



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Executive Board

Hundred and ninety-fifth session

195 EX/12 Part I

PARIS, 18 August 2014
Original: English

Item 12 of the provisional agenda

CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES

PART I

REPORT ON CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES

SUMMARY

In response to Executive Board 192 EX/Decision 15 (I) this report provides information on the status of progress regarding the alignment of agreements, concluded with category 2 institutes and centres, which entered into force before 2005, with the Model Agreement of the ruling Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for category 2 institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO, adopted by the General Conference at its 37th session in 2013.

Action expected of the Executive Board: proposed decision in paragraph 7.

1. By its 192 EX/Decision 15 (I), the Executive Board requested the Director-General to report to the current session on the status of alignment of the agreements of the category 2 institutes and centres which entered into force before 2005 with the Model Agreement of the ruling Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for category 2 institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO, adopted by the General Conference at its 37th session in 2013.

2. By its 37 C/Resolution 93 the General Conference approved the amended integrated comprehensive strategy and its attachments (37 C/18 Part I), as recommended by the Executive Board in its 190 EX/Decision 18 (I). The General Conference also decided that this strategy supersedes all its prior resolutions on the subject and requested the Director-General "to apply the strategy to all proposals for the establishment of category 2 institutes and centres and all renewals of existing agreements". Paragraphs 3 and 4 provide information on the relevant Articles affected by an alignment, while paragraph 5 presents the status report by Programme Sectors.

3. Article H.3 – *Review and adaptation of existing agreements* of the strategy states that “each existing agreement with category 2 institute or centre shall be reviewed in consultation with the Member State(s) with a view to bringing it into conformity with the present strategy for category 2 entities and respective sectoral strategies. In case of need for changes in the agreement Member States with such an agreement shall be provided with a reasonable transitional period to adapt the agreement to the revised strategy in future renewals”.

4. Likewise, under Article E – *Financial aspects*, provision 1.3 of the strategy states that “if a category 2 institute or centre ceases to receive financial support from sponsoring Member State(s) or any other funding source the Director-General shall invite sponsoring Member State(s) to explore other funding possibilities within the period of six months. Should there be no result, the Director-General may propose to the Executive Board to terminate the agreement signed and cancel the designation as category 2 entity”.

5. The following institutes and centres under the responsibility of programme sectors are concerned:

ED

- International Research and Training Centre for Rural Education (INRULED), China: the revised integrated comprehensive strategy was presented to the host Member State and further consultations are on-going towards signing the aligned agreement in the current biennium.

SC

- International Research and Training Centre on Erosion and Sedimentation (IRTCES), China: further to the renewal of the granting of category 2 status by the Executive Board 191 EX/Decision 14 (XI), consultations are in progress with the host Member State towards signing the aligned agreement before end 2014.
- International Research and Training Centre on Urban Drainage (IRTCUD), Serbia: the preparatory work for the renewal review was undertaken in 2013 and further consultations are in progress with the host Member State with a view to identifying necessary funds and to conduct and complete the consolidated review assessment in the current biennium.
- Regional Humid Tropics Hydrology and Water Resources Centre for South-East Asia and the Pacific (HTC), Malaysia: further to the renewal review, completed in 2013, the revised integrated comprehensive strategy was presented to the host Member State and consultations are in progress towards signing the aligned agreement in the current biennium.
- Regional Centre for Training and Water Studies of Arid and Semi-arid Zones (RCTWS), Egypt: further to the renewal review, completed in 2014, the revised integrated comprehensive strategy was presented to the host Member State and consultations are in progress towards signing the aligned agreement in the current biennium.
- International Centre on Qanats and Historic Hydraulic Structures (ICQHHS), Iran: further to the renewal of the granting of category 2 status by the Executive Board 191 EX/Decision 14 (XI), consultations are in progress with the host Member State towards signing the aligned agreement before end 2014.

CLT

- Regional Centre for Book Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (CERLALC), Colombia: the revised integrated comprehensive strategy was presented to the host

Member State which has identified half of the necessary funds required to proceed with an evaluation and possible renewal; six months are foreseen for the evaluation process to be completed.

