

Evaluation of IUCN World Heritage Programme 2014

Management Response

Date created: 16 April 2014

This IUCN management response to the recent Evaluation of the IUCN World Heritage Programme (WHP) is provided below. It sets out the ways in which IUCN proposes to respond to, and where appropriate, adapt its work to address the evaluation's **29 recommendations**. The management response has been prepared by the Director, IUCN World Heritage Programme, and the Global Director, IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group. In line with IUCN procedures, a view is provided as to whether the WHP agrees, partly agrees or does not agree with each recommendation. Comments are provided in each case. This analysis is provided in Annex 1 to the management response. In essence all the recommendations are agreed, although some have caveats and require additional comment. IUCN has also received feedback from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on the recommendations.

The desirable results of actions to be taken resulting from the IUCN management response are set out in Table 1 below, organised according to prioritised recommendations of the review. Each action sought has a timeline and suggested responsibility. This action plan will provide the basis for monitoring the results of the Evaluation.

Table 1: World Heritage Evaluation - Management Response: Recommendations and Action Plan

Recommendations of the Evaluation (grouped according to prioritised recommendations)	Desirable result of actions to be taken in response to the Evaluation (timeline) [actors]
A. Increased IUCN Influence on the World Heritage Convention	
15. IUCN senior management should determine how to best influence the World Heritage Convention to deliver on nature conservation, including consideration of communications aspects, the role of civil society, the role of IUCN Members and how to best use diplomacy and align positions with ICOMOS and ICCROM. This needs to include consideration of the role of the World Heritage Programme in relation to advocacy and how this should be managed and governed in relation to the Convention mandate. (Group with Recommendations 8, 22, 25)	A1: IUCN will uphold consistent high standards in IUCN advisory body work as the foundations of IUCN's role on WH. (Ongoing) [DIR/WHP]. A2: IUCN will put in place a new Influencing Strategy , supported by stronger and consistent communication across the Union, to strengthen results from the Convention, including greater direct support to States Parties, and how to engage IUCN members to attend the WH Committee, and support action at site level. (From 2015) [DIR/WHP] A3: IUCN WHP will carry forward actions in IUCN's management response to the DG UNESCO "Thinking Ahead" process , with participation at DG level in high-level meetings. (Ongoing) [DIR/WHP] A4: IUCN will seek amendments to the Convention's Operational Guidelines to introduce (a) new Upstream Process (2016), Revision of nomination format (2016), recognition of rights based approaches (2018) [DIR/WHP] A5: World Heritage content will be strengthened in new IUCN Programme , and consistently across all through raising projects and targeting activities in support of World Heritage sites (2016-2020) [DG, GD/BCG, DIR/ WHP, RDs]. A6. IUCN World Heritage Panel will be strengthened (Implement from 2015) [GD/BCG, DIR/WHP].
B. Systematic monitoring of impact of World Heritage status	
20. Systematic monitoring and measurement of impact should be built into Conservation Outlook Reporting when feasible and appropriate, so that the impact of all natural and mixed sites will eventually be measured regularly. (Group with Recommendations 3, 9)	B1: The new IUCN World Heritage Outlook (WHO) system will be launched at the 2014 WH Committee and World Parks Congress, and lead to trackable monitoring by IUCN and IUCN-WCPA of all natural World Heritage Sites (2014, then ongoing) [DIR/WHP] B2: A partnership of IUCN members to support the action to follow up WHO assessments, and undertake repeat reports, is established (From 2015) [DIR/WHP] B3: The second (2018), and third (2022) WH Outlook reports show demonstrable improvement in the conservation status of natural WH Sites, and their contribution to the Aichi biodiversity targets [DIR/WHP]
C. Effective World Heritage Communication Strategy	
23. The World Heritage Programme should develop a clear communications strategy/approach encompassing internal and external communications, both with individuals and larger audiences, and including monitoring and reporting of results. (Group with Recommendations 1, 7)	C1: IUCN launch a new and stronger World Heritage Communication Strategy to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support all aspects of its WH Programme, • engage across all interested members and Commissions, • influence the World Heritage Convention, and • use World Heritage as a model to demonstrate IUCN's work on Protected Areas, and results of the IUCN Programme (From 2015) [DIR/WHP, DIR/COMM, GD/UDG]

