

Hundred and seventy-fourth session

174 EX/20
PARIS, 23 February 2006
Original: English

Item 18 of the provisional agenda

**BIENNIAL EVALUATION REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS
OF ALL UNESCO DECENTRALIZED BODIES**

SUMMARY

In accordance with 30 C/Resolution 83 of the General Conference and 160 EX/Decision 6.4 of the Executive Board, the Director-General presents the biennial evaluation report on the activities and results of all UNESCO decentralized bodies. This report presents work in progress on the initiatives taken by the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) to evaluate decentralized bodies, in particular field offices and Major Programme I institutes and centres, based on the criteria that have been approved by the General Conference and the Executive Board.

Decision proposed: paragraph 41.

Background

1. One of the basic criteria for the implementation of UNESCO's decentralization reform is that decentralized bodies be subjected to periodic review by the Executive Board, which will make recommendations to decide on their future (30 C/Resolution 83). To facilitate this, the Executive Board receives biennial evaluation reports on the activities and results of decentralized bodies. In the period since the previous biennium (2002-2003) evaluation report (167 EX/14) which covered the results of IOS evaluations of 10 field offices, in 2004-2005 the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) has overseen the following evaluations of UNESCO decentralized bodies:

- A. Evaluations of Major Programme I (Education Sector) institutes and centres.¹ The evaluation reports are available at <http://www.unesco.org/ios/>.
- B. Evaluations of the functioning of the decentralization strategy and its impact in 17 Member States. The evaluations covered six clusters and for each cluster the evaluations covered the cluster office and several Member States within the cluster where there is no UNESCO office or where the UNESCO office had been closed as part of the implementation of the existing decentralization strategy. Where there was a national office within these clusters, IOS also evaluated the national office. In total 10 field offices,² three Member States with closed offices³ and four Member States⁴ without a UNESCO office were evaluated. The scope of the evaluations covered:
 - Roles and strategy
 - Programme planning
 - Structure and resources
 - Activities and results
 - Linkages and relationships

A report consolidating the results of these evaluations was submitted by IOS to the Director-General in November 2004 and is available at <http://www.unesco.org/ios/>. This report was summarized in the Director-General's report on the Reform Process – Decentralization (171 EX/6, Section III). The findings are not repeated in this report which therefore focuses on the results of the evaluations of the eight Major Programme I institutes and centres.

2. The evaluations form a critical part of the Director-General's review of UNESCO institutes and centres and have taken place against the backdrop of further progress on UNESCO's decentralization reforms (161 EX/41 refers), notably the rationalization and reorganization of the network of programme implementing offices. In addition, an overall strategy for UNESCO institutes and centres and their governing bodies was developed, including principles and guidelines for category I institutes and centres (33 C/19 and 171 EX/18).

3. These principles and guidelines set out the performance expectations for the institutes/centres. In short, they are intended "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 activities of institutes and centres is devoted to **capacity-building in their respective fields of competence**" (171 EX/18 para. 17). First and foremost, the institutes/centres are intended to be **world-class centres of research and**

¹ Six MP I institutes are also classified as Category I UNESCO institutes.

² Windhoek, Cairo, Beijing, Phnom Penh, Hanoi, Bangkok, Harare, Maputo, Tehran and Islamabad.

³ South Africa, Angola and Zambia.

⁴ Yemen, Sudan, Mongolia and Lao People's Democratic Republic.

training excellence and therefore require a high degree of specialized competence and knowledge. In fulfilling their core functions as laboratories of ideas, information clearing houses, capacity-builders, standard-setters and catalysts for international cooperation, they are expected to dovetail their strategies and activities with UNESCO's overarching strategies, major programmes and main lines of activity.

4. The evaluations show that only one of the institutes/centres, IIEP, currently match up to this ideal. However, it is important to note that UNESCO's decentralization reform and the development of an overall strategy for the institutes and centres are recent developments and many of the changes are still being bedded down. It is therefore not appropriate to evaluate the institutes/centres against the benchmark of an effectively functioning, fully decentralized UNESCO system. Nevertheless, the evaluators have interpreted the vision for the institutes/centres, described in paragraph 4, as a strong signal of the level of performance expected of them and of the manner in which they are expected to function. The overall strategy for UNESCO institutes and centres has therefore laid the groundwork for recommendations to enhance the reform process.

