rural land uses • The diversity of places of religious worship and other cultural places reflecting religious/cultural freedom (eg. related to German, Austrian and Polish Lutherans, Jesuits and Catholic migrants) • Aboriginal reserves reflecting the early but practically limited recognition of Indigenous rights
Vital adaptation of the model to the real and local conditions of the recipient colony, including significant adaptation by immigrants of different cultural groups within the overall settlement enterprise	• Examples of adaptation of the land settlement to environmental conditions • Examples of adaptation of the land settlement to different cultural groups, and the religious and cultural places associated with such groups
Heritage of innovation... adapted by immigrant communities in response to environmental and climatic conditions, strongly influenced by the settlement traditions of British, German and Polish	• Examples of adaptation of the land settlement to environmental conditions • Examples of adaptation of the land settlement to different cultural groups

Table 3. Analysis of Draft Outstanding Universal Value and Related Attributes	
Draft Outstanding Universal Value	Attributes
colonists, expressed in the land use and township patterns that included the 80 acre farms (sections)	
Autonomous adaptation by farmers and latterly by vigneron continues to be assisted by the types of planned adaptation that has led to the region	• Examples of adaptation by farmers and latterly by vigneron
History of settlement is still reflected in the landscape and its land use patterns, and in the presence of early surviving land uses including vineyards and orchards	• Examples of early surviving land uses including vineyards and orchards

The project was intended to identify areas which strongly reflect the potential OUV in the landscape. Such areas will be those which contain the attributes noted above. At the broadest scale, the maximum possible extent of the potential World Heritage property is known, corresponding to the extent of the Preliminary Districts and Special Surveys. As part of the process of refining the area for the property, there is also the suggestion above that an area of McLaren Vale represents the purest grid form of the Wakefieldian survey system.

However, refining the mapping of attributes beyond this point becomes difficult because of the lack of detail about the exact location of attributes. A review of the previous work by the University of Adelaide to map a variety of qualities in the Mount Lofty Ranges found it only of limited assistance for this task, and more detailed mapping of a range of specific attributes would still appear to be needed.

Some general comments about the qualities present in the landscape of the likely property area are possible though. This area:

- will reflect the best surviving evidence of Wakefield systematic colonisation;
- this will include rural area/s with 80 acre farm units (sections), especially those with surviving original farmhouses and rural buildings, and continuing rural land uses, as well as associated surveyed towns and villages, and associated survey markers;
- will include examples of original Aboriginal reserves;
- will include examples of adaptation of the land settlement to environmental conditions;
- will include examples of adaptation of the land settlement to different cultural groups, such as the hufendorf settlement patterns;
- will include examples of the diversity of places of religious worship and other cultural places reflecting religious/cultural freedom, probably usually associated with surveyed towns and villages;
- will include examples of adaptation by farmers and latterly by vigneron;
- will include examples of early surviving land uses including vineyards and orchards;
- will include representation from Preliminary Districts as well as Special Surveys;
- may include examples of town acres within the city of Adelaide, if the specific link to rural sections can be established; and
- may include the original surveyed city of Adelaide, though this requires further consideration.

3.3 ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON OF THE STRENGTH IN PROGRESSING A NOMINATION AS EITHER A HISTORICAL SITE OR CULTURAL LANDSCAPE LISTING

Part of the context to this question might be a concern about the size of any possible World Heritage property focused on the evidence of systematic colonisation, and also whether a single component property is proposed or a serial property with more than one component. Before addressing these issues, it is worth considering the definitions provided in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2017). Several key extracts are below.

‘For the purposes of this Convention, the following shall be considered as “cultural heritage”... sites: works of man or the combined works of nature and of man, and areas including archaeological sites which are of outstanding universal value from the historical, aesthetic, ethnological or anthropological points of view.’ (Paragraph 45, quoting the World Heritage Convention)

‘Cultural landscapes are cultural properties and represent the ‘combined works of nature and man’ as designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal.’ (Paragraph 47)

Three categories of cultural landscape are defined,

‘the clearly defined **landscape designed and created intentionally by man**. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles...

the **organically evolved landscape**. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

- a relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which evolutionary process came to an end in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.
- a continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time...

the **associative cultural landscape**. Such landscapes are included on the World Heritage List by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.’ (Annex 3, paragraph 10)

Importantly, sites include cultural landscapes because sites are a higher order definition of cultural heritage under the World Heritage Convention, along with monuments and groups of buildings. None the less, many sites are generally small and proscribe a feature such as a building, rock art, garden or archaeological ruin. On the other hand, some sites can be quite extensive, such as large archaeological sites.

Cultural landscapes tend to be larger and contain features developed on the natural landform such as roads following contours or water courses, settlements at crossing points, community buildings, farm units and boundaries. They must include the geography of the landscape as the basis of the human interaction with it. On the other hand, designed landscapes, for example, can be quite small, although these are not relevant in this case.

Accordingly, the key issue is not to contrast sites and cultural landscapes as different categories, because sites include cultural landscapes. The key issue is whether the Outstanding Universal Value relates to a place being a combined work of nature and people. If it is not, then it will be a site, or monument or group of buildings being the other categories of cultural heritage. If it is a combined work, then it will be a site as well as a cultural landscape.

The Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is clearly a cultural landscape because at its heart it displays this interaction, this combination of a 'natural' environment, recognising this was in fact an Aboriginal landscape, with the work of people – European settlers. The adaptation of an idealised settlement pattern to the local topography, such as the path of water courses, is a clear example of this interaction.

