

Hundred and seventy-first session

171 EX/18
PARIS, 17 March 2005
Original: English/French

Item 2.3 of the provisional agenda

**REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL ON THE REVISED AND
COMPLETED PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES REGARDING THE
ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF UNESCO INSTITUTES AND
CENTRES (CATEGORY I) AND INSTITUTES AND CENTRES
UNDER THE AUSPICES OF UNESCO (CATEGORY II)**

SUMMARY

In accordance with 167 EX/Decision 4.5, the Director-General submits in this document revised and completed principles and guidelines regarding the establishment and operation of UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) and institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II), taking into account the experience gained in the implementation on an experimental basis of the criteria for category I institutes and the application of the framework for category II institutes and centres already endorsed by the Executive Board (see especially 162 EX/Decision 4.2 and 165 EX/Decision 5.4). The document also contains a brief portion dealing with institutes and centres loosely associated with UNESCO.

The principles and guidelines are proposed to be applied to the current arrangements and to any future situation.

Updated comparative data on the statutes, governing bodies, staff, budgets and activities of the current UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) can be found in the associated information document 171 EX/INF.10. It also provides an updated list of institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II).

Decision proposed: paragraph 60.

I. BACKGROUND

1. In 1980, the General Conference approved document 21 C/36, which also contains a description of the characteristics of category I institutes and centres, which henceforth informed the establishment of the list of such institutes and centres. At its 30th session, the General Conference invited the Director-General “to submit proposals on an overall strategy, including coordination mechanisms, to the 161st session of the Executive Board, addressing the need to improve the coherence and implementation of the education programme as well as the cost-effectiveness and the functioning of the UNESCO education institutes and their governing bodies” (30 C/Resolution 2). At the same session, the General Conference adopted 30 C/Resolution 83 (“Draft guidelines for the rational implementation of decentralization”), containing “Basic criteria for the rational implementation of decentralization” with application to institutes and centres.

2. Further to these resolutions and after examining the Director-General’s report on the matter (161 EX/41), the Executive Board at its 161st session invited the Director-General “to continue the initiated review of UNESCO institutes and centres, extending it to all the Organization’s fields of competence, so as to consider the continued operation of and support to each institute or centre against alternative modalities of providing equivalent or better programme support for UNESCO activities based on: (a) levels of performance of each institute or centre against appropriate performance indicators of programme delivery, including those covering excellence, impact and relevance, and consistency with the strategic objectives of the major programmes; (b) the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of current systems of governance in UNESCO institutes and centres; (c) the results of the discussions on this item at its 162nd session”.

3. The Board further requested the Director-General “to submit to it at its 162nd session proposals on an overall strategy for UNESCO institutes and centres and their governing bodies, consistent with UNESCO’s overall decentralization strategy as set out in 30 C/Resolution 83, as well as recommendations with regard to each existing UNESCO institute or centre” (161 EX/Decision 3.2.4).

4. Consequently, the Executive Board at its 162nd session (October 2001) examined document 162 EX/18 (“Proposals for an Overall Strategy for UNESCO Institutes and Centres and their Governing Bodies”) and accompanying document 162 EX/INF.8 (“Proposals for an Overall Strategy for UNESCO Institutes and Centres and their Governing Bodies: Comparative Data on UNESCO Institutes and Centres”). In its decision 4.2, the Executive Board took note of these proposals and invited the Director-General to apply the criteria set out in paragraph 19 of document 162 EX/18 on an experimental basis for the further elaboration and operationalization of a strategy, in close consultation with directors of the institutes. It also requested the development of a specific strategy for category II institutes and centres. At its 165th session, the Executive Board took note of the progress reported on the elaboration of a strategy (“Progress report by the Director-General on the application of the criteria for an overall strategy with regard to UNESCO institutes and centres”, document 165 EX/20).

5. At its 167th session, the Executive Board examined the “Report by the Director-General on a comprehensive strategy for relations with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO and those loosely associated with UNESCO” (167 EX/16). In 167 EX/Decision 4.5, the Executive Board “endorses the criteria proposed by the Director-General in paragraphs 11 and 12 of document 167 EX/16 to serve as a permanent framework for designating and engaging with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II), within the overall strategy for institutes and centres to be approved by the General Conference”. The Board also invited the Director-General:

- (a) “to submit to it at its 171st session the revised and completed principles and guidelines regarding the establishment and operation of UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) and institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II), taking into account the experience gained in the implementation on an experimental basis of the strategy for category I institutes/centres, for consideration and onward transmission to the General Conference at its 33rd session”;
- (b) “to conduct, in consultation with Member States, a survey to ascertain the identity of entities using UNESCO’s name and/or logo, and to obtain all necessary information concerning their origin, mandate, legal status, standing with regard to UNESCO, relation to the National Commission for UNESCO, and activities, and to report on this matter to the Executive Board at its 171st session”.

6. As requested by the Executive Board, the Director-General presents herewith for consideration by the Executive Board the proposed “Revised and completed principles and guidelines regarding the establishment and operation of UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) and institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category I). The principles and guidelines contained in the present document have been developed based on an assessment of the experimental criteria by a Secretariat Task Force, chaired by the Deputy Director-General, with the full participation of all sectors, central services and directors of institutes and centres. Representatives of field offices also participated in the work of the Task Force.

7. The document contains further in Annex I “Guidelines concerning the creation of institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II)” and in Annex II a “Model agreement between UNESCO and a Member State concerned regarding an institute or centre under the auspices of UNESCO (category II)”. The two annexes take into account the recommendations made by the Legal Committee of the General Conference at the session held in November 2002 (see document LEG/2002/REP), according to which “the revised principles and guidelines should deal, in a clear and distinct way, with the procedure and conditions for the creation, the operation, the evaluation and the termination of the centres/institutes”. The guidelines in Annex I reflect those set out in document 21 C/36 and should be added to the criteria already endorsed by the Executive Board to serve as a “permanent framework” for designating and engaging with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (see 167 EX/Decision 4.5 and section III below).

8. As regards the use of *UNESCO’s name and/or logo*, this issue is only briefly addressed under part IV of the present document. It is more extensively addressed in a separate document submitted to the Executive Board at the present session, entitled “Report by the Director-General concerning the protection of the name and logo of UNESCO in the Member States” (171 EX/37).

II. UNESCO INSTITUTES AND CENTRES (“CATEGORY I”)

A. Overview of current situation

9. Based on the characteristics defined in document 21 C/36 of 1980, 11 institutions were hitherto included in the category I list (for details see document 171 EX/INF.10).

- One institute with a cross-sectoral mandate receiving a global financial allocation appearing in the C/5 to cover both staff and programme costs:
 - UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), Montreal, Canada.

- Six education institutes that receive global financial allocations appearing in the C/5 document under Major Programme I (Education) to cover both staff and programme costs:
 - UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE), Geneva, Switzerland;
 - UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), Paris, France;
 - UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE), Hamburg, Germany;
 - UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE), Moscow, Russian Federation;
 - International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;
 - UNESCO Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC), Caracas, Venezuela.
- Two education centres that are administered under Major Programme I in the same way as Headquarters units or field offices:
 - UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES), Bucharest, Romania;
 - UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education (UNEVOC), Bonn, Germany.
- One science institute, which is an integral part of the Organization programmatically, closely associated with the principal priority of the Science Sector and the priorities of the International Hydrological Programme (IHP), but financed entirely from extrabudgetary funds:
 - UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education, Delft, the Netherlands.
- One science centre that is administered under Major Programme II in the same way as a Headquarter unit or field office:
 - International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Trieste, Italy, a centre jointly operated by UNESCO and IAEA.

10. The preponderance of institutes and centres in the field of education is the result of deliberate historical choices made in the development of Major Programme I. Other Sectors rely on other modalities of decentralized action and delegated responsibility. This type of arrangement is well-suited for the field of education, which requires concentrated and highly specialized expertise and know-how in technical areas such as planning and management, curriculum development or adult literacy.