Recommendations of the Evaluation (grouped according to prioritised recommendations)	Desirable result of actions to be taken in response to the Evaluation (timeline) [actors]
D. Consistent clear and proactive IUCN policy on World Heritage, Extractive Industry and Sustainable Development	
5. IUCN needs to clearly set out its formal position on the relationship between World Heritage and sustainable economic development approaches such as No Net Loss and Net Positive Impact, used by other IUCN units and which aim to prevent biodiversity losses. This should include a clear definition of the 'no-go' concept (applicable to the extractive industries). Once this formal position is articulated, it needs to be communicated to relevant World Heritage stakeholders, including IUCN staff.	D1: A clear and consistent policy approach to WH and development is established by IUCN, and endorsed by Council and the 2016 WCC, and communicated across all parts of the Union (2016) [Council, <u>DG</u> , GD/BCG, GD/POL, DIR/WHP, DIR/GPAP, DIR/BBP]. D2: IUCN will seek to develop a major new area of work on World Heritage and development in the new IUCN Programme 2016-2020 focused on achieving positive results for sustainable development, in line with the policy approach adopted in D3. This may be considered as one area of possible activity in relation to WH and the GEF. (2016-) [<u>DIR/WHP</u>]
6. The World Heritage Programme should facilitate a dialogue with State Parties on how to approach economic development, including in and around natural and mixed World Heritage sites with a view to increasing/maintaining the relevance of both the Programme and the Convention. This dialogue should also contribute to a wider IUCN exercise aimed at defining so-called no-go areas. (Group with Recommendation 4)	D3: IUCN will convene a meeting of States Parties in Gland to explore further the issues raised in the evaluation regarding perceptions of IUCN's work. (2015) [<u>DG</u> , DIR/WHC].
E. Using World Heritage as a Test Case for IUCN knowledge products and new approaches	
14. The Programme should improve the relevance and accessibility of World Heritage knowledge products by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring all new knowledge products have benefited from an up-front demand analysis of potential end users • Improving accessibility electronically, including in situations where web access is not available and in as many major languages as possible • Monitoring use and effect of use of knowledge products • Ensuring best use of IUCN's flagship knowledge products (e.g. datasets, standards and tools related to the Red Lists, Key Biodiversity Areas). (Group with Recommendations 2, 10) 	E1: All new World Heritage Knowledge Products will follow a needs assessment, and the WHP will track the use of its knowledge products and report on the results each quadrennium. (First report 2016-) [<u>DIR/WHP</u>]. E2: IUCN WH Gaps studies , when revised, will make full use of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and emerging Red List of Ecosystems (RLE) (next revision 2016) [<u>DIR/WHP</u>]. E3: The developing Red List of Ecosystems (RLE) ensures policy coherence with IUCN's role on World Heritage (2014) [<u>DIR/EMP</u> , DIR/WHP]. E4: WH will be evaluated as a possible test-bed for the emerging IUCN Flagship Knowledge Products on Governance, and Human Dependency on Nature (2014) [<u>GD/NBSG</u> , DIR/WHP].
19. IUCN senior management should position the World Heritage Programme as a test case for new data sets, maps and tools to measure impact on biodiversity and local communities and indigenous peoples. The testing should start with uncontroversial World Heritage sites for which good data are available. (Group with Recommendations 28, 29)	
27. The Programme should continue its close collaboration with the Global Protected Areas Programme particularly, to ensure congruence between State of Conservation monitoring and the proposed Green List of protected areas, species and ecosystems and associated standards.	E5: IUCN WHP, WCPA and GPAP will ensure the contribution of WH is clearly positioned in the wider global work of IUCN on Protected Areas , via the World Parks Congress (2014) [<u>DIR/WHP</u> , <u>DIR/GPAP</u> , <u>WCPA</u>]. E6: IUCN World Heritage, notably through the new WH Outlook system, is used as the primary testing environment for new developments in Protected Planet/WDPA, and the developing IUCN Green Lists (from 2014) [<u>DIR/WHP</u> , <u>DIR/GPAP</u>].
F. More effective partnerships between IUCN and UNESCO, ICOMOS and ICCROM	
12. The World Heritage Programme should improve collaboration with ICOMOS, jointly setting relevant and achievable priorities given available capacity.	F1. IUCN and World Heritage Centre hold facilitated process to resolve more efficient working methods, and coordinate on extra budgetary activities. (2015). [<u>DG</u> , GD/BCG, DIR/WHP].