- International Institute for the Study of Nomadic Civilizations (IISNC), Mongolia: the revised integrated comprehensive strategy was presented to the host Member State which still should provide necessary funds for an evaluation and possible renewal, and then six months are foreseen for the evaluation process to be completed.
- International Institute for Central Asian Studies (IICAS), Uzbekistan: the Institute formally repudiated its status as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO in a letter to the Organization of 11 April 2014.

CI

- The International Centre for the Registration of Serial Publications (ISSN), France: the Centre informed the Secretariat that it cannot benefit from the designation as a category 2 center under the auspices of UNESCO as it does not fit within the appropriate requirements, and will further send an official notification to the Organization in a due course before end 2014, abrogating its status as a category 2 centre.

6. In view of the above, it is planned that the alignment of the agreements of all category 2 institutes and centres which entered into force before 2005, except IICAS and ISSN, will be finalized during the present biennium, subject to the consultations with the Member States concerned.

7. The Executive Board may wish to adopt a decision along the following lines:

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling its 192 EX/Decision 15 (I) and 37 C/Resolution 93,
2. Having examined document 195 EX/12 Part I,
3. Takes note of its content.



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Executive Board

Hundred and ninety-fifth session

195 EX/12

Part II

PARIS, 28 August 2014

Original: English

Item 12 of the provisional agenda

CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES

PART II

RENEWAL OF CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTES AND CENTRES

SUMMARY

Pursuant to the agreements with the governments establishing category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, evaluations of the following centres were carried out:

- The World Heritage Institute of Research for the Asia and Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP)
- The Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF)

In conformity with the revised integrated comprehensive strategy for category 2 institutes and centres (37 C/Resolution 93), UNESCO carried out an evaluation of WHITR-AP in May 2014. The main purpose was to assess the Institute's performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the Agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the People's Republic of China, and to examine its contribution to the World Heritage Committee's strategic objectives and UNESCO's programme activities. Based upon that evaluation, the Director-General recommends that the Executive Board renew the designation of WHITR-AP as a category 2 institute under the auspices of UNESCO.

Following the same pattern, an evaluation of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation was undertaken. Based upon this evaluation and in agreement with the decision made by the Kingdom of Norway not to renew the aforementioned Agreement and to prepare a new proposal for a category 2 centre, the Director-General recommends that the Executive Board not renew the designation of the NWHF as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO.

Action expected of the Executive Board: proposed decision in paragraph 35.

PART A: RENEWAL OF CATEGORY 2 INSTITUTE STATUS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE INSTITUTE OF TRAINING AND RESEARCH FOR THE ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION IN CHINA (WHITR-AP)

INTRODUCTION

1. In accordance with Article 5 of the Convention concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (hereafter, the “World Heritage Convention”), each State Party shall endeavour “*to foster the establishment or development of national or regional centre for training in the protection, conservation and presentation of the cultural and natural heritage to encourage scientific research in this field*”, the Government of the People’s Republic of China submitted, in March 2007, a proposal to the 176th session of the Executive Board to establish a World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP). Further to the decision by the Executive Board at its 177th session (177 EX/Decision 21), the General Conference, at its 34th session (November 2007), approved the establishment of WHITR-AP, and authorized the Director-General to sign the agreement between UNESCO and the Government of China (34 C/Resolution 41). The Agreement was signed on 12 February 2008 and entered into force on 10 April 2008 for a period of six years. The principal founding entities of WHITR-AP included Peking University in Beijing, Tongji University in Shanghai and the Suzhou Municipality.

2. In its 37 C/Resolution 93, the General Conference approved the revised integrated comprehensive strategy for category 2 institutes and centres and its attachments (document 37 C/18 Part I), as recommended by the Executive Board in its 190 EX/Decision 18 (I). In conformity with the said strategy, an independent evaluation was carried out in May 2014, covering the period from 2008 to 2014. The cost of the evaluation was financed by WHITR-AP. That evaluation included a recommendation that UNESCO renew WHITR-AP’s status as a category 2 centre, while integrating certain improvements into the renewal agreement and aligning it with the revised integrated comprehensive strategy.