11. All institutes, to the extent that they contribute to capacity-building in their respective area of competence, have an “education” dimension. Thus, the UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education is principally designed as a tertiary-level training centre in the field of science. The UIS’s activities in the field of statistical capacity-building and in the development of statistical standards also are of an “educational” nature.

12. While the activities of institutes and centres are highly decentralized and designed to service Member States in the developing world by providing the best expertise available at lowest cost, most of them are located in developed countries. This locational preponderance is to some degree offset by the recent establishment of such entities in developing or transition countries (IICBA and

IITE), by the establishment of decentralized branches (such as the IIEP office in Buenos Aires), and by the growing number of category II institutes and centres in developing countries. Category I and II institutes are expected to collaborate with each other. The evolution of the UNESCO network of institutes and centres in general shall build on existing structures, competence and know-how, and care needs to be taken to avoid weakening well-functioning institutions. If new institutes/centres are established, they should also aim to strengthen a horizontal division of labour among the institutes/centres. Experience has shown that the type of technical competence and expertise needed to develop world-class category I institutes and centres requires a high degree of institutional stability and development. Such stability is required so that on the one hand donors and Member States contributing extrabudgetary funding may be sure that projects will be executed and on the other hand user countries express a demand for assistance.

B. Definition

13. While there is diversity among UNESCO institutes and centres, they do share a number of **common features**. They are all created by a decision of UNESCO's General Conference following a review by the Executive Board; they are all headed by a UNESCO staff member, who is answerable to the Director-General; they all apply UNESCO rules and regulations to staff with UNESCO staff member status; they all bear UNESCO's name and logo. Most importantly – as outlined below – they all contribute to the preparation and implementation of UNESCO's programme as defined in the Medium-Term Strategy (C/4) and the biennial Programme and Budget (C/5). Also bearing in mind document 21 C/36 of 1980, the Director-General therefore proposes that henceforth the following definition of category I institutes and centres be applied:

Principle I/1 – Definition: UNESCO Institutes and Centres – also designated as “category I Institutes and Centres” – are institutionally part of UNESCO. These institutes and centres are established as an integral part of the Organization, upon recommendation of the Executive Board, on the basis of a formal decision of the General Conference, which approves their statutes or delegates to the Executive Board the authority to approve them. Their governing bodies are either elected by the General Conference or appointed, in whole or in part, by the Director-General and report to the General Conference. They are governed by UNESCO's rules and regulations and are directed by a UNESCO staff member, and their overall programmes and priorities form an integral part of the Organization's Programme and Budget (C/5).

14. This definition points to the need to address and remedy certain anomalies with respect to currently listed institutes and centres, should they continue to form part of category I entities:

- (a) as regards the European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) in Romania, it has never been approved by the General Conference;
- (b) as for the UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education (UNEVOC) in Germany, although its creation was authorized by the General Conference (see 30 C/Resolution 9),¹ the Centre is structured like any extrabudgetary project office.

¹ According to 30 C/Resolution 9, the General Conference, “*taking note* of the generous offer of the Government of Germany to host and support a UNESCO international centre for TVET” authorized the Director-General “to launch a UNESCO International Programme on Technical and Vocational Education and Training, with an increased budgetary allocation from the year 2000, and to establish a UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training in Bonn, in close collaboration with ILO and other international partners in TVET; (...)”.

15. In the context of a reformed, revitalized and decentralized UNESCO, the purpose, role and scope of activities of UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) as well as their relationship with the relevant Programme Sectors need to be clearly defined. This will be done in the principles and guidelines developed in this document, which should:

- (a) help reinforce and strengthen the work that institutes and centres have accomplished in support of Member States;
- (b) foster the emergence of a streamlined UNESCO structure avoiding duplication, while generating and taking advantage of synergies;
- (c) enhance coherence, quality and impact of the Organization's work towards its strategic objectives; and
- (d) improve efficiency and effectiveness in policy formulation, programme development and delivery of UNESCO's programme as a whole.

C. Common characteristics

Principle I/2 – Characteristics: A UNESCO institute or centre must always serve a specific purpose within the fields of competence of UNESCO. It must be principally programme-driven, respond to both global and field-based needs, be part of an operational network, have a degree of functional autonomy, be accountable and transparent and have balanced staff and programme costs.

Guideline I/1 – Purpose and functions: The purposes which a UNESCO institute or centre (category I) may serve encompass one or more of the following:

- (i) to contribute to the conceptualization, design and formulation of UNESCO's programmes, objectives and strategies, including regional and subregional strategies;
- (ii) to contribute to the pursuit of UNESCO's strategic objectives by providing deeper and concentrated resource support and services, especially through policy advice, capacity-building, training and outreach at regional and subregional levels with professional communities and counterparts in Member States;
- (iii) to serve as a laboratory of ideas, as a centre of excellence and experimentation as well as a standard-setter (e.g. in the areas of classification and accreditation as well as with respect to methodologies), both globally and regionally;
- (iv) to function as a clearing house and reference centre, to advance, deepen and impart knowledge and capacities and to employ novel modalities pertaining to a specific strategic objective or sub-objective of UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy and its biennial programmes and budgets;
- (v) to mobilize, in an innovative setting, a critical mass of specialized expertise, know-how and skills that cannot be made available within UNESCO's regular Secretariat structure;
- (vi) to reinforce UNESCO's overall decentralization strategy, based on a clear delineation of responsibilities and division of labour especially with the field offices, taking into account the principles of subsidiarity and complementarity;
- (vii) to enhance UNESCO's overall visibility, outreach and impact, as well as its public perception.

16. UNESCO institutes and centres are not only similar in administrative features, they also discharge similar functions. They are designed to serve as **centres of excellence** and **providers of technical support and expertise in their area of specialization** to Member States and other Secretariat units, including field offices. Indeed, one of the largest shares of activity of institutes and centres is devoted to **capacity-building in their respective fields of competence** in favour of Member States. It is largely through these institutes and centres that UNESCO is able to provide world-class capacity-building and technical support to Member States, as for instance in the area of educational management and planning through IIEP or in the area of statistical capacities through UIS. UNESCO-IHE is the world's leading institute for the training of water specialists and managers. "Capacity-building" in that sense encompasses a broad range of activities, from the training of individuals to institution-building to policy advice in an institute's or centre's technical area of expertise.

17. The provision of technical assistance and capacity-building activities necessitate a high degree of **specialized competence and knowledge**, which require long-term investment and approaches. Thus, institutes and centres require **a highly competent core staff** of professionals in their areas of expertise; the **constant updating and upgrading of knowledge and competence**; the development of **cutting-edge analytical work and capacities**; the support to a lively **professional dialogue through active networks** of skilled professionals; and the development and maintenance of (frequently online) **databases and information clearing houses** on emerging trends and challenges for practitioners in areas of activity (see box). In order to fulfil their mandate, institutes and centres typically publish highly-regarded analyses and research in their area of competence (such as IIEP's *Fundamentals of Educational Planning*, IBE's *Prospects* published with Kluwer Academic Publishing, and CEPES's quarterly review *Higher Education in Europe* published with Carfax Publishing, Taylor & Francis Group). They also conduct research allowing the identification of priorities, best practices and innovations (between 2000 and 2001, IIEP conducted research in 56 countries, and associated some 150 researchers in its work).

Box: Networks and databases

UNESCO institutes and centres maintain, within their fields of expertise, robust and high-level networks of experts and related institutions, which contribute to bolster UNESCO's outreach towards professional communities, including the NGO communities. Without such efforts, the institutes and centres would rapidly lose their comparative advantage and their standing as international reference institutions, laboratory of ideas and good practices in their areas of competence. It is indispensable that this level of competence and skills be maintained, and that its necessity be acknowledged.

Institutes and centres maintain high-level databases on a range of diversified issues, such as statistics on education, science and culture (UIS), the impact of HIV/AIDS on education systems and curricula (IIEP and IBE), national educational policies and curricula (IBE), or statistical information on higher education in Central and Eastern Europe (CEPES). UIE maintains since 1997 the Adult Learning Documentation and Information Network (ALADIN), which supports co-operation between 85 documentation centres on adult learning in all regions of the world.

