United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Executive Board

ex

Hundred and seventy-first session

171 EX/17
PARIS, 28 February 2005
Original: English

Item **22** of the provisional agenda

**COMMENTS BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL
ON THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORTS SUBMITTED
IN THE 2004-2005 BIENNIUM**

SUMMARY

In accordance with the provisions of 170 EX/Decision 5.2, the Director-General hereby submits to the Executive Board a short report on some of the evaluations carried out in the 2004-2005 biennium, together with his comments.

Decision proposed: paragraph 33.

BACKGROUND

1.   Executive Board Decisions: At its 170th session, by 170 EX/Decision 5.2, the Executive Board reiterated that the Director-General should continue to report periodically to it on evaluations that are carried out on the Organization's programme activities, on the progress made in the follow-up to evaluation recommendations and in strengthening the quality of the evaluations undertaken.

2.   UNESCO Evaluation Strategy: The Organization continues to implement the UNESCO Evaluation Strategy (165 EX/19). The Director-General is committed to improving the quality of the evaluations undertaken, and to developing an evaluation culture to include effective learning from evaluation findings in managing for results. Three of the four evaluations presented here are from the regular programme, while the fourth covers extrabudgetary funded activities. One of the three from the regular programme is an evaluation outstanding from document 31 C/5. There is still one evaluation outstanding from document 31 C/5, the final report of which is still to be received. This will be presented to a later session of the Executive Board.

3.   Layout of the document: The first part of the document presents, in summarized form, a description of each of the evaluation reports, including major findings (achievements and challenges) and main recommendations. This is followed by a brief account of the actions that the Director-General has taken already or is taking in response to the recommendations made in the evaluation reports. In the second part of the report, the Director-General presents the generic lessons that have emerged from the evaluations.

PART I – PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION REPORTS:

- Evaluation of UNESCO's programme for the inclusion of children from various marginalized groups within formal education programmes;

- Evaluation of the UNESCO Communication and Information Sector's WebWorld Internet Initiative;

- Evaluation of the World Heritage Fund's Emergency Assistance activities;

- Culture Heritage Management and Tourism: Evaluation and mainstreaming.

EVALUATION OF UNESCO'S PROGRAMME FOR THE INCLUSION OF CHILDREN FROM VARIOUS MARGINALIZED GROUPS WITHIN FORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

Brief description and background of activities evaluated

4.   Background: In July 1994, the World Conference on Special Needs Education: Access and Quality (held in Salamanca, Spain) adopted the principle of "inclusive education". UNESCO was mandated to undertake a number of tasks in order to support the development of inclusive education (IE). The unit for Special Needs Education was gradually transformed into an IE unit at UNESCO Headquarters. In addition to the work of this unit, staff in the UNESCO regional bureaux, cluster and national offices carry out IE activities and have responsibility for promoting IE.

5.   UNESCO's activities: One aspect of the mandate arising from Salamanca was to mobilize funds from donors to undertake an Inclusive Schools and Community Support (IS&CS)

programme, "which would enable the launching of pilot projects that showcase new approaches for dissemination", and to develop "indicators concerning the need for and provision of special needs education" (UNESCO, 1995, p. 12). UNESCO's IE initiatives since 1994 have included capacity-building via workshops, seminars, partnerships and networks; the development and dissemination of training materials and publications; and the development of policy guidelines with case studies as examples of good practice to be followed.

6.   This evaluation: The National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in the United Kingdom conducted the evaluation in the period October 2003 to May 2004. It was undertaken in three main phases: (i) documentation collection and review, and interviews with UNESCO staff, sponsors and experts. The aim of the first phase of the evaluation was to collect data which would give an overview of UNESCO activity relating to the inclusion of pupils with disabilities; the rationale for such activity; the way in which decisions about resource allocation and support were made; and the perceptions of the donors who have helped to facilitate aspects of the activity. Interviews were conducted with: a total of six current and former staff of the IE unit, two of the sponsors of the IS&CS programme, and six other experts and academics who had worked with the sponsors on UNESCO and other IE activities; (ii) a questionnaire to all UNESCO cluster and national offices, regional bureaux and other contacts/ministries of education where links with IE had been identified. The questionnaire was developed in order to obtain an overview of country and regional UNESCO IE activities in the past ten years; and (iii) case studies were undertaken in three countries, the purpose of which was to examine in more detail the country-level perception of the impact of UNESCO's inclusive education activities. Over 50 interviews were undertaken and observations made during the field visits. Interviews were held with current UNESCO office staff working on IE, Education for All (EFA) and other areas of education; ministry of education staff; non-governmental organizations; teacher trainers; academics; and schoolteachers.

