

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

EVALUATION OF THE IUCN WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMME

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION

The World Heritage Programme coordinates IUCN's work on the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. IUCN role under the Convention is threefold:

1. IUCN evaluates all natural and 'mixed' sites nominated for World Heritage Status, and contributes to evaluations of certain cultural landscapes.
2. IUCN monitors the state of conservation of existing World Heritage Sites.
3. IUCN contributes to capacity building, training and related initiatives, particularly at regional and field levels.

The IUCN World Heritage Programme also implements initiatives to enhance the role of the World Heritage Convention in protecting the planet's biodiversity and promotes effective use of its mechanisms to strengthen the conservation and management of natural World Heritage sites.

The recent Independent Evaluation of the Implementation of The Global Strategy for the World Heritage List and of the Partnerships for Conservation Initiative (Pact)¹ questioned the viability of continuing the Global Strategy and the compatibility of current evolutions of the List with the objectives of the World Heritage Convention.

The Strategic Action Plan for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012-2022 adopted in November 2011 explicitly intends to draw on the recommendation of this Independent Evaluation. The role of the IUCN World Heritage Programme in the development of the Implementation Plan for the strategy, through the provision of technical support and access to expert networks, will be central to supporting the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

In this context and given the fact that the last Programme evaluation was conducted in 2005, it is timely to assess how the IUCN World Heritage Programme's work in fact contributes to Heritage conservation and to IUCN's Global Programme overall.

The Director of the IUCN's World Heritage Programme is therefore commissioning a programme evaluation to inform future planning and implementation.

2. AUDIENCES FOR THE EVALUATION

The primary audience for the evaluation includes the Director and staff of the World Heritage Programme. In particular, recommendations are expected to feed in the design of the IUCN

¹ 2011. Final report of the Audit of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative.

World Heritage Component Programme for 2013-2016. IUCN senior management (primarily Programme Directors) and the World Commission of Protected Areas could also have a significant interest in the outcome of this evaluation. Evaluation findings will also be shared and discussed with the current main partners and donors of the programme: UNESCO, the MAVA Foundation and the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment.

3. PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

The purpose of the Evaluation of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is to assess recent Programme results and impacts in relation to the Programme objectives and the wider IUCN mission. The evaluation will also examine key strategic questions to assess the performance and the capacity of the Programme (the organisational unit and its delivery mechanisms) and identify areas for improvement.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

1. To assess the relevance of the Programme

The following questions will be looked into:

- Are the Programme objectives² consistent with the World Heritage Convention Objectives?
- Are the Programme objectives consistent with the IUCN mission, its value proposition and Programme?
- Is the niche filled by the World Heritage Programme relevant from the perspective of fund providers, partners and beneficiaries?

2. To assess the performance of the Programme

The following questions will be looked into:

- What is/are the **intervention logic(s)** underlying the World Heritage Programme? What assumptions are made and what hypotheses are being tested?
- What were the most significant **results** achieved by the Programme over the last 5 years?
- What have been the main **impacts** of the Programme over the last 5 years?
- Is the programme delivering results in a **cost-effective** manner compared to other conservation approaches promoted by IUCN?
- Are results delivered **sustainable**?
- Are the types of interventions undertaken maximizing the programme results/impacts?
- What are the main **internal or external factors** affecting the performance of the Programme?

² IUCN World Heritage Programme's objectives are identified in the quadrennial programmes of the IUCN *Programme on Protected Areas/World Heritage Programme* for the 2005-2008 and the 2009-2012 periods.

3. To assess the organisational capacity of the Programme

In particular the following questions will be looked into:

- Does the Programme benefit from adequate **strategic leadership**?
- Do the Programme **governance and operating structures** facilitates performance?
- Does the Programme have sufficient and skilled **human resources** to successfully implement its programme?
- Does the Programme have sufficient and well managed **financial resources** to successfully implement its programme?
- What is the Programme current **capacity in terms of mobilising the union** (working with and delivering through other IUCN programmes, regions, members and commissions)?
- What is the Programme current **capacity to deliver conservation, livelihood and development** results as foreseen in the 2013-2016 programme?
- In the current context, what are the reputational risks incurred by IUCN? What are the opportunities?