It is interesting to note that in a practical sense, a single World Heritage property can also include both sites, such as fragments of structures or non-building structures, and landscapes within the same property. An example is the Australian Convict Sites property which is a serial property of both sites in this sense (ie. Cascades Female Factory and Yard 4 North, and Coal Mines Historic Site) and larger cultural landscapes (ie. Brickendon Estate, Woolmers Estate, Port Arthur Historic Site, Old Government House and Government Domain, and Kingston and Arthurs Vale Historic Area). This property also has buildings or groups of buildings. However, in formal terms, the property is regarded as a serial of groups of buildings.

In summary:

- sites and cultural landscapes can both be large or small in area;
- sites and cultural landscapes can both be single component World Heritage properties or serial properties with multiple components, and, at a practical level, a serial property can contain both sites and landscapes even though it may get classified as just one or other; and
- in formal terms, sites include cultural landscapes because sites are a higher order definition of cultural heritage under the World Heritage Convention.

With regard to the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia, this is a cultural landscape because it is a combined work of nature and people. However, it is not yet clear whether the property is best presented as a single component or serial property, and the scale of the property is also not yet established. Once the values and attributes are clear, and drafts of these are provided above, then these can be mapped, their integrity and authenticity assessed, and boundaries can be developed. The scale and character of the property (ie. single component or serial) will then emerge.

3.4 INITIAL ASSESSMENT AGAINST COMPARABLE SITES

Framework for the Comparative Analysis

The purpose of the comparative analysis is to identify whether there are other properties with the same values and attributes that are on the World Heritage List or which might be nominated in future. Being a highly selective list, in theory only one or a very few such properties can be included in the World Heritage List. The comparative analysis is a very important part of a nomination, and many nominations fail because of inadequacies with the analysis provided.

Identifying comparable properties requires defining the context for the analysis, which arises from the proposed Outstanding Universal Value and the related attributes. In this case, the core of the values relate to:

- Wakefield systematic colonisation, with higher-order themes being European free migration following the Age of Discovery, European free and un-free migration more broadly in this period, as well as post-Enlightenment attempts to create a model society; and
- agricultural innovation.

This formulation offers five potential contexts for the comparative analysis. At this stage, it seems likely that European free and un-free migration following the Age of Discovery would not need to be considered, as the lower-order theme of European free migration in the period would appear to be an important enough theme in World Heritage terms. Although the broad sweep of migration, both free and unfree would be addressed in the history chapter of a nomination.

On the other hand, limiting the analysis to just Wakefield systematic colonisation, while the obvious context and one that must be addressed, risks appearing too narrow. The purpose of considering a broader migration theme is to contrast Wakefield systematic colonisation with other forms of colonisation, to consider what might, in some instances, appear superficially similar properties, and to demonstrate significant differences, if any.

Accordingly, the suggested contexts for the comparative analysis are:

- Wakefield systematic colonisation;
- European free migration following the Age of Discovery;
- post-Enlightenment attempts to create a model society; and
- agricultural innovation.

Potentially Comparable Properties

Using the framework above, the following table presents an initial list of potentially comparable properties with an initial analysis, based on a limited review and research.

Table 4. Potentially Comparable Properties on the World Heritage List or Otherwise			
Country	Name	Date inscribed on World Heritage List/Criteria/Size of property/ buffer zone	Initial Analysis
Wakefield Systematic Colonisation			
Australia	South Australia (1836)	Not listed/--/--/--	The original and best surviving example of systematic colonisation reflecting a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society focused on rural enterprise.
Australia	Australind (1840)	Not listed/--/--/--	Based on an area of 420 square kilometres, it was surveyed and included a detailed plan for a town. It included 100 acre farms. However, the settlement began to fail early, little of the town was developed, and settlement plans were officially abandoned in 1875. Now a dormitory suburb of Bunbury. A handful of historic buildings survive. (Woollacott 2015, pp. 51-2; Wikipedia, 'Australind, Western Australia', https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australind,_Western_Australia , accessed 19 April 2019)
Australia	Darwin (1863)	Not listed/--/--/--	The implementation of Wakefield principles was attempted in the settlement after South Australia annexed its Northern Territory, but the settlement was a failure as an example of systematic colonisation. 'the soil was too poor and the climate too difficult for the port's few residents to replicate the kind of farming established in the hinterland of the southern city of Adelaide. The Territory's climate and remoteness generally defeated efforts by South Australians to recreate the closely settled and populous rural-and-town pattern so established on the Adelaide Plains and in the Ranges. Nor could the South Australian government foster private land development. As Powell concludes, 'the commercial-agricultural base of South Australia consistently failed to develop in the north'.' (Mount Lofty Ranges National Heritage nomination)
New Zealand	Wellington (1840)	Not listed/--/--/--	Few details about the New Zealand examples have been found so far. Wakefield came to disparage the Australian examples, and thought positively of the New Zealand colonies, at least for a period. While the other New Zealand colonies had problems, at least initially, Canterbury was regarded as a success due to its much higher rate of settlers compared to land speculators. This led to productive use of the land, and jobs for colonists who were not in a financial
New Zealand	Wanganui (1840)	Not listed/--/--/--	
New Zealand	New Plymouth/ Taranaki (1841)	Not listed/--/--/--	
New Zealand	Nelson(1841)	Not listed/--/--/--	
New Zealand	Otago (1848)	Not listed/--/--/--	
New Zealand	Canterbury (1850)	Not listed/--/--/--	

Table 4. Potentially Comparable Properties on the World Heritage List or Otherwise