Major findings (achievements and challenges)

7.   The evaluation recognized several **achievements** with UNESCO's IE activities:

(a)   UNESCO's role in IE: UNESCO's role in responding to the 1994 World Conference on Special Needs Education is widely acknowledged. There was agreement between IE unit staff, sponsors and other experts on the important role that UNESCO's IE unit had played in putting IE "on the map" internationally;

(b)   Wide range of stakeholders influenced: UNESCO's activities have influenced a wide range of stakeholders, including policy-makers, teachers, parents and pupils. At the most fundamental level, there are children currently being educated with their peers, who might either be at home without education or in a segregated institution were it not for UNESCO's activities;

(c)   Core texts: Some of UNESCO's materials form core texts in the development of inclusive education in many countries and have been translated into a wide range of languages for use around the world;

(d)   Credibility of UNESCO: UNESCO has credibility at all levels – from governments, to NGOs, to grass-roots practitioners. UNESCO is seen as an informative and authoritative body, independent of local and national politics.

8. The evaluation recognized the following **challenges** for UNESCO's IE activities:

(a) Strategic approach not evident: Nearly a decade after the Salamanca conference, there was evidence of training activities and the development of a large amount of materials, suggesting that a good deal of advice and guidance was available for those who sought it. However, there was little recorded evidence of the outcomes of those activities and, in particular, of their impact on the inclusion of all children in education. There was also little evidence of the way in which the guidance had influenced practice;

(b) Different understanding of the role of the IE unit: The role and remit of the IE unit is understood in different ways within UNESCO, particularly in terms of how it relates to EFA. This led to some confusion, which was reflected in the responses from external interviewees;

(c) Lack of good data management: There was a lack of data management and communication processes in relation to IE activities and UNESCO officers. This led to problems in relation to a limited awareness of the work of others, resulting in overlap, ineffective use of resources, and failure to identify shared interests and approaches;

(d) Limited resources in the IE unit and in the field: Sustainability of inclusive education was threatened by the limited resource capacity of the IE unit and field offices and external factors such as unstable political administrations, poverty and conflicting priorities within education.

Recommendations

9. Following their analysis, the evaluators **recommended** that the following measures be considered:

To UNESCO Headquarters:

(a) There appears to be a need for clarification or review of the role of the IE unit in relation to other thematic teams within UNESCO, to ensure that IE is not perceived as being the responsibility of a small number of individuals or as solely related to special educational needs. Other sections should consider IE issues and develop collaborative strategies with the IE unit.

(b) There is a need for a systematic data management system and, related to this, for greater awareness of the plethora of activities occurring around the world, if valuable experience is not to be lost.

(c) The evaluators faced particular challenges in conducting this evaluation, because of the absence of written and systematic records of key contacts and activities and the frailty of data management systems.

To the IE unit:

(d) The role of the IE unit cannot be singular as countries are in very different stages of development – some embedding inclusive education widely and some where inclusive education would be liable to disappear with UNESCO's absence.

(e)   A strategic plan for IE activities is needed. In order to achieve ownership, ensure relevance and facilitate its implementation, the strategy should be developed in consultation with UNESCO staff at all levels.

(f)   There should be mutual benefit from greater clarity over the responsibility for IE activities between the IE unit, regional bureaux and national offices.

To regional bureaux:

(g)   IE activities are not solely the responsibility of the IE unit, and UNESCO officers at all levels need to develop a coordinated, strategic approach, and to communicate with Headquarters about this.

(h)   All pilot projects should provide opportunities for learning, and conclusions should be disseminated.

To cluster national offices:

(i)   UNESCO should focus on macro-level activities, which have the capacity to exert influence on a large scale – for example, by influencing policies or national approaches. Work of this nature requires UNESCO to be a catalyst and facilitator: it does not require long-term resource commitment from UNESCO.

(j)   Workshops should be directed towards change agents and those who will influence others, either by policy development or by training; there should be an expectation that events will have an inherent programme of further action and/or dissemination.

Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General

10.   The Director-General welcomes the evaluation and notes a distinctive achievement of the programme, as assessed by the evaluators, to be that "… there are children currently being educated with their peers, who might either be at home without education or in a segregated institution were it not for UNESCO's activities". This is particularly important in view of UNESCO's mandate in addressing Education for All (EFA). Major actions already initiated, or to be taken include:

(a)   Further dissemination of relevant materials such as: "Changing Teaching Practices", for teacher training and "Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education" has now taken place, thus expanding on an achievement recognized by the evaluators. More than 30 IE documents are available for download from the website: www.unesco.org/education/inclusive. In addition, "Policy Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to EFA" has been developed to bring a more strategic focus to approaches employed in IE. Also, an electronic filing system has been established to facilitate wide access to IE data and information. These initiatives will help all the constituents to learn from the wide range of activities occurring around the world.

(b)   The Education Sector is to ensure that the strategic issues concerning inclusive education are appropriately reflected in its plans, particularly with respect to EFA. Further important aspects would include the roles of the IE unit, Headquarters divisions, and field offices, and how these should effectively complement each other.

EVALUATION OF THE UNESCO COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION SECTOR'S WEBWORLD INTERNET INITIATIVE

Brief description and background of programme evaluated

11. Background: Information and communication technology (ICT) has become a major determining factor in many issues central to the mission of UNESCO and to the international development process. UNESCO's primary strategic advantages in developing ICT projects include: the worldwide reach of the Organization, and the importance and extent of the issues and information that it deals with. Consequently, high priority has to be placed on information dissemination to the widest possible extent. WebWorld was created in 1997 with the foregoing in mind. It is a "portal" type website developed and maintained by the Communication and Information (CI) Sector to serve as a gateway to its programmes and services, a repository of information about CI programmes and an access point to portals for libraries, archives, and free software, as well as an Information Society Observatory.