4. To Make recommendations for enhancing the programme performance

4. METHODOLOGY

The IUCN Evaluation Policy³ sets out IUCN's institutional commitment to evaluation, and the criteria and standards for the evaluation and evaluation of its projects, programmes, organizational units. IUCN's evaluation standards and criteria are based on the widely accepted OECD DAC Evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The Evaluation will be carried out by the IUCN Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. It will be undertaken from an utilisation-focused perspective with the intent to facilitate judgement, decision making and action by the World Heritage Programme constituents (World Heritage Programme unit, WCPA, Regional focal points, panel members, etc) and their partners as well as by IUCN senior management.

4.1 Documentation Identification and Preliminary Review

The Evaluation will begin with a preliminary review of documentation identified in partnership with the World Heritage Programme Staff. Initially, the evaluators will briefly look at documents, websites and other sources relevant to the mandate. A literature review on World Heritage contribution to conservation will also be initiated at this stage.

4.2 Development of an Inception Note

The inception note developed by the evaluator will contain the following:

³ IUCN Evaluation Policy, approved by the IUCN Council in 2001.

<http://www.iucn.org/themes/eval/index.htm>

A mapping of the Project intervention logic

A refined methodology and a draft evaluation matrix

The evaluator will develop a more detailed methodology and a draft evaluation matrix designed to guide the data gathering and analysis process. The matrix will detail the issues to be addressed and sub-questions to be covered, as well as performance indicators, sources of information and information-gathering methods for each issue.

A list of stakeholders to be consulted and draft questionnaires

The evaluator will identify a list of stakeholders to be consulted in the context of the review. This will include the following stakeholder groups i) World Heritage Programme staff, ii) IUCN HQ Senior Management, iii) relevant IUCN staff in the regions, iv) IUCN members, v) IUCN commissions, vi) Programme donors, vii) Programme partners, viii) others preeminent organisations working on World Heritage issues. Draft interview protocols for these stakeholder groups will be included in the inception note.

A detailed work plan

The reviewers will propose a detailed work plan building on the draft work plan proposed in section 6 below.

4.3 Data Collection

Data collection methods will include literature and documentation review, face-to-face interviews in Gland, telephone interviews with various stakeholders, and questionnaires circulated by email, when relevant.

4.4 Data Analysis and Reporting

At the data analysis stage, the evaluator will analyze all of the data collected. To the extent possible, data triangulation will be achieved by analyzing information from multiple sources. A draft report adhering to the evaluation terms of reference and highlighting the principal findings of the review will be presented and submitted to a stakeholders' review process before a final report is submitted.

All data collection tools are to be included as an Annex to the final report. The link between evaluation questions, data collection, analysis, findings and conclusions must be clearly made and set out in a transparent manner in the presentation of the review findings.

4.5 Travel Required

Interviews will be conducted by phone as relevant. If resources are available one of the evaluators will be attending the next session of the World Heritage Committee for a short period.

4.6 Management of the Evaluation

This will be an IUCN internal evaluation managed and conducted by the IUCN Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

5. REPORTING OF THE EVALUATION RESULTS

The evaluation findings and recommendations will be presented by the evaluation team to the World Heritage Programme.

An Action Plan will be developed with the World Heritage Programme for improvements in 2013-2016 period.

6. WORK PLAN

The evaluation will take place between May and August 2012.

A more detailed time schedule will be developed with the evaluation team, including an agreed timeframe for the following steps in the evaluation.

Milestone	Indicative Completion Date
Start date	April 15 2012
Further develop Terms of Reference and draft evaluation matrix	April 30
Undertake evaluation	May -June 2012
Preliminary findings presented to the World Heritage Programme	End of July 2012
Final report	End of August 2012
Action Plan developed	Fall 2012

ANNEX 2: PROTOCOLS

Protocol for IUCN staff

1. Please describe your working relationship with the World Heritage Programme

2. Relevance

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
2.1 The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the IUCN Programme and Mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 World Heritage is a highly relevant tool for biodiversity conservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.5 Comments on the above (please reference the question):

2.6 How could the IUCN World Heritage Programme become more relevant to (1) the World Heritage Convention, and (2) to biodiversity conservation?