Country	Name	Date inscribed on World Heritage List/Criteria/Size of property/ buffer zone	Initial Analysis
			position to be able to buy land. However, the settlement of Otago and Canterbury gave greater prominence to religion, perhaps undermining the early ideal of religious freedom. An adequate supply of land proved difficult at Wellington. At Wanganui there were tensions with Maori about land acquisition, commercial development was slow and the town remained small and undeveloped. New Plymouth was also troubled by land conflicts, and the lack of a harbour until the 1880s. (Ballantyne 2015, pp. 96-97)
Brazil	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential in reframing the key land law in 1850. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 98)
Canada	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential in land policies from the 1840s. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 96)
France	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential on French reflections on the nature of colonial societies. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 98)
India	Not known		The details of influence in India has not yet been established.
Jamaica	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential in debates about providing immigrants to resolve a labour crisis. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 98)
South Africa	Cape Colony and Natal		Wakefield's ideas were influential on population movement to settler colonies. Colonial land sales funded transportation and accommodation for new colonists. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 95)
Sri Lanka	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential on land policies but it is not known if this resulted in a distinctive landscape similar to

Table 4. Potentially Comparable Properties on the World Heritage List or Otherwise			
Country	Name	Date inscribed on World Heritage List/Criteria/Size of property/ buffer zone	Initial Analysis
			systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 98)
USA	Not known		Wakefield's ideas were influential in debates about land, markets and migration. However, it is not clear if there was an associated physical impact in the landscape similar to systematic colonisation. (Ballantyne 2014, p. 98)
European Free Migration following the Age of Discovery			
Argentina and Brazil	Jesuit Missions of the Guaranis: San Ignacio Mini, Santa Ana, Nuestra Señora de Loreto and Santa Maria Mayor (Argentina), Ruins of São Miguel das Missões (Brazil) (17 th and 18 th centuries)	1983, extended 1984/iv/--/--	This property displays a version of systematic colonisation. However, the theoretical basis for the colonisation seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example, such as the evangelising objective. This property is also comprised of buildings and architectural ensembles, it does not have a landscape dimension or embrace rural enterprise.
Bolivia	Jesuit Missions of the Chiquitos (1696-1760)	1990/iv, v/--/--	This property displays a version of systematic colonisation. However, the theoretical basis for the colonisation seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example, such as the evangelising objective. This property is also comprised of buildings and architectural ensembles, it does not have a landscape dimension or embrace rural enterprise.
Canada	Landscape of Grand Pré (17 th century)	2012/v, vi/ 1,323.24 ha/buffer 5,865 ha	While an example of colonisation involving rural enterprise and a landscape, it is not clear what aspects might be regarded as systematic. The Acadians were also deportees, reflecting unfree migration. The theoretical basis for the colonisation seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example.
Denmark	Christiansfeld, Moravian Church Settlement (1773)	2015/iii, iv/21 ha/ buffer 385 ha	This is an example of systematic colonisation, related to Enlightenment ideals. However, this is a town without the associated rural/agricultural landscape. The theoretical basis for the colonisation also seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example, such as the religious basis of the settlement.
Dominican Republic	Colonial City of Santo Domingo (1498)	1990/ii, iv, vi/106 ha/--	This is an example of systematic colonisation in the sense of a planned colonial city which was very early in the history of European migrations to the New World. However, it does not include a landscape of rural enterprise. In addition, the theoretical basis for the colonisation

Table 4. Potentially Comparable Properties on the World Heritage List or Otherwise

Country	Name	Date inscribed on World Heritage List/Criteria/Size of property/ buffer zone	Initial Analysis
			seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example, it is well before the Enlightenment, and the settlement had an evangelising role.
Malaysia	Melaka and Georgetown (15 th century)	2008/ii, iii, iv/219 ha/buffer 393 ha	These are historic colonial trading towns. Their qualities related to systematic colonisation are not clear, and they do not include rural enterprise and associated landscapes.
Paraguay	Jesuit Missions of La Santísima Trinidad de Paraná and Jesús de Tavarangue (17 th and 18 th centuries)	1993/iv/28 ha/ buffer 37 ha	This property displays a version of systematic colonisation. However, the theoretical basis for the colonisation seems to display significant differences to the South Australian example, such as the evangelising objective. This property is also comprised of archaeological ruins of urban complexes, it does not have a landscape dimension or embrace rural enterprise.
USA	Statue of Liberty (1886)	1984/i, vi/6 ha/--	A powerful symbol of free migration but not related to a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society or rural enterprise.
Post-Enlightenment attempts to create a Model Society			
Germany	Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz (18 th century)	2000/ii, iv/14,500 ha/--	Enlightenment era planned landscape expressing philosophical principles of the time, including agricultural lands. Not related to migration.
Netherlands and Belgium	Colonies of Benevolence (1818)	Nominated 2017, referral 2018/iii, v, vi/Not available	An example of a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society focused on rural enterprise. Included unfree labour and is not related to migration.
United Kingdom	New Lanark (1786)	2001/ii, iv, vi/146 ha/buffer 667 ha	An example of a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society but focused on housing for industrial workers. Not an example of rural enterprise or related to migration.
United Kingdom	Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (1767-1850)	1995/ii, iv/--/--	An example of a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society but focused on town planning. Not related to rural enterprise or migration.
United Kingdom	Saltaire (1853)	2001/ii, iv/20 ha/buffer 1,078 ha	An example of a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society but focused on housing for industrial workers. Not related to rural enterprise or migration.
United Kingdom	Port Sunlight (1888)	Not listed/--/--/--	An example of a post-Enlightenment attempt to create a model society but focused on housing for industrial workers. Not related to rural enterprise or migration.
Agricultural Innovation			
Germany	Garden Kingdom of Dessau-Wörlitz (18 th century)	2000/ii, iv/14,500 ha/--	Enlightenment era planned landscape expressing philosophical principles of the

Table 4. Potentially Comparable Properties on the World Heritage List or Otherwise			
Country	Name	Date inscribed on World Heritage List/Criteria/Size of property/ buffer zone	Initial Analysis
			time, including agricultural lands. Demonstrated new farming methods.
Spain	Cultural Landscape of the Serra de Tramuntana	2011/ii, iv, v/30,745 ha/buffer 78,617 ha	The agricultural landscape demonstrates adaptation to difficult environmental conditions, and is testimony to the continuous evolution of human settlement.