12. UNESCO's activities: WebWorld has progressed from a simple, manually updated set of HTML pages to a modern web application system. The overall strategy of the CI Sector is to further develop WebWorld into a truly interactive, thematic and comprehensive portal that provides a wide array of services to members of professional communities in the public and private sectors and to the broader public interested in communication and information issues.

13. This evaluation: This evaluation of WebWorld is intended to assist UNESCO to determine how WebWorld can best meet overall UNESCO goals and the needs of CI stakeholders, including Member States. Virtual Productions Services LLC (United States of America) undertook the evaluation in the period January to August 2004. Over 40 interviews and a Logical Framework Analysis were conducted at UNESCO Headquarters, as well as interviews by phone and Internet chat with a variety of offsite stakeholders. In addition, an online survey involving over 780 survey returns (out of 12,500) was conducted. Further investigations included: (i) direct observation of users in navigating the site; (ii) testing and analysis of site availability, and the extent to which WebWorld is known (visibility); (iii) examining the processes and tools for acquiring content; (iv) assessing site usage patterns and website usability design and standards; (v) analysis of the use and suitability of software tools related to support for web development; and (vi) analysis of the suitability of processes, tools and methods related to support for capacity-building, including networking and collaboration.

Major findings (achievements and challenges)

14. The evaluation recognized several **achievements** of WebWorld:

    (a)   WebWorld provides rich and varied content on important CI themes: All respondent groups strongly praised the quality of content of the WebWorld news and of the WebWorld portals. While there was a call for broader thematic coverage, all of the current portals were mentioned as covering themes important to the stakeholders;

    (b)   WebWorld is useful within and outside UNESCO: Virtually all UNESCO staff interviewed (including interviewees in the Director-General's office, in the Bureau of Public Information – BPI – and in CI and other sectors) reported that WebWorld (especially the news feature) is useful to them;

    (c)   WebWorld assisting in networking: 54% of online survey respondents reported having learned about or communicated with other organizations as a result of using WebWorld;

(d)   WebWorld serves a research and development function in use of ICT: All interviewees agreed that there is currently no formal function within UNESCO to provide research and development on the use of ICT to promote programmatic goals, and that WebWorld has stepped in to supply that function;

(e)   Progress on availability and accessibility: Testing and analysis of the site showed that, with minor exceptions, WebWorld is continuously available and substantively designed in a way that promotes accessibility to disabled users.

15.   The evaluation recognized the following **challenges** with regard to WebWorld:

(a)   Content acquisition needs to be expanded and diversified: Close to two thirds of all news articles on WebWorld originate at Headquarters. There are few articles from regional and national offices. Content from National Commissions and from non-United Nations partner agencies is rare;

(b)   Interactivity needs strengthening: WebWorld contains a number of excellent interactive features. However, these features are somewhat hidden, and the site creates the perception that it is not very interactive;

(c)   Site is underutilized and some stakeholders under-represented: While almost half of UNESCO in-house respondents reported daily or weekly use of WebWorld, only 14% of non-UNESCO respondents reported use on a daily or weekly basis;

(d)   Some thematic areas are under-represented: Respondents called for a better coverage on some themes and regions of the world, particularly Latin America and Africa;

(e)   Difficulties in access and use: The plethora of themes, portals, menus and links obscure many useful areas of the site. User observation and analysis of information architecture both pointed to a need to make the site less visually crowded and more cleanly organized;

(f)   Underuse of open standards/open source software hampers development and accessibility: The use of the Simplify content management system has led to problems in availability (use of Simplify dynamic pages), in visibility (forcing overuse of robots.txt), in accessibility (use of unintelligible Uniform Resource Locators – URLs) and in lack of adherence to web development standards (allows admixture of content and format). There are few UNESCO-wide or WebWorld-wide standards for page weights, use of images for navigation, use of animation, image size, use of colours to indicate alternate functions or content archiving;

(g)   Ongoing monitoring and user feedback mechanisms are lacking: User feedback is handled individually with no central repository or even record of user interactions. There are no regularly performed user observation sessions, user satisfaction surveys or focus groups. Site visibility and analysis of links from other sites to WebWorld are not performed on a regular basis. Stakeholder content provision and usage patterns are monitored only informally.

Recommendations

16.   Following their analysis the evaluators gave 15 pages of **recommendations** addressed to UNESCO as a whole, WebWorld and other UNESCO ICT initiatives, covering the following:

(a)   Provide institutional support for broader and more balanced content acquisition: This would include some or all of the following: (i) the establishment of a full-time position for a WebWorld content manager/editor; (ii) include web reporting and web-based programme implementation in the Terms of Reference for all CI personnel and initiatives; (iii) establish a CI sector-wide Content Oversight Committee for WebWorld; (iv) consider moving WebWorld from a division level to a CI Sector-wide level; and (v) provide resources to support multilingualism.

