

This management response to the recent Evaluation of the World Heritage Leadership Programme (WHLP) is provided below. It sets out the ways in which the Programme management proposes to respond to the evaluation's 7 overarching recommendations. The management response has been prepared by the Programme Coordinator and the IUCN Programme Director. Although the programme agrees to all the recommendations, some have caveats and require additional comment. To each recommendation a view is provided whether the programme management agrees or partly agrees, and detailed comments are provided in Table 1.

The actions to be taken resulting from the management response in order of priority can be found in Table 2 below. Each action has a timeline and suggestion of responsibility. The action plan will provide the basis for monitoring the results of the evaluation.

Overall the key actions can be summarised as the following.

- Establish a Theory of Change and relevant indicators to measure impacts of the programme

- Continue and enhance collaborative and consultative working methods with different partners through the means of established meetings, formalized MOUs and agreements, and through the statutory working methods of the WH Tm0 g(h)3(e)9st)6(at0FT9ga.9hrTfkin)6)4Em6(o)-5sHf1m()b 994(ro)6n1

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
Recommendation 1: Fostering the big picture of the Programme		
The Programme management should introduce a fully-fledged and documented Theory of Change.	Agreed	The programme contains significant elements of a typical Theory of Change, which are stated throughout the planning and communication documents, but we agree could be more explicitly developed into a coherent and holistic Theory of Change. This would benefit both communication and monitoring goals in further development of the Programme. We also thank the evaluators for proposing a first draft Theory of Change, to begin this process.
Programme management should further discuss and refine the Theory of Change with the main actors of the Programme (including all Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre) during which measurable indicators that distinguish between short- and midterm outcomes/results during the P a a a a c phase, as well as long-term impacts should be identified.	Agreed	We agree that the Programme Advisory Group meetings, working group meetings for the various manuals, and WHC/ABs meetings are the appropriate vehicles to share the overall Programme progress and results, and to consult on and agree the Theory of Change. The indicators and long-term impacts will also be shared through the relevant Committee documents reporting on Capacity Building and activities of the Advisory Bodies.
Recommendation 2: Agreeing on a coherent indicator system The Programme management, the Advisory group and the donors should agree on a coherent indicator system in close conjunction with the Theory of Change, in order to define and measure		

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
<p>Follow-up surveys or meetings should be organised with training participants at least one year after the training to identify success stories, behavioural changes, or changes in conservation practice. This could take place by means of an online survey or virtual meetings, and by using existing networks (e.g. WhatsApp groups). This should be followed by a qualitative approach to assist in identifying regional differences in the applicability of results and regional implementation barriers.</p>		<p>practices after training) as a follow-up to the training activities carried out by the programme)</p>

Recommendations of the Evaluation

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
<p>Should agree on ways and means to strengthen the resources for the management of the Programme, in order to adapt it to new dynamics and requirements for the remaining time of the current phase (and a potential new phase).</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>We recognise the limitations due to staff capacity for the Programme. In the present phase of the Programme these are being primarily addressed via engagement of support through a team of programme consultants.</p> <p>In the possible new phase, increasing a new programme staff position will be considered and planned for.</p>

Continuing with the implemented structure and

The following is a table outlining the desirable actions by priority.

Priority 1: Action within 3-6 months, within 2020

Priority 2: Action within 12 months, within 2021

Priority 3: Action within 24 months, within 2022 (End of Phase 1 of WHL)

Additional : Actions that could be considered for a potential 2nd phase, after 2022

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
----------------------	----------------	------------------------------

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
		T2. Prepare a concept document that could be utilized by other regions for similar initiatives.