Scope of evaluations

5. The evaluations were conducted by teams of external evaluators working under consistent terms of references and a coordinated approach. The purpose of the evaluations was to contribute to UNESCO's review of education institutes and centres in the context of its decentralization reform process, and in particular to assess:

- The **relevance** of the institutes and centres to UNESCO's programme priorities in the field of education;
- The **results achieved** by the institutes and centres, and their contributions to UNESCO's efforts in achieving EFA goals;
- The **quality of interaction and coordination** between the institutes/centres and UNESCO Headquarters, field offices, Member States and partners with regard to planning and programme implementation; and
- The **funding patterns**, mechanisms and their risks for sustained institutional capacity and the **quality of organizational management**.

6. The evaluations cover the following Major Programme I institutes and centres: International Bureau of Education (IBE); UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP); UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE); UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE); International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA); UNESCO Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC); UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES); and UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education (UNEVOC).

7. These institutes/centres have many features in common. They are institutionally part of UNESCO and their governing boards⁵ are either elected by the General Conference or appointed, in whole or in part, by the Director-General. They report to the General Conference and are governed by UNESCO's rules and regulations. They are directed by a UNESCO staff member and their overall programmes are an integral part of UNESCO's Programme and Budget (C/5). Nevertheless, the institutes and centres are also characterized by considerable diversity, differing according to

⁵ UNEVOC is the only one which does not have a governing board or advisory board.

year of creation, size (in terms of budget and staff), area of specialization (e.g. educational planning, curriculum development), location, geographical scope (e.g. some are globally oriented whereas others are regionally oriented) and status (i.e. six institutes and two centres). The attached annex provides summary comparative data on the institutes/centres.

Major findings

8. The following paragraphs summarize the major findings of the evaluations of Major Programme I institutes and centres against the four principal evaluation criteria identified in paragraph 6. A comprehensive summary of the achievements of the institutes/centres is available at <http://www.unesco.org/ios/>.

Relevance

9. Relevance was assessed from the perspective of how well aligned the programmes and activities of the institutes/centres are with the strategies and goals of UNESCO and the needs of Member States. Key considerations were the degree to which the institutes/centres and the UNESCO Secretariat undertake coordinated planning and the consistency of their activities, particularly those funded by extrabudgetary funding (EBF), with the priorities of Major Programme I.

10. In general, the programmes and activities of all eight institutes/centres are in full alignment with, or generally supportive of, UNESCO's medium-term strategic objectives, Major Programme I priorities and EFA goals. Three institutes and one centre stand out as being particularly relevant to the strategic and programmatic priorities of UNESCO and the needs of Member States: IIEP, UIE, IBE and UNEVOC. This is not surprising since these entities:

- Specialize in areas that are central to the achievement of UNESCO education priorities and EFA goals (i.e. educational planning; literacy, non-formal education; curriculum development; and technical and vocational education). In contrast, some of the other institutes/centres focus on topics (e.g. IT use in education) that are relatively new development priorities, and IICBA's formal mandate is very broad and its intended areas of specialization unclear;
- Have a global focus and reach, unlike the other institutes/centres which have an explicit or implicit regional focus: CEPES on the Europe region; IESALC on Latin America and the Caribbean; IICBA on Africa; and IITE is increasingly focusing on the CIS and Baltic region; and
- With the exception of UNEVOC, are the most established (in terms of length of history, size of budget and staffing levels) institutes/centres. The youngest of the three big institutes (IIEP, IBE and UIE) is IIEP which was established in 1963. In comparison, the three institutes that tackle relatively new priorities for development (IESALC, IITE and IICBA) were created in the second half of the 1990s.

11. It is critical that the funds devolved to the institutes/centres (15.5% of the regular budget in 2004-2005) are used for activities that are relevant to UNESCO's priorities. With this in mind, three factors would appear to be particularly important:

- First, institutes/centres should have clearly specified mandates that entail the performance of tasks that are central to the achievement of UNESCO's objectives for education. In this respect, IICBA stands out as requiring clarification of its mandate since it was originally

created to build capacity in educational planning in Africa, clearly overlapping with the mandate of IIEP, but has instead predominantly focused on teacher training;