THE EVALUATION

3. In conformity with the integrated comprehensive strategy for category 2 institutes and centres, the main purpose of the evaluation is to assess WHITR-AP’s performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the 2008 Agreement between UNESCO and the host Government, to examine its contribution to the Organization’s and the World Heritage Committee’s Strategic Objectives and UNESCO’s sectoral programme priorities and themes, as defined in Programme and Budget for 2014-2017 (document 37 C/5) sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes. The findings of the evaluation serve as the basis for the Director-General’s recommendation to the Executive Board as to whether the Agreement should be renewed or not.

4. The evaluation was conducted by an international team of two experts/evaluators and was managed by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC) in consultation with UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) and the Bureau of Strategic Planning (BSP). WHC coordinated and oversaw the evaluation process by defining the terms of reference for the evaluation and providing technical guidance during the evaluation process.

5. The methodology of the evaluation included: the review of written documents, provided by the WHITR-AP and UNESCO Secretariat; a visit to WHITR-AP, including interviews with the Institute’s management and staff; and consultations with key stakeholders and partners (including the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee, i.e. ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM) through interviews and questionnaires. The draft evaluation report was submitted in July 2014. The full evaluation report is available in English on the website of the World Heritage Centre, at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/category2centres/>.

6. Overall, the evaluation concludes that the work of WHITR-AP has been far-reaching in terms of training and capacity-building, with participants coming from around the globe. The work produced by WHITR-AP was also seen to be of very high quality, making a valuable contribution to the preservation and maintenance of world heritage. The evaluation also reports that there is strong support for renewing the agreement between the Government of the People's Republic of China and UNESCO. The potential for complementary action between the different locations, or "founding entities" of WHITR-AP could provide for a unique institute providing a range of world heritage activities spanning nature and culture, as well as traditional craftsmanship. Issues with coordination between the different entities and a lack of staffing at the Peking University have however left these potential synergies incomplete. Nevertheless, such an opportunity should not be lost. So far, WHITR-AP activities are coordinated with UNESCO and its World Heritage Centre, as well as through the representation of UNESCO on its Governing Board, and WHITR-AP has participated in all World Heritage Committee sessions since the Institute's founding.

7. Being the first category 2 institute of its kind, and thus with no existing models to follow, it has been, however, difficult to assess whether the goals and objectives as set out in the agreement are being achieved: the data monitored by the Institute have focused on activities as opposed to the outcomes of those activities, and no strategic planning framework for all three entities is currently in place. Nevertheless, WHITR-AP has now been carrying out its work for approximately six years and there is evidence of a growing body of knowledge and an increase in activities that should pave the way for the activities of the World Heritage-related category 2 centres created since. The transfer of the Secretariat to Tongji University in Shanghai and the appointment of a Vice-Director focusing on international cooperation have resulted in a sharp increase of activities. It would be useful to create a picture of the scope of achievements of the Institute retrospectively and begin monitoring changes in indicators based on the results-based management approach adopted by the category 2 centres in 2013. This might include indicators such as the number of properties in each of the States Parties in the Asia-Pacific region, the involvement of WHITR-AP in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and the ways in which training session and conference participants have used the training they have received.

8. The evaluation notes among the challenges the need:

- (a) for improvement in the operations of the Governing Board through increased attendance, clearly-specified expectations for Board members, specified terms of office, more frequent meetings and the creation of an Executive Committee. Since relocating the Secretariat to Tongji University in Shanghai, steps have been taken to have a working group meet more frequently. This has provided stronger support to the Shanghai and Suzhou entities, but has had little impact on Peking University since they have not attended the meetings. This group should be formalized as an Executive Committee with a commitment from Peking University to attend. As of yet, no Advisory Committee has been constituted;
- (b) for the involvement of the Peking University and improved coordination between the Beijing branch and the other two entities. The lack of direction and staffing at the Peking University creates a situation where there are no resources for the Beijing branch to work with the other entities. As well, the lack of attendance of the Peking University representative at Board meetings undermines efforts for coordinated planning;
- (c) to ensure a real representation on the Governing Board from the Asia-Pacific Member States. And WHITR-AP has not fully realized its potential to become a focal point in bringing the Asia-Pacific countries together to work for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the region. While some activities have occurred, there has yet to be a strong strategic thrust to reach out to new potential partners or collaborators. This is a priority articulated in the Mid-Term Strategy (2014-2018) of WHITR-AP.

