

Hundred and sixty-first Session

161 EX/41
PARIS, 7 May 2001
Original: English

Item 3.2.4 of the provisional agenda

**PROPOSALS ON AN OVERALL STRATEGY FOR UNESCO'S
EDUCATION INSTITUTES AND THEIR GOVERNING BODIES**

SUMMARY

As a follow-up to 30 C/Resolution 2, the Director-General submits a progress report on the elaboration of an overall strategy for UNESCO's education institutes/centres and their governing bodies.

Decision required: paragraph 28.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Background
- II. Summary description of the UNESCO education institutes and centres
- III. Policy issues
 - Institutional identity of the institutes
 - Mandate of the institutes and their role within UNESCO's education programme
 - Evaluation
 - Ensuring programme coherence while preserving autonomy
 - Coordination issues
 - Interaction at the field level
 - Administrative issues
 - Role and obligations of the host countries
- IV. Conclusions and draft decision
- Annex Comparative data on UNESCO education institutes/centres

I. Background

1. The Executive Board, at its 155th session, having examined the “Report by the Director-General on coordination among UNESCO education institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat” (155 EX/6) invited the Director-General *inter alia* “to continue his consultations with the governing bodies of the institutes concerned with a view to preparing a coherent programme for the biennium 2000-2001 (30 C/5)” and further invited the Director-General “to ensure the development of a modern communication infrastructure allowing Headquarters, field offices and UNESCO education institutes and centres closely connected with the Organization’s programmes to cooperate as a dynamic network of specialized institutes at the service of Member States”. When examining the Draft Programme and Budget for 2000-2001, the Executive Board concluded at its 156th session that “a better coordination among UNESCO education institutes and between the institutes and the Secretariat at and away from Headquarters is essential to ensure the coherence of the education programme”.

2. The General Conference, at its 30th session, invited the Director-General to establish a system of coordination and division of labour between the Secretariat at Headquarters and all units away from Headquarters, in particular the UNESCO education institutes, field offices and affiliated institutes, on the basis of 29 C/Resolution 7 and of the relevant recommendations of the External Auditor; and to submit “proposals on an overall strategy, including coordination mechanisms, to the 161st session of the Executive Board, addressing the need to improve the coherence and implementation of the education programme as well as the cost-effectiveness and the functioning of the UNESCO education institutes and their governing bodies” (30 C/Resolution 2, para. 1).

3. At the same session, the General Conference invited the Director-General to undertake a major review of the Organization’s decentralization policy and adopted “basic criteria for the rational implementation of decentralization” (30 C/Resolution 83).

4. Guided by these decisions and resolutions, the Director-General included the development of a rational decentralization strategy among the priorities of his reform programme, it being understood that the issue of education institutes could not be dealt with in isolation from the redesign of UNESCO’s overall decentralized system. As a first step, the Director-General concentrated on the rationalization of the field office network, a task that proved extremely difficult and time-consuming. With the final decision on clusters of Member States and cluster offices made in early 2001, this new network is now being implemented. As a next step, the Director-General has initiated a review of UNESCO’s institutes and centres, which form another key part of the Organization’s decentralized system. It is to be noted that the Director-General believes that such a review should cover all UNESCO institutes and centres rather than education institutes/centres only. For this purpose, he has established a task force that is chaired by the Deputy Director-General and includes representatives of various sectors and services at Headquarters as well as directors of institutes/centres and selected field offices.

5. UNESCO institutes and centres can be roughly divided into two main groups: those who are part of UNESCO and those who are associated with the Organization in one way or another without being institutionally part of it. The institutes belonging to the first group are governed by statutes and resolutions adopted by the General Conference; they are headed by a UNESCO staff member and their financial rules and regulations follow closely the financial policies and procedures of UNESCO. The institutes and centres falling in the second group

are associated with the Organization through agreements or contracts. They do not apply UNESCO's financial rules and regulations nor does a staff member head them.

6. With regard to the institutes and centres that are part of UNESCO, the Task Force has been working to:

- (a) review their functioning, including their respective mandates, structure, staffing, funding and administrative procedures, their interrelations with their governing bodies and those of UNESCO, as well as with Headquarters and field offices;
- (b) propose ways and means to ensure their rational integration into the new decentralized network and to optimize coordination, interaction and division of labour among those institutes and centres, Headquarters and field offices;
- (c) propose measures to improve planning, monitoring, reporting and evaluation mechanisms so as to ensure that the activities of those institutes and centres meet UNESCO's priorities and contribute in a meaningful way to the Organization's strategies and programmes;
- (d) identify measures to address their staff needs, in terms of recruitment, career development and training, within the framework of the UNESCO human resources policy and the biennial programme and budget.