Recommendations of the Evaluation (grouped according to prioritised recommendations)	Desirable result of actions to be taken in response to the Evaluation (timeline) [actors]
<p>24. The Director General [of IUCN] should, with agreement from UNESCO, coordinate a facilitated process to clarify and define roles and responsibilities of the World Heritage Programme and the World Heritage Centre, and the other Advisory Bodies. This process needs to include identification, and consideration of, the reasons why previous attempts were not fully successful.</p>	<p>F2: IUCN and ICOMOS develop a joint and extra-budgetary funded collaborative programme on providing Upstream Advice and linking nature and culture. (from 2015) [DIR/WHP, ICOMOS].</p> <p>F3: ICCROM and IUCN successfully raise funding for WH Capacity Building Strategy, and shared programme of work (from 2014) [ICCROM, DIR/WHP].</p>
<p>G. More effective leverage of IUCN Commissions to support World Heritage</p>	
<p>26. The World Heritage Programme should strengthen further its long-standing collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Areas, and also explore new opportunities to collaborate with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Species Survival Commission (recognizing that work has already started) on the use of, and contribution to, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the Key Biodiversity Areas standard • the Commission on Ecosystem Management on the Red List of Ecosystems • the Commission on Economic, Environmental and Social Policy on the Natural Resource Governance Framework and more generally on rights-based approaches and indigenous peoples issues. <p>(Group with Recommendations 11 and 18).</p>	<p>G1: A new WCPA Specialist Group on World Heritage is established and operates effectively (2014 and ongoing) [WCPA, DIR/WHC, DIR/GPAP].</p> <p>G2: An SSC Focal Point is included in the IUCN World Heritage Panel (2014 onwards) [DIR/WHP, SSC].</p> <p>G3: Viable partnership arrangements are agreed with CEM, CEESP and other interested commissions for implementation in the new IUCN Programme (2016-2020). [DIR/WHP, Commission Chairs].</p>
<p>H. Increased allocation of resources, and reduce stress and workload to reasonable levels</p>	
<p>16. The IUCN Director General and UNESCO should ensure that the resources allocated to the World Heritage Programme are adequate to meet the growing workload of the programme.</p>	<p>H1: An increased allocation of framework funding is provided by IUCN to its work on World Heritage, from 2015, based on benchmarking with IUCN HRMG and IUCN Chief Finance Officer, to ensure that core tasks of World Heritage Programme can be delivered within appropriate limits on workload and stress levels. (from 2015) [DG, CFO, HRMG, GD/BCG, DIR/WHP].</p>
<p>17. The World Heritage Programme should investigate opportunities for raising funds, including working with expert fundraisers and mapping potential donors.</p>	<p>H2: IUCN adopts a clear position to reduce the unsustainable workload in the World Heritage Convention, through advocating a reduced frequency of World Heritage Committee meetings to take place every two years, and seeks support from UNESCO for this approach. Alternatively an increase in resources from UNESCO to meet the requirements of an annual cycle of meetings is provided. [DG, DIR/WHP].</p>
<p>21. The World Heritage Programme needs to prioritise its workload and maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of internal procedures and processes where possible. At the same time, IUCN as a whole, through the Human Resources Management Group and the Director General, should carefully consider the workload/stress level situation of the World Heritage Programme and propose solutions that either increase resources or reduce workload.</p>	<p>H3: Additional resources are raised through a higher priority for World Heritage in extra budgetary fundraising within IUCN, with clear targets and timelines, and an agreed and practical fundraising strategy including between IUCN top management, World Heritage Programme and regions. [DG, DIR/SP, DIR/WHP, RDs].</p>

[* Abbreviations of IUCN posts whose action will contribute to achieving the above response: DG=IUCN Director General, GD/BCG= Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group, GD/NBSG=Global Director, Nature Based Solutions Group, GD/POL=Global Director, Policy, GD/UDG=Global Director, Union Development Group, WCPA=World Commission on Protected Areas, SSC=Species Survival Commission, DIR/WHP=Director, World Heritage Programme, DIR/GPAP=Director, Global Protected Areas Programme, DIR/EMP=Director, Ecosystem Management Programme, DIR/BBP=Director, Business and Biodiversity Programme, DIR/SP=Director, Strategic Partnerships, RDs=IUCN Regional Directors]

Jane Smart, Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group
Tim Badman, Director World Heritage Programme

16 April 2014

Evaluation of IUCN World Heritage Programme 2014

ANNEX 1 Management Response: Response of Director, World Heritage Programme, and Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group to each recommendation of the evaluation.