- Second, attaining the ideal of an effectively functioning world-class institute/centre requires a critical mass of human, financial and organizational capital. Depending on the specific mandate and location of the institute/centre, there is a minimum efficient scale (in terms of budget and programme staff) required for it to function effectively. A number of the smaller institutes and centres (i.e. UNEVOC, IESALC, CEPES and IICBA), particularly those that have not raised significant EBF, are arguably operating below the minimum scale required;
- Third, the rationale for having institutes/centres with a regional rather than a global focus is not clear. While different regions face different challenges, and there is some need for regional specialization, there is a strong case for having institutes/centres that are globally rather than regionally oriented. There are likely to be synergies from locating skills, resources and capabilities in one place, whereas regionally oriented institutes/centres encourage duplication and dilution of resources. In this regard, consideration should be given to the need for two separate higher education entities (CEPES and IESALC), the sensibility of IITE's focus on the CIS and Baltic region, and clarification of IICBA's role in Africa.

Results achieved

12. The results achieved by the institutes and centres were assessed against the framework of UNESCO's principal functions as a laboratory of ideas, clearing house, standard-setter, capacity-builder in Member States and catalyst for international cooperation. As expected, different institutes/centres have different mandates, priorities and institutional capabilities and, consequently, different strengths and weaknesses. The main results are summarized below.

13. With some exceptions, the effectiveness of the institutes and centres as a *laboratory of ideas* is uneven and disappointing overall. IIEP is strong in this area, having conducted a significant amount of generally high quality and relevant research. In contrast, entities such as UIE and IICBA need to increase their research capacity and improve the consistency of research quality. A number of institutes/centres (i.e. IBE and IITE) have shifted their orientation away from research activities towards training and operational activities, owing in part to increasing dependence on EBF. Neither CEPES nor IESALC are research institutes (i.e. they do not conduct in-house research but instead commission research from outside experts).

14. The *clearing house* role is performed consistently and effectively by the institutes/centres and for IBE and IESALC is regarded as a key strength (e.g. IBE's comprehensive database of curriculum development activities in Member States is unique and highly valued within UNESCO and by external stakeholders). In general, all eight institutes/centres have been active in collecting and disseminating information, experiences and best practices through digital (e.g. websites, electronic fora and discussion groups) and other (e.g. seminars, conferences and workshops) means. Such activities have generated downstream impacts including improving access to information, raising awareness of key development issues (e.g. countering corruption in education), and facilitating exchanges of information.

15. Few institutes/centres have formal roles or responsibilities in the area of *standard setting*, thereby limiting the results that can be reported. CEPES is very active in its role as standard-setter, leading UNESCO's work on the follow-up of the Council of Europe/Lisbon Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the Europe Region. In this capacity

CEPES has initiated debate on key issues relating to European academic recognition and mobility of staff and students and has developed codes of good practice to promote recognition and mobility. UNEVOC is also active in standard-setting, administering the Convention on Technical and Vocational Education in close cooperation with the ILO. Like CEPES, IESALC is the official Secretariat for the Regional Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications in Latin America and the Caribbean but it has not been active in this role.

16. The institutes/centres contribute to *capacity-building* in Member States through training, institution-building and technical assistance among other activities. Most institutes/centres have significantly strengthened their capacity-building efforts since 1999, with a noticeable increase in operational activities financed by EBF. This strategic shift owes much to UNESCO's policy of encouraging EBF together with the trend towards decentralization of UNESCO support at country-level. IIEP stands out as having made a very positive contribution towards capacity-building in Member States – it has trained more than 5,000 people in educational planning since 1999 and has provided significant technical assistance to training institutions and government ministries. IBE, UIE and, to a lesser extent, UNEVOC have also enhanced the capacity of education institutions in Member States. Together, these entities have made a significant contribution towards progress on EFA. The outcomes from the capacity-building efforts of the other institutes/centres have been modest, in part owing to the relatively small scale of their efforts. Some institutes (i.e. IICBA, IESALC and UNEVOC) were criticized by the evaluators for a lack of focus on institutional development and follow-up on technical assistance, which has undermined the sustainability of capacity-building efforts.

17. All eight institutes and centres are active in the *promotion and facilitation of international cooperation*. IIEP acts as an effective catalyst through its networking activities (e.g. support for Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality) and is making a big difference in this area. Similarly, IBE and UNEVOC are important catalysts of international cooperation: IBE through its organization of the International Conference on Education, which has been improved in recent years; and UNEVOC by using its valuable network of 157 national centres to promote the exchange of experience in relation to issues of common concern. Other institutes/centres are also active and generally well regarded in their catalysing role, although their profile is lower than the aforementioned institutes/centres.