7. As far as the institutes and centres sponsored by or associated with UNESCO are concerned, the Task Force will:

- (a) examine the legal aspects of their association with UNESCO and in conformity with the established procedures, as described in DG/Note/00/16 of 28 July 2000;
- (b) assess their contribution to UNESCO's programme implementation;
- (c) propose a strategy and mechanisms to ensure synergy between their activities and UNESCO's programmes and to the extent possible harmonize approaches.

8. The Task Force will also reflect on criteria for the establishment of new UNESCO institutes and centres.

9. Given the decision of the Executive Board to place the item "Proposals on an overall strategy of UNESCO education institutes and their governing bodies" on the agenda of its 161st session, the Director-General decided to focus the work of the Task Force during the first phase exclusively on the UNESCO institutes and centres working in the field of education. The considerations laid down in this document, therefore, represent an initial contribution to the formulation of a new strategy concerning UNESCO's institutes and centres in general. The Director-General seeks the guidance of the Executive Board and proposes that the debate on this item be continued at the next session of the Board and, if so desired, be included in the agenda of the General Conference.

II. Summary description of the UNESCO education institutes and centres

10. Among the first group of education institutes and centres the following eight institutes and centres are to be considered (for details see Annex):

(1) UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE) Geneva

Established in 1925 as a non-governmental education centre, became the first intergovernmental organization in the field of education in 1929; is part of UNESCO as of 1969

Area of competence: information exchange, capacity-building and policy dialogue in the field of educational contents, methods, structures and curriculum development

Geographical coverage: international

(2) UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) Paris

Established in 1963

Area of competence: advanced training and research in the field of educational planning and administration and capacity-building in the field.

Geographical coverage: international with developing countries as priority

(3) UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE) Hamburg

Established in 1952

Area of competence: adult education and lifelong learning including adult basic education, literacy and non-formal education

Geographical coverage: international with developing countries as priority

(4) UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE) Moscow

Established in 1997

Area of competence: information exchange, research and training concerning the application of information and communication technologies in education

Geographical coverage: international with focus on the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States

(5) UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC) Caracas

Created as Regional Centre for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean in 1976, *converted* into an institute in 1998

Area of competence: reform of higher education, recognition of studies and diplomas, inter-university cooperation

Geographical coverage: regional – Latin America and the Caribbean

(6) UNESCO International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa Addis Ababa

Established in 1999

Area of competence: capacity-building in the field of teacher education and curriculum development

Geographical coverage: regional – Africa

(7) UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES) Bucharest

Established in 1972

Area of competence: reform of higher education, recognition of studies and diplomas, inter-university cooperation

Geographical coverage: Europe region (the countries of Europe, North America and Israel), with focus on countries in transition

(8) UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training (UNEVOC) Bonn

Established in 2000 as a result of an international project launched in 1992

Area of competence: clearing house and networking in the field of technical and vocational education and training, coordination unit of the UNEVOC-network

Geographical coverage: international with developing countries as priority

11. The first six of this group are traditionally designated as UNESCO education institutes: they receive a global allocation which is approved by the General Conference and covers both programme and staff costs. They report to the General Conference and enjoy intellectual and functional autonomy. CEPES (Bucharest) and UNEVOC (Bonn) do not have the same level of autonomy. They are run as field offices, i.e. their programme budget and their staff are part of the Education Sector's budget and staff establishment. Two institutes/centres which could have been mentioned are not included in the above list: the Asia-Pacific Centre of Educational Innovation and Development (ACEID) in Bangkok and the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS). ACEID represents a special case: although its name suggests that it is an autonomous centre, it is in reality not. The name is due to the fact that the Asia-Pacific Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID) received in its early years major extrabudgetary funds, which required a separate structure. Today ACEID is a section of the UNESCO Bangkok Office. The UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS), although responsible for UNESCO's education statistics, is excluded from this study because of its transdisciplinary mandate.

12. The second group of institutes and centres forms a rather complex pattern with a variety of structures and operation modes. According to the definition chosen it could include even more institutions than mentioned below. For the purpose of this document it is proposed to limit the list to the following institutes/centres mentioned in the Programme and Budget for 2000-2001:

1. International Research and Training Centre for Rural Education (INRULED), Baoding, China

Established in 1994

Area of competence: capacity-building in rural education

Geographical coverage: Developing countries, in particular in Asia and Africa

Governance: UNESCO is represented on the Governing Board

2. International Literacy Institute (ILI), Philadelphia, United States

Established in 1994

Area of competence: literacy and non-formal education

Geographical coverage: international, mainly the developing countries

Governance: the Director-General of UNESCO serves *ex-officio* on the Board

3. Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (ACEIU), Inchon, Kyunggi Province, Republic of Korea

Established in 2000

Area of competence: promotion of international understanding through education

Geographical coverage: regional (Asia and the Pacific)

Governance: the Director-General appoints three members, including a staff member

4. International Academy for Education and Democracy, Copenhagen, Denmark

Established in 2000

Area of competence: education for peace and democracy

Geographical coverage: activities in all regions

Governance: UNESCO to appoint a member of the Board

5. International Institute for Youth, Lilongwe, Malawi

Established in 1997

Area of competence: guidance, counselling and youth development programmes

Geographical coverage: focus on Africa

Governance: UNESCO is represented on the Board

Under preparation:

International Centre for the Education of Girls and Women, Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso);

International Centre for Special Needs Education, New Delhi (India).