Effectiveness

3. Effectiveness

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.1 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of evaluating nominations for natural and mixed sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of monitoring the state of conservation of existing WH sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of providing capacity building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.4 Comments on the above (please reference the question)

IUCN World Heritage Knowledge Products (i.e. Publications)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.5 The IUCN World Heritage Programme's guidelines on nominations, Outstanding Universal Value and WH management and planning are very useful knowledge products	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6 The IUCN World Heritage Programme's thematic and tentative list studies are very useful knowledge products?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.7 Overall, the IUCN World Heritage Programme has produced highly useful studies and guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.8 Can you give any examples of how these knowledge products have been used? To what effect?

3.9 Can you identify any gaps in the knowledge products provided by the IUCN World Heritage Programme?

Influence over the World Heritage Process

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.10 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the decisions on WH nominations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.11 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in efforts to improve management of existing WH sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.12 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the policies and procedures of the WH Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.13 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in identifying potential gaps in World Heritage properties worldwide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.15 Overall, IUCN has performed well within its role as the advisory body to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.16 Comments (please reference the question)

Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

4.3 What value do you see in the volunteer contributions of the World Commission on Protected Areas and the Species Survival Commission?

Note: we cover more aspects of efficiency through the organizational aspects section (next)

5. Organizational aspects

Please note that individual protocols exist for:

- World Heritage Programme Staff
- The Director General, Deputy Director General/Managing Director, Global Director Biodiversity Conservation Group and the Director, Global Programme on Protected Areas
- Chair, Vice Chair (World Heritage) for WCPA, Chair, SSC
- Regional World Heritage Focal Points

And should be used during the same interview as this protocol

6. Impact

6.1 In what ways do you see that World Heritage sites are beneficial for biodiversity conservation?

6.2 Do you see World Heritage as a “flagship” example of protected areas? What does this mean for protected areas work more generally?

6.3 What would be the implication for the World Heritage Convention of IUCN not working on World Heritage?

7. Looking forward

7.1 How do you see the World Heritage Convention evolving in the next ten years? What role do you see for IUCN?

7.2 What would you like to see the IUCN World Heritage Programme do more of? Less of?

7.3 What are the main opportunities for the IUCN World Heritage Programme?

Protocol for external stakeholders

1. Please describe your working relationship with the World Heritage Programme

2. Relevance

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
2.1 The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.2 The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the IUCN Programme and Mission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.3 World Heritage is a highly relevant tool for biodiversity conservation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.5 Comments on the above (please reference the question):

2.6 How could the IUCN World Heritage Programme become more relevant to (1) the World Heritage Convention, and (2) to biodiversity conservation?

Effectiveness

3. Effectiveness

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.1 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of evaluating nominations for natural and mixed sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.2 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of monitoring the state of conservation of existing WH sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of providing capacity building	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.4 Comments on the above (please reference the question)

IUCN World Heritage Knowledge Products (i.e. Publications)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.5 The IUCN World Heritage Programme's guidelines on nominations, Outstanding Universal Value and WH management and planning are very useful knowledge products	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.6 The IUCN World Heritage Programme's thematic and tentative list studies are very useful knowledge products?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.7 Overall, the IUCN World Heritage Programme has produced highly useful studies and guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.8 Can you give any examples of how these knowledge products have been used? To what effect?

3.9 Can you identify any gaps in the knowledge products provided by the IUCN World Heritage Programme?

Influence over the World Heritage Process (external)

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
3.10 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the decisions on WH nominations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.11 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in efforts to improve management of existing WH sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.12 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the policies and procedures of the WH Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.13 The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in identifying potential gaps in World Heritage properties worldwide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.14 Overall, IUCN has performed well within its role as the advisory body to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.16 Comments (please reference the question)

4. Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
4.1 The IUCN World Heritage Programme is good value for money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.2 Comments

4.3 What value do you see in the volunteer contributions of the World Commission on Protected Areas and the Species Survival Commission?

4.4 Do you see any strengths or weaknesses you would like to highlight in terms of how IUCN has organized its work on World Heritage?

6. Impact

6.1 In what ways do you see that World Heritage sites are beneficial for biodiversity conservation?

6.2 Do you see World Heritage as a “flagship” example of protected areas? What does this mean for protected areas work more generally?

6.3 What would be the implication for the World Heritage Convention of IUCN not working on World Heritage?

Impact and the World Heritage Convention (outside stakeholders)

6.4 Can you give examples of how the World Heritage Programme has effectively helped fill gaps in the coverage of World Heritage properties worldwide?

6.5 Can you give examples of how the World Heritage Programme has effectively helped with issues related to local communities, indigenous peoples and World Heritage?(Is there a difference with IUCN's work on Protected Areas?)