Quality of interaction and coordination

18. As with previous evaluations of UNESCO decentralized bodies (see document 167 EX/14), the level and quality of interaction and coordination exhibited by the education institutes/centres was found to be poor overall. Without exception, the evaluations found a need for significant improvement on this dimension of performance, although some institutes/centres perform better than others. For example, there is a generally high level and quality of engagement between IIEP, the UNESCO Secretariat and other institutes although there are also instances of overlap between IIEP and some divisions of the Education Sector, particularly EPS. In other cases, such as IITE, there is no evidence of useful cooperation with the Secretariat or other institutes, and only very limited cooperation with field offices.

19. A key reason for the poor quality of interaction and coordination relates to the low frequency of engagement and contact, resulting in poor levels of awareness. A more systemic reason is the lack of clear definition and division of roles and responsibilities among the institutes/centres and the Secretariat. For example, the formal mandates of IIEP and IICBA appear to overlap, even though in practice there is little overlap in activities, and there are a number of examples of overlap between the activities of the institutes/centres and those of the Education Sector. The lack of proactive and integrated planning processes for UNESCO as a whole was found to impede effective coordination.

While the institutes/centres operate with a high degree of functional autonomy, which offers considerable flexibility and enhanced responsiveness to the needs of Member States, this should not preclude high levels of communication and effective cooperation with other UNESCO entities.

Funding patterns

20. There has been a striking trend towards an increased share of EBF for most institutes/centres. It is now common for institutes/centres to have two to five times more EBF than regular programme funding, consistent with UNESCO's policy of encouraging EBF as a means of increasing capacity. Of the eight institutes/centres, only UNEVOC, IESALC and CEPES have not raised significant amounts of EBF.⁶

21. The increase in EBF has brought with it increased financial and operational flexibility, enabled the institutes/centres to build additional capacity, and broadened the scope of work that is possible (particularly the increase in operational activities). In addition, the ability to raise significant EBF should itself be seen as an indicator of the success of the institutes/centres. Nevertheless, the increase in EBF has generated tensions between the demands of donors and the priorities of the institutes/centres and UNESCO. Furthermore, there is a risk that ill-disciplined use of EBF could divert resources away from core priorities and result in mission-creep.

22. A balanced judgement suggests EBF has been good for the institutes/centres and UNESCO, but close monitoring is required to ensure that it does not divert the institutes/centres from their core objectives or compromise financial sustainability. A number of the institutes/centres are heavily dependent on host-country funding (i.e. UNEVOC, UIE and IITE). This is very risky, as evidenced by the German Government's decision in 2000 to phase out its regular grant to UIE by 2006, which required UIE to scale back its staff and devote significant effort to fund-raising. Some institutes (e.g. IIEP) have strategies for strengthening financial sustainability (e.g. negotiating multi-year funding, organizing Donors days, and operating stabilization reserves) but most remain vulnerable to a withdrawal of donor support.

Quality of organizational management

23. The evaluations found considerable variation in the quality of governance and organizational management of the institutes/centres. For example, IIEP and IBE were found to be well governed and managed, whereas some weaknesses were found in the governance and management of CEPES, IESALC and UNEVOC. The capacity and activism of governing boards varies across the institutes/centres, as does the quality of internal/external reporting and strategic planning. All institutes/centres could improve significantly in the area of results-based management (RBM), as the level of self-evaluation activity is generally low. A further area for improvement relates to human resource management, with a number of the institutes not having staff development plans in place or investing significantly in training.

24. While some of these shortcomings require remedial actions that are specific to each institute or centre, there are some systemic issues to be addressed. These relate particularly to the accountability arrangements for the institutes, which are deficient in a number of respects. Specific areas to be addressed include:

- *Clarification of reporting lines* – the current reporting lines place all directors and heads of education institutes and centres under the direct authority of the Education Assistant Director-General, an arrangement that was previously described by the External Auditor of

⁶ It is important to note that some of the institutes/centres are recipients of indirect, non-monetary contributions from host Member States, such as free publication services, cost sharing of conferences and so forth.