Date created: 10 March 2014

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
Relevance		
1. IUCN should produce an explanatory document to contextualize the role of World Heritage in its conservation toolkit, demonstrate its role in biodiversity conservation (business case) and manage expectations.	Agreed.	<p>The communication of the role needs to go beyond the production of an explanatory document and covers many other recommendations of the evaluation. Additional activities include the WH website, consolidation of WH publications, press/media strategy, use of Twitter and translation into local languages.</p> <p>Communication activity needs to be a much larger part of the work of WHP in its further work, and requires secure funding and capacity.</p>
2. The World Heritage Programme should make use of IUCN knowledge products that allow for prioritization and assessment, such as Key Biodiversity Areas, the proposed Green List of Protected Areas, to increase relevance to biodiversity conservation and, by implication, IUCN's mission.	Agreed.	<p>IUCN flagship Knowledge Products (KP) have been used in the overhaul of latest World Heritage gaps studies during 2013, generating a paper published in Science. IUCN-WHP has made a full contribution to the work on Green Lists based on its three years of work developing the new World Heritage Outlook system. IUCN-WHP has participated in the development of Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA). This work needs to continue and it is expected that further work on WH gaps, including a priority for regional work will continue to integrate with KBA work, and if possible Red List of Ecosystems (RLE).</p> <p>Providing input to KP processes is currently felt to be difficult for WHP given time constraints. In addition, the complexity of the different processes, and lack of overall coordination in relation to the six flagship KP initiatives, and lack of information on some of these, notably the RLE and the two 'new' KPs is a further constraint</p> <p>Relationship of WH to RLE, HDN and NRGF products has not been established, and it should be made clear if there is a relevant link to be made, and if so how. It is important to note that WHP has been asking for ground-truthing of RLE before this KP is further developed, given the risk that it may provide conflicting IUCN positions due to unresolved issues regarding the scale of application of RLE, e.g. the treatment of large animals and migratory species within RLE methodologies. WHP has not been able to achieve input or influence on RLE.</p> <p>The positioning of the new World Heritage Outlook in relation to work on IUCN Green List(s) needs to be brought to a conclusion, ahead of launch leading to the 2014 World Parks Congress.</p>
3. The World Heritage Programme should define its theory of change or conservation logic relating World Heritage with biodiversity conservation and test the results.	Agreed.	<p>The evaluation of the programme presents a theory of change developed by the evaluators in conjunction with the Programme. This provides a basis for testing the theory, and designing indicators to measure effectiveness. The theory of change should be consulted on and agreed by Director GPAP, and Global Director, BCG.</p> <p>Indicators relevant to the achievement of change should be developed as a basis for monitoring the impact of WHP. Staff time required to undertake this is an issue. See recommendations 16 and 21. World Heritage Outlook should assist greatly.</p>

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
<p>4. The World Heritage Programme should explore, with relevant stakeholders, the reasons behind the perception that it has a stance against economic development in and around World Heritage sites. This could include clarification and communication of relevant sections of the Programme's World Heritage Convention mandate</p>	<p>Agreed, with a caveat that the Programme considers that this is a matter of perception, and that there appears to be substantial areas where the reported perception in the review does not accord with the approach the programme takes to questions of development.</p>	<p>The question of perception has been addressed partly by the Evaluation. The establishment of a clear position from IUCN on Development and World Heritage is covered under Recommendation 6, which provides a principal output related to this recommendation.</p> <p>The issue of what kind of 'development' can be accommodated in WH areas / is seen as damaging to WH areas is important here and there appears to be some internal confusion in IUCN. Support from senior management and the GPU to enable the relevant discussion to take place is important. Getting clear IUCN policy positioning around this issue is critical. Council level discussion of this finding of the Evaluation will be essential.</p>
<p>5. IUCN needs to clearly set out its formal position on the relationship between World Heritage and sustainable economic development approaches such as No Net Loss and Net Positive Impact, used by other IUCN units and which aim to prevent biodiversity losses. This should include a clear definition of the 'no-go' concept (applicable to the extractive industries). Once this formal position is articulated, it needs to be communicated to relevant World Heritage stakeholders, including IUCN staff.</p>	<p>Agreed, with the caveat that this should be focused on sustainable development, not only sustainable economic development.</p>	<p>This is an action first for IUCN as a whole re these approaches, which are controversial, and still under consideration.</p> <p>IUCN has a stated policy position on Extractive Industry and World Heritage. Extensive work has been done by WHP in this area, including jointly with Business and Biodiversity Programme (BBP), who managed an independent review on this subject. It is essential that the work being led by Nature Based Solutions Group on the mitigation hierarchy and biodiversity offsets should engage WH expertise.</p> <p>Since the evaluation was concluded, Total has made a new commitment to the no-go principle in relation to World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>See also comments in relation to Recommendation 4.</p>
<p>6. The World Heritage Programme should facilitate a dialogue with State Parties on how to approach economic development, including in and around natural and mixed World Heritage sites with a view to increasing/maintaining the relevance of both the Programme and the Convention. This dialogue should also contribute to a wider IUCN exercise aimed at defining so-called no-go areas.</p>	<p>Partially agreed, but the recommendation is vague. The focus should be relevance to achieving conservation of WHS and achieving IUCN Programme and refer to appropriate <u>sustainable social and economic</u> development..</p>	<p>This should be considered after the Recommendations 4 and 5 have been accomplished.</p> <p>This is a substantial area of work that will require a major multi-year effort and needs to connect also to IUCN wider Protected Area policy and programme. It is recommended that this matter is discussed by Council, as a key issue raised by the evaluation. In addition, this requires adequate funding and staff time to deliver, and should not begin work of this scale and with potential implications for IUCN WH work unless there are adequate resources to ensure delivery.</p> <p>IUCN has been contributing to efforts coordinated by UNESCO to develop a policy framework on sustainable development and World Heritage.</p>

