

Evaluation of IUCN World Heritage Programme 2014

Management Response

Date created: 16 April 2014

This IUCN management response to the recent Evaluation of the IUCN World Heritage Programme (WHP) is provided below. It sets out the ways in which IUCN proposes to respond to, and where appropriate, adapt its work to address the evaluation's **29 recommendations**. The management response has been prepared by the Director, IUCN World Heritage Programme, and the Global Director, IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group. In line with IUCN procedures, a view is provided as to whether the WHP agrees, partly agrees or does not agree with each recommendation. Comments are provided in each case. This analysis is provided in Annex 1 to the management response. In essence all the recommendations are agreed, although some have caveats and require additional comment. IUCN has also received feedback from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre on the recommendations.

The desirable results of actions to be taken resulting from the IUCN management response are set out in Table 1 below, organised according to prioritised recommendations of the review. Each action sought has a timeline and suggested responsibility. This action plan will provide the basis for monitoring the results of the Evaluation.

Table 1: World Heritage Evaluation - Management Response: Recommendations and Action Plan

Recommendations of the Evaluation (grouped
accordi4n (t)Tj 0.28 0 Td (i)Tj -0.009 Tc 0.009 T

Recommendations of the Evaluation (grouped according to prioritised recommendations)	Desirable result of actions to be taken in response to the Evaluation (timeline) [actors]
<p>24. The Director General [of IUCN] should, with agreement from UNESCO, coordinate a facilitated process to clarify and define roles and responsibilities of the World Heritage Programme and the World Heritage Centre, and the other Advisory Bodies. This process needs to include identification, and consideration of, the reasons why previous attempts were not fully successful.</p>	<p>F2: IUCN and ICOMOS develop a joint and extra-budgetary funded collaborative programme on providing Upstream Advice and linking nature and culture. (from 2015) [DIR/WHP, ICOMOS].</p> <p>F3: ICCROM and IUCN successfully raise funding for WH Capacity Building Strategy, and shared programme of work (from 2014) [ICCROM, DIR/WHP].</p>
<p>G. More effective leverage of IUCN Commissions to support World Heritage</p>	
<p>26. The World Heritage Programme should strengthen further its long-standing collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Areas, and also explore new opportunities to collaborate with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Species Survival Commission (recognizing that work has already started) on the use of, and contribution to, the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species and the Key Biodiversity Areas standard • the Commission on Ecosystem Management on the Red List of Ecosystems • the Commission on Economic, Environmental and Social Policy on the Natural Resource Governance Framework and more generally on rights-based approaches and indigenous peoples issues. 	

Evaluation of IUCN World Heritage Programme 2014

ANNEX 1 Management Response: Response of Director, World Heritage Programme, and Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group to each recommendation of the evaluation.

Date created: 10 March 2014

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
Relevance		
<p>1. IUCN should produce an explanatory document to contextualize the role of World Heritage in its conservation toolkit, demonstrate its role in biodiversity conservation (business case) and manage expectations.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>The communication of the role needs to go beyond the production of an explanatory document and covers many other recommendations of the evaluation. Additional activities include the WH website, consolidation of WH publications, press/media strategy, use of Twitter and translation into local languages.</p> <p>Communication activity needs to be a much larger part of the work of WHP in its further work, and requires secure funding and capacity.</p>
<p>2. The World Heritage Prog</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>		

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
<p>4. The World Heritage Programme should explore, with relevant stakeholders, the reasons behind the perception that it has a stance against economic development in and around World Heritage sites. This could include clarification and communication of relevant sections of the Programme's World Heritage Convention mandate</p>	<p>Agreed, with a caveat that the Programme considers that this is a matter of perception, and that there appears to be substantial areas where the reported perception in the review does not accord with the approach the programme takes to questions of development.</p>	<p>The question of perception has been addressed partly by the Evaluation. The establishment of a clear position from IUCN on Development and World Heritage is covered under Recommendation 6, which provides a principal output related to this recommendation.</p> <p>The issue of what kind of 'development' can be accommodated in WH areas / is seen as damaging to WH areas is important here and there appears to be some internal confusion in IUCN. Support from senior management and the GPU to enable the relevant discussion to take place is important. Getting clear IUCN policy positioning around this issue is critical. Council level discussion of this finding of the Evaluation will be essential.</p>
<p>5. IUCN needs to clearly set out its formal position on the relationship between World Heritage and sustainable economic development approaches such as No Net Loss and Net Positive Impact, used by other IUCN units and which aim to prevent biodiversity losses. This should include a clear definition of the 'no-go' concept (applicable to the extractive industries). Once this formal position is articulated, it needs to be communicated to relevant World Heritage stakeholders, including IUCN staff.</p>	<p>Agreed, with the caveat that this should be focused on sustainable development, not only sustainable economic development.</p>	<p>This is an action first for IUCN as a whole re these approaches, which are controversial, and still under consideration.</p> <p>IUCN has a stated policy position on Extractive Industry and World Heritage. Extensive work has been done by WHP in this area, including jointly with Business and Biodiversity Programme (BBP), who managed an independent review on this subject. It is essential that the work being led by Nature Based Solutions Group on the mitigation hierarchy and biodiversity offsets should engage WH expertise.</p> <p>Since the evaluation was concluded, Total has made a new commitment to the no-go principle in relation to World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>See also comments in relation to Recommendation 4.</p>
<p>6. The World Heritage Programme should facilitate a dialogue with State Parties on how to approach economic development, including in and around natural and mixed World Heritage sites with a view to increasing/maintaining the relevance of both the Programme and the Convention.</p>		

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
----------------------------------	---	---------

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
----------------------------------	---	---------

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
Impact		

19. IUCN senior management should

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
24. The Director General should, with agreement from UNESCO, coordinate		

Recommendation of the Evaluation	Response from Director WHP and Global Director, BCG	Comment
27. The Programme should continue its close collaboration with the Global Protected Areas Programme particularly, to ensure congruence between State of Conservation monitoring and the proposed Green List of protected areas, species and ecosystems and associated standards.	Agreed	GPAP and WHP are clustered programmes that are working increasingly closely, and with joint team meetings, shared communication and joint work on project development. The Green List provides a key opportunity, but needs to be developed in such a way that it is supportive of WH work and approach. and use of WH as exemplars