Discussion of Certain Potentially Comparable Properties

In order to compare places of colonial settlement an understanding of previous types of migration is necessary. They were either forced as in slavery or convictism, or by indenture or contract, or unregulated. The theoretical Wakefield model for free migration was a revolutionary concept emerging from Enlightenment thinkers.

The Wakefield system was also used later in South Australia's Northern Territory in Darwin, as well in New Zealand and the USA but there is little evidence of its use in rural areas. Darwin and its hinterland is of particular interest in a comparative analysis of regions surveyed and settled on the basis of Wakefield's principles, as the South Australians themselves attempted to follow those principles in establishing the northern Australian settlement. South Australia annexed its 'Northern Territory' in 1863 for systematic colonization on the basis that the Territory must pay for itself, but the Territory's sub-tropical climate and remoteness generally defeated constant efforts by South Australians to recreate the closely-settled and populous rural-and-town pattern so prevalent on the Adelaide Plains and in the adjacent ranges.

Edward Gibbon Wakefield emigrated to New Zealand in the early 1850s and although his ideas were the basis for six settlements there of which the last, Canterbury, has associated rural lands. Wakefield regarded these settlements positively although New Zealand historians of the 1940s and 1950s thought they were not successful. Nevertheless, his land settlement ideas were influential in British Empire settler societies – Australia, New Zealand, Lower Canada, Ceylon and Jamaica, and also in Brazil which was a Portuguese colony.

In settler societies and in Europe there were also planned settlements undertaken by religious or cultural groups wanting to establish a new way of life for both their adherents and for the Indigenous people they were usurping. In all these properties the ideas of the founders became realities in the landscapes. The following examples are inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Jesuit Missions of La Santísima Trinidad de Paraná and Jesús de Tavarangue** are part of a series of 30 missions in the Río de la Plata basin established by the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits) during the 17th and 18th centuries. Seven of these missions were located in Paraguay and the rest in the present-day countries of Argentina and Brazil. The mission complexes were attached to reducciones (settlements) and are evidence of a unique urban scheme.

In Argentina, the four **Jesuit-Guarani Missions**, located in the southern Misiones

province, provide an exceptional example of systematic and organized territorial occupation. The properties' surviving ruins depict the experience of the Society of Jesus in South America, where there emerged a singular system of spatial, economic, social, and cultural relations in 30 settlements – referred to as *reducciones* – that included ranches, mate plantations (mate is a species of holly used to make a beverage), and networks of trails and waterways extending across the Uruguay River and its tributaries. This particular model of the *reducciones* also included smaller structures and constructions designed to support the basic functions of the settlements. Together, these elements, each closely integrated within productive lands, and each manifesting the distinct potential and complementary traits of the various settlements and the other Jesuit provinces in the region, inform this underlying interpretation, reflected by the serial heritage property in a singular and specific fashion.

Unlike other Jesuit missions in South America, the **Jesuit Missions of the Chiquitos** in Bolivia survived the expulsion of the Society of Jesus in 1767, though by the 1850s the *reducciones* system of the missions had disappeared. These traditional architectural ensembles have more recently become vulnerable under the impact of changes following the agrarian reform of 1953 that threatened the local social and economic infrastructure.

By way of contrast, **Christiansfeld** founded in 1773 in South Jutland, Denmark, is an example of a planned settlement of the Moravian Church, a Lutheran free congregation centred in Herrnhut, Saxony. The town was planned to represent the Protestant urban ideal, constructed around a central Church square. The architecture is homogenous and unadorned, with one and two-storey buildings in yellow brick with red tile roofs. The democratic organization of the Moravian Church, with its pioneering egalitarian philosophy, is expressed in its humanistic town planning. The settlement's plan opens onto agricultural land and includes important buildings for the common welfare such as large communal houses for the congregation's widows and unmarried men and women. The buildings are still in use and many are still owned by the local Moravian Church community.

Situated in the southern Minas Basin of Nova Scotia, Canada, the **Grand Pré** marshland and the remains of the associated old villages constitute a cultural landscape bearing testimony to a remarkable effort, over many centuries, using the polder technique to develop agricultural farmland, in a maritime location with extreme tides. In particular, it demonstrates the permanency of its hydraulic drainage system using dykes and *aboiteaux*, and its agricultural use through a community-based management system established by the Acadians and then taken over by the Planters and their modern successors. Grand Pré is also testimony to the history of the Acadians in the 17th and 18th centuries and their deportation. The landscape is an exceptional example of the adaptation of the first European settlers to the conditions of the North American Atlantic coast.

The influence of the Enlightenment can be seen in many areas of urban planning and settlement, for example **Edinburgh New Town** and **New Lanark**. Inscribed in 1992 for its a dramatic reflection of significant changes in European urban planning, from the inward looking, defensive walled medieval city of royal palaces, abbeys and organically developed burgh plots in the Old Town, through the expansive formal Enlightenment planning of the 18th and 19th centuries in the New Town. While New Lanark in Scotland is a model industrial community based on textile production built by Utopian idealist Robert Owen (1771-1858) who formulated his Utopian vision of a society without crime, poverty and misery. New Lanark prospered under his enlightened management.

In the Netherlands, the **Colonies of Benevolence** have been nominated to the World Heritage List because of their design. Between 1818 and 1825, a series of seven colonies were built as a visionary solution that combined education, employment and land clearing, an approach in which relief for the poor and the prevention of crime more or less overlapped. Large areas of uncultivated heathland were systematically cleared to make way for the construction of agricultural colonies, and in addition to systematic land use planning there were consistent building styles.