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
Effectiveness		
7. The World Heritage Programme and IUCN senior management should clarify the role of the World Heritage Programme in relation to its two distinct mandates (stemming from both the Convention and IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations). The World Heritage Programme should then communicate this role to its stakeholders, addressing any (perceived) conflict of approach. (WITH 1 and 23)	Partially agreed. This distinction is clear to the Programme, and conflicts of interest are already managed.	<p>Some overlap with previous recommendations. This could best be done after 4 and 5 are completed.</p> <p>We see the focus to be more than considering conflict of interest, but rather about how to mobilize the strength of IUCN to contribute to WH goals in its own right, and in a way that is compatible with its role as an independent Advisory Body to the World Heritage Committee.</p> <p>There needs to remain a focus on reform to the processes of the WH Convention to ensure it remains relevant. The roles of IUCN-WHP in relation to both mandates are also in the course of evolution (eg Upstream Process, and proactive monitoring should be introduced to the Convention) a goal of alignment is another way to look at this and better than a reactive focus on conflict of interest.</p> <p>Requires consideration by GMT, with prior discussion in Council.</p>
8. The IUCN should work to improve the alignment between the World Heritage Convention and relevant IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations, and decide who in IUCN should be responsible for ensuring this.	Agreed, but we consider this is already clearly a core role of WHP.	<p>WHP considers this is part of its core role. There is a healthy relationship between the two mandates of IUCN-WHP, so that IUCN can maintain a clear and progressive mandate for work on WH, transparent in IUCN resolutions. This gives a clear basis for inputs to the role of IUCN within the Convention. IUCN resolutions and recommendations on WH have been presented to WH Committee, so there is already action taken. IUCN has also taken a clear position on current issues of reform in the World Heritage Convention, notably in relation to the “Thinking Ahead” process that has been led by DG, UNESCO.</p> <p>There are significant resource constraints, as well as institutional inertia in relation to changing WH processes, that limit the capability to achieve significant alignment.</p>
9. The World Heritage Programme should improve the evaluation process of new World Heritage nominations by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including more emphasis on future threats to sites, in particular explaining the impact of proposed economic activity • Including a greater focus on community and governance issues • Ensuring recommendations can feasibly be implemented within the context of the site. 	Agreed.	Work on these issues has already been substantially implemented during 2013-14, although further reflections are always useful. The first bullet is difficult to implement, given the complexity of impact assessment, and that aspects should remain a responsibility of developers and States Parties.
10. The World Heritage programme should continue to refine the application of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, making use of IUCN’s flagship knowledge products.	Agreed	<p>This is an ongoing role of WHP, with substantial progress in 2013-14 with major global studies on marine and terrestrial biodiversity. Next steps need to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Effective dissemination b) Implementation of regional programmes to fill gaps in priority regions c) Considering how to connect KBA and RLE to future updates.
11. The World Heritage Programme should continue to expand the pool of evaluators and monitoring experts, aiming to achieve technical, regional, linguistic and gender balance.	Agreed.	Significant progress has been made on this since the last evaluation of the programme, but a fully balance cadre of specialists has not yet been achieved and more needs to be done. The limited working languages of the WH Convention (English and French only) are a significant constraint to regional/linguistic diversification.