6.6 Can you give examples of how the World Heritage Programme has effectively helped improve management and sustainability of World Heritage properties?(Is there a difference with IUCN's work on Protected Areas?)

7. Looking forward

7.1 How do you see the World Heritage Convention evolving in the next ten years? What role do you see for IUCN?

7.2 What would you like to see the IUCN World Heritage Programme do more of? Less of?

7.3 What are the main opportunities for the IUCN World Heritage Programme?

World Heritage Programme survey 26.04.2013 (English)

This survey should take around 15 minutes. Your answers are anonymous. If you have any questions, please contact us at evaluation@iucn.org

1. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The work of the IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly relevant to the IUCN Programme and Mission	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
World Heritage is a highly relevant tool for biodiversity conservation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. How could the IUCN World Heritage Programme become more relevant to the World Heritage Convention?

3. How could the IUCN World Heritage Programme become more relevant to biodiversity conservation?

World Heritage Programme survey 26.04.2013 (English)

4. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of evaluating nominations for natural and mixed sites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of monitoring the state of conservation of existing WH sites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme is highly effective in its role of providing capacity building	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The IUCN World Heritage Programme's guidelines on nominations, Outstanding Universal Value and World Heritage management and planning are very useful knowledge products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme's thematic and tentative list studies are very useful knowledge products	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, the IUCN World Heritage Programme has produced highly useful studies and guidelines	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. Can you identify any gaps in the knowledge products provided by the IUCN World Heritage Programme?

World Heritage Programme survey 26.04.2013 (English)

7. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the decisions on World Heritage nominations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in efforts to improve management of existing World Heritage sites	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in influencing the policies and procedures of the World Heritage Convention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The IUCN World Heritage Programme has been highly effective in identifying potential gaps in World Heritage properties worldwide	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall, IUCN has performed well within its role as the advisory body to the World Heritage Convention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The IUCN World Heritage Programme is good value for money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statement:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
The World Heritage Programme has effectively helped tackle issues related to local communities, indigenous peoples and World Heritage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

World Heritage Programme survey 26.04.2013 (English)

10. How do you see the World Heritage Convention evolving in the next ten years?

What role do you see for IUCN?

11. What stakeholder group do(es) you/your organisation belong to? (you can tick more than one box)

- Donor (ie your organisation provides funds to the IUCN World Heritage Programme)
- IUCN Commission
- IUCN member
- IUCN National Committee
- IUCN staff
- IUCN World Heritage Panel
- World Heritage Centre (UNESCO)
- World Heritage Committee
- ICOMOS or ICCROM
- World Heritage site evaluator
- World Heritage Convention State Party
- Other

12. Please identify the region in which you principally work:

- Africa
- Central and South America
- North America and the Caribbean
- South and East Asia
- West Asia
- Oceania
- Eastern Europe, North and Central Asia
- Western Europe

Thank you for your time and your valuable contribution!

ANNEX 4: BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badman, T. and Bomhard, B. 2008. World Heritage and Protected Areas. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/edocs/2008-006.pdf>
- Badman, T., Bomhard, B., Fincke, A., Langley, J., Rosabal, P. and Sheppard, D. 2008. Outstanding universal value: Standards for natural world heritage. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2008-036.pdf>
- Bertzky, B., Shi, Y., Hughes, A., Engels, B., Ali, M.K. and Badman, T. 2013. Terrestrial Biodiversity and the World Heritage List: Identifying broad gaps and potential candidate sites for inclusion in the natural World Heritage network. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2013-016.pdf>
- Borges, M.A., Carbone, G., Bushell, R. and Jaeger, T. 2011. Sustainable tourism in World Heritage: Priorities for action. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/sustainable_tourism_and_natural_world_heritage_report.pdf
- Buckley, R. 2002. World Heritage Icon Value: Contribution of World Heritage Branding to Nature Tourism. Australian Heritage Commission. http://macha.itc.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/7217/20002_1.pdf?sequence=1
- Cameron, C. 2005. Evaluation of IUCN's Work in World Heritage Nominations https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/evaluation_of_iucn_work_in_world_heritage_nominations_2005.pdf
- Dingwall, P., Weighell, T. and Tim Badman. 2005. Geological World Heritage: A global framework - A Contribution to the Global Theme Study of Natural World Heritage Natural Sites. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN <http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/geology.pdf>
- IUCN 2013. Evaluations of Nominations of Natural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_evaluation_report_2013.pdf
- IUCN 2013. IUCN Council decisions November 2013 (internal document).
- IUCN 2013. IUCN World Heritage Advice Note: Mining and Oil/Gas Projects. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_advice_note_on_mining_in_wh_sites_final_060512_2.pdf
- IUCN 2012. Brief - IUCN Conservation Outlook Assessments https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/brief_iucn_conservation_outlook_assessments_0812.pdf
- IUCN 2012. IUCN Recommendation 2012: WCC-2012-Rec-154-EN Protecting the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area of Australia. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://www.iucnworldconservationcongress.org/member_s_assembly/resolutions/
- IUCN 2012. IUCN Resolution 2012: WCC-2012-Res-046-EN Strengthening the World Heritage Convention. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://www.iucnworldconservationcongress.org/member_s_assembly/resolutions/
- IUCN 2012. IUCN Resolution 2012: WCC-2012-Res-047-EN Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the context of the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://www.iucnworldconservationcongress.org/member_s_assembly/resolutions/
- IUCN 2011. IUCN Evaluation of World Heritage Nominations: Guidance for Desktop Reviewers. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/guidance_iucn_world_heritage_dektop_reviews.pdf