13. It is to be noted that the UNESCO associated institutes and centres are privileged partners of the Organization and part of UNESCO's extension network. Some were founded with the assistance of UNESCO; in other cases, UNESCO agreed that its name and logo could be used. Relations with these centres and institutes are usually based on agreements or contracts, in some cases even decisions of the General Conference. Financial support given to them is considered a programme activity under a given subprogramme. They are, however, not part of UNESCO's institutional set-up and, therefore, not primarily targeted by the document. Support given to them and coordination of their activities are being ensured in the framework of the relevant programmes and subprogrammes constituting Major Programme I.

III. Policy issues submitted to the Executive Board for discussion

Institutional identity of the institutes/centres

14. The statutes of the six institutes and two centres considered under the first group use different terminology to describe their institutional identity: IBE was "integrated into UNESCO", IIEP was "established in the framework of UNESCO", UIE was established by UNESCO as a foundation under the German law, etc. Notwithstanding these constitutional differences, which may or may not have to be adjusted in the course of the exercise, it is evident that all institutes have a clear institutional identity as a UNESCO institute. This implies that they are guided and inspired by the Constitution of the Organization and its programme priorities, governed by its rules and regulations and subject to the decisions of the General Conference and the Director-General. In order to clarify their status it might even be said that they are autonomous units within the Secretariat, autonomy being defined as delegation of authority by the General Conference to the respective governing bodies and by the Director-General to the directors of the institutes. The scope and limitations of the autonomy granted are laid down in the respective statutes approved by the General Conference and other administrative documents approved by the Director-General. It is up to him and the General Conference to decide whether their status should be maintained or modified. A reconfirmed institutional identity as "UNESCO Institutes" would have important implications for most of the policy issues presented below in so far as all achievements/failures of the institutes are automatically to be considered as achievements/failures of UNESCO as a whole.

Mandate of the institutes and their role within UNESCO's education programme

15. It is equally important that the institutes under consideration be clearly identified as education institutes contributing in their respective mandate to the implementation of UNESCO's education programme. In line with UNESCO's role as an organization for intellectual cooperation, the institutes serve in their fields of specialization as international reference centres and poles of expertise which can provide services and technical assistance to Member States, cooperation partners and also internally to the network of field offices and existing networks. By implementing the programme approved by their governing bodies they are expected to contribute directly to attaining the objectives of Major Programme I and, more specifically, the goals formulated in the Dakar Framework for Action. In the course of their historical development, the institutes have acquired very diverse technical competences. In addition to serving as clearing house and reference centres, they provide training and undertake research-based pilot projects. Policy advice, exchange of experience, capacity-building and networking are strong components of their programmes. One of their characteristics is the established links with the professional community working in their field of specialization. With the help of these networks they mobilize expertise and provide services to Member States, cooperation partners and also internally to Headquarters and the network of field offices.

16. The present mandates and fields of competence of each institute are well known and generally accepted. However, these mandates need to be constantly adapted to reflect the changing needs of the Organization and of emerging trends and challenges in the field of education. Thus, in the light of the Dakar Framework for Action and the Draft Medium-Term Strategy and Programme and Budget 2002-2003, there may be a need for redefinition and adjustments so as to formally entrust specific functions to one or another institute (e.g. the implementation of activities in the field of preventive education against HIV/AIDS to IIEP). As there has never been a systematic and comparative review of the respective mandates and roles of all institutes, the Executive Board may wish to invite the institutes and their governing bodies to prepare collectively – in close cooperation with the Education Sector – an agreed mission statement outlining the role of the institutes in the implementation of the new Medium-Term Strategy. Once prepared and available the Executive Board may wish to consider the document and formulate its observations.

Evaluation

17. That proposal is closely linked with the question whether or not it would be desirable to undertake an external evaluation of the collective achievements of the institutes. So far, several evaluations of individual institutes have been carried out at the request of their governing bodies. The reports were used to make internal adjustments and, as for instance in the case of IBE, helped to redefine its programme priorities. In 1999, the former Director of the Institute of Education, University of London, Mr Denis Lawton, prepared a report of the three "traditional" institutes IBE, IIEP and UIE (text available upon request). However, there has been no systematic evaluation of the collective impact of institutes on educational reform and development in Member States nor assessment of their relative importance in UNESCO's programme. The main issue to be examined in such an evaluation would be to review UNESCO's policy concerning the institutes as part of its overall decentralization strategy. Should the Executive Board deem that such an external evaluation is desirable, a group of Member States – preferably those who do not host an institute on their territory – may be interested in sponsoring and implementing it. In addition, the Board may wish to formally invite the governing bodies to foresee internal and external programme evaluations which

should be coordinated with the Office of Internal Oversight (IOS) and the Bureau for Strategic Planning (BSP). Institutes should follow the same policy and practice in the field of evaluation as other units of the Secretariat.