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
<p>12. The World Heritage Programme should improve collaboration with ICOMOS, jointly setting relevant and achievable priorities given available capacity.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>This recommendation needs a shared strategy with ICOMOS to build on some positive but still small scale joint projects which begun in 2013-14. One real constraint is the limited capacity of ICOMOS in comparison to IUCN. It is also vital in relation to our Advisory Body role to not be significantly out of step with ICOMOS.</p>
<p>13. Existing capacity building efforts should be focussed on developing a capacity building programme (for experts, State Parties) meeting the needs of the target audience. This can either be done by the World Heritage Programme using new and additional resources, or carried out by another player and supported by the programme, feeding in its expertise. Capacity building efforts should seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turn guidelines and standards into training materials • Offer regionally balanced training opportunities • Provide professional accreditation certification • Track the deployment of those certified in subsequent evaluation of nominations and monitoring of state of conservation. 	<p>Agreed, noting that a modest capacity building programme is already in place.</p>	<p>Likely to be highly constrained by lack of significant resources, and joint efforts rely on partnership with (notably with ICCROM) in terms of leadership and fundraising. Additional priority needed for fundraising in this area, including a possibly priority for IUCN to consider in relation to the GEF.</p> <p>One significant current opportunity will be to clearly position WH in relation to larger regionally based Protected Area Capacity Building, such as the work on BIOPAMA, and this positioning should also be a key goal at the 2014 World Parks Congress.</p>
<p>14. The Programme should improve the relevance and accessibility of World Heritage knowledge products by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring all new knowledge products have benefited from an up-front demand analysis of potential end users • Improving accessibility electronically, including in situations where web access is not available and in as many major languages as possible • Monitoring use and effect of use of knowledge products • Ensuring best use of IUCN's flagship knowledge products (e.g. datasets, standards and tools related to the Red Lists, Key Biodiversity Areas). 	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Some work on gaps needs to be proactive regarding advocacy for conservation , so is cannot only be driven by end user demand, but better links to implementation are needed, and regional programmes, accompanied by communication and translation are a clear priority.</p> <p>Clear explanations of WH KPs are needed including how they link to existing flagship knowledge products. Relevant links to be made between IUCN's Flagship KPs. Careful and consistent development of standards and branding is required.</p> <p>This is a major priority for next steps to build on work to date regarding gaps on the World Heritage List. Options for improving on line access and translation are part of current planning of programme activities from 2015-</p> <p>IUCN WHP will seek to introduce both needs analysis and tracking of the use of its studies into the programme, beginning with the new quadrennium (2016), when a report on the use of thematic advice provided by IUCN in relation to the gaps on the World Heritage List should be provided.</p>

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
<p>15. IUCN senior management should determine how to best influence the World Heritage Convention to deliver on nature conservation, including consideration of communications aspects, the role of civil society, the role of IUCN Members and how to best use diplomacy and align positions with ICOMOS and ICCROM. This needs to include consideration of the role of the World Heritage Programme in relation to advocacy and how this should be managed and governed in relation to the Convention mandate.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>An extremely large recommendation, that will involve clarity around policy positions as mentioned above and prior discussion with Council. Positioning of IUCN advocacy must remain clearly based on our objective science based role, and should not become a lobbying activity. Assessment of the situation in UNESCO post re-organization of the World Heritage Centre and given budget cutting taking place is also essential.</p> <p>Work on advocacy needs to consider a number of points including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Levering the roles of WCPA and WHP who can speak on different priorities (WHP focusing on the Advisory Body Role, WCPA on the standard setting role of WH in relation to Protected Areas goals) b) More active and constructive early engagement with States Parties (who are IUCN State Members) to ensure effective dialogue and communicate IUCN analysis on key issues. c) enabling constructive inputs from the growing interest of IUCN NGO members who are engaging in World Heritage, both to contribute their knowledge to IUCN inputs to WH, and for them to take their own positions on key issues of concern to them. d) Designing and implementing an appropriate Media strategy, noting the very high degree of interest from the press in IUCN's comments on WH issues.
<p>Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness</p>		
<p>16. The IUCN Director General and UNESCO should ensure that the resources allocated to the World Heritage Programme are adequate to meet the growing workload of the programme.</p>	<p>Fully agree.</p>	<p>Many of the recommendations made here will involve the need for additional resourcing of a Programme which is already dangerously stretched to the limit. It is recommended that the current funding situation be assessed by senior management and Council in relation to the recommendations in this review. Advice on prioritisation of recommendations will be sought. See Recommendation 21.</p>
<p>17. The World Heritage Programme should investigate opportunities for raising funds, including working with expert fundraisers and mapping potential donors.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>This points to need for consolidation of partners, and support from senior management Strategic Partnerships. WHP work continuously on fundraising and the Programme has grown over the last 4/5 years, but there is limited capacity for this given the continuing demands for delivery.</p> <p>As a first step the programme will develop a series of "A project" concepts on unfunded needs, such as a capacity building programme for experts and managers of WH sites and specific project work on showcasing conservation techniques within World Heritage Sites.</p>
<p>18. The World Heritage Programme, the Global Programme on Protected Areas and the World Commission on Protected Areas should maximize the contributions of WCPA volunteers to World Heritage, for instance through training, skills sharing and accreditation. This should include consideration of the limits of WCPA volunteer contributions, whether/when these are reached, and how to manage the implications.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>WCPA contribution to World Heritage is essential to IUCN's ability to deliver its expected work, and there is a strong cadre of expertise contribution, inter alia, to the World Heritage Panel, field missions and inputs to the monitoring of sites. WCPA are also consolidating their expertise through the formation of a new World Heritage Specialist Group which should further enable these inputs. The inputs from WCPA are capable of being increased, but there is a need for adequate resources to both support costs of volunteers, and to have adequate staff time to managing and supporting increased volunteer input.</p>