18. The specific role of the Education Institutes and of UIS has been brought into sharp relief by the **Strategic Review of UNESCO's role in EFA**, conducted at the request of the Executive Board (see document 170 EX/8 and related debates at the 170th session). Education institutes and centres (IBE, IIEP, UIE, IESALC, IITE, IICBA) each have a clear mandate to help countries reach the EFA goals. For its part, UIS has the vital role of monitoring progress towards the EFA and MDG education-related goals. There was broad agreement among the members of the Executive Board that the institutes and centres are expected to shoulder a large part of the operational work necessary

to reach the EFA goals, and that their role in capacity-building and technical assistance is of particular relevance. The Strategic Review concluded that this role needed to be reinforced in the future to reach EFA goals. This concerns in particular: capacity-building for education policy planning and management (IIEP), training and capacity-building for statistical systems (UIS), curricula for quality education (IBE), literacy (UIE), teacher training in sub-Saharan Africa (IICBA), and the role of ICTs for distance education (IITE).

19. The experience gained over the last three years has also shown the critical need for UNESCO institutes and centres to be able to maintain and increase their level of **competence in their area of expertise**. This level can only be achieved through constant attention to proper recruitment, training and staff development. Present staff competence in institutes and centres is very high, and needs to be preserved.

D. Diversity

Principle I/3: The global management of UNESCO institutes and centres needs to be handled with flexibility to build on the accumulated diversified range of experience and expertise.

20. The **diversity** of UNESCO institutes and centres is a **strength**, which needs to be translated into an asset for UNESCO. This recognition brings with it the necessity of ensuring that the global management of UNESCO institutes and centres is handled in a pragmatic manner and with flexibility to build on the diversified range of expertise which these entities offer individually and collectively.

21. This diversity finds its expression at various levels and in various forms, for instance:

- (a) The **geographical scope** of institutes and centres varies. Some institutes and centres are global in their mandate and reach (IBE, IIEP, UIE, UNESCO-IHE, UIS etc.), others are regional (IICBA, IESALC, CEPES).
- (b) The **thematic scope** of institutes and centres varies: most institutes and centres (8 out of 11) are related to Major Programme I; two institutes and centres fall within the purview of Major Programme II; UIS is of a cross-sectoral nature, with a mandate covering all fields of competence of the Organization.
- (c) Several UNESCO institutes and centres are relatively **recent in creation**: the majority of category I institutes and centres (6 out of 11) was established since 1997, the latest being IHE, which became operational in 2003. Each creation has posed challenges both to Headquarters and to the newly established entities on a range of issues – e.g. administration, management, staffing, fund-raising, name recognition. Drawing on lessons of the past, the accession to category I can henceforth be properly prepared.
- (d) The **staffing** of institutes and centres varies in numbers, status, ratio of international/national staff, staff management and delegation of authority to the heads of institutes and centres in matters of promotion and appointment.
- (e) All UNESCO institutes and centres but one (IHE) receive **funding** from UNESCO's regular budget. In addition, all institutes garner extrabudgetary funding, some significantly larger than regular programme support from UNESCO. IHE is a special case as it does not receive any regular programme funds but is exclusively funded from extrabudgetary resources in accordance with its Statutes.

- (f) The **governance** of institutes and centres varies, in particular the appointment of board members (see table below). The boards of institutes and centres typically consist of outstanding specialists in the field of expertise of that institution, representing different regions of the world, and meeting periodically to review the progress of the Institute's work and to plan future activities. Several governing boards include members of other organizations: for instance, the Board of UIS reflects a broad and representative international partnership of organizations, including the World Bank – which is important in view of its lead agency responsibility for statistics in education, science and technology, culture and communication; IICBA has a representative of the African Development Bank on its governing board; ICTP is managed jointly with another United Nations agency, IAEA; and in case of CEPES, the following organizations are represented: the Council of Europe, the European Commission, OECD, and EUA – the European University Association. The potential of all such formal associations and partnerships needs to be further explored, as it ensures a high degree of technical and financial outreach, as well as it reinforces UNESCO's collaborative arrangements within the multilateral system.

E. Programme orientation and coherence

Guideline I/2: The activities of all institutes and centres shall be programme-driven and correspond to one or several strategic objectives of the Medium-Term Strategy (contained in the C/4 document) as well as the programme priorities of UNESCO (contained in the C/5 document), as approved by the General Conference. This shall establish an overall programme coherence between a major programme and the institutes and centres concerned. Existing and potential complementarities should be made fully use of; existing and potential duplications and overlaps should be avoided or eliminated. In line with the Organization's results-based programming and management approach, all activities must be designed in a results-based manner and hence related to the outcomes of the Medium-Term Strategy and the expected results and their performance indicators in the approved biannual programme and budget document.

22. The experimental application of the 2001 criteria for institutes and centres has shown that care must be taken to ensure a balance between unity and diversity, between global management requirements and the individual arrangements of each institution. UNESCO may be best served by avoiding a pre-conceived or one-size-fits-all formula and rather concentrating on a **programme-driven and results-oriented approach**.

23. The internal assessment by the Task Force suggests that **programme coherence** has improved in the past three years. Institutes and centres, including their governing boards, have become active participants in the preparation and formulation of UNESCO's Programme and Budget strategic framework and priorities. As such, they take an active part in the design of the programme and bring their expertise to bear in its formulation and implementation. The **Sector ADG** concerned has a major responsibility for ensuring the overall programme coherence and proper concentration of a particular major programme, on the basis of collegial consultation.

24. The Task Force assessment highlighted the importance of the early stages of programming, which largely condition the definition, relevance and quality of the expected results defined for UNESCO as a whole, in particular in its Education programme. Best results are obtained when they are preceded by early consultation between institutes and centres, Headquarters and field units, and by a collegial process of implementation and monitoring. Every effort is made to ensure that progress continues to be made in this essential area and to overcome obstacles. It is recognized that a programme- and results-driven approach may in some instances be hampered by an insufficient

mutual understanding of each other's area of competence, by insufficient working consultations, or by lack of timely communication. Mechanisms are being set up or revived to ensure the achievement of a higher degree of consultation, collegiality and coherence with the involvement of all parties. In the case of Major Programme I, it is particularly noteworthy that the Director-General has revived the **Education Programme's Coordinating Group on EFA**, in which Directors of institutes participate. The goal is to ensure enhanced programme coherence, cooperation and coordination among all contributing parts of the Education programme, and to suggest appropriate mechanisms as needed. As stressed below, coordination is not only of importance between institutes and Headquarters units. It is of particular and increasing importance at country level in the context of decentralization.

25. The three-year experience with the experimental criteria has confirmed that the mandates of each institute and centre and the division of labour are clearly established. However, it has also been shown that for the sake of programme coherence potential and existing duplications or overlaps on the one hand and complementarities on the other hand must be explicitly addressed – among institutes/centres, between institutes/centres and Headquarters units and at country level across all UNESCO units.

26. In most instances, however, no significant **overlaps and duplications** occur in reality. Each institute and centre is usually concerned with one specific aspect of a given issue and the focus tends to be on capacity-building or technical assistance activities in these areas. As regards mainstreaming and cross-cutting issues, it is recognized that coordination and cooperation is essential to reinforce complementarity and to avoid an actual duplication of work or non-convergent approaches.

27. In the context of programme activities, it should also be noted that some UNESCO institutes and centres, based on their mandate, have **responsibilities within the United Nations system** and at the international level. For example, UIS is recognized within the network of United Nations statistical responsibilities as the lead agency for statistics on education, culture, communications, and science and technology. To that end, it participates in many professional partnerships with other international organizations having similar mandates, such as the United Nations Secretariat (the Statistics Division), the World Bank and the OECD. As part of this responsibility, UIS provides data and analyses for agencies and associations with direct interests in monitoring progress towards the EFA goals, as well as many high profile international initiatives that complement and reinforce EFA, such as the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, the Literacy Decade, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, HIV/AIDS initiatives, the Fast-Track Initiative and the United Nations Girls Education Initiative.