UNESCO as “experimental”. These reporting lines have recently been confirmed (see Principle I/8 in document 171 EX/18) but they nevertheless remain unorthodox (i.e. in essence, institute/centre directors have two lines of accountability:⁷ one to the ADG Education and one to their respective governing board) and should be closely monitored to ensure adequate accountability;

- *Improved specification of objectives and performance expectations* – significant improvements have been made in recent years in the setting of objectives and performance expectations for the institutes/centres (e.g. the C/5 document now routinely includes specific performance expectations for each institute/centre and this is underpinned by SISTER). However, there would be benefits in specifying objectives in greater detail in documents such as the C/5 document. Tools could also be developed to better align institute/centre funding and expected results (e.g. a contractually based funding approach would improve transparency with regard to use of the UNESCO financial allocation);
- *Improved quality of reporting* – the quality of reporting to the General Conference on the activities and results achieved by the institutes/centres remains variable. The biennial activities reports of some institutes/centres have a tendency to be dense and describe all activities performed rather than providing summary information on the results achieved. While the responsibility is with the institutes/centres to improve their reporting, the UNESCO Secretariat should play a stronger guiding role; and
- *Strengthened monitoring and review of performance* – the current Focal Point system in the Education Sector is not providing a consistently high level of oversight of the activities of the institutes/centres. Monitoring and review of the performance of the education institutes is an important ongoing function of the Secretariat and requires strengthening, possibly through the establishment of a dedicated “Institute/Centre Monitoring Unit” to oversee performance and to facilitate joint planning and coordination.

Challenges and key issues to address

25. The evaluations produced a long list of challenges for the institutes/centres, some of which are specific to the institutes/centres and others which are systemic in nature (a comprehensive summary of the key challenges and respective recommendations for each institute/centre is available at <http://www.unesco.org/ios/>). The paragraphs below discuss the systemic challenges and the corresponding issues to be addressed.

Balance between operational activities and other core functions

26. In some cases, for IIEP in particular, the evaluations noted a trend of significant growth in country- and regional-level operational activities conducted by the institutes/centres, largely financed by growth in EBF. While this is consistent with the expectation that the institutes/centres will shoulder a large part of the operational work necessary to reach EFA goals, the increase in operational activities represents a significant challenge for the institutes/centres. In particular, it has diverted focus away from other core functions (e.g. research and training). It is also somewhat at odds with UNESCO’s medium-term plan to strengthen field offices and have them shoulder more of the burden in relation to operational activities (i.e. under the decentralization strategy, the institutes/centres are intended to provide technical assistance and back-office support through the field offices).

⁷ Some institutes/centres (e.g. CEPES) also report to BFC on all non-programme related matters.

27. **Key issue to address 1:** A key issue for the institutes/centres is how to ensure an appropriate balance between operational activities and other core functions (e.g. research) without losing the responsiveness and effectiveness of the institutes/centres in providing technical assistance to Member States. In this regard, UNESCO should clarify the short- and long-term expectations regarding the role of the institutes/centres in conducting operational and other activities in Member States vis-à-vis the field offices and the Secretariat.

Research capability

28. To function effectively, institutes/centres require a high degree of specialized competence and knowledge, which in turn requires each institute/centre to be at the forefront of research in their area of specialization. Experience has shown that the type of technical competence and expertise required to develop world-class institutes/centres requires a high degree of institutional stability and development. Consequently, only the longest-lived UNESCO institutes/centres are close to attaining the level of specialized competence and capability required to be world class. The evaluations also identified a need to strengthen research capability and improve the consistency of research quality for the other institutes/centres, particularly UIE and IICBA.

29. **Key issue to address 2:** There is a general need to strengthen the research capability of the institutes/centres, particularly as this core competency underpins the effectiveness of other functions (e.g. capacity-building).

Planning and coordination

30. It is long recognized that better coordination between UNESCO education institutes/centres and the Secretariat is essential to ensure the coherence of the education programme. However, all eight evaluations concluded that the frequency and quality of interaction and coordination exhibited by the institutes/centres was poor. This coordination problem is exacerbated by planning practices that are centred around the programmatic activities of the Education Sector, such that there being little interaction between the institutes/centres and the Secretariat in relation to planning, and efforts to coordinate work programmes are ad hoc.

