Sub-Group 2 on "Structure, composition and methods of work of UNESCO's International and Intergovernmental Bodies"

Informal Summary of the third meeting
9 May 2017

The Co-Chairs recalled that the agenda and programme of work were approved at the first meeting of Sub-Group 2 on 28 February 2017. They informed that, as discussed by the Bureau of the Working Group, a fourth meeting of Sub-Group 2 was scheduled on 9 June 2017 to review the draft recommendations concerning the International and Intergovernmental Bodies.

h. Convention on the Promotion and Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005)

The meeting started with the consideration of the last item under part 6 of the agenda, the 2005 Convention. The Co-Chairs recalled the eight general issues raised during the previous meeting by Member States in connection with UNESCO's Cultural Conventions.[1]

The following best practices were highlighted by Member States for the 2005 Convention:

- Implementation of IOS' recommendations;
- Preparation for Committee, with information meetings, and advance sharing of draft amendments;
- Satisfaction survey at the end of each Committee;
- Election of Bureau of Committee at the end of the session, so Bureau can work in preparation for next session;
- Presentation and use of periodic reporting;
- Prioritization exercise;
- Results framework and reporting against C/5 Expected Results;
- Working meetings of Bureau with civil society; and
- Fund mobilization policy

Member States recognized the good work of the Secretariat, even though with limited resources. It was noted only 6 to 10 projects were accepted each year, despite the large demands and this needed to be analyzed. The importance of capacity building was reiterated. More visibility and involvement of partners were advocated by representatives, taking into account the global context. While the website was cited as informative, it was also noted that it was not operational at the time.

The Secretariat recognized that the good practices highlighted by Member States were due to the States Parties themselves, allowing for innovative approaches to governance, such as involving civil society to promote transparency and accountability. The voluntary nature of funding however, impacted on sustainability of the Convention.

---

[1] As reflected in the informal summary of the 31 March 2017 meeting.

The Co-Chair drew attention to Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of Parties pertaining to the election of Intergovernmental Committee members. Based on the rule, consecutive mandates on the Committee were prohibited, unless an electoral group submitted a "clean slate" of candidates. The Co-Chair expressed the view that this approach could be examined in connection with to discussions on term limits for membership on the Executive Board and other IIBs.

7. International Fund, International Programmes, and International Expert Bodies

The Sub-Group turned to examination of the fund, international programmes and expert bodies under its agenda item 8. The Co-Chair noted that these mechanisms were created by the main Governing Bodies, but working with more operational autonomy in their respective expert fields. The Co-Chairs suggested eight broad themes that could underpin the discussion:

1. Transparency and effective information-dissemination
2. Visibility and relations with the General Conference and Member States
3. Updating of mandates
4. Membership and composition
5. Possible harmonisation of rules of procedure and working methods
6. Strengthening in terms of resources
7. Synergies and cooperation
8. Accountability/ feedback/ follow-up mechanisms

Several speakers suggested that relevant recommendations of Sub-Group 1 could be applicable to these IIBs. The methods of appointment of the experts in these bodies by the Director General were referred to, and the need to increase transparency on criteria, qualifications, terms of references, methods of work and follow-up of recommendations. In general, there was a call for more information to be shared with Member States and for their participation as observers in the meeting of these Funds, Programmes and expert bodies.

a. International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC)

The connections between the IFPC and the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFDC) and the 2005 Convention were brought up by some Member States: further alignment and/or cooperation were considered desirable. Speakers noted the lack of information on the composition of the Administrative Council, the impact of selected projects, and the availability of resources. The fact that projects go to the benefit of individuals and not of communities was also pointed out.

