

Management Response to the World Heritage Leadership Programme Evaluation – ICCROM/IUCN

October 2020

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 Convention.
- Formalize the official status and format of the knowledge products that will be produced during the first phase of the programme.
- Formulate a Communication strategy to better present and promote the progress and results of the Programme.
- Establish regional action plans for implementing and translating programme activities to ensure global outreach.
- Prepare plans for increasing human and budgetary resources to manage increasing workload.

Table 1 Management response to the WHL Evaluation

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 Programme’s duration and a potential second 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 the progress and success of the Programme within the next three months.	Agreed	The Programme will ensure a clearer linking of the deliverables with the objectives. In particular the mid term evaluation has given valuable information on the results chain between capacity building activities and on-ground impacts resulting. We consider that indicators should include. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site level: Indicators linked to expected changes at site level (e.g. number of sites that have actively included communities in site management, or have revised their management plans/systems, or have revisited site values in relation to nature-culture linkages) - Institutional level: Indicators linked to expected changes in the World Heritage System (e.g. Impact Assessment Guidance adopted by the Committee, or role of site manager reflected in the Operational Guidelines) - Heritage practitioners level: Indicators linked to the expected changes with regards to the target group (e.g. percentage of site managers adopting new

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
		practices after training) as a follow-up to the training activities carried out by the programme)
<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>	Agreed	<p>We agree that it will be necessary to initiate a longer-term follow up process with programme participants to gather this information, beyond the current end-of-course questionnaires, so we will establish that follow-up as part of our ongoing monitoring process in revisions to the Programme. ICCROM is in the process of establishing a long-term follow up process with course participants and alumni, and WHL activities will utilize this process as well as follow up on a programme level. It will take the hybrid form of a regular survey to be sent out to all participants on a periodic basis (interval of 2, 5, 10 years after completion of course), focus interviews to be conducted with key participants, and collection of case studies of practitioners. The Site Managers Forum also provides the opportunity for group discussions and feedback which may also be useful.</p>
<p>To consider the standardised evaluation reports (e.g. SOC [State of Conservation] reports) to assess the long-term conservation impact of its activities.</p>	Partly Agreed.	<p>We agree that the relationship to SOC reports needs to be more fully developed, including in relation to identifying programme participants from sites where problems could benefit from the outputs of the Programme. This needs further reflection with the Advisory Group to ensure that there is greatest feasible synergy achieved between the Programme and direct responses to SOC reports.</p> <p>We note that this recommendation is not fully applicable to all cases as not all participants always work with WH sites that are going through the SOC process. Also the SOC process is limited in identifying specific issues that may not have a direct relationship with capacity building of human resources. It is important to understand that SOC reports mostly focus on the problems that have been visible and demonstrated rather than seeking the origins of the problem, which could be for a multiple range of different reasons depending on the context. SOC reports are also generally very synthetic so may not provide sufficiently detailed information to confirm attributable impacts from the programme. We therefore consider that this follow up might need to be included in the individual feedback process with participants.</p>
<p>Make use of concrete success stories for awareness raising, promotion and communication.</p>	Agreed	<p>The Programme is in the process of collecting success stories of case studies to be promoted within webinars of the programme, but also through the PANORAMA Nature-Culture Thematic community which will actively be utilized as a platform to showcase different approaches to conservation practice.</p>