28. Other UNESCO institutes and centres are similarly charged with **coordinating international partnerships**. As an example, IIEP is assuring the Secretariat of the International Working Group on Education – a working group of funding agencies and foundations working on education – and it is the host of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), a network of African Ministries of Education, development agencies, education specialists and researchers, and NGOs active in education, established at the initiative of the World Bank in 1998. ADEA focuses on developing partnerships between ministers of education and funding agencies in order to promote effective education policies based on African leadership and ownership. CEPES serves, jointly with the Council of Europe, as the co-Secretariat of the Council of Europe/UNESCO Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education in the European Region.

F. Contribution to the UNESCO decentralization process

Principle I/4: UNESCO Institutes and Centres shall support and contribute to the Organization's overall decentralization process by responding to field-based needs and requirements.

Guideline I/3: UNESCO institutes and centres shall be linked among themselves and with the UNESCO Secretariat at Headquarters and in the field through a global network so as to exchange experience and share knowledge.

29. UNESCO institutes and centres shall respond to field-based needs, subject to availability of resources, especially given the strong emphasis on the role of decentralized programme activities and delivery in a reformed UNESCO. A principal challenge will be how the present system of institutes and centres can be fitted with the reformed decentralized programmatic approach of UNESCO, including their positioning vis-à-vis all types of field offices (national, cluster and regional) as well as National Commissions and other UNESCO partners. UNESCO institutes and centres shall define and formulate their future programmes and interventions in close interaction with the field, including contacts with Member States, current national partner institutions of institutes as well as UNESCO field offices, so as to ensure the emergence of programmes relevant to the specific conditions of Member States and rooted in UNESCO's overall effort in a particular field of competence. Care should be taken to balance the needs perceived and identified by field offices as well as National Commissions with the approaches identified by institutes and centres through their cooperation with specific professional communities and their counterparts in Member States. Discussions in that regard can be conducted, for example, in the context of the newly established Programme Review Committees (PRCs), being part of the revised programme management cycle, with which the institutes will be associated in future, and vice versa, the field offices should recognize and draw on the specialist expertise and knowledge of the institutes. They should take into account – at all levels of programming – the potential that institutes offer for decentralized programme delivery, including regular mutual knowledge-sharing and support. Any resource support at the country or (sub)regional level should be targeted to a very specific context and also supported by on-the-ground political work to ensure adoption. For example, institute programme activities and missions at the country and regional level should be planned with the full involvement of a field office so as to be relevant for country offices' activities.

30. To take advantage of institutional and programmatic synergies, networking arrangements should be put in place to enable the institutes and centres to become integrated parts of a truly global operational network of UNESCO, allowing interaction, exchange of experience and knowledge-sharing, both through regular meetings and electronic means, as well as the formation of small inter-institute and interregional teams, reinforcing UNESCO's presence and impact, especially at the field level.

G. Functional autonomy, accountability and governance

Principle I/5: Functional autonomy is a key structural and operational requirement and feature of category I institutes and centres.

Guideline I/4: Institutes and centres shall have a degree of functional autonomy – laid down in the respective statutes and other pertinent decisions approved by the General Conference and in administrative documents approved by the Director-General. The relative autonomy is an asset, allowing the institutes and centres to operate in a more flexible manner and to attract substantial extrabudgetary funding. Yet, the institutes and centres are not independent from the Organization, which must preserve its institutional integrity. They act under the authority of the Director-General and their programme activities are an integral part of UNESCO’s programme.

31. The experience with the criteria adopted on an experimental basis in 2001 suggests that the work of institutes and centres is enhanced, not reduced, by **autonomy and flexibility**, as long as these are exercised in the context of a proper system of governance and accountability, and are related to the prevailing priorities of the Organization. The management of the institutes and centres needs to build on **mutual trust** and, as outlined above, the recognition that **organizational diversity** is an asset.

32. Granting **functional autonomy** to UNESCO institutes and centres is a strong asset for UNESCO as a whole. Functional autonomy means that the institutes and centres are given sufficient **delegated authority and flexibility** to carry out their mandate fully and effectively. The degree of functional autonomy varies according to each category I entity. Arrangements concerning delegation of authority are different, especially in matters of staff management. Governing bodies may be chosen differently and discharge their responsibilities in a somewhat different manner. *Functional autonomy* as currently conceived and applied tends to support a system based on attaining results rather than on prescribing and enforcing burdensome procedures. Experience shows that the diversity in matters related to *functional autonomy* appears to work satisfactorily, and that it ensures a sufficient degree of independence in programme design and implementation.

33. In particular, *functional autonomy* allows the entities concerned to respond more flexibly to requests and to attract funds which may not otherwise have been directed to UNESCO. In this respect, the performance of most institutes and centres in attracting extrabudgetary funding is praiseworthy.

34. *Functional autonomy* should not translate into general rules applicable in all cases, but rather allow the design of **diversified approaches, including a responsiveness to the communication needs of institutes in different regions and time-zones of the world, while recognizing the need for shared standards in matters related to accountability, transparency, management principles and reporting practices**. Ultimately, “functional autonomy” is a matter of mutual trust, relying on a balance between autonomy and accountability. All efforts should be made to keep transaction costs in that regard to a minimum.

35. The system appears all the more efficient as it is accompanied by “checks and balances” and accountability in the form of audits, regular independent evaluations, and ongoing consultations with UNESCO programme sectors and field units. Most importantly, institutes and centres are subject to UNESCO’s rules and regulations. It is nevertheless recognized that these rules and regulations may at times need to undergo revision and change to adapt to the different and changing needs of institutes and centres, in order to facilitate their work and proper functioning.

Principle I/6: Accountability and transparency must be ensured for all UNESCO institutes and centres.

Guideline I/5: Accountability and transparency must be ensured, as is the case for all activities by the Secretariat, in line with the policies and requirements set by the Internal Oversight Service (IOS), the Comptroller (DCO) and the External Auditors and bearing in mind the applicable Financial Rules and Regulations. The financial statements of the institutes shall be submitted to the governing body of an institute, as stipulated by the current financial rules and regulations, and to the Comptroller of UNESCO, as required. Unless there are special requirements or arrangements, they shall also be submitted to the External Auditor together with UNESCO's accounts.

36. The Statutes of UNESCO Institutes and Centres define the degree of functional autonomy and the Financial Regulations and Rules of their Special Accounts define the extent of financial autonomy. The situation may vary somewhat from an institute to another but in general the Directors as chief executive officers have sole responsibility for the preparation of the yearly programme and budget which is submitted for discussion and approval to their governing bodies. They have the authority to draw up the detailed plans for implementation of the approved programme, the authority for its execution, for the payment of all sums due and for establishing the financial rules and procedures so as to ensure effective financial administration and economy. As described in the Financial Regulations of the various Special Accounts, the Director-General has delegated to each Director full authority to accept (and negotiate) income on behalf of their institute, to incur obligations and make expenditures, to transfer funds from and within appropriation lines and to make allotments, to establish reserve funds, trust funds and reserve and subsidiary accounts.

37. The maintenance of the accounting records, the preparation of the annual accounts, the opening of bank accounts and the investment of any unrequited cash remain under the responsibility of UNESCO's Comptroller. No prior control is exercised but DCO – and IOS – operate an *ex post facto* control. The Comptroller appoints the certifying officers in each institute upon the recommendation of the Director. The accounting records of the institutes are an integral part of the accounting records of UNESCO; they are thus maintained in accordance with the United Nations System Accounting Standards (UNSAS) as well as the Financial Regulations of their Special Account. The final yearly accounts are prepared, in draft form, by each institute's Administrator and submitted to the Comptroller for final review. The final accounts jointly signed by the Comptroller and the Director, are submitted to their Board for approval and to the External Auditor of UNESCO when required.

38. Category I institutes and centres constitute an integral part of UNESCO and the Director-General is regularly informed of their approved programmes and their financial allocations. This is planned to be complemented by associating and incorporating the programme and financial parts of each institute into UNESCO's online finance and accounting system (FABS) and its programming and monitoring tool (SISTER), by using the SAP software chosen by UNESCO. The category I institutes will eventually join or be associated with SISTER and FABS, making due provisions for the institutes' functional, administrative and financial autonomy. A special working group has been set up to study a system which permits substantive and financial reporting for all institutes through the UNESCO-established tools, while preserving the Institutes' prerogatives of functional autonomy and administrative authority.