- IUCN 2011. Tabe'a Nature and World Heritage in the Arab States: towards future IUCN priorities. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/nature_world_heritage_in_the_arab_states_tabe_a_9_june_2011.pdf
- IUCN 2011. Terms of Reference for the IUCN World Heritage Panel. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/tor_20for_20iucn_20world_20heritage_20panel_20final.pdf
- IUCN 2009. IUCN Evaluation of World Heritage Nominations: Some Suggestions to Evaluators for IUCN Evaluation Missions and IUCN Technical Evaluation Reports. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/guidelines_for_evaluators_2013.pdf
- IUCN 2009. World Heritage in danger - A compendium of key decisions on the conservation of natural World Heritage properties via the list of World Heritage in Danger. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
<https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2009-066.pdf>
- IUCN (various years). World Heritage Capacity Building Newsletter. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN
http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/our_work/capacity_building/
- IUCN (various years). Evaluations of Nominations of Natural and Mixed Properties to the World Heritage List. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/our_work/wcpa_nomination/
- IUCN (various years). State of Conservation Reports. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/our_work/monitoring/conservation_reports/
- IUCN and UNEP-WCMC, 2012. KML Layer of Natural and Mixed World Heritage Sites as recorded in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC. http://www.unep-wcmc.org/kml-file-of-world-heritage-sites_812.html
- IUCN and UNEP-WCMC, 2011. African Natural Heritage: Possible Priorities for the World Heritage List. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC http://www.unep-wcmc.org/medialibrary/2011/07/07/13ae4848/wh_africa_en.pdf
- Jackson, P. 2012. Value for money in international development: Deconstructing myths to promote a more constructive discussion, Paris, France: OECD <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/49652541.pdf>
- Larsen, P.B. 2012. IUCN, World Heritage and Evaluation Processes Related to Communities and Rights: An independent review. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/review_world_heritage_communities_and_rights_larsen_2012.pdf
- Larsen, P.B. 2012. DISCUSSION PAPER: Advisory body evaluations of World Heritage nominations in relation to community and rights concerns, an independent assessment. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/world_heritage_and_communities_advisory_body_follow_up_larsen_2012.pdf
- Lockwood, L. Worboys, G.L. and Kothari, A., 2006. Managing protected areas: A global guide. Trowbridge, UK: Cromwell Press.
- Magin, C. 2005. World Heritage Thematic Study for Central Asia: A Regional Overview. Prepared for IUCN Programme on Protected Areas. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.
http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/central_asia.pdf
- National Park Service, US Department of the Interior. The National Park Service World Heritage Fellows Program. http://www.nps.gov/oia/new/New_Page/WH_Fellowship.htm [accessed on 20.08.2013]