Plantations may be another category of property worth considering in the comparative analysis. While there have been ‘plantations’ of settlers in Europe over time like the Moors in Spain and the English in Ireland, in the New World settlements there were plantations such as for cotton and sugar in the eastern USA, and tea plantations in India and Sri Lanka. Plantations were large-scale estates which usually had a planned form. The scale of these estates therefore compares with planned settlements involving a collection of smaller-scale farms and towns.

4. RESEARCH GAPS, ADDITIONAL WORK & WORK PLAN

4.1 RESEARCH GAPS AND ADDITIONAL WORK REQUIRED TO DEVELOP THE PROPOSAL

There are several initial points to recall in the development of a World Heritage nomination:

- such nominations are the largest and most complex tasks in the heritage sector, usually taking many years, requiring resourcing and persistence, and resulting in a substantial document of many hundreds of pages. There is a set format for the contents of a nomination provided in Annex 5 of the *Operational Guidelines*;
- a carefully planned approach is essential, usually involving a team and a lead author, and supported by other experts, stakeholders and political leaders, often structured into groups or committees;
- developing a nomination is invariably an iterative process. For example, Outstanding Universal Value may be drafted, tested, revised, tested, informed by the comparative analysis, revised, informed by issues of integrity, authenticity, protection and management, revised, peer reviewed, and so on. This is normal and part of the strength of the process;
- while the task is large it is commensurate with the rewards of World Heritage listing;
- successful nominations are usually the result of a body of expert work coupled with a campaign to develop a broader international body of expert opinion in favour of the nomination – a critical mass of supportive expert opinion. There are various ways of encouraging such support, and the efforts of other countries provide a range of examples in achieving this;
- successful nominations are also the result of ensuring or developing support within governments and the local community; and
- in the case of the Mount Lofty Ranges, the Councils and others supporting the process realise the challenges, the process has been underway for many years, a large body of work has been developed, and expert, stakeholder, community and political support has already been encouraged.

The development of the nomination may be broadly divided into the following stages:

- development of a Tentative List submission, to some extent drawing on the initial tasks below;
- development of the nomination – initial tasks – refine draft Outstanding Universal Value, develop comparative analysis, refine attributes and identify boundaries;
- development of the nomination – later tasks – ongoing refinement of Outstanding Universal Value, comparative analysis, attributes and boundaries, and development of the remaining parts of the nomination; and
- other important tasks (eg. development of a management plan or system which will be vital to support the nomination).

In the case of the Tentative List submission, the connection between this step and National Heritage listing should be clarified. While previously the policy has been to require National Heritage listing before inclusion on the Tentative List, recent developments suggest this is not strictly always the case.

The following table presents an overall preliminary workplan for these stages. Initial tasks are highlighted in green. To some extent, there is some potential or real overlap between the Tentative List tasks and the nomination tasks. Hopefully, many of the proposed tasks may be able to build upon the previous work undertaken on the World Heritage project, and in some cases the work or organisation may fully exist. Further development of the workplan would include an assessment of this previous work and organisation, and its usefulness for the next phase of the project.

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan			
No.	Task	Comments	Timing
Tentative List Submission			
	Clarification of connection between National Heritage listing and inclusion on the Tentative List, and other matters	At present it appears there is some flexibility in the policy linking National Heritage and World Heritage. This flexibility should be confirmed in the case of the proposed property. Given the possible Aboriginal history and lands might be part of the property, the requirements of the Commonwealth regarding demonstrating Aboriginal consent should also be clarified.	7-8/2019
	Preparation of draft Tentative List submission (number of drafts TBA)	Initial task • The submission is quite short, and will draw on tasks below related to the development of the nomination itself • Identify lead for the submission and core team • Develop more detailed workplan for the submission • Review of current or possible additional committees or reference groups to support the submission • Strengthen the understanding of Outstanding Universal Value as much as possible, noting this task will continue through the development of the nomination dossier • Refine the understanding of attributes • Give some indication of possible draft boundaries, noting these are subject to further refinement • Develop initial information about likely management implications	7-11/2019
	Expert review/s	Initial task • Related to the expert reviews for the nomination itself, but with a more limited scope • Identify experts to support the submission development through reviewing drafts	10/2019
	Governments/community/stakeholder engagement	Initial task • Develop a strategy to promote understanding and encourage government/community/stakeholder support, including government heritage authorities	7/2019 + implementation to follow

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan

No.	Task	Comments	Timing
		Implement the strategy	
	Government agencies' review/s	Initial task Presumably review by related local government Councils, the SA Heritage Council, SA Department for Environment and Water, Australian Heritage Council and Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy	By 2/2020
	State government support/ agreement	Initial task Building upon earlier engagement with State government agencies as part of other tasks, this task is the decision point for formal State government support to take the proposal to the Meeting of Environment Ministers	7/2020
	Meeting of Environment Ministers agreement	Initial Task	By 11/2020
	Final government review	Initial task	12/2020
	Preparation of final Tentative List submission	Initial task	1/2021
	Despatch to WHC by the Commonwealth	Initial task	Before 1/2/2021
Nomination – General Tasks			
	Nomination planning	Initial task This workplan is a first draft version	To be determined
	Coordination	Ongoing task - Should include a review of current or possible additional committees or steering/reference groups to support the nomination - Identify lead for nomination project and core team	
	Community/stakeholder consultation	Initial task - Develop a communication strategy (this might include an evolving short nomination summary and other fact sheets to address issues, amongst other products) - Implement the strategy	
	Draft Nomination (number of drafts TBA)	Later task	
	Expert review/s	Ongoing task - Maybe worth establishing a panel of reviewers whose support will be needed periodically, including World Heritage and subject matter experts – not clear if this group will meet or work separately - Includes international peer review, which might partly be addressed through an international workshop - Develop an indicative schedule for expert reviews	
	Government agencies' review/s	Later task	
	Printing of draft	Later task	