39. It is also recognized that the diversity of the individual institutes and centres needs to be accompanied by the practice of **common rules with respect to evaluation, accountability and transparency**. With regard to **evaluation**, the Executive Board has already requested that the institutes and centres need to be subject to periodic external evaluations, which will be undertaken in addition to the annual or biannual financial and accounting audits carried out by the Internal Oversight Service. Evaluations of category I by IOS are under preparation and their results are likely to be presented to the Executive Board in 2006. In addition, UNESCO institutes and centres

are also subject to external evaluations in relation to funds they receive from other organizations, such as the World Bank or regional development banks.

Principle 1/7: The governance of UNESCO institutes and centres needs to ensure representation of the Director-General.

Guideline I/6: Taking into account past practices, the Director-General or his representative (for entities associated with a major programme, normally the Sector ADG concerned) should always be represented on the governing body of each institute or centre as a member or observer – without the right to vote –, thus underlining the close linkage and integration between UNESCO and each institute and centre. Such an arrangement will also foster permanent dialogue with their governing bodies. When submitting reports of the governing bodies of institutes and centres to the Executive Board and the General Conference, as appropriate, any comments by the Director-General thereon shall be submitted in a separate document.

40. Concerning the **governance** of institutes and centres, an external audit report on governing bodies in the education field was released in October 2003 (“The Education Institutes: Managing and Governing for Results”). This report, though limited in scope, identified some areas for improvement, in particular as regards reporting and information. Various institutes and centres have already initiated a review of these recommendations, with a view to further improving and streamlining the overall management of institutes and centres. The following table provides an overview of the current status of governing bodies of UNESCO institutes and centres:

UNESCO institute or centre	Governing body
UIS	A governing board composed of 12 members: six members elected by the General Conference and six members designated by the Director-General.
IBE	A Council composed of 28 Member States elected by the General Conference (half of the members change every two years).
IIEP	A governing board composed of 12 members, of whom four designated by international organizations and 8 elected, including the Chairperson.
UIE	A governing board composed of 11 members, appointed by the Director-General; one member is a national of the host country.
IITE	A governing board composed of 11 members, appointed by the Director-General; one member is a national of the host country.
IESALC	A governing board composed of 13 members: nine members chosen by the Heads of Delegation of GRULAC at the UNESCO General Conference, three appointed by the Director-General and one member representing NGOs appointed by the Director-General.
IICBA	A governing board composed of 12 members, appointed by the Director-General as follows: nine members from the region, one of whom is a national of the host country; two members from regional organizations and one member representing the bilateral donor community.
CEPES	An advisory board composed of 12 members: eight appointed by the Director-General and four designated by international organizations at the invitation of the Director-General.
UNEVOC	To be established.
ICTP	A steering committee composed of four members: one representative of UNESCO, one representative of the IAEA, one representative of Italy and the Director. The Chairperson of the Scientific Council is appointed jointly by the Directors-General of UNESCO and IAEA, after consultations with the Steering Committee and the Director of the Centre.
UNESCO-IHE	A governing board of 13 persons, appointed by the Director-General for a renewable term of office of four years: six elected by the

	Intergovernmental Council of the International Hydrology Programme, one for each electoral group of UNESCO; seven designated by the Director-General out of which: (a) two persons from agencies, institutions and the private sector; (b) one person from professional international associations in the water sector and one representing the IHE alumni associations worldwide; (c) three persons designated upon recommendation by the Government of the Netherlands. The Board elects a chairperson for a term of four years.
--	--

Principle I/8: As a matter of principle, Directors of UNESCO institutes and centres, with the exception of UIS, shall be placed under the direct authority of the relevant Sector ADG, through whom they report to the Director-General.

41. In the interest of establishing a rational and effective organizational, managerial and reporting interface, but without prejudice to their obligations vis-à-vis their respective governing bodies, all directors of UNESCO institutes and centres – as staff members of the Secretariat – shall as a matter of principle and overall programme coherence – and with the exception of UIS – be placed under the direct authority of the relevant Sector ADG. As a Sector ADG’s tasks comprise the coordination of a programme’s/sector’s overall effort, the Directors should report through the Sector ADG concerned to the Director-General. This shall not preclude direct interaction between the Director of an institute or centre and the Director-General, whenever required.

H. Budget and personnel matters

Principle I/9: UNESCO institutes and centres shall normally receive funding under the biannual programme and budget of the Organization, except where their statutes provide for extrabudgetary financing of their activities.

42. Each UNESCO institute and centre, with the exception of IHE, shall receive funding from the biannual Programme and Budget (C/5). Most institutes (except CEPES and UNEVOC) receive a lump-sum allocation, which can be used for staff and/or activities at the discretion of an institute and its governing body. This open allocation leaves the responsibility for ensuring the pursuit of targeted programme priorities and improvements in the ratio between staff and programme costs with an Institute Director and the governing body concerned. The contribution to ICTP will in the 33 C/5 clearly be identified as a separate financial allocation. CEPES and UNEVOC are being treated as decentralized units of the Secretariat and receive programme funds through the decentralization of programme resources by a major programme concerned.

43. The present arrangement of lump-sum allocations to most institutes is also considered to facilitate the raising of extrabudgetary resources. In this connection, IHE has introduced a **new organizational model for category I institutes** – one **financed entirely by extrabudgetary funds**, enjoying a large degree of autonomy while working towards the objectives and priorities of UNESCO, within the framework set by the General Conference. IHE’s governing board adopts the programme and budget, reviews and assesses activities and reports to the Executive Board and the General Conference. IHE’s Director administers the institute by delegation of authority from the Director-General.

44. As the provision of extrabudgetary funding by “baskets” is being introduced by some donors, UNESCO for its part will need to ensure full transparency how the funds are being allocated and utilized, providing also an opportunity for access by UNESCO institutes and centres.

Principle I/10: The management of personnel of UNESCO institutes and centres having the status of UNESCO staff members shall be in line with UNESCO staff policies, rules and regulations, and in accordance with the delegation of authority from the Director-General to each Director of a UNESCO institute and centre.

Guideline I/7: The delegation of authority will be further specified in accordance with the financial and budgetary autonomy provided through the Financial Regulations of each UNESCO institute and centre. Concrete decisions by Directors of institutes and centres will be taken in accordance with the delegation of authority and after consultation with Director HRM and the Director-General, where required. The requirement of geographical distribution applies only to international professional staff from the institutes and centres occupying established posts financed from the UNESCO programme and budget.

45. In accordance with the Appropriation Resolution in the Programme and Budget (C/5) by UNESCO's General Conference, the posts of category I institutes whether funded from financial allocations provided by the Organization and from extrabudgetary resources are not included in UNESCO's established posts, within the meaning of that appropriation resolution. Consequently the posts of category I institutes are not subject to the requirements of regular programme posts. Yet in filling vacant posts, the Directors bear in mind the need to implement a reasonable geographical distribution and pay attention to candidates from under-represented Member States. In accordance with the financial and budgetary autonomy provided through the Financial Regulations of each Institutes' Special Accounts, the Directors decide on the creation or suppression of any post of the institute, within the limits of the budget voted by the governing body. Any new post should be accompanied by a post description, established on the appropriate UNESCO form, and shall respect the classification norms adopted by the Organization.

46. The UNESCO institutes and centres apply existing staff regulations and rules as well as procedures of UNESCO to their personnel having the status of UNESCO staff members. The Director-General has delegated to each Director authority to manage their personnel up to certain levels. Thus each institute's Director can take the decisions concerning the appointment, extension, promotion, and separation from service for all General Service staff and for Professional staff from grade P1 to P4 with the exception of the Director of UIS who can take decisions for grades P1-P5, in full respect of the above-mentioned regulations and rules. The decision concerning the appointment, extension, promotion and separation of staff at the P-5 and the Director's levels are taken by the Director-General, upon submission of the relevant request by an institute Director, generally after having consulted the governing body and the Director HRM.