Ensuring programme coherence while preserving autonomy

18. One of the major criticisms of the External Auditor in relation with UNESCO's education programme was to state that the "strategic planning process is deficient" (cf. document 155 EX/27 Addendum, Annex 1, p. 27). In fact, the institutes are involved in the Organization's planning processes, including the preparation and the follow-up of the World Education Forum in Dakar, the preparation of the new Medium-Term Strategy and the preparation of the new Programme and Budget 2002-2003 represent a major exercise of strategic planning, in which the institutes have been fully involved. The same is true for the organization of other world conferences such as the fifth International Conference on Adult Education – CONFINTEA (Hamburg, 1997), the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, 1998), the Second International Congress on Technical and Vocational Education (Seoul, 1999), and the forty-sixth session of the International Conference on Education to be held in Geneva, from 5 to 7 September 2001. Subject to the approval of the General Conference, the Organization will have formulated clear priorities and targets in the field of education that provide a stable programmatic framework for the years ahead. All activities will have to be conceived in such a way so as to contribute to the objectives set in those documents. However, while considerable efforts are made by the institutes to ensure adequate programming of their activities, there appears to be a need to ensure that they are adequately involved in the overall reform process of the Organization and in the new results-based programming processes.

19. In the past, programme activities of the institutes used to be planned rather autonomously within the overall mandate given to them. In order for UNESCO to play its role as the United Nations agency specialized in education and in particular as coordinating agency of the Dakar process effectively, it will be necessary to introduce new procedures at the planning and programming stage. Further possibilities of joint action such as joint publications or a coordinated website could be explored. To improve coherence and avoid fragmentation it will in particular be necessary for the institutes to use and contribute to the central information systems. In addition, greater programmatic coherence will need to be ensured through adequate consultation mechanisms and exchanges of information with the Education Sector and central services.

Coordination issues

20. The Executive Board discussed the coordination among UNESCO institutes and between the institutes and Headquarters at its 155th session (cf. document 155 EX/6, para. 17). The proposals made at that time are still valid, i.e. under the overall responsibility of the Assistant Director-General for Education, coordination is achieved by the following measures:

- (a) representation of the Director-General at the different governing boards/councils of the institutes;
- (b) inviting the Directors of the institutes to prepare their programmes and budgets in close consultation with the relevant programme divisions and central services;

- (c) regularly evaluating the implementation of the institutes' programmes and activities;
- (d) organizing regular meetings with the Directors of the different institutes;
- (e) encouraging direct contacts between the Directors of programme divisions and staff of the institute;
- (f) making budgetary allocations according to the overall priorities of the Organization.

21. During the past few years, the expanded use of modern information technologies, in particular the use of e-mail, has not just increased but also substantially improved the communication and cooperation between the institutes and other units of the Secretariat. There is even a risk that too much staff time is allocated for consultation, coordination and reporting. Efforts will have to be made to ensure that coordination contributes to improving programme delivery without becoming a bureaucratic burden. In this spirit the Assistant Director-General for Education and his Executive Office will continue to coordinate and facilitate the operations of the institutes, while the relevant programme divisions at Headquarters will be the institutes' counterparts on substantive issues.

Interaction at the field level

22. Special attention should be given to interaction between institutes/centres and UNESCO Offices at the field level. UNESCO's education programme is to a large extent decentralized and it is the Organization's explicit policy that the countries are to be "in the driver's seat". Close coordination and, where adequate, joint programming and implementation of activities with the newly established cluster offices and remaining country offices will, therefore, be essential in order to avoid duplication of efforts and redundancies in fund-raising activities. Without taking away from the institutes/centres the right to have direct contacts with their respective partners, the field offices need to be informed and, as far as possible, involved in the institutes' activities at country level. New procedures will have to be worked out in order to foster synergies and cooperative arrangements. The unity and coherence of the Organization's programme at field level will be promoted through the development of national action plans as foreseen in the Dakar Framework for Action. Furthermore, field units will be encouraged to make better use of the institutes' professional expertise, while the institutes should increasingly entrust to them the execution of relevant national and regional activities.

23. Such interaction is all the more necessary in the case of institutes having a regional focus/mandate. This is the case of IESALC, which is to target the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean, and IICBA, which addresses the needs of African countries, while IITE, although international in scope, gives priority to capacity-building in the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

24. A related issue in this respect is the current geographical coverage pattern of the existing institutes/centres. It is to be noted that the three "traditional" institutes, that are truly international in scope, are located in Europe. The three new institutes, whose creation was intended to diversify the location of UNESCO's education institutes, are more focused on their respective regions. The question before the governing bodies is whether this orientation should be pursued.