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
Recommendation 3: Reconciling outputs and results with the regional and local level		
Programme management should closely collaborate with the Advisory group and focus on setting up and implementing a systematic approach for reconciling Programme outputs and results (i.e. knowledge product deliverables) with regional specificities within the next 6 months.	Agreed	The web realization of the Knowledge Framework and related products will be planned and shared with all partners regularly and in-depth, in conjunction with the development of the content of the products. The establishment of inclusive and regionally diverse consultation and feedback from site managers is the most obvious concrete action we will take in this regard, together with ensuring translation of key deliverables, to the extent that time and budget allows.
The Programme management should revise the programme process plan and consider integrating a phase which deals with the “regionalisation” of the globally worked out results (e.g. EIA, DRM, etc.), ideally systematically linked with the training activities and courses in close collaboration with the Advisory group and interested donors.	Agreed	Alternating regional and international activities provides the Programme a scope to harness different and diverse realities into formulating the knowledge products. A regional rollout plan will be established to ensure the Programme outputs are able to be tuned to regional specificities. The relationship with the UNESCO category 2 centres for World Heritage and other relevant regional heritage institutions are particular opportunities to ensure this regional tuning.
The Programme management should target the cooperation with the networks that facilitate training (e.g. C2C, UNESCO Chairs and WH-related master Programmes) to ensure long-term integration of the content developed.	Agreed	On-going collaboration with WHITRAP, AWHF, ARC-WH will be enhanced whilst new partnerships will be sought with the LAC region C2C in Zacatecas Mexico. A research network connecting the Universities operating WH-related programmes will be planned and implemented for 2021 and 2022. Although there is not an active C2C in Europe, there are many WH related Universities and institutions active in the region to forge stronger connections.
The Programme management should set up a separate implementation plan for field testing, ground truthing and adoption of the key deliverables in collaboration with the target audience at local level.	Agreed	The content development progressing in parallel with course and activities implementation has enabled the Programme to respond in an agile manner to restructure and establish the current system of products in relation, revising where needed in the original programme document. Whilst these types of continuous feedback mechanism will be retained for field testing and ground truthing, the remaining two years of the Programme will focus on delivering the planned knowledge products. The possible second phase of the Programme would also focus on enhancing the delivery and sharing of the content at local level developed in the first phase.
The Programme management should plan to translate the most relevant outputs into the 6 languages of the WHC.	Agreed	The Programme is currently planning for the translation of all products into French as the working language of the WH Convention within the Programme budget, but will launch a translation campaign by engaging States Parties of the Convention.

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
		This is the main reason for compiling an integrated glossary that would facilitate the appropriate translation of all materials into multiple languages. Plans for providing a translation guidance for all the products is also underway.
Programme management should closely collaborate with the Advisory group and interested donors to consider further strengthening the role of Category 2 Centres with regard to the regionalisation of content by offering regional courses. Representatives of C2C also indicated the interest in translating manuals and materials into regional languages (i.e. Chinese, Arabic).	Agreed	The Programme is continuously discussing with new partners and donors for financial and technical partnerships. Further collaboration with the C2Cs to convene regional courses and ensure translations of the products into different languages will continuously be pursued.
Programme management should closely collaborate with the Advisory group and interested donors to work on developing and documenting a commonly agreed understanding of the knowledge framework and on the corresponding alignment of its written content with the activities.	Agreed	We agree this is crucial, and the evaluation has confirmed that to date this need is being addressed. The Programme will continue to ensure regular meetings to share the commonly agreed understanding of the Knowledge Framework with all partners, including the Advisory Group but also with the wider set of financial and technical partners.
Recommendation 4: Legitimising and embedding results and outputs into the WH environment		
Programme management should identify and implement a process for legitimising and embedding relevant results and outputs into the WH environment in close cooperation with relevant members of the Advisory group and the WHC.	Agreed	The Knowledge Framework and manuals already have a legitimate position within the WH Convention environment as a Resource Manual. However the Programme will ensure that the content of the manuals and other products are well delivered to the Committee and well embedded into subsequent documents and decisions where reference is needed, so that the results can be utilized to its maximum capacity.
Programme management should cooperate with all the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre to seek clarification on the intended status of the elaborated deliverables (guidelines, manuals, knowledge framework, training syllabuses) in the setting of the World Heritage Convention and the	Agreed.	We agree but consider this need is being addressed. The entire programme is a means of implementing the Capacity Building Strategy of the Convention, and has been reported to every meeting of the World Heritage Committee, and presented in regular side events. The modalities for publication of resource manuals is well understood by the project partners, including the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, and will be followed in completing these outputs. The format and