The Secretariat confirmed that the IFPC does not have a Bureau, as its functions were performed by the Administrative Council. The internet site of the Fund presented relevant information. It was also recalled that the Secretariat's proposal to merge the IFPC with the IFDC was not approved by the Executive Board which preferred to maintain the intellectual and functional separation of the funds.

b. International Basic Science Programme (IBSP)

Speakers who took the floor noted the rather limited role of Members States in the programme was one of the factors that did not allow for adequate visibility. The webpage of the programme could be updated extensively to allow interaction with stakeholders and Member States in particular, including presentation of recent activities. It was also suggested that Member States could be provided with passwords to access information not available to the general public. There was a call for more transparency, in terms reporting on tasks of the Scientific Board as well.

The Secretariat confirmed a 40% reduction of its budget, which affected capacity. Nevertheless, work continued in key areas such as cooperation with Category 2 Institutes and science visits to Africa.

c. International Geoscience and Geoparks Programme (IGGP)

Synergies established due to the joining of the Geosciences and Geoparks programmes were commended. Speakers highlighted the need for more information-sharing and reporting to the General Conference and the Executive Board, including posting of useful information on a dedicated webpage. The international scope of the programme's activities, as well as the involvement of local communities, helped reinforce impact and visibility. The governance mechanism of IGGP, setting a limit to one re-election only, was considered a best practice.

Concerning UNESCO Geoparks, Member States noted that it was a global brand of significance. It was an attractive label, in some circumstances more suitable than World Heritage for some properties. Member States supported more synergies with MAB and WHC activities. They also noted the potential of the Geoparks to be vehicles for North-South and South-South international cooperation.

The Secretariat confirmed that there was a Steering Group coordination mechanism among the three programmes, and in the field, cooperation and coordination among different sites, and sites with multiple designations, was fruitful. The opportunities to further expand international cooperation, especially South-South cooperation, were being examined.

d. Executive Committee for the International Campaign for the Establishment of the Nubia Museum in Aswan and the National Museum of Egyptian Civilization in Cairo

The Co-Chairs recalled the mandate of the Executive Committee and the important results achieved thus far, namely opening of the Nubia Museum in Aswan in 1997, and the soft opening of the National Museum of Egyptian Civilization in Cairo earlier this year. Based on information received, the National Museum would be officially inaugurated in 2018 and fully operational in 2019/2020.

It was noted that out of the 15 seats available on the Committee, only five were currently filled. The Committee would have its next session this year. Consultations were taking place on a

possible exit strategy of the Committee upon fulfillment of its mandate, when the National Museum becomes fully operational.

e. International Advisory Committee (IAC) of the Memory of the World Programme

The Co-Chairs proposed to take note of the decision entitled "Report of the International Advisory Committee (IAC) on the Review Process of the Memory of the World Programme" taken by the Executive Board at its 201st session, and no Member State took the floor.

8. Category 1 Institutes

a. Abdus Salam Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)

Member States referred to the IOS report and its 13 recommendations and inquired on the status of their implementation. The impact of ICTP's activities and the connections to UNESCO's Natural Science programme were not sufficiently explicit, even though ICTP reported in the EX/4 and organised an information meeting on its activities for Paris-based delegations. The Sub-Group agreed to recommend that ICTP submit a regular report on its activities to the General Conference, as presently there is no scheduled reporting.

In reply to a question of a speaker on the use of the term "Centre" instead of "Institute", the representative of ICTP explained that ICTP was a legal entity of a different nature before becoming a UNESCO Category 1 Institute. Nevertheless, it did function as an institute. The Sub-Group was also reminded that the Institute is special, as it operates under a tripartite agreement between the Italian Government, UNESCO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

b. Education Category 1 Institutes

A general debate concerning governance of Education Category 1 Institutes was held. The meetings of Chairs of Education Category I Institutes were welcomed by Member States who took the floor. It was suggested that UIS also be invited to these meetings. The Secretariat informed that regular ED sector leadership meetings took place at Headquarters involving the Secretariat, the heads of the four regional offices, and the directors of the seven Education Category 1 Institutes. UIS was always invited to those meetings.