9. The evaluation indicates that there is scope for strengthening WHITR-AP in these regards and that all of the concerns noted can be resolved. Action to address some of the areas in need of improvement is already under way. The evaluation also offers several recommendations for strengthening the Institute's governance, programming and planning, as well as communications and coordination between WHITR-AP and UNESCO. The recommendations particularly note the needs for stronger coordination in planning between the three principal founding entities and clearer budgeting of individual programmes, consistent staffing at the Peking University to reinforce research in natural heritage, ensuring representation of Asia-Pacific Member States on the Governing Board, and in increased focus on capacity-building in the Asia-Pacific region through increased resources. Enacting these changes would increase the effectiveness of both WHITR-AP's many activities, in general, and its contributions to UNESCO's programme priorities and objectives, in particular. The summary text of the recommendations of the evaluation follows in the box below:

Recommendations

- (i) Renewal and revision of the agreement to ensure stronger involvement of Peking University and WHITR-AP's outreach to the region to encourage Member States' participation;
- (ii) Ensure Peking University's increased contributions through its representative's presence at all meetings of the Governing Board and the Executive Committee and the creation of five academic/professional posts at the University as well as necessary administrative staff and the potential removal of Peking University from WHITR-AP through modification of the agreement by UNESCO, at its Executive Board session in fall 2015, should its involvement not improve;
- (iii) Convene an Advisory Committee, with representation from the Asia-Pacific region, to advise the Institute and liaise with UNESCO-affiliated and other institutions in the region;
- (iv) Modifications to the WHITR-AP Constitution to ensure more representation from the Asia-Pacific region, appropriate rotation of the Governing Board members and their roles, participation of Board members in key meetings, and clear and distinct roles for the Executive Committee and Advisory Committee;
- (v) Increased focus on capacity-building and programme development in the Asia-Pacific region, potentially through increased staffing;
- (vi) Establishment of a regular, results-based monitoring and evaluation framework to identify objectives for and assess outcomes of programme activities;
- (vii) Creation of a joint programme and budget for the three entities, indicating revenue sources and categories of expenditures for each of the entities as well as for the Secretariat and any joint activities, and regular audited financial reporting to ensure consistency with the planned budget;
- (viii) Preparation of a mid-term evaluation for the Governing Board to assess WHITR-AP's ongoing improvement and achievement of its stated goals;
- (ix) Concluding the incorporation of WHITR-AP as an independent, non-profit institution.

10. In line with its recommendations, the evaluation suggests a number of specific provisions be included in a renewal agreement in order, first, to conform as closely as possible to the model agreement of the integrated comprehensive strategy (37 C/18 Part I) and, second, to clarify WHITR-AP's responsibility to make a "significant contribution to the UNESCO's strategic programme objectives and expected results aligned with the four-year programmatic period of the

C/5 document (Programme and Budget), and related sectoral or programme priorities and themes”, as provided in the current model agreement.

11. The proposed agreement for the renewal of the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP) deviates from the model agreement (document 37 C/18 Part I, Attachment 2) in minor respects. As this is a renewal agreement, UNESCO and the Government of the People’s Republic of China sought to maintain the greatest possible continuity with the 2008 Agreement between UNESCO and the host government while conforming to the model agreement of the current integrated comprehensive strategy and responding to the concrete recommendations of the evaluation.

12. The five articles that deviate from the model agreement have been annexed to this document so that the Executive Board can be fully informed of the said deviations. The Executive Board may consider whether or not to renew the designation of WHITR-AP as a category 2 institute under the auspices of UNESCO and whether or not to authorize the divergences, if it so decides.