(b)   Clearly define and prioritize stakeholders: The evaluators recommend that WebWorld define and prioritize its primary stakeholders as: (i) development, human rights, governance and policy professionals; (ii) journalists, broadcasters and media professionals; (iii) informaticians, software and computing professionals; (iv) archivists, librarians and preservationists; (v) educators, researchers and students; and (vi) the general public. Groups (i) and (ii) are currently underserved.

(c)   Recognize and support WebWorld's role in research and development: Currently UNESCO has no formal research and development function regarding programmatic uses of ICT. WebWorld has stepped in to informally fill this gap. The evaluators recommend that UNESCO formally recognize and support WebWorld's role in research and development on ICT programmatic goals.

(d)   Add interactivity and services to broaden sources of information and deepen participation: The evaluators recommend that WebWorld provide mechanisms to facilitate broader participation in content provision.

(e)   Institute regular monitoring and user feedback mechanisms: WebWorld to institute a number of the initiatives similar to those carried out in this evaluation as ongoing monitoring methods.

(f)   Strengthen website usability – provide focus and clarity of options: Many features can be strengthened or added to increase and enhance website usability. The evaluators recommend that WebWorld staff engage in efforts to: emphasize features in addition to the news; provide dynamic focus through changing featured articles; differentiate gateway pages from destination pages; consolidate and reduce the number of navigation options and increase emphasis on content; and make strategic and improved use of fonts and colours to improve user navigation and usability.

(g)   Use open source software and standards: WebWorld and other UNESCO ICT initiatives to give strong consideration to open source software in all future internal software decisions, in order to promote ongoing access and flexibility of development options. Further: move to static pages; use human-readable URLs; reduce page download weights; significantly reduce dependency on images for navigation; gain greater separation between content and format to promote accessibility; develop features specifically for disabled users; and institute standards for image sizes and archiving.

Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General

17.   The Director-General appreciates the evaluators' assessment of WebWorld and notes that ICT in general, and web technology in particular, provide unprecedented potential to fulfil UNESCO's function as a clearing house, that gathers, transfers, disseminates and shares information, knowledge and best practices in its fields of competence. UNESCO, driven by a small number of sectoral web initiatives, chiefly WebWorld, is now developing its complex web system into a knowledge portal

that will strengthen UNESCO's position as a knowledge broker. Immediately after receipt of the evaluators' report, the Sector started implementing several of the technical recommendations. Major actions already initiated, or to be initiated, include:

(a)   The CI Sector joined efforts with UNESCO's web-workers' community to create UNESCO-wide usability and accessibility guidelines. The usability recommendations are gradually being implemented while preparing for the development of the new version of WebWorld that complies with the guidelines;

(b)   The CI Sector has strengthened the WebWorld team providing a full-time assistant content-manager/editor through an internal restructuring. Also, the information services group of the CI Sector has added the tasks of a "content oversight committee for WebWorld" to its terms of reference;

(c)   The CI Sector has put in place a number of tools of different functionality and complexity (mailing lists, discussion boards, project management platforms, specialized community platforms) to further develop WebWorld as a space for community development;

(d)   The CI Sector is to consider how to appropriately provide WebWorld in the other working languages of UNESCO, in addition to English and French;

(e)   In the further development of WebWorld, the CI Sector is to ensure that the needs of the priority stakeholders (development, human rights, governance and policy professionals) are better served, introduce appropriate interactivity and services to broadening sources of information and deepen participation, make increased use of suitable monitoring and feedback mechanisms, promote a proper balance in the use of open source and proprietary software for accessibility and development, and develop/provide web usability and accessibility guidelines;

(f)   Finally, the CI Sector is to explore the feasibility of developing a programme activity dedicated to research and development focusing on web services as new tools for implementation of programme activities.

AN EVALUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND'S EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

Brief description and background of activities evaluated

18.   Background: The UNESCO World Heritage Centre was set up in 1992 by the Director-General to: (i) serve as the Secretariat of the World Heritage Convention and carry out the decisions adopted by the Committee at its annual meetings; and (ii) coordinate all activities of the UNESCO Secretariat in the field of world heritage, cultural and natural. The World Heritage Fund, created in 1972 by the World Heritage Convention, is used to provide "International Assistance" to States Parties. The International Assistance as such covers five types of assistance, including Emergency Assistance. In view of the increasing incidence and severity of natural disasters and civil conflict, protecting cultural and natural heritage remains a high priority. Emergency Assistance, according to the Operational Guidelines of the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (July 2002), is granted to sites which "have suffered severe damage due to sudden, unexpected phenomena (such as sudden land subsidence, serious fires or explosions, flooding) or are in imminent danger of severe damage caused by these phenomena" and "does not concern cases of damage or deterioration that has been caused by gradual processes such as decay, pollution, erosion, etc.".

19.   UNESCO's activities: The World Heritage Centre's activities cover the implementation of procedures and mechanisms for the receipt of applications for, and the disbursement of funds, for approved emergency activities. Three tiers of decision-making are in use, depending on the amount requested – Chairperson for amounts of US $50,000 or below, Bureau for amounts between $50,000 and $75,000, and the Committee for amounts above $75,000. They consider applications for assistance with inputs from the Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM). The average amount per request during the six-year period (1998-2003) was $53,000.