47. The Directors have full autonomy concerning the recruitment of supernumeraries, consultants and fee contractors, ALD, local staff or any other personnel not falling under the staff regulations and rules. Here again, the Directors follow the rules, procedures and fees applicable in UNESCO.

48. The UNESCO policy of staff rotation does not apply to personnel of the institutes and centres and in this respect their posts are not rotational within the mandatory rotation scheme, due account being taken of the fact that the international professional staff of the institutes/centres are generally very specialized, that they cannot exercise their skills well unless they are part of a team, that they require specialized training and are thus not easily replaced. However, international professional staff members of institutes/centres can be part of the voluntary rotation scheme and for that purpose they can apply for other posts within the Organization and in as much as possible such transfer will be encouraged. Posting of a limited number of institute/centre staff members in field offices can also be encouraged if it meets with the agreement of the Directors of the institute/centre and the field office concerned. Rotation of administrative staff in the Professional category may, within the

voluntary rotation scheme, apply between the institutes/centres and Headquarters, but in a cycle which will be compatible with the institutes'/centres' cycle of programmes and budgets, which, unlike the rest of UNESCO, are yearly.

49. These provisions and practices notwithstanding, it is desirable to review periodically policies and arrangements pertaining to staff administration and management by UNESCO institutes and centres and to harmonize, as required, the degree of delegation of authority.

I. Advocacy and communication

Principle I/11: UNESCO institutes and centres and their work should be promoted through targeted and coordinated public relations work, in accordance with UNESCO's communication and public relations strategy.

50. UNESCO's communication and public relations strategy (161 EX/43 and 164 EX/44), which was devised to raise the visibility of its action, stresses that a global approach to UNESCO's external information and communication driven by the Secretariat is not sufficient and calls for the mobilization of all parts of UNESCO, in particular the centres and institutes in the field. While the Organization has increased its efforts towards establishing a structure to manage communication strategically, UNESCO's institutes and centres could still be promoted much more effectively to the public through targeted and coordinated public relations work.

51. An important component of such an approach is to establish, within each of UNESCO's institutes and centres a specific pole of expertise in information and communication and to assure smooth liaison with all central services charged with advocacy and communication such as UNESCO's Bureau of Public Information (BPI).

52. The following additional components of successful advocacy seem essential to fully communicate the value of UNESCO's institutes and centres to all relevant publics: (a) anchoring communication activities in the programme of institutes and centres; (b) distinguishing substantive communication from institutional communication so that they are better coordinated; (c) making communication a two-way process through responsiveness to target audiences; (d) developing a communication culture; (e) spreading the load by involving partners in communication activities; and (f) coordinating all forms of external communication, including websites.

J. Host country agreements

Principle I/12: The Director-General and the Directors of UNESCO institutes and centres shall ensure that all host country agreements are duly signed by all parties concerned.

Guideline I/8: Amendments to seat agreements for UNESCO institutes and centres shall be made by the Director-General and the representative of a host country in appropriate supplementary and mutually acceptable legal documents, without having to renegotiate the entire agreements.

53. Care should be taken to ensure that all host country agreements are duly signed by all parties concerned, while seeking to ensure in each case the most favourable conditions for the Organization. This is particularly important in the context of new security needs.

54. The present mandates and fields of competence of UNESCO institutes are well established in their statutes, which on the whole provide an adequate framework for close cooperation. Amendments to the statutes of these bodies may be made only through a decision of the UNESCO governing body that has approved them. As regards the seat agreements concluded by UNESCO

with the countries hosting the institutes, they define the privileges and immunities granted to them in the territory of a country concerned. The Director-General should be authorized, whenever necessary, to establish specific arrangements for amendments through appropriate supplementary and mutually acceptable legal documents, without having to renegotiate each time the existing agreements in their entirety.

III. INSTITUTES AND CENTRES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF UNESCO (“CATEGORY II”)

55. As stated in document 162 EX/18, institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II) are entities which are not legally part of the Organization, but which are associated with it through formal arrangements approved by the General Conference. They are to contribute to the execution of UNESCO’s programme through capacity-building, through exchange of information in a particular discipline, theoretical and experimental research and advanced training, etc. They also contribute to technical cooperation among developing countries. In general, UNESCO is represented on their governing bodies and provides technical and, in certain cases, financial assistance on an ad hoc basis. However, as a rule, they are neither headed by a staff member nor do they apply UNESCO’s rules and regulations. An updated list of all institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO is provided in the associated document 171 EX/INF.10.

Criterion II/1: Institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II) are entities which are not legally part of the Organization, but which are associated with it through formal arrangements approved by the General Conference.

56. The following criteria are based on the strategy for relations with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II) (167 EX/16), which was already endorsed by the Executive Board at its 167th session (167 EX/Decision 4.5).

Criteria for the creation/association, activities, operations and management of as well as termination of association with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II):

II/2 – Creation/association: category II institutes and centres are created or associated with UNESCO by a decision of the General Conference. Such a decision should specifically state that the entity in question is to be “under UNESCO’s auspices”. In certain cases, the General Conference may wish to authorize the Executive Board to take a decision on its behalf in designating a category II entity.

II/3 – Legal responsibility of UNESCO: category II institutes and centres are associated with UNESCO but are legally outside of the Organization (i.e. UNESCO is not legally responsible for them and bears neither responsibility nor liabilities of any kind, be it managerial, financial or otherwise).

II/4 – Contribution to UNESCO’s programmes: The activities of any such entity should make a substantial contribution to UNESCO’s strategic objectives and programme priorities. The actual contribution must be demonstrated in the request for creation/association and the related feasibility study, and reconfirmed through subsequent regular evaluations.

II/5 – Programmatic and thematic coverage: Efforts should be made to ensure that the programmatic and thematic coverage of category II institutes corresponds to the various strategic objectives of the Organization as well as to programme priorities established in the various C/5 documents during the period of a Medium-Term Strategy.

II/6 – Global or regional scope: The scope of activities of category II institutes and centres must be global or regional in nature. Alternatively, they could be supported by a broad coalition of Member States so as to ensure sufficient outreach.

II/7 – Geographical representation: Efforts should be made to ensure a more equitable geographical representation and spread of category II institutes and centres overall, particularly in developing regions.

II/8 – Representation: UNESCO must be represented as a full member in the governing body of a category II institute/centre.

II/9 – Direction: As a matter of principle, the Directors of category II institutes and centres should not be appointed by the Director-General. While the Director-General may be consulted on the choice of candidates, the actual appointment should be the responsibility of other appropriate authorities. Each already existing arrangement with a category II institute/centre should be carefully examined in consultation with the entity concerned with a view to bringing it into conformity with the prevailing principle.

II/10 – Financial contributions: UNESCO may contribute financially to concrete activities/projects of category II institutes and centres if those are deemed in line with UNESCO's programme priorities; it should not, however, provide financial support for administrative or institutional purposes.

II/11 – Financial accountability: While being accountable in its own records for any financial contributions provided, UNESCO is not responsible for managing the accounts/finances of category II entities.

II/12 – Employment of UNESCO staff: category II institutes and centres should neither be headed by nor employ UNESCO staff members. However, they could occasionally benefit from the temporary detachment of UNESCO staff, such detachment to be decided by the Director-General on an exceptional basis if justified by the implementation of a joint activity/project within a priority area as approved by UNESCO's governing bodies.

II/13 – Use of UNESCO's name and logo: category II institutes and centres should be allowed to use UNESCO's name and/or logo in accordance with the conditions and procedures established by UNESCO. The title of each such institute and centre should always refer to their status as institutes/centres "under the auspices of UNESCO".

II/14 – Sunset clause: The designation as a category II institute or centre should be reviewed by the Director-General every six years in the context of the preparation of a new Medium-Term Strategy for the Organization (C/4 document). This should ensure that the focus and coverage of the activities of a category II entity is in line with the strategic objectives of the Organization and the agreed criteria. Unless such a complementarity is determined, a renewal should not be recommended to the Executive Board and its designation as category II institute/centre should lapse.