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
Impact		
19. IUCN senior management should position the World Heritage Programme as a test case for new data sets, maps and tools to measure impact on biodiversity and local communities and indigenous peoples. The testing should start with uncontroversial World Heritage sites for which good data are available.	Agreed	<p>World Heritage Sites provide a so far untapped opportunity for IUCN as a place to test and demonstrate new ideas within the IUCN Programme, given the particular role IUCN has on WH, the knowledge we hold on WH sites, and their potential function as demonstration sites in the world Protected Areas network.</p> <p>Realising this objective requires consideration by GMT and should be linked to developing partnerships between WHP and other IUCN global and regional programmes. Priorities should be set to ensure that the idea can be delivered.</p>
20. Systematic monitoring and measurement of impact should be built into Conservation Outlook Reporting when feasible and appropriate, so that the impact of all natural and mixed sites will eventually be measured regularly.	Agreed	<p>The launch of a new World Heritage Outlook system during 2014 is seen as the keystone of the future of the programme. This is a transformative new tool for our work, but will need to be launched carefully and managed effectively to deliver long term results. The World Heritage Outlook system also provides a focus for connections between WH and IUCN's flagship Knowledge Products.</p>
Organisational aspects		
21. The World Heritage Programme needs to prioritise its workload and maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of internal procedures and processes where possible. At the same time, IUCN as a whole, through the Human Resources Management Group and the Director General, should carefully consider the workload/stress level situation of the World Heritage Programme and propose solutions that either increase resources or reduce workload.	Agreed	<p>One of the most important recommendations in the Review, noting the striking view of the evaluation regarding the unsustainable workload situation in WHP, and that this is the most significant such example the evaluators have encountered in 16 years of evaluations in IUCN, notably due to the annual meeting of the World Heritage Convention. Detailed discussion and engagement with HR and senior management will be sought. This needs to be considered along with Rec 16 and there is a need to either provide more resources to be able to do more, or to decide to reduce work. . It should be noted that whilst existing and new donors may support implementation of some of these recommendations, they will not support programmatic core funding, so an increase in framework support should be considered, noting that WH is currently the programme unit with the smallest framework allocation.</p> <p>It should further be noted that subsequent to the review a very significant reduction in capacity in UNESCO on World Heritage is currently underway, due to budget issues in UNESCO.</p>
22. The World Heritage Panel should be modernised, including (a) preparation of a clearer and updated Terms of Reference, (b) delineation of clearly defined roles vis-a-vis the World Heritage Programme, (c) clearer provisions for transparency of its governance, operations, procedures and decisions.	Agree	<p>Options for reform will be considered, although better communication of existing TOR and procedures will help. The Panel relationship to WHP via the Director WHP as a non-voting convenor of the panel, and head of IUCN delegation to the WH Committee, has been a long-standing arrangement producing consistent and successful results, and was not changed following the previous review of the Programme, so it is not proposed to change this in relation to advisory body work. But the relationship should be more clearly documented so that this role is clear.</p>
23. The World Heritage Programme should develop a clear communications strategy/approach encompassing internal and external communications, both with individuals and larger audiences, and including monitoring and reporting of results.	Agree	<p>This is a high priority recommendation, considering a substantial number of recommendations require strengthened and consistent communication. The delivery of this recommendation has ongoing resource requirements.</p>