20.   This Evaluation: The evaluation of the World Heritage Fund Emergency Assistance Activities was foreseen in the deliberations of the World Heritage Committee (Decision 26 COM 25.3) at its 26th session, and funds earmarked at the 27th session of the World Heritage Committee (Decision 27 COM 11.2). Two independent evaluators undertook the evaluation in the period from November 2003 to May 2004. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed which included document review, meetings and interviews with Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS, ICCROM), World Heritage Centre staff, and leading cultural and natural heritage experts knowledgeable about Emergency Assistance. Research on disaster preparedness and mitigation efforts at the international and national level was undertaken. Also, questionnaires were sent to selected World Heritage States Parties Committee members.

Major findings (achievements and challenges)

21.   The evaluation found several **achievements** associated with UNESCO's activities:

(a)   Administration of the grants: A total of 72 requests were approved amounting to $3,686,866 in the period 1998-2003. The World Heritage Centre demonstrated improvements in the administration of the grants from the year 2000 onwards. Decisions on the majority of proposals were taken in a timely manner, averaging less than three months;

(b)   Data and information management: From 2000 onwards, data kept by the World Heritage Centre were more consistent and had fewer gaps. Prior to this date, the information provided was thin, and in 1998 and 1999 sometimes contradictory;

(c)   Funding for emergency assistance: Despite the decrease of the overall annual budget of the World Heritage Fund, the Emergency Assistance budget line has increased during this period from $500,000 in 1998 to $789,300 in 2002;

(d)   Mitigation and preventive work: Latin America and the Caribbean show some evidence of using Emergency Assistance for preventative work and mitigation planning (for example Joya de Ceren, El Salvador);

(e)   Multiplier effects: There were several clear cases where Emergency Assistance demonstrated strong performance as seed money with significant multiplier effects, being helpful in attracting other sources of support. Examples include: Cesky Krumov (Czech Republic) and the five World Heritage sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(f)   Additions to the World Heritage List: Of the six sites granted Emergency Assistance that were not on the World Heritage List, four have subsequently been added (Archaeological Site of Zvarnots, Armenia; Medina of Essaouira, Morocco; Ashur, Iraq; Curonian Spit, a transborder site shared by the Russian Federation and Lithuania), thus fulfilling one of the stated aims of Emergency Assistance;

(g)   More general framework for action: In some Emergency Assistance requests, a clear financial or human resource involvement from the States Parties is stated, showing that the Emergency Assistance will help in a more general framework of actions. Activities in Afghanistan for instance included the holding of large stakeholder meetings as part of the participatory approaches employed.

22.   The evaluation identified several **challenges** associated with UNESCO's activities:

(a)   Absence of a comprehensive strategy: The World Heritage Fund grants for Emergency Assistance have not been guided by a comprehensive strategy. The blurring of categories, for example use of Emergency Assistance for post-conflict reconstruction or cases of failure of national governments to maintain properties and enforce policies, contravenes the *Operational Guidelines* and creates confusion among States Parties. The current Emergency Assistance policy is not well understood, given that applications are received and approved for activities that do not strictly meet the working definition of severe damage due to sudden, unexpected phenomena;

(b)   Definition of roles and accountability: The evaluation identified a situation of weak definition of responsibilities and accountability, little documentation during implementation, and minimal financial information to show how the funds that have been transferred to UNESCO field offices are used. Institutional responsibilities, and the interface between responsible government agencies and other institutions or NGOs, are weakly defined leading to unsatisfactory implementation and failure to maximize other disaster management efforts;

(c)   Issues with the identification and preparation of Emergency Assistance requests: The International Assistance Request Description format is not standardized. Although proposals were generally better prepared after 2000, the information provided by the proponents lacks adequate evidence to ensure that objectives will be met and that actions relate to these objectives. The objectives of the projects are often poorly articulated, as are the mechanisms that will be used to achieve them. Work plans are sketchy. Budgets are often general, with amounts up to $35,000 having no further itemization of costs;

(d)   Criteria for judging requests: The Advisory Bodies are asked to make comments and provide recommendations on the requests received. They are not, however, given criteria by which to judge the requests, nor is it clear whether they have a no-objection role or are meant to provide technical reviews. The World Heritage Committee has overridden the Advisory Bodies' recommendations in several cases. The need for standard criteria for the judging of International Assistance requests was noted at the Advisory Bodies meeting in Gland in January 2004;

(e)   Questions of impact: There is little attention to sustainability in project design in terms of institutional arrangements, maintenance, financing, or public awareness. Site managers, who have primary responsibility for safeguarding properties, seem to be virtually absent in the Emergency Assistance process. There are very few mitigation plans among the Emergency Assistance requests. Preparedness and prevention are seldom a focus of attention. There is little evidence that national authorities are better equipped to deal with emergencies after Emergency Assistance. Scale is largely ignored, although many of the disasters are severe and have high cost implications;

(f)   Monitoring and evaluation: There is no standard format for final reports. The Committee did not endorse the last evaluation of International Assistance in 1998 and the recommendations were not acted upon, as they were not action-oriented. The Evaluation noted that the revised *Operational Guidelines*, which come into force in February 2005, include the following: "The Committee will adopt a mechanism for tracking progress, evaluation and follow-up of International Assistance, to be reviewed and updated on a regular basis". These guidelines are expected to guide the management of Emergency Assistance.