IV. INSTITUTES AND CENTRES LOOSELY ASSOCIATED WITH UNESCO

57. In addition to category I and category II institutes and centres, there is a group of entities which is only loosely associated with UNESCO, but which often times use the Organization's name in different variations. It should be recalled in this context that the term "institutes and centres

loosely associated with UNESCO” is purely descriptive, and has no normative or legal basis. It is meant to describe the fact that there exist throughout the world entities of varying nature which are using UNESCO’s name and/or logo, but which do not belong to formally constituted networks recognized by the governing bodies.

58. Among those institutes and centres loosely associated with UNESCO, there are organizations, which are members of the UNESCO Clubs movement and which are referred to as “UNESCO Club”, “UNESCO Association” as well as “UNESCO Centre.” Following Executive Board decisions 164 EX/Decision 7.3 and 169 EX/Decision 7.1, an Ad hoc Committee set up by UNESCO and comprised of a selected number of representatives of the UNESCO Clubs movement has developed strategies for the renewal of the World Federation of UNESCO Clubs, Centres and Associations (WFUCA) and the further reinforcement of the worldwide UNESCO Clubs Movement. Upon recommendation of this Ad hoc Committee, UNESCO will organize at Headquarters a World Conference for the Clubs Movement from 18 to 20 July 2005. The Conference will discuss proposals from the Ad hoc Committee, including a revised draft Constitution of WFUCA, in which proposals for strengthened roles of the above-mentioned “UNESCO Centres” in the future management of WFUCA are reflected. In preparation for this Conference, a census of existing UNESCO Clubs, Centres and Associations is under way in cooperation with the National Federation and the National Commissions for UNESCO in the Member States.

59. Following ongoing discussion and future decisions by the Executive Board and the General Conference on the proper use of UNESCO’s name and emblem, the possibility of encouraging the members of Clubs Movement to use hereafter a denomination, which reflects their relations to UNESCO more correctly, for example adding the terms “for UNESCO”, is being considered (see document 171 EX/37). Based on the results of the World Conference for UNESCO Clubs Movement, the Director-General will report to the Executive Board at its 172nd session on the outcomes of the work of the Ad hoc Committee for the Renewal of WFUCA.

Proposed draft decision

60. In the light of the above, the Executive Board may wish to consider the following draft decision:

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 21 C/Resolution 40.1, 30 C/Resolution 2 and 30 C/Resolution 83 of the General Conference, and 161 EX/Decision 3.2.4, 161 EX/Decisions 4.1 and 4.2, 162 EX/Decision 4.2 and 165 EX/Decision 5.4 and 167 EX/Decision 4.5 of the Executive Board,
2. Further recalling the recommendations of the Legal Committee of the General Conference following the adoption by the Executive Board of 165 EX/Decision 5.4 (LEG/2002/REP, para. 11),
3. Having examined documents 171 EX/18 and 171 EX/INF.10,
4. Takes note of the updated data on UNESCO institutes and centres (category I) and the updated list of institutes and centres belonging to category II (171 EX/INF.10);
5. Approves the principles and guidelines proposed by the Director-General for UNESCO institutes and centres (category I), as contained in section II of document 171 EX/18 and decides to submit them to the General Conference;

6. Invites the Director-General to submit to the General Conference, through the Executive Board at its 172nd session, draft statutes for those institutes and centres previously classified as part of category I that have not yet been approved by the General Conference;
7. Approves the criteria proposed by the Director-General in section III of document 171 EX/18 to serve as a permanent framework for designating and engaging with institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO (category II) and decides to submit them, together with Annexes I and II to document 171 EX/18, to the General Conference;
8. Invites the General Conference to authorize it to decide, when appropriate, on its behalf, about the granting of category II status to new institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO;
9. Decides that the principles and guidelines for category I and the criteria for category II institutes and centres, together with Annexes I and II of document 171 EX/18, constitute the “Overall Strategy for UNESCO Institutes and Centres and their Governing Bodies” and submits it in its entirety for consideration and approval by the General Conference at its 33rd session.

ANNEX I

GUIDELINES CONCERNING THE CREATION OF INSTITUTES AND CENTRES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF UNESCO (CATEGORY II)

1. The arrangements for the establishment of the institutes and centres and their cooperation with UNESCO should comply with the following guidelines:
2. The procedures for the establishment of relations between UNESCO and the institutes and centres placed under its auspices shall take account of whether the Organization has participated in the setting up of these institutes and centres and has made a financial contribution to the execution of their activities.
3. The establishment procedure shall comprise four stages:

(i) The request for action submitted to UNESCO

This request must emanate from the State or group of States concerned and include the necessary particulars with respect to:

- the objectives and functions of the institute or centre;
- its existing or future legal status (particularly in terms of the legislation of the State in which it will be established);
- its method of financing (the origin of its various resources and its legal authority to accept such resources as subventions, gifts and legacies or payments for services rendered);
- the type of cooperation sought with UNESCO (nature, participation in activities, UNESCO representation within governing bodies, etc.);
- the respective responsibilities of the State or States concerned and of the Organization (nature and the duration of the contribution expected from UNESCO; obligations incumbent upon the State or States vis-à-vis the institute/centre and its activities);
- the undertaking by the State or States concerned to take the necessary measures for the establishment of the institute or centre (where it has not yet been set up).

(ii) Feasibility study

Such study shall be the responsibility of the Secretariat of UNESCO and shall focus on:

- relations between the activities of the institute or centre on the one hand, and, on the other, the Organization's purposes as set forth in its Constitution and, also, the priorities of its programme and the objectives which it seeks to attain through the execution thereof;
- the regional or international impact (actual or potential) of the institute or centre, in particular the complementarities between its activities and those of other existing institutes or centres and also the contribution that it makes to strengthening technical cooperation among developing countries;

- the results expected from UNESCO's contribution (the role played by the institute/centre in executing the Organization's programme and the impact of UNESCO's expected contribution upon the activities of the institute or centre).

(iii) Examination by the Executive Board

The Executive Board shall examine the feasibility study and a draft agreement which have been submitted to it by the Secretariat and shall make appropriate recommendations to the General Conference.

(iv) Decision by the General Conference

Should the General Conference (or in some cases the Executive Board) decide in favour of establishing an institute or centre under UNESCO's auspices, an agreement will be concluded between UNESCO and the government or governments concerned.

4. A similar procedure should be followed, *mutatis mutandis*, when the Organization is required to provide its support to an already existing institute or centre. A cooperation agreement should be concluded between UNESCO and the State or the institute or centre concerned defining the contribution to the activities of the institute or centre.

5. These guidelines do not apply to the relations between UNESCO and non-governmental organizations or private bodies, which shall be governed by the Directives concerning UNESCO's relations with non-governmental organizations and with foundations and similar institutions, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference.

ANNEX II

MODEL AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNESCO AND A MEMBER STATE CONCERNED REGARDING AN INSTITUTE OR CENTRE UNDER THE AUSPICES OF UNESCO (CATEGORY II)¹

The Government of the State concerned on the one hand, and

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the other hand,

Having regard to the resolution whereby the UNESCO General Conference seeks to favour international cooperation in respect of [...],

Considering that the Director-General has been authorized by the General Conference to conclude with the Government [...] an agreement in conformity with the draft which was submitted to the General Conference,

Desirous of defining the terms and conditions governing the contribution that shall be granted to the said Institute/Centre in this Agreement,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Interpretation

1. In this Agreement, unless the context requires a different meaning, “UNESCO” refers to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
2. “[...]” means [...]
“[...]” means [...]
“[...]” means [...]

ARTICLE II

Establishment

The Government shall agree to take, in the course of the year [...], any measures that may be required for the setting up at [...], as provided for under this Agreement, of an institute/centre [...] hereinafter called “the Institute/Centre”.

ARTICLE III

Participation

1. The Institute/Centre shall be an autonomous institution at the service of Member States and Associate Members of UNESCO that, by their common interest in the objectives of the Institute/Centre, desire to cooperate with the Institute/Centre.

¹ If special circumstances necessitate amendments to the model agreement, a suitable justification of the proposed amendment should be given.