Administrative issues

25. IBE, IIEP, UIE, IITE, IESALC and IICBA receive each a financial allocation covering both staff and programme costs. CEPES and UNEVOC are administered in the same way as Headquarters units and field offices. The Executive Board may wish to consider whether all institutes/centres should be treated administratively in the same manner. Depending on its decision, it may be necessary to develop in detail and for each institute administrative rules and procedures and to train their administrative officers accordingly. Likewise, the staff rules may have to be modified in order to allow the institutes to manage their human resources in a simplified and more flexible manner.

Role and obligations of the host countries

26. All UNESCO institutes in the field of education are located away from Headquarters and receive substantial support from their respective host countries. This includes in all cases rent-free office space (in the case of IBE, Switzerland granted a substantial down-payment [36% of the total investment] an interest-free loan for the acquisition of office space), technical support and facilities, contributions for programme activities and staff (in some cases local staff is provided on secondment). The General Conference has regularly expressed its appreciation for the support received. In order to ensure the operations of the institutes on a long-term basis, the Director-General envisages, however, to review the existing host country arrangements and, if necessary to renegotiate them with the relevant authorities. If the need should arise for instance in the case of limited financial resources, he may have to propose alternative solutions for a specific institute such as its conversion into an associated institute, its relocation or the transfer of its functions to other units within the Secretariat. It is obvious that the Organization will not be able to maintain the institutes without substantial support from the host countries or other extrabudgetary sources.

IV. Conclusions and draft decision

27. The Organization is going through a period of profound transformation and reforms, which calls for a thorough review of all existing arrangements. This process is driven by the need to refocus, revitalize and modernize UNESCO, which is strongly felt by both the Member States and the Secretariat. The constraint of zero nominal growth budget makes this process particularly challenging. Under these circumstances, the need for concentration and prioritization of programme activities is ever more pressing, especially in Major Programme I, which represents the largest part of the regular budget. In addition, the new results-based programming and budgeting process and instruments imply a review of programming, evaluation (relevance, effectiveness, impact) and functioning of all parts of the Organization, with a view to ensuring the harmonization of approaches and programme coherence. Furthermore, the new decentralization strategy approved by the governing bodies, has redesigned UNESCO's network of field offices and attributed new functions to cluster offices and regional bureaux, which may affect the *opus moderandi* of UNESCO institutes/centres and the determination of their priorities, objectives and activities.

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

The Executive Board,

1. Recalling 30 C/Resolution 2 and 30 C/Resolution 83,
2. Having examined document 161 EX/41,
3. Takes note of the work carried out so far by the Secretariat with regard to preparing proposals on an overall strategy for UNESCO's education institutes and their governing bodies,
4. Invites the Director-General to continue the initiated review of UNESCO institutes and centres, extending it to all the Organization's fields of competence, so as to consider the continued operation of and support to each institute/centre against alternative modalities of providing equivalent or better programme support for UNESCO activities, based on:
 - (a) levels of performance of each institute/centre against appropriate performance indicators of programme delivery, including those covering excellence, impact and relevance;
 - (b) the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of current systems of governance in UNESCO institutes/centres;
5. Further invites the Director-General to submit to it at its 162nd session proposals on a strategy for UNESCO institutes and centres, within UNESCO's overall decentralization strategy, as well as recommendations with regard to each existing UNESCO institute or centre.

ANNEX

COMPARATIVE DATA ON UNESCO EDUCATION INSTITUTES/CENTRES
(based on replies to the questionnaire)

UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE), Geneva, Switzerland

Year of creation	Created in 1925 as an independent education center for international understanding, it became the first intergovernmental organization in the field of education in 1929; it became part of UNESCO in 1969.			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO (15 C/Res. 14.1, 19 C/Res.1.521, 21 C/Res.1.13, 24 C/Res.4.3, 25 C/Res.1.2.1, 28 C/Res.1.10 and 22, 29 C/Res.3, 30 C/Res.3) Agreement on ownership of part of the building (1999)			
Council (Governing board)	Representatives of 28 Member States elected by the General Conference for a 4-year period (half of the members change every two years)			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 2000): Ms Cecilia Braslavsky, D-2 (Argentina), appointed following international competitive selection under the supervision of the Chairperson of the IBE Council and close monitoring of the Council's Steering Committee 18 UNESCO staff: 1 D-2; 1 P-5 (funded by the host country); 2 P-4, 4 P-3; 2 P-2, 2 G-6; 3 G-5; 2 G-4; 1 G-1 (1 P-4 and 1 G-4 under recruitment) 9 non-UNESCO staff: 4 professional (short-term), 5 service (temporary)			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference Financial autonomy, with Financial Regulations and Rules approved by the Executive Board Accountable to the Council and to UNESCO (special account set up in 1994)			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO*	Host country	Extrabudgetary**
	Programme	861,800	570,000	1,805,000
	Staff costs	3,265,000	120,000	330,000
	Indirect costs	488,000		
	Premises	138,000		
	Total	<i>4,752,800</i>	<i>690,000</i>	<i>2,135,000</i>
In-kind contribution	2 associate experts (Netherlands); 1 professional (France); 1 professional (Togo); 1 professional (Switzerland); 2 young professionals (UNEVOC Canada)			
Main programme activities (1996-2001)	Capacity-building and networking for curriculum development: - 12 meetings organized at regional and subregional levels Observatory/platform on educational content, structures and methods: - development of databanks on national education systems (World Data on Education); educational innovations (INNODATA) - resources and information made available through the website Policy dialogue: organization of the International Conference on Education (45th session, 1996; 46th session, 2001) Publications: - <i>Prospects</i> (UNESCO journal on education) Surveys, comparative studies; meeting reports, educational practices, monographs on educational innovations.			
Reporting system	Director to the IBE Council (every year) Director to the Director-General and ADG/ED President of the IBE Council to the General Conference Financial report to the Financial Comptroller of the Organization			
Evaluation	Annual evaluations by the Council; an external evaluation report (1996) upon the request of the Council			

* In addition, UNESCO pays a mortgage of 200,000 SF per year for the building that belongs to the Organization (cf. 30 C/5, para. 16003).

** Includes estimated income for 2001.

**UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)
Paris (France)**

Year of creation	1963			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO (1962) (12 C/Res.1.213; 14 C/Res.14; 15 C/Res.13; 30 C/Res.4) Host-country agreement between the Government of the French Republic and UNESCO (1954) applicable; instrument sent by the French authorities providing the Institute's building (1970)			
Governing board	12 members, 4 designated and 8 elected (including the Chairperson)			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 1999): Mr Gudmund Hernes, D-2 (Norway), appointed upon the recommendation of the Governing Board following international competitive selection 49 UNESCO staff: 1 D-2; 1 D-1; 4 P-5; 5 P-4; 9 P-3; 4 P-1/P-2; 3 G-7; 5 G-6; 6 G-5; 10 G-4; 1 G-3 Non-UNESCO staff: 7 professional; 16 service			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference. Financial regulations and rules under the IIEP Special Account. Accountable to the Governing Board			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	1,234,038		2,820,400
	Staff costs	3,245,000		3,655,000
	Indirect costs	165,000	121,312	700,000
	Total	4,644,038	121,312	7,175,400
In-kind contribution	The building is provided free-of-charge by the French Government (estimated at US \$1 million yearly)			
Main programme activities (1996-2001)	Contribution to the reform and reconstruction of education systems in Member States through applied research, advisory services and technical support Reinforcement of national capacities in policy planning, management and evaluation of education through training Training of educational managers, planners and administrators Execution of operational programmes at the request of Member States			
Reporting system	Director to the Governing Board (yearly) Chairperson of the Governing Board to the General Conference			
Evaluation	Evaluation carried out by the Executive Board (142 EX/12), 1993 An evaluation carried out by ADEA (Association for the Development of Education in Africa), 1994 An evaluation carried out in 1996 by SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), 1996			

**UNESCO Institute for Education (UIE)
Hamburg (Germany)**

Year of creation	1952			
Statutes and host-country agreements	A foundation according to German Civil Law to which UNESCO staff members are detached, endorsed by several resolutions of the General Conference, 30 C/Res.5 Host-country agreement: discussions under way			
Governing board	11 members appointed by the Director-General for a 4-year period			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 1999): Mr Adama Ouane, D-2 (Mali), appointed upon the recommendation of the Governing Board following an international competitive selection 5 UNESCO staff: 1 D-2; 3 P-5; 1 P-4 16 non-UNESCO staff: 7 professional; 8 service (host-country contribution); 1 professional (Belgium)			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference Financial autonomy: accountable to the Governing Board, which appoints an external auditor			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	828,000	742,000	979,000
	Staff costs	1,256,000	1,250,000	85,000
	Indirect costs	67,000	171,500	34,000
	Total	2,151,000	2,163,500	1,098,000
In-kind contribution	Host country: building provided free-of-charge (estimated at US \$170,000 per annum) 1 professional seconded by Belgium			
Main programme activities (1996-2001)	Preparation and organization of the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA V, 1997); coordination of its follow-up; Research, capacity-building and exchange of experience in the field of adult and lifelong learning; Follow-up to the Dakar World Education Forum (Objective 4); Organization of Global Dialogue 7 “Building Learning Societies – Knowledge, Information and Human Development” (World Exposition, Hanover, 2000); Publications: <i>International Review of Education</i> (international journal on comparative theory and practice of formal and non-formal education, quarterly); monographs and reports on literacy and adult education; Information network ALADIN (Adult learning and Documentation Network)			
Reporting system	Director to the Governing Board and its Standing Committee (twice a year) Director to the Director-General and to the ADG/ED Chairperson of the Governing Board to the General Conference			
Evaluation	A management audit done by IOM, 1999 A programme assessment carried out at the request of the Governing Board, 1999 A fact-finding mission undertaken by SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), 2000 An external evaluation under way at the request of the Governing Board, UNESCO and the German Government			

**UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE)
Moscow (Russian Federation)**

Year of creation	1997			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO (29 /Res.6; 30 C/Res.6) Host-country agreement: 1996			
Governing board	11 members appointed by the Director-General for a 4-year period			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 1998): Mr Vladimir Kinelev, D-1 (Russian Federation), appointed by the Director-General 3 UNESCO staff: 1 D-1; 1 NOD; 1 NOC Non-UNESCO staff: 20 professional; 24 service			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference Financial autonomy, accountable to the Governing Board (special account set up in 1999)			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	518,280		
	Staff costs	538,520		
	Indirect costs	143,200		
	Total	1,200,000		
In-kind contribution	Host country: Detached staff: 20 professional, 24 service (estimated at US \$50,000 yearly); Building/equipment (estimated at US \$1,210,000 yearly); Programme (estimated at US \$481,500 for biennium) Private sector: 2 computer classrooms (equipment and software) put at the disposal by Apple and IBM			
Main programme activities (1998-2001)	Creation of a clearing house and of an international network of focal points (32 countries) for exchange and dissemination of information and best practices with regard to the application of ICTs in education; 11 research and studies on the application of ICTs in education, including distance and special education, education via the Internet and teacher-training materials; Launching of 2 national pilot projects: Kazakhstan (distance education for rural schools) and the Russian Federation (in-service teacher training); Expert meetings and workshops on ICTs in education, particularly for CIS countries, and regular training sessions launched; <i>Newsletter</i> , surveys and reports on ICTs in education and distance learning			
Reporting system	Director to the Governing Board and its Executive Committee (yearly) Director to the Director-General and to the ADG/ED Chairperson of the Governing Board to the General Conference			
Evaluation	Foreseen in 2003			

**UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America
and the Caribbean (IESALC), Caracas (Venezuela)**

Year of creation	1997			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO (154 EX/19 and Add.; 155 EX/22 and Add.; 155 EX/56; 30 C/Res.7) Host-country agreement: 1984			
Governing board	13 members appointed for a 4-year period: 9 elected by Member States of the region; 4 appointed by the Director-General			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 2001): Mr Claudio Rama, D-1 (Uruguay), appointed upon the recommendation of the Governing Board following international competitive selection 13 UNESCO staff: 1 D-1; 1 P-5; 1 P-3; 1 P-2; 1 L-7, 4 L-6; 4 L-4; 1 L-3 8 non-UNESCO staff: 2 professional; 6 service			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference Financial autonomy, accountable to the Governing Board (special account set up in 1998)			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	553,000		120,246
	Staff costs	1,340,000		
	Indirect costs	472,000	6,531	
	Total	2,365,300	6,531	120,296
In-kind contribution	Host country: building provided free of charge (estimated at US \$180,000 yearly) Fellowships (estimated at 1,175) from ICETEX (Colombia)			
Main programme activities (1996-2001)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthening higher education's institutional capacities in the region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - several seminars and courses on university reform, management and financing for the formation of a new category of leaders, notably the international seminar on "The university's social responsibility" (2000, Cali, Colombia) and the international seminar on "Management, evaluation and accreditation of higher education institutions" 2. Advisory programme for institutional accreditation and evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support offered since 1997-1998 to the Juan Misael Saracho Autonomous University in Tarija (Bolivia) to further its external self-evaluation and evaluation processes; to the University of the Republic of Uruguay (UDELAR) for the evaluation process of degree courses; and to the Central University of Venezuela (UCV) 3. Following up on the decisions of the International Forum on Education for All 4. Reformulation of international cooperation in the field of higher education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - creation of focal points in several countries and regions; - accreditation of studies, diplomas, degrees and programmes; - creation of a network of associated institutions and partners in the field of higher education; - follow-up to the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, 1998) 5. Publications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the "Respuesta" collection - joint publications - special contributions 			
Reporting system	Director to the Governing Board Director to the Director-General and to the ADG/ED Chairperson of the Governing Board to the General Conference or to the Director-General			
Evaluation	Foreseen for 2002			