Recommendations

23.   Following their analysis, the evaluators **recommended** that the following measures be considered by the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies:

(a)   reassess attitudes towards emergencies and bring its policies and procedures up to date;

(b)   revise the proposal format in line with the *Operational Guidelines* recommended International Assistance proposal form and include reporting requirements;

(c)   finalize criteria for Advisory Bodies to use in selection of proposals;

(d)   conduct training to raise skills level of World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies (possibly interested members of the World Heritage Committee) in regard to disaster preparedness and mitigation. Training and/or awareness-raising for the primary stakeholders in charge of the implementation, monitoring and reporting of the Emergency Assistance, such as UNESCO Regional Offices, should also be held. A focal point for disasters should be designated at the World Heritage Centre;

(e)   develop reliable monitoring mechanisms for projects under implementation;

(f)   arrange a seminar for the World Heritage Centre and Committee and Advisory Bodies to present the full findings of the evaluation;

(g)   in view of the blurring of lines with other International Assistance funded activities, proceed with a more comprehensive evaluation of Emergency Assistance and how it links to the other forms of International Assistance (Technical Cooperation, Preparatory Assistance, Training and Promotional Assistance) with a view to revising the delivery of International Assistance;

(h)   begin to develop strategies for risk preparedness for the regions most exposed to natural disasters, i.e., Latin America and the Caribbean under International Assistance, in coordination with the efforts of other agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank and national disaster coordination units.

Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General

24.   The Director-General takes note of the evaluation and the recommendations contained therein. He also notes that Decision 28 COM 10b taken by the World Heritage Committee at its 29th session was based on findings from the evaluation. The said decision requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare a comprehensive strategy for the operation of Emergency Assistance Activities under the World Heritage Fund, including details on risk preparedness in cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. To the foregoing, the Director-General would like to add:

(a)   that the World Heritage Centre together with the Advisory Bodies prepare a comprehensive set of criteria for evaluating proposals received for emergency assistance to be presented to the World Heritage Committee;

(b)   also, that the World Heritage Centre ensure that appropriate monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of projects funded under emergency assistance are undertaken on a timely basis and according to the revised and adopted *Operational Guidelines*. The Internal Oversight Service (IOS) will offer support in helping the World Heritage Centre to establish such arrangements;

(c)   finally, that the World Heritage Centre in collaboration with UNESCO field offices will continue to improve its data and information management practices with regard to decentralized activities. IOS will undertake an audit of all World Heritage Centre activities in 2005 to help take forward this initiative.

CULTURE HERITAGE MANAGEMENT AND TOURISM: EVALUATION AND MAINSTREAMING

Brief description and background of activities evaluated

25.   Background: The four-year project managed by the UNESCO Bangkok Office on "Culture Heritage Management and Tourism: Models for Cooperation among Stakeholders" (CHMT), was implemented in four phases in the period 1999 to 2002: (i) during Phase I, test sites were identified and onsite analytical studies of both the tourism and heritage sectors were conducted; (ii) during Phase II the results of the analyses in Phase I were presented at a workshop held in Bhaktapur, Nepal in April 2000, and Action Plans completed for the pilot sites; (iii) in Phase III the Action Plans were implemented at each pilot site; and (iv) in Phase IV, a workshop was organized in Lijiang, China in October 2001 to evaluate the implementation of the action plans, reformulate the action plans where necessary, and define models of cooperation for the development of a sustainable tourism industry at the community level. The eight pilot sites involved were: (i) Bhaktapur, Nepal; (ii) Hoi An, Viet Nam; (iii) Kandy, Sri Lanka; (iv) Levuka, Fiji; (v) Lijiang, China; (vi) Luang Prabang, Lao People's Democratic Republic; (vii) Melaka, Malaysia; and (viii) Vigan, Philippines.

26.   UNESCO's activities: UNESCO's activities undertaken during the implementation of the project include: (i) the holding of seminars and training workshops to disseminate both technical information and raise awareness of the pertinent issues in culture heritage management and tourism; (ii) advocacy with authorities at municipal, national and regional levels on the same issues; and (iii) the construction and testing of what has now come to be known as the "Lijiang Models of Cooperation for the Development of Sustainable Tourism in Asia and the Pacific". The four models developed are: (i) models for fiscal management of heritage conservation, maintenance and development at a municipal level – provided by an overview of current income generating mechanisms and identification and utilization of new opportunities; (ii) models for investment by the tourism industry in the sustainability of the culture heritage base – achieved through education of tourism operators on the value of culture heritage and by formulating means by which the tourism industry can contribute to preservation activities; (iii) models for community education and skills training leading to employment in the heritage conservation and culture tourism sector, with emphasis on opportunities for women and youth – achieved by identifying equipment applications and training needs and by designing programmes to meet these needs; and (iv) models for conflict resolution among tourism promoters, property developers and heritage conservationists – achieved by encouraging group participation in the formulation of case studies and activity implementation,

and by providing a structured venue where all stakeholders can raise and discuss their situations and concerns.