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan

No.	Task	Comments	Timing
	Send draft nomination to WHC	Later task	
	WHC review of draft nomination	Later task	
	Final government review	Later task	
	Final Nomination	Later task	
	Nomination production	Later task	
	Despatch to WHC by the Commonwealth	Later task	
Nomination – Components of the Dossier			
1.	Identification of the Property		
1.a	Country (and State Party if different)	Later task	
1.b	State, Province or Region	Later task	
1.c	Name of Property	Initial task Important for the branding/recognition/publicity of the property, even if it may change later	
1.d	Geographical coordinates to the nearest second	Later task	
1.e	Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone	Initial task - Source good quality topographical and cadastral base mapping - Generate base mapping of relevant attributes - Begin mapping of possible boundaries based on identified attributes - Refine as attributes are refined and other issues considered (integrity, authenticity, protection, management)	
1.f	Area of nominated property (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.) Area of nominated property: _ ha Buffer zone _____ ha Total _____ ha	Later task	
2.	Description		
2.a	Description of Property	Later task	
2.b	History and Development	Later task	
3.	Justification for Inscription		
3.1.a	Brief synthesis	Initial task	
3.1.b	Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)	Initial task - Development of the justification text to support/refine the criteria text - Develop text on the broader theme of migration, into which the South Australian example and systematic colonisation can be contextualised - Develop background text on the character of non-systematic colonisation, with examples	

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan

No.	Task	Comments	Timing
		- Develop background text on the Enlightenment/post-Enlightenment, and the impact on the development of model societies - Develop an understanding of the role of the city of Adelaide (eg. the town acres) and its role in the systematic colonisation story - Refine the description of the characteristics of systematic colonisation, including the size and variability of sections (farm units) - Ensure the presentation of systematic colonisation reflects both the idealised theory as well as the reality of its implementation, including a fair reading of positive and negative aspects - Develop an overview of the authoritative historical assessments of systematic colonisation, including whether there is a prevailing consensus about its importance - Revise the draft OUV in the light of the comparative analysis	
3.1.c	Statement of Integrity	Initial task - Ongoing refinement of attributes - Establish integrity of attributes and overall property	
3.1.d	Statement of Authenticity (for nominations made under criteria (i) to (vi))	Initial task Establish authenticity of attributes and overall property	
3.1.e	Protection and management requirements	Later task	
3.2	Comparative Analysis	Initial task - Develop the analysis, especially regarding other examples of systematic colonisation in the world and what landscape evidence exists of these - Also develop the analysis related to agricultural innovation - A closer check of Tentative Lists should be included	
3.3	Proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value	Initial task Based on inputs from other tasks	
4.	State of Conservation and factors affecting the Property		
4.a	Present state of conservation	Later task	
4.b	Factors affecting the property	Later task	
4.b(i)	Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture, mining)	Later task	
4.b(ii)	Environmental pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change, desertification)	Later task	
4.b(iii)	Natural disasters and risk preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)	Later task	

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan			
No.	Task	Comments	Timing
4.b(iv)	Responsible visitation at World Heritage sites	Later task	
4.b(v)	Number of inhabitants within the property and the buffer zone Estimated population located within: Area of nominated property Buffer zone Total Year	Later task	
5.	Protection and Management of the Property		
5.a	Ownership	Later task	
5.b	Protective designation	Later task	
5.c	Means of implementing protective measures.	Later task	
5.d	Existing plans related to municipality and region in which the proposed property is located (e.g., regional or local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)	Later task	
5.e	Property management plan or other management system	Later task	
5.f	Sources and levels of finance	Later task	
5.g	Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques	Later task	
5.h	Visitor facilities and infrastructure	Later task	
5.i	Policies and programmes related to the presentation and promotion of the property	Later task	
5.j	Staffing levels and expertise (professional, technical, maintenance)	Later task	
6.	Monitoring		
6.a	Key indicators for measuring state of conservation	Later task	
6.b	Administrative arrangements for monitoring property	Later task	
6.c	Results of previous reporting exercises	Later task	
7.	Documentation		
7.a	Photographs and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form	Later task	
7.b	Texts relating to protective designation, copies of property management plans or documented management	Later task	

Table 5. Preliminary World Heritage Nomination Workplan			
No.	Task	Comments	Timing
	systems and extracts of other plans relevant to the property		
7.c	Form and date of most recent records or inventory of property	Later task	
7.d	Address where inventory, records and archives are held	Later task	
7.e	Bibliography	Ongoing task	
8.	Contact Information of responsible authorities		
8.a	Preparer Name: Title: Address: City, Province/State, Country: Tel: Fax: E-mail:	Later task	
8.b	Official Local Institution/Agency	Later task	
8.c	Other Local Institutions	Later task	
8.d	Official Web address http:// Contact name: E-mail:	Later task	
9.	Signature on behalf of the State Party	Later task	
Other Tasks			
	Development of management plan/system	Later task	
	Development of tourism management plan, including interpretation	Later task	

One opportunity to note is the international ICOMOS General Assembly to be held in Sydney in October 2020. This major international meeting will bring to Australia a large number of overseas experts, and it will provide a focus on Australia's World Heritage activities. This may provide an opportunity to both present the possible World Heritage case for the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia, and also to seek international expert views on the property. The General Assembly might also be a useful target to be able to announce the positive decision of the Meeting of Environment Ministers, if that can be achieved.