13. Articles 1-6 of the draft shall be replaced by the standard articles of the model agreement. Article 7 on the Governing Board reflects the recommendations of the 2014 evaluation and the official name of the government bodies in China. Article 8 of the draft agreement describes the composition of an Executive Committee of the Governing Board, and corresponds to the previous Article IX of the 2008 Agreement. Such an Executive Committee figures into the Constitution of the Institute, and has proven to be an effective mechanism for preparing the work of the Governing Board. Although not required by the current model agreement, this article does not contradict any of its terms. This also applies to Article 9 on the composition of an Advisory Committee of WHITR-AP (previous Article X of the 2008 Agreement).

14. Similarly, Article 10 of the draft agreement describes the composition and functions of the Institute’s Secretariat and corresponds to the previous Article XI of the 2008 Agreement. Article 11 of the draft agreement describes the functions and responsibilities of the Director of the Institute, corresponding to the previous Article XII of the 2008 Agreement. As with Articles 8 and 9 cited above, these provisions no longer figure into the current model agreement, but do not contradict any of its terms. The Constitution of WHITR-AP refers to both its Secretariat and its Director.

15. Finally, Article 7.1 of the draft agreement diverges in a minor respect from the model agreement in its omission of a reference to a periodic renewal of the Governing Board. The Governing Board consists of a representative of the Government of China (Chinese National Commission for UNESCO), a representative of the Director-General of UNESCO, and a representative of Asia-Pacific State Party to the World Heritage Convention, representatives from the principal founding entities and representatives of other Chinese universities. Given that each institution should designate its own representative on the Governing Board, and that each institution should have the prerogative to determine the duration of office of such representative, imposing a fixed period of renewal of the Board (every two/three years) is not possible.

16. The evaluation was reviewed by the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. In addition to the recommendations of the evaluation, WHC notes that continuous cooperation between WHITR-AP and WHC has been established through regular meetings of the Secretariat and the Governing Board. WHC additionally recognizes an emerging challenge for WHITR-AP in adapting to UNESCO’s strategies regarding synergies with other cultural conventions: the Institute may need to develop wider expertise and partnerships to enhance those potential synergies in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Asia and the Pacific region. WHITR-AP must strive to be a provider of training and capacity-building activities on cultural and natural world heritage, and broader heritage issues, in the Asia-Pacific region. The financial inputs for the operation of the Institute shall be jointly made by the founding entities.

RECOMMENDATION

17. In conformity with the integrated comprehensive strategy, and based upon the results of the evaluation, the Director-General recommends that the Executive Board renew the designation of the World Heritage Training and Research Institute for Asia and the Pacific in China (WHITR-AP) as a category 2 institute under the auspices of UNESCO.

PART B: NON-RENEWAL OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY AND UNESCO CONCERNING THE NORDIC WORLD HERITAGE FOUNDATION (NWHF)

Introduction

18. Following a proposal by the Kingdom of Norway to establish the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF), in collaboration with Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, and further to the decision of the Executive Board at its 166th session (166 EX/Decision 3.4.4), the General Conference, at its 32nd session, approved the establishment of the NWHF as a category 2 centre and authorized the Director-General to sign the Agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway (32 C/Resolution 36). The Agreement was signed and entered into force on 14 November 2003 for the period 2003-2008, with the intent that it be reviewed in 2008.

19. Following an evaluation carried out in 2008 and presented at its 179th session, the Executive Board, by 179 EX/Decision 12, took note of the evaluation submitted, confirmed that the NWHF had performed satisfactorily as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO, and decided to renew the NWHF's status as a category 2 centre. The Executive Board authorized the Director-General, for this purpose, to conclude an agreement with the Government of the Kingdom of Norway, as presented in the Annex to document 179 EX/12, with the text of the Agreement amended to include provisions ensuring that an external evaluation would be conducted in conjunction with any future renewals of the Agreement, and that the Executive Board would have an opportunity to review the renewal before it takes effect. The Kingdom of Norway was also encouraged by the Executive Board to bear the cost of the evaluation. The renewal Agreement was signed and entered into force at the end of December 2008 for a period of six years, with the intent that it be reviewed in 2014.