27.   This Evaluation: This evaluation was conducted as the last activity within phase IV of the CHMT project. It consisted of: (i) the preparation of self-evaluation reports by the stakeholders of each of the eight pilot sites, covering in particular the impacts of the projects in the said sites; and (ii) the holding of an evaluation and mainstreaming workshop in Penang, Malaysia from 15 to 18 January 2003. The self-evaluation reports were presented and discussed at the workshop, and strategies for mainstreaming of the best case practices in the pilot sites into policy, formulated. A draft workbook for heritage site management in the Asia and Pacific region was also reviewed. The four-day workshop was attended by some 60 participants including project beneficiaries, sister agencies, several external evaluators, government officials, two mayors and one vice-mayor. Sister agencies included the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, World Tourism Organization and Pacific Asia Travel Association.

Major findings (achievements and challenges)

28.   The evaluation revealed several **achievements** associated with the project:

(a)   Enthusiasm, commitment, and ownership: The enthusiasm and commitment of the local government units and community groups have been substantial. The self-evaluation reports presented by the eight sites clearly show that the four-year project has been beneficial to their local communities, in terms of introducing revenue-generating schemes from the tourism industry, integrating conservation and site presentation into local development plans and budgets, human resource development in the tourism industries and services, and strengthening community participation in planning and implementation of project activities;

(b)   Training, information dissemination, and facilities: Accomplishments included the following: (i) local youths were successfully trained as tour guides; (ii) heritage education conducted among schoolteachers and NGOs; (iii) the production of heritage information maps completed; and (iv) new tourist brochures and news clips on cultural heritage published and distributed. Appropriate facilities were also established, for example: (i) a heritage office and information centre in Kandy, and (ii) an interpretive centre (in 2003) in Melaka, Malaysia;

(c)   Policy changes by municipalities in the pilot sites: The project was instrumental in getting several municipalities in the pilot sites to effect relevant policy changes. Included here are: (i) conservation policies and guidelines for the development and conservation of the historic core have been implemented in Bhakatapur, Nepal; (ii) municipal ordinances were enacted to enforce implementation of activities formulated within the context of the tourism project, and the relocation of noisy business establishments outside the historic core area in Hoi An, Viet Nam; (iii) appropriate amendments made to the 1976 Town and Country Planning Act have empowered the municipality to impose an increased fine for offences involving demolition of heritage buildings in Melaka, Malaysia; and (iv) in Vigan, Philippines, ordinances aimed at reducing pollution (noise, air and visual), improving sanitation and waste management, have been enacted;

(d)   Conservation and restoration work: Important conservation and restoration activities were successfully completed. These include: (i) in Bhakatapur, Nepal some 290 heritage

conservation projects were completed employing local skilled workers in conservation/restoration work; (ii) in Hoi An, Viet Nam, 11 buildings have been restored as museums and for public use since April 2002; and (iii) in Vigan, Philippines, a historic building was restored and is being used as the Vigan Cultural Trade Centre;

(e) Financial matters: Accomplishments traced to the project in financial matters include: (i) in Bhakatapur, Nepal, policies on taxation of tourism-related establishments were adopted by the Municipal Council in August 2002, and a Cultural Heritage Fund was established. US $32,000 have been allocated yearly to provide grants for the repair and maintenance of privately owned heritage houses; (ii) in Hoi An, Viet Nam, expenditures on cultural activities accounted for 17% of total municipal expenditures in 2002, compared to only 5% in 2001 and 7% in 2000. At the same time, revenue from tourism, mainly from entry fees, increased to $7.5 million in 2002, compared to $5.1 million in 2001 and $2.8 million in 2000. In 2002, 74% of total revenue from tourism was reinvested back into heritage conservation; and (iii) in Lijian, China, the collection of preservation tax increased by 158% from $2.21 million in 2001 to $5.7 million in 2002, and the municipal expenditure in cultural conservation increased from 7% in 2001 to 13% of total expenditure in 2002;

(f) Employment opportunities: In Hoi An, Viet Nam, the number of local inhabitants employed in heritage conservation and tourism-related establishments increased by 22% from 1999 levels, while substantial increases in paid employment in the tourism sector have been recorded in Levuka, Fiji accompanied by continuing community involvement in the traditional ways of managing cultural resources and low-key tourism.