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
<p>24. The Director General should, with agreement from UNESCO, coordinate a facilitated process to clarify and define roles and responsibilities of the World Heritage Programme and the World Heritage Centre, and the other Advisory Bodies. This process needs to include identification, and consideration of, the reasons why previous attempts were not fully successful.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Whilst in agreement, the situation and needs have changed radically considering the recent changes in UNESCO which are ongoing at the present time, but will see a significant reduction in UNESCO capacity on WH during 2014 due to budget cuts. Thus this review needs to be timed to occur once the picture of a reorganized UNESCO is clear. The incoming IUCN DG should undertake this in 2015, and also after work to clarify internal policy inconsistencies on WH within IUCN have been clarified</p>
<p>25. The World Heritage Programme should adapt its interactions with the Committee through a better understanding of Committee information needs, including minimum technical jargon, to ensure effective communication.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>The need for this action is however partly due to the decrease in natural heritage expertise in delegations to the World Heritage Committee. Whilst evaluation reports include inevitable technical detail, it is important to communicate them simply and effectively.</p>
<p>26. The World Heritage Programme should strengthen further its long-standing collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Areas, and also explore new opportunities to collaborate with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Species Survival Commission (recognizing that work has already started) on the use of, and contribution to, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the Key Biodiversity Areas standard • the Commission on Ecosystem Management on the Red List of Ecosystems • the Commission on Economic, Environmental and Social Policy on the Natural Resource Governance Framework and more generally on rights-based approaches and indigenous peoples issues. 	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>This also links to WHP interaction in relation to various knowledge products.</p> <p>On specifics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCPA is discussed above • SSC engagement has been increased significantly, and will consolidated through a new SSC member on the IUCN WH Panel from 2014. • CEM – as noted above input on RLE has been sought but not achieved to date, and will be welcome to both consider synergies, and avoid risks to IUCN WH role. • CEESP – there is now strong engagement via TILCEPA, but more systematic engagement of CEESP in the evaluation of new nominations would be welcome. This is also part of the reflection on possible interactions with ICOMOS, and the linkages between natural heritage and cultural heritage.

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
27. The Programme should continue its close collaboration with the Global Protected Areas Programme particularly, to ensure congruence between State of Conservation monitoring and the proposed Green List of protected areas, species and ecosystems and associated standards.	Agreed	<p>GPAP and WHP are clustered programmes that are working increasingly closely, and with joint team meetings, shared communication and joint work on project development. The Green List provides a key opportunity, but needs to be developed in such a way that it is supportive of WH work and approach. and use of WH as exemplars in wider PA projects are key priorities. Further priorities would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Effective teamworking in support of delivery of the World Parks Congress b) Including WH as a component of larger PA project fundraising c) Joint programme development with IUCN regions, considering it does not make sense for PA and WH to be managed as distinct programmes at the regional level.
28. IUCN senior management should recommend ways of improving IUCN programme integration more generally, including between thematic programmes, and between global and regional levels.	Agreed	<p>This is a leadership task for DG and GMT, and broader than WHP; but we would be happy to use WH as a case study in the way suggested in other recommendations. This also relates to recommendations on the need to resolve internal inconsistent viewpoints because without that further integration will be very challenging. Focusing on the Knowledge Products would be a good way to operationalise this (Note comments made on Reccs linked to KPs).</p> <p>Building cohesive and consistent regional programmes should be a shared goal of WHP and GPAP, see previous recommendation.</p>
29. The World Heritage Programme should aim to develop medium to long term reciprocal collaborations with one or two IUCN technical programmes to demonstrate the use of management or restoration tools within World Heritage sites.	Agreed	<p>This also links to to Recc. 19 and 28. An increase in capacity is needed to focus on restoration, and this is not the only priority. Capacity will be an issue. A priority next step beyond existing collaborations would be to consider how to achieve a joint project with one global programme in the Nature Based Solutions group.</p> <p>The next IUCN Programme could enable progress on this by giving clearer guidance to global and regional programmes regarding how they engage with World Heitage.</p>

Jane Smart, Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group
Tim Badman, Director World Heritage Programme

31 March 2014