20. By its 37 C/Resolution 93, the General Conference approved the revised integrated comprehensive strategy for category 2 institutes and centres and its annex (document 37 C/18 Part I), as recommended by the Executive Board in its 190 EX/Decision 18 (I). In conformity with this strategy, an independent evaluation was carried out to review the Centre's activities and its contribution to the strategic programme objectives of the Organization. This in-depth evaluation, conducted by an independent consultancy firm, was also foreseen in the Agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway, as said agreement is due to expire by the end of December 2014. The Norwegian Ministry of the Environment coordinated the survey and provided the necessary funding; the evaluation itself was carried out in close collaboration with a "reference group" comprised of representatives of the World Heritage Centre and the Internal Oversight Services (IOS).

THE EVALUATION

21. In conformity with the integrated comprehensive strategy, the evaluation reviewed both the NWHF's performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the 2008 agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway, and its contribution to UNESCO's strategic programme, objectives and sectorial programme priorities and themes, as set out in recent Programmes and Budgets of the Organization, specifically the 34 C/5 Approved, 35 C/5 Approved and 36 C/5 Approved that applied during the period under evaluation. The report of the evaluation is available on the website of the World Heritage Centre at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/category2centres>.

22. The evaluation found that overall, the NWHF is carrying out its contractual functions and objectives, as defined in Article 7 of the Agreement, in a satisfactory manner. The Foundation assists UNESCO in the implementation of the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, and the World Heritage Centre directly benefits from and appreciates the NWHF's assistance. However, the

evaluation found that the NWHF does not entirely fulfil its objectives, as it has not entirely acted as a “Nordic focal point”, although it has carried out activities (mainly related to capacity-building) on a Nordic level.

23. The evaluation found that stakeholders consistently underline the relevance of the NWHF’s activities for their own purposes. Stakeholders who have been in contact with NWHF also report that the foundation is professional, efficient and effective in communication and cooperation. However, the evaluation noted that the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment and academics specialized in world heritage issues in the Nordic countries consider the NWHF to be of low relevance, as it does not appear to act as a Nordic focal point and to facilitate engagement of Nordic experts in world heritage-related work on an international scale. The evaluation also underlined that at present, the Foundation works as a “competence centre”, rather than as a facilitating focal point, which would be more in alignment with its mandate.

24. The evaluation recognized that the NWHF is of high value to UNESCO and useful for many stakeholders. It also underlined that there is room for improvement in several areas, especially in aligning the Foundation’s mandate and its actual activities. The evaluation further underlined that whilst the Foundation’s work is very important, the current organizational structure of the NWHF (i.e. as an independent body) may not be thoroughly appropriate.

25. The evaluation recommended increasing cooperation with and between Nordic experts, both academically and otherwise, in order to facilitate the dissemination of competence and the exchange of knowledge. It was suggested that an established network of experts on world heritage issues may be useful in this regard, and that the Periodic Reporting exercise may provide a sound basis to foster such a network. The evaluation expressed the opinion that involving experts, rather than the NWHF’s own staff, in projects would represent a better use of resources, human and otherwise, and create synergies within the Nordic countries.

26. The evaluation highlighted that fundraising is a key aspect of the NWHF’s mandate, and that it is crucial to ensure the sustainability of the organization. Therefore, the evaluation recommended hiring qualified personnel with experience in fundraising.

27. The evaluation also addressed differences of interpretation regarding the terms of the Agreement between the NWHF and the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment, notably regarding the Foundation’s activities, and emphasized the importance of a clear, common understanding of the expectations and mandate of the NWHF.

28. The evaluation highlighted the need for increased visibility for the NWHF, and recommended that external marketing and profiling activities be strengthened, with a view of reaching the general public and the relevant Nordic experts. It noted that the communication plan was yet to be implemented, and that the Nordic experts ought to either be an integral part of this plan, or be the focus of a specific strategy. It was suggested that the NWHF could produce promotional information material aimed at all those involved with Nordic World Heritage, and ensure its distribution at key events.

29. Regarding questions of management, the evaluation highlighted that the results-based management system ought to focus on quantifiable indicators for both specific activities of NWHF and their outcomes, rather than on outcomes that are dependent on the agency of a third party. The evaluation also highlighted the need to implement regular monitoring and evaluation processes.

30. Finally, the evaluation recommended that, should the parties involved decide to renew the Agreement, a thorough analysis of various possible organizational models would be essential, making sure that both the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment and the NWHF have equal steering power with regard to the Foundation.