2. Member States of UNESCO wishing to participate in the Institute/Centre's activities, as provided for under this Agreement, shall send the Director-General of UNESCO notification to this effect. The Director-General shall inform the Institute/Centre and the Member States mentioned above of the receipt of such notifications.

ARTICLE IV

Purpose of the Agreement

The purpose of this Agreement is to define the terms and conditions governing collaboration between UNESCO and the Government concerned and also the rights and obligations stemming therefrom for the parties.

ARTICLE V

Juridical personality

The Institute/Centre shall enjoy on the territory of the [...] the personality and legal capacity necessary for the exercise of its functions, in particular the capacity:

- to contract;
- to institute legal proceedings;
- to acquire and dispose of movable and immovable property.

ARTICLE VI

Constitution

The Constitution of the Institute/Centre must include the following provisions:

- (a) a legal status granting to the Institute/Centre, under national legislation, the autonomous legal capacity necessary to exercise its functions and to receive subventions, obtain payments for services rendered and carry out the acquisition of all means required;
- (b) a governing structure for the Institute/Centre allowing UNESCO representation within its governing bodies.

ARTICLE VII

Functions/Objectives

The functions/objectives of the Institute/Centre shall be to [...]

- [...]
- [...]

ARTICLE VIII

Governing Board

1. The Institute/Centre shall be guided and supervised by a Governing Board renewed every [...] years and composed of:
 - (a) a representative of the Government concerned or his/her appointed representative;
 - (b) a representative of each of the other Member States that shall send to the Director-General of UNESCO a notification, in accordance with the stipulations of Article III, paragraph 2, above;
 - (c) a representative of the Director-General of UNESCO.
2. The Governing Board shall:
 - (a) approve the long-term and medium-term programmes of the Institute/Centre;
 - (b) approve the annual work plan and budget of the Institute/Centre, including the staffing table;
 - (c) examine the annual reports submitted by the Director of the Institute/Centre;
 - (d) issue the rules and regulations and determine the financial, administrative and personnel management procedures of the Institute/Centre;
 - (e) decide on the participation of regional intergovernmental organizations and international organizations in the work of the Institute/Centre.
3. The Governing Board shall meet in ordinary session at regular intervals, at least once every calendar year; it shall meet in extraordinary session if summoned by the Chairperson, either on his/her own initiative or at the request of the Director-General of UNESCO or of [x] of its members.
4. The Governing Board shall adopt its own rules of procedure. For its first meeting the procedure shall be established by the Government and UNESCO.

ARTICLE IX

Executive Committee

In order to ensure the effective running of the Institute/Centre between sessions, the Governing Board may delegate to a Standing Executive Committee, whose membership it fixes, such powers as it deems necessary.

ARTICLE X

Secretariat

1. The Institute/Centre's Secretariat shall consist of a Director and such staff as is necessary for the proper functioning of the Institute/Centre.
2. The Director shall be appointed by the Chairperson of the Governing Board in consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO.

3. The other members of the Secretariat may comprise:
 - (a) members of UNESCO's staff who would be temporarily detached and made available to the Institute/Centre, as provided for by UNESCO's regulations and by the decisions of its governing bodies;
 - (b) any person appointed by the Director, in accordance with the procedures laid down by the Governing Board;
 - (c) Government officials who would be made available to the Institute/Centre, as provided by Government regulations.

ARTICLE XI

Duties of the Director

The Director shall discharge the following duties:

- (a) direct the work of the Institute/Centre in conformity with the programmes and directives established by the Governing Board;
- (b) propose the draft work plan and budget to be submitted to the Governing Board for approval;
- (c) prepare the provisional agenda for the sessions of the Governing Board and submit to it any proposals that he/she may deem useful for the administration of the Institute/Centre;
- (d) prepare reports on the Institute/Centre's activities to be submitted to the Governing Board;
- (e) represent the Institute/Centre in law and in all civil acts.

ARTICLE XII

Contribution of UNESCO

1. UNESCO shall provide assistance in the form of a technical and/or financial contribution for the activities of the Institute/Centre in accordance with the strategic goals and objectives of UNESCO.

2. UNESCO shall agree to:

- provide the assistance of its experts in the specialized fields of the Institute/Centre;

AND/OR

- detach temporarily members of its staff. Such detachment may be decided by the Director-General on an exceptional basis if justified by the implementation of a joint activity/project within a priority area as approved by UNESCO's governing bodies;

AND/OR

- include the Institute/Centre in various programmes which it implements and in which the participation of the latter seems necessary to it;

AND/OR

- contribute to the Institute/Centre over [x] years of its existence an amount which shall not be less than [...].

3. In all the cases listed above, this contribution shall be provided for in UNESCO's Programme and Budget.

ARTICLE XIII

Contribution of the Government

The Government shall agree to provide all the resources, either financial or in kind, needed for the administration and proper functioning of the Institute/Centre:

- The Government shall make available to the Institute/Centre [...]

AND/OR

- the Government shall entirely assume [the maintenance of the premises, etc.]

AND/OR

- shall contribute to the Institute/Centre a total amount of [...]

AND/OR

- the Government shall make available to the Institute/Centre the administrative staff necessary for the performance of its functions, which shall comprise: [...]

ARTICLE XIV

Privileges and immunities

The contracting parties shall agree, when circumstances so require, on provisions relating to privileges and immunities.²

[For example]

- All staff members of the Institute/Centre, regardless of their nationality, shall enjoy immunity from all legal process in respect of all acts performed in the exercise of their duties. [...]

ARTICLE XV

Responsibility

As the Institute/Centre is legally separate from UNESCO, the latter shall not be legally responsible for it and shall bear no liabilities of any kind, be they financial or otherwise, with the exception of the provisions expressly laid down in this Agreement.

² The provisions relating to privileges and immunities should only be included when circumstances so require, as agreed between the parties to the Agreement.

ARTICLE XVI

Evaluation

1. UNESCO may, at any time, carry out an evaluation of the activities of the Institute/Centre in order to check:
 - whether the Institute/Centre makes an important contribution to the strategic goals of UNESCO;
 - whether the activities effectively pursued by the Institute/Centre are in conformity with those set out in this Agreement.
2. UNESCO shall agree to submit to the Government, at the earliest opportunity, a report on any evaluation.
3. UNESCO shall reserve the option to denounce this Agreement or amend its contents, following the results of an evaluation.

ARTICLE XVII

Use of UNESCO name and logo

1. The Institute/Centre may mention its affiliation with UNESCO. It may therefore use after its title the mention “under the auspices of UNESCO”.
2. The Institute/Centre is authorized to use the UNESCO logo or a version thereof on its letterheaded paper and documents [option: in accordance with the conditions established by the governing bodies of UNESCO].

ARTICLE XVIII

Duration of the Organization’s assistance

UNESCO’s assistance under this Agreement is fixed for a period of [x] years as from its entry into force and may be renewed by tacit agreement.

ARTICLE XIX

Entry into force

This Agreement shall enter into force upon meeting the formalities required to that effect by the domestic law of the [country] and by UNESCO’s internal regulations.

ARTICLE XX

Denunciation

1. The non-observance of one or several obligations contained in the present Agreement by one of the parties shall entitle the other to denounce unilaterally the Agreement.
2. The denunciation shall take effect within [x] days following receipt of the notification sent by one of the contracting parties to the other.

ARTICLE XXI

Revision

The present Agreement may be revised by consent between the Government concerned and UNESCO.

ARTICLE XXII

Settlement of disputes

1. Any dispute between UNESCO and the Government concerning the interpretation or application of this Agreement, if it is not settled by negotiation or any other appropriate method agreed to by the parties, shall be submitted for final decision to an arbitration tribunal composed of [x] members [...]

option 1: who shall be appointed as follows [...]

option 2: one of whom shall be appointed by [a representative of the Government], another by the Director-General of UNESCO, and the third, who shall preside over the tribunal, chosen by these two. If the two arbitrators cannot agree on the choice of the third, the appointment shall be made by the President of the International Court of Justice.

2. The Tribunal's decision shall be final.

In witness whereof, the undersigned have signed this Agreement.

Done in [x] copies in the [...] languages, on [...]

For the United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

For the Government