**UNESCO International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA)
Addis Ababa (Ethiopia)**

Year of creation	1999			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO (30 C/Res.8) Host-country agreement: negotiations under way			
Governing board	12 members to be appointed by the Director-General (3- and 4-year period)			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 1998): Ms Fay King Chung, D-2 (Zimbabwe), appointed by the Director-General 3 UNESCO staff: 1 D-1; 1 P-4 (funded from staff costs of UNESCO); 1 NOA			
Financial regulations	Allocation approved by the General Conference Financial autonomy to be established as of April 2001			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	939,000		185,000
	Staff costs	361,000		
	Indirect costs			
	Total	<i>1,300,000</i>		<i>185,000</i>
In-kind contribution	Host country: building and utilities			
Main programme activities (1999-2001)	Initiation of a teacher education network and capacity upgrading programme; Launching of a teacher education network (Senegal, Liberia, Ethiopia, Madagascar and Zimbabwe); Distance education degree programme with Indira Gandhi National Open University; Multigrade pilot project in Ethiopia; Workshops on interactive textbook writing; in the use of ICTs for teachers and teacher trainers; Creation of electronic libraries			
Reporting system	Director to the Governing Board (yearly) Director to the Director-General and to the ADG/ED Chairperson of the Governing Board to the General Conference			
Evaluation	Not yet foreseen			

**UNESCO European Centre for Higher Education (CEPES)
Bucharest (Romania)**

Year of creation	1972			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO Secretariat Host-country agreement: 1972			
Advisory board	12 members serving for a 4-year period: 8 <i>ad persona</i> nominated by the Director-General and 4 designated by international organizations at the invitation of the Director-General			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 1999): Mr Jan Sadlak, D-1 (Canada), appointed following international competitive selection and consultation with the Advisory Board 23 UNESCO staff: 1 D-1; 1 P-5; 2 P-3; 1 NOA; 2 L-7, 5 L-6; 1 L-5; 5 L-4; 2 L-3; 3 L-1 Non-UNESCO staff: 1 professional (France)			
Financial regulations	Allocation from the regular budget (Education Sector, Higher Education Division); Creation of a special account initiated			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	507,500	42,000	
	Staff costs	1,084,000		
	Indirect costs	160,000		
	Total	1,751,500	42,000	
In-kind contribution	Host country: Building (estimated at US \$380,000 per biennium); security (US \$14,000 per biennium) 1 intern seconded by France; costs for programme activities shared with partner institutions			
Main programme activities (1996-2001)	<p>Contribution to the implementation of Subprogramme I.2.3 – Higher Education and Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - follow-up activities to the World Conference on Higher Education (Paris, 1998): initiation of the project “Strategic Indicators for Monitoring Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century”; - workshops and studies on policy and reform of higher education, in particular in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, including participation in the work of the Task Force Education and Youth of the “Enhanced Graz Process”; <p>Publication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Higher Education in Europe</i> (quarterly review in English, French and Russian as e-journal); - monographs, studies and papers on higher education; - studies on science and culture; - UNESCO CEPES website (including various databases). 			
Reporting system	Director to the ADG/ED and to ADG/ERC Director to the Advisory Board			
Evaluation	Not yet foreseen			

**UNESCO International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training
Bonn (Germany)**

Year of creation	2000			
Statutes and host-country agreements	Integral part of UNESCO Secretariat (30 C/Res.9) Host-country agreement: 2000			
Advisory board	Not currently applicable			
Staff of the Institute	Director (since 2001): Mr Rupert Maclean, D-1 (Australia), appointed following an internal recruitment procedure 3 UNESCO staff: 1 D-1; 1 P-5 (2000-2001); 1 P-4 (foreseen) 3 non-UNESCO staff: 1 professional; 2 service			
Financial regulations	Allocation from the regular budget (Education Sector, Division of Secondary, Technical and Vocational Education; German funds-in-trust allocation			
Cash contribution (US \$) (2000-2001)		UNESCO	Host country	Extrabudgetary
	Programme	38,400	341,000	20,000
	Staff costs	454,000	121,000	
	Indirect costs		191,000	
	Total	492,400	653,000	20,000
In-kind contribution	Host country: rent-free premises; programme support from the private sector and various governmental bodies			
Main programme activities (2000-2001)	<p>Contribution to the implementation of Subprogramme I.2.2 – Renovation of general secondary and vocational education, the most important being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Learning for Life, Work and the Future: Stimulating reform in southern Africa through subregional cooperation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an initial workshop organized in Botswana (December 2000); 2. Capacity-building and subregional cooperation in technical and vocational education and training: the small Pacific Island States: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a series of meetings on the occasion of the UNESCO Conference on technical and vocational education training (March 2001, Adelaide); 3. Continuous development of the international UNEVOC Network of national focal points (UNEVOC Centres); 4. Information and knowledge management: services provided to target groups (UNESCO-UNEVOC Electronic Mail Forum, website) 			
Reporting system	Director to the ADG/ED			
Evaluation	Not yet foreseen			