FURTHER INFORMATION

31. In a letter dated 10 April 2014, the Norwegian authorities informed the Director of the World Heritage Centre that, further to the outcomes of the evaluation, they decided not to renew their Agreement with UNESCO regarding the designation of the NWHF as a category 2 centre. The Norwegian authorities expressed that while they wish to continue hosting a category 2 centre in the future to support the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, a new category 2 centre with an organizational structure that would allow the host country to have a seat on the Board would be most appropriate. They also noted that in its current form, the NWHF would require a substantial increase in funding to fulfil its entire mandate, and that a clearer distinction between the roles of the State Party and the category 2 centre is necessary.

32. In a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre dated 19 May 2014, the Norwegian authorities submitted an outline for a new category 2 centre in Norway to support the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, subject to appropriate governmental approval. The Norwegian authorities consider that it shall be important to rethink the role and position of a Norwegian centre as well as its possible interactions with other centres in the field of World Heritage. They propose that this reflection be conducted in partnership with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies of the World Heritage Committee (ICOMOS International, IUCN and ICCROM). Once formally submitted by the Government of the Kingdom of Norway, the proposal shall follow the standard procedure for the designation of a new category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO.

33. Therefore, taking into account the decision of the Government of the Kingdom of Norway not to renew the Agreement regarding the designation of the NWHF as a category 2 centre, a further renewal of this Agreement, which expires by the end of December 2014, cannot be proposed.

RECOMMENDATION

34. In conformity with the integrated comprehensive strategy, and based upon the results of the evaluation and the information submitted by the Norwegian authorities, the Director-General recommends that the Executive Board not renew the designation of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO.

Proposed decision

35. In the light of the above, the Executive Board may wish to adopt the following decisions:

Part A: Renewal of category 2 institute status of the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP)

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 37 C/Resolution 93 and 34 C/Resolution 41,
2. Taking into account document 37 C/18 Part I and its attachments,
3. Having examined document 195 EX/12 Part II and its annex,
4. Notes the Director-General's recommendation that the designation of the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP) as a category 2 institute under the auspices of UNESCO be renewed;
5. Requests the Government of the People's Republic of China to ensure Peking University's increased involvement in the work and governance of WHITR-AP and the

creation of professional posts as well as necessary administrative staff to support the Institute's functioning;

6. Decides to review progress on the involvement of Peking University in WHITR-AP and potential modification of the agreement at its session in fall 2015;
7. Encourages the Government of the People's Republic of China to ensure WHITR-AP's outreach to the Asia-Pacific region to encourage Member States' participation in its work;
8. Further notes the deviations of the draft agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the People's Republic of China from the model agreement for category 2 institutes approved by the General Conference in 37 C/Resolution 93;
9. Decides to renew the designation of the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region in China (WHITR-AP) as a category 2 institute under the auspices of UNESCO, with stipulations requiring a review to ensure stronger involvement of Peking University and WHITR-AP's outreach to the region to encourage Member States' participation;
10. Authorizes the Director-General to sign the corresponding agreement.

Part B: Non-renewal of the agreement between the Kingdom of Norway and UNESCO concerning the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF)

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 37 C/Resolution 93 and 32 C/Resolution 36,
2. Taking into account document 37 C/18 Part I and its annex,
3. Referring to the Agreement between UNESCO and the Government of Norway regarding the Nordic World Heritage Foundation as a centre under the auspices of UNESCO (category 2),
4. Having examined document 195 EX/12 Part II,
5. Notes the Director-General's recommendation that the designation of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO not be renewed;
6. Decides not to renew the designation of the Nordic World Heritage Foundation as a category 2 centre under Foundation as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO.

ANNEX

PROVISIONS DEVIATING FROM THE MODEL AGREEMENT

Article 7 – Governing Board

7.1. The Institute shall be guided and overseen by a Governing Board and include:

...