29. The evaluation identified several **challenges** associated with the project:

(a) Constraints in income generation: The generation of income from tourism for the local communities has not been without problems. For instance, the evaluation noted that there is a tendency for financial benefits accrued from tourism based on cultural heritage to be taken away from the sites concerned, as in the case of Levuka, Fiji. Also, although the Heritage Fund has already been established in Luang Prabang, Lao People's Democratic Republic, no income has been generated from the proposed $2 bed tax per tourist due to the reluctance of the owners of accommodation facilities to declare their occupancy, which may affect their property taxes;

(b) Room for increasing awareness: The evaluation assessed that the cultural awareness level among policy-makers, community members, tourist operators, and tourists can be improved. Policy-makers still have to fully understand when and how to regulate and control the number of tourists, and how to ensure that the benefits from tourism are equitably distributed among the local stakeholders;

(c) Updating draft workbook: The "Workbook for Heritage Site Management in the Asia-Pacific Region" still has to be completed by incorporating relevant feedback and suggestions provided at the evaluation workshop. It would then be published and widely disseminated;

(d) Cultural impact assessment: The evaluation also revealed that there is room for the formalization of "cultural impact assessments" to provide an authoritative basis for the protection of irreplaceable cultural heritage resources from destruction through modern development. The assessments should aim to measure the impact of possible modern developments on: (i) World Heritage Sites and Tentatively Listed Sites; (ii) nationally

protected areas, sites and monuments; and (iii) public and communal properties such as cemeteries and communal pastureland;

(e) Developments with Heritage Trusts: The merits and demerits of government versus private trusts as vehicles in the implementation of conservation activities still have to be systematically explored and the necessary guidelines for their effective use produced.

Recommendations

30. The evaluation **recommended** that the following measures be considered (by UNESCO Bangkok Office) with the aim of contributing to the sustainability of the results achieved and demonstrated by the implementation of the action plans in the eight pilot sites:

(a) The preparation, publication and dissemination of materials such as: (i) the "Workbook for Heritage Site Management in the Asia-Pacific Region"; (ii) a reference book on conservation and heritage issues facing Asian cities and towns; (iii) best practices under the UNESCO series on "IMPACT: the impact of tourism on the culture and environment"; and (iv) a Homeowners' Preservation Manual;

(b) Developing a Regional Methodology for Cultural Impact Assessment for Asia covering details on how to consider the environmental, cultural, social, and psychological carrying capacities of heritage sites;

(c) The Workbook and other new and innovative heritage site management tools can be effectively introduced during a caucus of mayors of World Heritage Sites and other sites identified for inclusion in the World Heritage List in the Asia and Pacific region. Given the number of issues raised during the Penang workshop, discussions during the Mayors' Caucus may be broadened to encompass not only the outputs of the tourism project but to discuss other urgent aspects of heritage conservation under a central theme of "political will to use heritage resources in an appropriate manner in the development of local economy".

Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General

31. The Director-General acknowledges the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. He notes that this extrabudgetary funded project has impressive achievements in the four years of its implementation. What is more, the enthusiasm shown by the local authorities, with the mayors, for instance, actively participating in the project, supporting relevant policy improvements, and exploring ways of mainstreaming the best practices identified, reflects the positive effects UNESCO seeks to induce when working with Member States. Further, the active participation of sister agencies such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank in the evaluation underscores the impact the project has had in the field. UNESCO Bangkok is therefore encouraged to prepare the necessary documentation for soliciting extrabudgetary funding for a further phase of the project to:

(a) develop and test an appropriate methodology for Cultural Impact Assessments in the region;

(b) continue working with the local authorities to mainstream the best practices identified;

(c) widely disseminate the material – workbooks and guidelines developed through the project, and actively monitor and report on their use.

PART II – CONCLUDING REMARKS OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL

32.   Lessons learned: These four evaluations have highlighted several common lessons. These are briefly discussed below:

   (a)   Improving data gathering and information management practices: Two of the four evaluations showed that there is a need for programmes to improve their data management practices so that there is adequate material available for evaluators to assess whether expected results have been achieved. IOS has found this to be a common problem in many programmes and is always pleased to provide support at the programme planning stage to identify the data that needs to be collected in order to monitor and evaluate programme implementation effectively;

   (b)   Enhancing strategic alignment of UNESCO activities: The need for further efforts to ensure that strategic issues are appropriately covered in planned activities came through from the Inclusive Education Evaluation. This has come through from a number of previous evaluations and is an issue that needs continuing attention;

   (c)   Developing guidelines for impact assessments: These were found to be missing from the World Heritage Centre Emergency Assistance Programme. The absence of such guidelines has been identified on other programmes and IOS now intends to give support generally to all sectors in developing such guidelines;

   (d)   Using web-based approaches to disseminate relevant materials: The need to strengthen UNESCO's arrangements for disseminating materials on, for example, the results of programme activities and best practices is well recognized. The WebWorld evaluation shows the great potential for web-based approaches for this purpose to further strengthen UNESCO's standing as a knowledge broker.

Proposed draft decision

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

   The Executive Board,

   1.   Recalling 170 EX/Decision 5.2,

   2.   Having examined document 171 EX/17 and taking into consideration the evaluation reports that have been presented,

   3.   Taking note of the recommendations made by the evaluators as well as the report of the Director-General on the implementation of these recommendations,

   4.   Invites the Director-General to implement in an appropriate manner recommendations which improve the programmes to which they relate, and to continue to improve the quality of evaluations by implementing the UNESCO Evaluation Strategy;

   5.   Requests the Director-General to continue to report to the Executive Board on evaluations that are carried out on the Organization's programme activities, on the progress made in the follow-up to evaluation recommendations and in strengthening the quality of the evaluations undertaken.