31. **Key issue to address 3:** Mechanisms and processes to enhance interaction and coordination between the institutes/centres and the UNESCO Secretariat are urgently needed. A priority is to introduce enhanced planning processes that facilitate a constructive dialogue between the Secretariat and the institutes/centres. Improved coordination could also be facilitated by using written agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) between Headquarters and the institutes/centres that outline the respective roles and expectations of both parties in relation to planning and coordination, particularly where responsibility for expected outcomes is shared.

Overlap with the Education Sector and other institutes/centres

32. Notwithstanding the high degree of specialization of the institutes/centres compared to other decentralized bodies, the regional focus of some institutes and the related activities of the UNESCO Secretariat highlight the potential for overlap, duplication and inefficient use of scarce resources. The evaluations found a number of instances of overlap between the mandates of institutes/centres. A particular case is that of IICBA, which has a mandate for educational planning in Africa that overlaps with IIEP's global mandate in this area. There is also ambiguity and confusion of roles and responsibilities between the institutes/centres and the Secretariat (e.g. both IIEP and the Division of Educational Policies and Strategies (EPS) have responsibilities for providing technical assistance to Member States in relation to national planning for EFA). The problem of overlap is exacerbated by: a perception of overlapping accountabilities between the institutes/centres and the Education Sector

in relation to the expected outcomes specified in Major Programme I; planning processes that do not facilitate a constructive dialogue between the Secretariat and institutes/centres; and competition between UNESCO entities for EBF.

33. **Key issue to address 4:** There is an urgent need to further clarify the respective roles of the institutes/centres, the Education Sector and field offices. This would go some way to reducing actual and potential future overlaps. In particular, a clear determination is required on the question of whether IICBA should play a role in educational planning in Africa, or whether it should fully focus on the initiative for teacher training in sub-Saharan Africa.

Governance and accountability

34. For the institutes/centres to function effectively, and in line with the prevailing priorities of UNESCO, strong governance and accountability arrangements are required. The evaluations generally confirm the view expressed in document 171 EX/18 that “the work of the institutes and centres is enhanced, not reduced, by [functional] autonomy and flexibility”. However, the evaluations also find evidence of lack of clarity in the governance and accountability arrangements, which undermine the benefits of functional autonomy. A key area of weakness is the lack of monitoring and oversight of the performance of the institutes/centres by the Secretariat on behalf of the General Conference. In addition, there is weak accountability in relation to the UNESCO financial allocation, which could be strengthened by introducing a contractually based funding approach, especially for service related functions, in relation to the UNESCO financial allocation.

35. **Key issue to address 5:** Governance and accountability arrangements could be strengthened through a contractually based funding approach to determine the intended use of the financial allocation for each institute/centre and by establishing a dedicated “Institute/Centre Monitoring Unit”. The role of the monitoring unit would encompass: resource requirements and negotiation of Memoranda of Understanding (see para. 31) and funding agreements as appropriate; management of the Board appointment process; and monitoring performance of the institutes/centres. The unit performing the monitoring could also be the main conduit for non-operational engagement between Headquarters and the institutes/centres (e.g. in relation to planning), as well as providing guidance and stewardship on raising extrabudgetary funding.

Critical mass, synergies and global versus regional focus

36. The evaluations found that a number of the smaller institutes/centres (i.e. UNEVOC, IESALC, CEPES and IICBA) are arguably too small to function at a world-class level. The evaluations also raised questions about the rationale for having institutes/centres with a regional rather than a global focus in light of this lack of critical mass. Building world-class centres of research and training excellence (whether globally or regionally oriented) requires significant human, financial and organizational capital. There are likely to be synergies from locating these skills, resources and capabilities in one place or merging some into one entity.

37. **Key issue to address 6:** Strategic decisions are required on whether to discontinue or bolster the capability of the smaller institutes. Consideration might be given, in order to promote global focus and synergies, to a possible merger between CEPES and IESALC or UNEVOC and UIE, and the sensibility of IITE’s focus on the CIS and Baltic region should be re-examined.

Strengthening results-based management

38. A final issue of consistent weakness identified by the evaluations is that of RBM. In general, the level of self-evaluation activity is low and few institutes/centres are evaluated externally on a

regular basis. Furthermore, the specification of expected outcomes and the content of internal/external reporting emphasizes the completion of tasks and activities to the exclusion of intermediate and final outcomes. This limits the usefulness of results-based data for decision-making purposes. While each institute/centre should take steps to improve RBM practices, there is a need for more guidance and training by the UNESCO Secretariat.