- (b) representatives of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention from the Asia-Pacific region who are serving on the World Heritage Committee and which have sent to the Institute notification for membership and have expressed interest in being represented on the Board;
- (d) one representative from each of the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN) as observers;
- (f) two representatives of the Government of China, one from the Ministry of Housing, Urban and Rural Development and one from the State Administration of Cultural Heritage (SACH);
- (i) representatives of other States Parties with academic or institution representation in the Asia-Pacific region, of international governmental organizations and of international non-governmental organization working in the field of cultural and natural heritage may be invited, if needed, as observers to the meetings of the Governing Board.
- (j) The Director of the Institute, as an *ex-officio* member;

7.2 The Governing Board shall:

...

review and ensure Peking University's increased involvement in the work and governance of WHITR-AP and the creation of professional posts as well as necessary administrative staff to support Institute's function;

ensure outreach to the Asia-Pacific region to encourage Member State's participation in its work, with increased focus on capacity-building and programme development in the Asia-Pacific region, potentially through increase staffing;

ensure that the Executive Committee and the Advisory Committee are constituted and have clear terms of reference each with a different Chairperson.

[Articles 7.3 through 7.4 do not deviate from the model agreement.]

Article 8 – Executive Committee

8.1. To ensure the effective functioning of the Institute, an Executive Committee composed of seven members elected for four years by the Governing Board will be created to ensure day-to-day management of the Institute. The Committee shall meet at least twice a year and be responsible for:

- (a) monitoring the implementation of the long-term and medium-term programmes of the Institute as approved by the Governing Board;

- (b) monitoring the implementation of the annual work plan of the Institute as approved by the Governing Board;
 - (c) reviewing the programme, the work plan and budget and submit its recommendations to the Board;
 - (d) proposing to the Board candidates for the post of Director of the Centre.
- 8.2. The Executive Committee will be composed of a member of the Governing Board, the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee, one representative from each of the principal founding entities, a representative of the Director-General of UNESCO and one further ad hoc member from the Governing Board. It shall adopt its own rules of procedure and elect its Chairperson. Representatives of the World Heritage Advisory Bodies would be invited according to the agenda items. The cost of participation of UNESCO representative shall be borne either by the Government of China or by the Institute.

Article 9 – Advisory Committee

- 9.1 The Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Governing Board from among scientific, technical and legal experts recommended by the competent government authorities of China, Member States of the Asia-Pacific region and representation of the incumbent Asia-Pacific members of the World Heritage Committee, by UNESCO Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the World Heritage Committee (ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN).
- 9.2 Experts may be selected from those with relevant expertise and experiences in the Asia and the Pacific region and relevant UNESCO associated institutions, universities, and other institutions.
- 9.3 The Chairperson of the Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Governing Board.

Article 10 – Secretariat

- 10.1. The Secretariat of the Institute shall consist of a Director and the staff necessary for the proper functioning of the Institute.
- 10.2. The Director shall be appointed for a term of four years by the Governing Board, after consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO, and shall have a university degree and recognized professional experience in one of the fields of World Heritage (cultural and/or natural)
- 10.3. The other members of the Secretariat may include:
- (a) staff seconded for a defined period of time from the principal founding entities participating within the Institute, with the approval of the Governing Board;
 - (b) any person appointed by the Director in accordance with procedures established by the Governing Board;
 - (c) any officials made available to the Institute by the Government, in accordance with national regulations;
 - d) any staff may be temporary detached and made available to the Institute by Member States of the Asia-Pacific region.

Article 11 – Functions of the Director of the Institute

The Director of the Institute shall perform the following functions:

- (a) direct the work of the Institute in accordance with the programmes and directives established by the Governing Board and the Executive Committee;
- (b) propose, after consultation with UNESCO, the draft programme, work plan and budget to be submitted to the Executive Committee for recommendation to the Governing Board;
- (c) prepare the documents for the Governing Board and the Executive Committee as well as the provisional agenda of their meetings, including any proposal he/she deems appropriate, and distribute them to their members no later than two weeks before the opening of the meetings;
- (d) prepare and submit to the Governing Board reports on the activities of the Institute as mentioned in Article 7.2 above;
- (e) appoint staff members in accordance with the staffing table and the staff regulations and rules approved by the Governing Board.

(...) the rest are standard model Agreement articles ...