With regard to the possible budget required to develop a nomination following submission of the Tentative List proposal, there are many factors which will influence this budget, such as:

- the ultimate complexity of the nominated property, including its physical extent;
- the extent of in-kind support provided by councils, the State Government and Australian and overseas experts – noting some degree of support is likely;
- the timeframe for the project – a shorter timeframe perhaps entailing greater cost; and

- the production quality of the nomination dossier – while not required, nominations can be very handsome productions, but this adds to the overall cost.

A preliminary estimate is that a budget of \$250,000 to \$350,000 would be required, possibly with additional funding for:

- supporting any current or additional committees or groups that may be needed;
- implementation of community/stakeholder consultation;
- expert peer reviews;
- technical support for attribute and boundary mapping;
- development of a management plan or system, if existing management planning or systems are not adequate; and
- development of a tourism management plan, including interpretation, if existing planning is not adequate.

4.2 WORK PLAN REQUIRED TO PROGRESS THE PROJECT TO THE LEVEL REQUIRED TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR TENTATIVE LISTING

The Tentative List is a formal part of the overall process for the development of the World Heritage List, especially related to nominations to the List. As noted in the *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* (UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2017),

‘A Tentative List is an inventory of those properties situated on its territory which each State Party considers suitable for nomination to the World Heritage List. States Parties should therefore include, in their Tentative Lists, details of those properties which they consider to be of potential Outstanding Universal Value and which they intend to nominate during the following years.’ (Paragraph 62)

‘Tentative Lists are a useful and important planning tool for States Parties, the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat, and the Advisory Bodies, as they provide an indication of future nominations.’ (Paragraph 70)

Several important points to note are:

- Tentative List submissions are checked for completeness of the documentation, but are not evaluated in terms of the claimed Outstanding Universal Value;
- the submission is usually quite short, perhaps a few pages;
- Tentative List submissions are not meant to be based on a fully developed case for World Heritage listing. There needs to be reasonable expert grounds for believing a property may meet the requirements for World Heritage, but this does not mean absolute certainty is required. Such certainty, or at least greater certainty, only arises through the research to prepare the actual nomination dossier. State Parties have on occasions included properties on the Tentative List which have subsequently been found through such research not to have a good case for Outstanding Universal Value. This is exactly how the Tentative List should operate;
- a property needs to be on the Tentative List for one year before it can be nominated;
- Australia has, over decades, not been able to develop a meaningful Tentative List for many reasons. One of those reasons has been that successive governments have been reluctant to list properties unless the Commonwealth and relevant State or Territory governments were in full agreement. While this is largely a political issue, there is also a technical dimension as the support of Commonwealth, State or Territory heritage authorities is also a factor. This has also sometimes meant that Tentative Listing has only occurred when there has been a full commitment to proceed with a nomination;
- it is noted that South Australia has another likely Tentative List proposal, and other States are also likely to have proposals (eg. Victoria). Tentative Listing is not a competition. State Parties can submit any number of properties, there is no limit. The only limit applies to nominations that can be submitted in any given year – which is one nomination. But recognising that it takes considerable time to develop a nomination, there is actually likely to be no competition between ‘rival’ Australian nominations;
- the development of a Tentative List submission is a relatively small and simple technical/expert task, especially given the reasonable progress with research to date regarding the settlement landscape. However, this can and should be strengthened in certain key areas, as discussed below; and
- the more difficult task may be achieving Commonwealth and State political and expert support.

With regard to what further research is needed to support the development of the Tentative List submission, in one sense it might be possible to proceed with a submission based on current information. However, in practical terms stakeholders and the local community will probably be keen to know the likely boundaries and management implications, and the submission may trigger criticism if these things are not outlined, even in a draft form. The previous indications about the boundary will be taken as the likely future boundaries unless alternative information is provided. It should be noted the Tentative List submission does not include or require boundary information. Such information is only provided with the nomination.

Accordingly, further research might usefully:

- strengthen the understanding of Outstanding Universal Value as much as possible, noting this task will continue through the development of the nomination dossier;
- refine the understanding of attributes;
- give some indication of possible draft boundaries, noting these are subject to further refinement; and
- develop initial information about likely management implications.

The tasks on OUV and attributes will be inputs to the submission, and the boundary and management implications information will be helpful for stakeholders including governments, their heritage authorities, and the local community.

In order to address the issues noted regarding governments, community and stakeholders, including government heritage authorities, it seems worthwhile developing a strategy to promote understanding and encourage support for the submission.

The work plan to develop the Tentative List submission, taking into account the points made above, is included in Table 5 in the preceding section. A timetable is suggested, targeting 1 February 2021 for submission to the World Heritage Centre. This date has some benefit in case a completed nomination is to be submitted in 2022. However, much depends less of the technical side than on the achieving the support of governments, community and stakeholders. If there are delays or difficulties regarding these sectors, then a later Tentative List submission date is likely.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the key question underlying this independent expert review is whether there is a good case for seeking World Heritage listing for the Mount Lofty Ranges? The brief answer is – yes, there is a good case. However, to realise this potential, a number of issues will need to be addressed.

With regard to the **rationale** text, this begins to present the core justification for World Heritage listing in terms which resonate with the purpose, scope, criteria and threshold of the World Heritage List. But this text is, of course, only the start of the justification needed, or rather, it is a brief summary of research already undertaken. The World Heritage nomination would present an extended justification of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value.

Importantly, the core of the current rationale for pursuing a World Heritage listing for parts of the Mount Lofty Ranges reflecting the 19th century model of systematic colonisation appears quite sound at this stage.