Some Member States expressed the view that more systematic and coherent presentation of the work of these bodies could be submitted to the Executive Board. A Member State proposed that the Directors of Category 1 Institutes could pay regular visits to the Executive Board to revitalise a dialogue with Member States. This was especially important considering the share of UNESCO's regular budget that went to them. The internet sites of some of the Institutes could also be improved to enhance transparency and information-sharing.

The Secretariat confirmed that the institutes were integrated into the C/5 under each of the expected results, and that regular reporting to the Board was ensured in the EX/4.

Furthermore, an information meeting had been organised to brief delegations on IIEP, UIL and IBE contributing to Major Programme I. In addition, a specific portion was organized during the meetings of the Education Commission at each General Conference on the Institutes.

A question was raised on the concrete definition of "functional autonomy" of the institutes. The Secretariat explained that after the IOS audit, the Education Sector had been working on clarifying such definition. In terms of programme and planning, they were part of UNESCO Major Programmes under each Expected Result. Institutes have their own governing bodies and therefore have autonomy in the course of implementation. In terms of financial management, the Institutes have to be in line with UNESCO's rules and procedures, while specific spending was decided by each Director. On human resource management, a couple of issues were under discussion.

Statues of the institutes were different and needed some updating and harmonisation. The Secretariat was studying this and would propose changes to the Executive Board. The Secretariat was also looking closely at the work of each CAT 1 Institute vis-a-via SDG 4 and would come up with a mapping exercise to identify respective roles and assets. One delegation underlined the importance of respecting the specificities of each body and suggested that if the Working Group on Governance extended its work into the next biennium, it could consider the review and harmonisation of the statutes of these institutes. Speakers also suggested that new Board members receive an orientation course to facilitate their understanding of the Institutes.

In the review of individual education category 1 institutes, discussions were as follows:

- On the **International Bureau of Education (IBE),** one member noted the important role and the world-wide visibility of the institute thanks to its communication strategy.
- The **UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP)** can be set as a best practice in terms of impact of online training programs. Its office in Argentina should be reinforced.
- The key role of **the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning (UIL)** in connection with SDG 4.
- No intervention addressed the **UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (IITE).**
- Concerning the **UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (IESALC),** one member wanted to stress the importance of respecting the functional and intellectual autonomy of the institute and called for increased recognition of its added value. Other speakers supported the key role of the Institute, which is the only one devoted to higher education and could have a wider geographical scope.
- No intervention addressed the **Mahatma Gandhi Institute on Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP)**
- The inputs on the fact sheet of the **UNESCO International Institute for Capacity-Building in Africa (IICBA)** were just received earlier in the morning. Some members stressed the good cooperation between IICBA, headquarters, the five multi- sectorial

offices in Africa and the other Field Offices. The internet site of this Centre should also be available in French considering that it covers the Africa region.

c. UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)

Member States recognised that UIS constituted an asset for UNESCO and played a highly important role in the monitoring of the 2030 Agenda.

Regular reporting was provided to the Executive Board. While the Institute communicated constantly, shared the minutes of Steering Committee meetings, and had a fund mobilisation strategy, it still lacked expertise in fund raising. It was suggested that that institutes participate in the Structured Financing Dialogues UNESCO is planning to launch after the approval of the 39 C/5.

In conclusion, the Co-Chair noted issues raised by the Sub-Group in relation to the Education Category 1 Institutes:

1. Transparency and information-dissemination
2. Enhancing visibility and interaction with Member States, including feedback mechanisms
3. "Functional autonomy" and implications
4. Mapping of assets for the implementation of SDG 4
5. Synergies
6. Harmonization of statutes and procedures
7. Best practices

In connection with draft recommendations of Sub-Group 2, a delegation raised the importance of regular information-sharing and consultations within and among electoral groups, and the crucial role of the Bureaus in this regard. Member States were elected to Bureaus to represent and inform their electoral groups. The possibility of recommending guiding principles or a code of conduct for Bureau members was suggested.