- Olsen, N., Bishop, J. and Anstee, S., 2011. Exploring ecosystem valuation to move towards net positive impact on biodiversity in the mining sector. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. (IUCN and Rio Tinto Technical Series No.1) <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/2011-062.pdf>
- Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd. 2009. World Heritage Status: Is there opportunity for economic gain? UK: Lake District World Heritage Project. <http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>
- Tabet, J. 2010. Review of ICOMOS' working methods and procedures for the evaluation of cultural and mixed properties. Paris, France: ICOMOS http://www.icomos.org/world_heritage/WH_Committee_34th_session_Brasilia/JT_Final_report_en.pdf
- Temple, H.J., Anstee, S., Ekstrom, J., Pilgrim, J.D., Rabenantoandro, J., Ramanamanjato, J.B., Randriatafika, F. & Vincelette, M. 2012. Forecasting the path towards a Net Positive Impact on biodiversity for Rio Tinto QMM. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. . (IUCN and Rio Tinto Technical Series No.2) http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/publications_doc/publications/?uPubsID=4711
- Thorsell, J. 2003. World Heritage Convention: Effectiveness 1992-2002 and lessons for governance. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/gpap_home/gpap_capacity2/gpap_pub/gpap_effectivenesspub/?2245/World-Heritage-Convention-Effectiveness-1992-2002-and-Lessons-for-Governance
- Turner, S.D. 2012. World Heritage sites and the extractive industries. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/whs_and_extractive_industries_20_jun_12.pdf
- Turner, S.D. 2009. Strategic Review of the IUCN Programme on Protected Areas. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/programme_on_protected_areas_strategic_review_2009.pdf
- UNESCO 2013. Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre <http://whc.unesco.org/en/guidelines/>
- UNESCO 2011. Adapting to Change: The State of Conservation of World Heritage Forests in 2011. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre <http://whc.unesco.org/document/115693>
- UNESCO 2011. Strategic Action Plan for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention 2012 -2022. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-18qa-11-en.pdf>
- UNESCO External Auditor 2011. Final report of the Audit of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative. Paris, France: UNESCO <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2011/whc11-35com-9Ae1.pdf>
- UNESCO 2007. World Heritage: Challenges for the millennium. Paris, France: UNESCO World Heritage Centre <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/306/>
- UNESCO 1972. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Paris, France: UNESCO <http://whc.unesco.org/en/convention/>
- WCMC 2000. A Global Overview of Protected Areas on the World Heritage List of Particular Importance for Biodiversity. Cambridge, UK: UNEP-WCMC <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/WH-WP-005.pdf>
- Williams, P. 2008. World Heritage Caves and Karst. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2008-037.pdf>
- Wood, C. 2009. World Heritage Volcanoes: A thematic study: A Global Review of Volcanic World Heritage Properties: Present Situation, Future Prospects and Management Requirements, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN <http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/whvolcanoes.pdf>

World Heritage Programme project/internal documents

IUCN (no date). MAVA Foundation Proposal - The World Heritage Agenda for Nature: Project Document

IUCN (no date). MAVA Foundation Proposal - The World Heritage Agenda for Nature: Budget and Financial Strategy

IUCN (no date). MAVA Foundation Proposal - The World Heritage Agenda for Nature: Technical and Financial Report Year 1 & 2 (2010-11 and 2011-2012)

IUCN 2005. The WHP Quadriennial and annual workplan 2005-2011

IUCN 2009. Global Protected Programme on Protected Areas/World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA): Component Programme Monitoring Plan.

IUCN.2010. Swiss Federal Office for the Environment Proposal - Short-Term World Heritage Capacity Building Project Framework proposal 2010-2012/13

IUCN 2012. IUCN Programme 2013-2016 – proposed component programme: World Heritage Programme

IUCN 2013. Analysis of the degree of fit between IUCN recommendations and the WH Committee decisions 2003-2013.

IUCN 2013. The 37th session of the World Heritage Committee: Headlines for IUCN

IUCN 2013. Modular costs for evaluations and monitoring IUCN

IUCN 2013. World Heritage Programme budgets 2010-2013

IUCN 2012. World Heritage Programme marketing and communications plan 2012 – 2013

MEDIA

BBC Evening Extra, 19 June 2013, Interview with Tim Badman

The Economist, 26.08.2010. UNESCO's World Heritage sites: A danger list in danger. The Economist <http://www.economist.com/node/16891951>

The Land, 18 June 2013. 'Reef on brink of 'danger' listing'. 18 June 2013 <http://www.theland.com.au/news/agriculture/general/news/reef-on-brink-of-danger-listing/2659909.aspx?src=rss>