The core **narrative** previously developed is helpfully structured according to the World Heritage criteria and contains key text which also speaks clearly to the possibility of World Heritage value or Outstanding Universal Value. While at this stage such text looks promising, again much depends on the supporting and detailed justification that can be provided. For example, there is a need to develop text on:

- the broader theme of migration, into which the South Australian example and systematic colonisation can be contextualised;
- the character of non-systematic colonisation;
- the Enlightenment/post-Enlightenment, and the impact on the development of model societies;
- a refined description of the characteristics of systematic colonisation, including the size and variability of sections (farm units);
- an overview of the authoritative historical assessments of systematic colonisation, including whether there is a prevailing consensus about its importance;
- the comparative analysis, especially regarding other examples of systematic colonisation in the world and what landscape evidence exists of these; and
- the analysis related to agricultural innovation.

Brief draft text for two of these aspects is included in the body of the report above.

While the analysis and commentary undertaken presents a generally positive view of the possibilities for World Heritage, albeit with qualifications, it is also worth highlighting there are potential weaknesses and difficulties that may be encountered.

A review of the potential **World Heritage criteria** found:

- the stronger criteria relevant to the proposed property are (ii), (iv) and (vi);
- weaker or more difficult criteria are (iii) and (v), or at least parts of claims that could be made under criterion (v). In the case of (ii), one aspect of the use of this criterion might also be weak – related to the influence on non-British immigrant communities; and
- the criterion which is clearly not relevant is (i).

The report considered the question of the possible **name for the property**, and proposes the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia.

Previously, brief draft **justification text** or criteria text had been developed against four criteria – (ii), (iv), (v) and (vi). Based on further analysis, this justification text has been revised and is the core of the current draft Outstanding Universal Value for the property. Based on this draft OUV, related attributes have been identified. However, refining the mapping of attributes beyond a broad scale becomes difficult because of the lack of detail about the exact location of attributes. Some general comments about the qualities present in the landscape of the likely property area are provided.

One of the project tasks related to the question of whether the property should be considered a **historic site or cultural landscape**. The technical context is that:

- sites and cultural landscapes can both be large or small in area;
- sites and cultural landscapes can both be single component World Heritage properties or serial properties with multiple components, and, at a practical level, a serial property can contain both sites and landscapes even though it may get classified as just one or other; and
- in formal terms, sites include cultural landscapes because sites are a higher order definition of cultural heritage under the World Heritage Convention.

In this case, the Systematic Colonisation Settlement Landscape of South Australia is clearly a cultural landscape because at its heart it displays the interaction of humans with the environment – an Aboriginal landscape evolved from the natural environment which was then modified by European settlers. The adaptation of an idealised settlement pattern to the local topography, such as the path of water courses, is a simple if clear example of this interaction.

However, it is not yet clear whether the property is best presented as a single component or serial property, and the scale of the property is also not yet established. Once the values and attributes are clear, and drafts of these are provided above, then these can be mapped, their integrity and authenticity assessed, and boundaries can be developed. The scale and character of the property (ie. single component or serial) will then emerge.

Initial work was undertaken regarding the **comparative analysis** for the property. Four suggested contexts for the comparative analysis were identified:

- Wakefield systematic colonisation;
- European free migration following the Age of Discovery;
- post-Enlightenment attempts to create a model society; and
- agricultural innovation.

Using this framework, an initial list of potentially comparable properties was identified and analysed, based on a limited review and research.

The **development of the nomination** may be broadly divided into the following stages:

- development of a Tentative List submission, to some extent drawing on the initial tasks below;
- development of the nomination – initial tasks – refine draft Outstanding Universal Value, develop comparative analysis, refine attributes and identify boundaries;
- development of the nomination – later tasks – ongoing refinement of Outstanding

Universal Value, comparative analysis, attributes and boundaries, and development of the remaining parts of the nomination; and

- other important tasks (eg. development of a management plan or system which will be vital to support the nomination).

A preliminary **workplan** is presented structured according to these stages. Additional comments are also provided regarding the development of a Tentative List submission.

6. REFERENCES

- Ballantyne, T 2014, 'The theory and practice of empire-building, Edward Gibbon Wakefield and 'systematic colonisation'' in *The Routledge history of Western Empires*, R Aldrich and K McKenzie (eds), Routledge, pp. 89-101.
- Bardsley, D & E Palazzo 2018, 'Making the case for a heritage of innovation: could World Heritage listing facilitate sustainable rural adaptation to climate change?', in *Infinite rural systems in a finite planet: bridging gaps towards sustainability*, V P Carril, R C L Gonzalez, J M T Santamaria and F H McKenzie (eds), Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, pp. 83-90.
- Herraman, Anne 2017, From ideas to reality – agricultural settlement in the Mt Lofty Ranges, unpublished paper.
- Johnston, Stephanie (2018), 'Do landscapes migrate? A metaphorical conceptualisation of the early settlement landscapes of the Mount Lofty Ranges', to be published in *Historic Environment*, vol. 30, no. 3 [preprint].
- Mount Lofty Ranges National Heritage nomination,
<http://www.mountloftyranges.org/library.html>, accessed 9 April 2019.
- Olssen, Erik 1997, 'Mr Wakefield and New Zealand as an experiment in post-Enlightenment experimental practice', in *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 197-218, http://www.nzjh.auckland.ac.nz/docs/1997/NZJH_31_2_01.pdf, accessed 23 April 2019.
- Pretty, Graeme 1967, 'Wakefield, Edward Gibbon (1796–1862)', *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/wakefield-edward-gibbon-2763/text3921>, published first in hardcopy 1967, accessed online 8 April 2019.
- Richards, Eric 2017, The new system of colonisation and mass emigration, unpublished paper.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2017, *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*.
- Woollacott, A 2015, *Settler society in the Australian colonies: self-government and imperial culture*, OUP.