39. **Key issue to address 7:** Some specific actions have already been taken following the first tranche of institute/centre evaluations (e.g. RBM training for UNEVOC). The second tranche of evaluations confirmed a general need for strengthening of RBM practices and, consequently, there is a need for a major programme of RBM training for other institutes/centres.

Actions taken/to be taken by the Director-General

40. The Director-General welcomes the evaluations of Major Programme I institutes and centres, and notes the findings of the evaluators. The Director-General has already taken necessary actions and has:

- (a) established a Steering Group, under the chairmanship of the DDG, with an objective to provide a set of key strategic recommendations regarding the future configuration of category I institutes and centres;
- (b) initiated, via the Steering Group, the process for addressing some of the critical issues identified by the evaluators, such as clarification of reporting lines, coordination with Headquarters and strengthening of results-based management;
- (c) initiated, via the Steering Group, the process of investigating options for the establishment of a dedicated “Institute/Centre Monitoring Unit” to oversee the performance of institutes and centres and to facilitate joint planning and coordination; and
- (d) committed to promoting institutional alliances whenever practical and within the resources available. He recognizes that a merger of UNEVOC and UIE would help to secure a better utilization of scarce resources. However, he believes that institutes or centres with a regional focus are appropriate and necessary from the angle of an efficient utilization of scarce resources, it being understood that the work of such an institute or centre (with a regional focus) should not duplicate that of other institutes or centres with global responsibility.

Proposed draft decision

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

The Executive Board,

1. Having examined document 174 EX/20 and taking into consideration the biennial evaluation report that has been presented,
2. Taking note of the key issues to be addressed, which were identified by the evaluators, as well as the report of the Director-General on actions taken and to be taken,
3. Invites the Director-General to address in an appropriate manner the key issues raised by the evaluators, which will improve the overall performance of institutes and centres;
4. Welcomes the Director-General’s decision to establish a Steering Group on institutes and centres; and

5. Requests the Director-General to report to the Executive Board on progress made by the Steering Group in defining the strategic direction and configuration of institutes and centres, as well as on progress made in the implementation of evaluation recommendations.

ANNEX

COMPARATIVE DATA ON UNESCO MAJOR PROGRAMME I INSTITUTES/CENTRES

| This document has been printed on recycled paper. Name of institute/centre | Year of creation | Location | Specialization | Regional focus | Governance/Advisory Board | UNESCO Financial Allocation RP 32 C/5 in USD ⁸ | Total staff |
|---|--|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|---|------------------|
| UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE) | 1925 (integrated into UNESCO in 1969) | Geneva, Switzerland | Curriculum development | Global | Representatives of 28 Member States elected by General Conference for a four-year period | 4.591 million | 15 (6 vacant) |
| UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) | 1963 | Paris, France | Educational planning and management | Global | 12 members, four designated and eight elected (including Chairperson) | 5.1 million | 91 |
| UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) | 1952 | Hamburg, Germany | Literacy, non-formal education, adult and lifelong learning | Global | 11 members appointed by the Director-General for a four-year period | 1.9 million | 28 |
| UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) | 1997 | Moscow, Russian Federation | Application of ICTs in education | CIS and Baltic States | 11 members appointed by the Director-General for a four-year period | 1.1 million | 44 |
| UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC) | 1997 | Caracas, Venezuela | Higher education | Latin America and the Caribbean | 13 members (four appointed by the Director-General and nine elected by Member States of the region) appointed for four-year period | 2.2 million | 17 |
| UNESCO Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA) | 1999 | Addis Ababa, Ethiopia | Teacher training | Africa | 12 members appointed by the Director-General for a three- to four-year period | 2 million | 17 |
| UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) | 1972 | Bucharest, Romania | Higher education | Europe region | 12 members serving for four-year periods (eight nominated by the Director-General and four designated by international organizations which have observer status) | 0.548 million | 23 (1 vacant) |
| UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training (UNEVOC) | 2000 | Bonn, Germany | Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) | Global | An action is being taken currently to establish an Advisory Board | 0.287 million | 11 (1 vacant) |

⁸ For IBE, IIEP, UIE, IITE, IESALC and IICBA the source of data is document 32 C/5, and for CEPES and UNEVOC the data was extracted from FABS and represents respectively, for CEPES the total operating funds decentralized, and for UNEVOC the total regular programme funds.