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
management of World Heritage Sites respectively.		content of the web platform and its visibility will be discussed and shared with all the partners during planning and execution.
Programme management should lead the above discussion with a view to ensuring the long-term sustainability of the results. The evaluation team recommends that consideration be given to integrating all the outputs into the formal environment of the WHC (e.g. in the Operational Guidelines) and of other relevant partners such as ICOMOS and IAIA.	Partly agreed.	We agree with the essence of this recommendation, although in practice the integration of the outputs into the work of the World Heritage Convention is a more complicated process than simply working through the Operational Guidelines. Connections to Committee decisions (both general policy decisions, and site-specific conservation recommendations) are likely to be a more impactful means of ensuring implementation. We also agree on the importance of maximising the recognition of Programme outputs within the wider work of ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM: we think this is being progressed effectively, but with the need to keep this on the agenda with the Advisory Group. This also points to the importance of the outreach components of the Programme, both within the World Heritage System, and also in the wider “ecosystem” of natural and cultural heritage practice, such as engagement with the Convention on Biological Diversity, and with wider programmes across the culture sector of UNESCO.
Programme management should closely collaborate with the relevant members of the Advisory Group to identify the potential for alignment and synergies with other Programmes and initiatives (e.g. the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme), which should also be considered in the context of the Knowledge framework.	Agreed	The Programme is actively collaborating with the Renewable Energy Facilities guidance project and the Climate Change Policy and Working group initiatives. Synergies with other programmes such as the WH Sustainable Tourism Programme could be considered for the possible second phase of the Programme.
Recommendation 5: Strengthening partnerships and networks		
Programme management should closely collaborate with relevant stakeholders to identify ways and resources to formalise the SMF [Site Managers’ Forum] by the end of the current phase. A potential second phase should include measures for strengthening partnerships and networks on their way to more formalised	Agreed	The SMF is already formalized through the Host Country agreement for convening the World Heritage Committee meeting between the host country and UNESCO. The Site Managers Forum has been recognized as the two formal fora that is convened in conjunction with the World Heritage Committee. The Programme will ensure that WHC and the ABs maintain a good collaborative framework to utilize the SMF as effectively as possible to provide a platform for site managers to be

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
<p>settings. The Programme should try to formalise the SMF in collaboration with the relevant organizations in a long-term perspective, and seek geographical balance. The Programme management should closely collaborate with the relevant stakeholders to promote the successive linking of the SMF to the WHC as well as possible, and encourage partnerships with relevant organisations (e.g. Youth Forum)</p>		<p>represented and share appropriate materials to maintain it as a healthy environment for discussion.</p>
<p>Programme management has succeeded in creating a huge professional network of different actors, institutions, the Advisory Bodies, experts, and site managers. However these networks need to be formalised in some way, as self-maintaining approaches will hardly work. The formalisation of those networks needs a joint effort to be undertaken, including the officially responsible institutions. The recognised gap between the statutory level and the site level seems to be a major barrier which needs to be overcome in order to find a long-term solution.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>The Programme will actively seek to include different targets of site level, regional level, state level, international level practitioners through different activities to make sure various entry points for all related professionals are provided for, bearing in mind that the ultimate objective is to find common ground to work and communicate together between the different levels of practitioners. The Programme will continue to maintain a database of all involved programme participants and explore the formalization of these networks. Formalization will not necessarily be limited to official recognition such as establishing a network roster, but will also include mechanisms to encourage the regular re-participation of these professionals to the Programme through various surveys and activities.</p>
<p>Consider formalising the partnerships with partner organizations to create more tangible institutional bonds (e.g. MoUs or partnership agreements).</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The Programme will establish written agreements (via MOUs, partnership agreements or direct contracts where paid work is involved), with existing partners to solidify the institutional bonds and strengthen the collaboration. MOUs with ICOMOS and IAIA will be followed up with priority.</p>
<p>Support the initiative for the establishment of an African Regional Site Managers Forum and explore the options to establish similar subforums in other regions.</p>	<p>Agreed. Noting though the importance of the voluntary initiative of the regional site managers to feel the necessity of establishing such a regional forum.</p>	<p>Programme will primarily collaborate with AWHF and regional partners to push forward with the African Regional Site Managers Forum and utilize it as a pilot case for encouraging other regional initiatives.</p>
<p>Recognize necessity to include further resources and/or a corresponding sharing of tasks and</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>The Programme will expand partnerships with existing institutions to support the various networks formulated. Each region has different needs and dynamics, some already equipped with strong existing networks. Therefore the Programme will</p>

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
responsibilities to ensure continuity and further strengthen the still fragile networks.		analyse the needs of each region accordingly to assist and support the ways of ensuring the networks to operate.
Recommendation 6: Mainstreaming communication and dissemination		
The Programme management should coordinate with the Advisory Bodies and the Advisory Group to prepare a communication strategy that differentiates between internal and external communication measures. Such a communication strategy should clearly state the purpose of the communication measures to be taken, define the sender and receiver, and outline the content planned as well as the communication channels to be used. Additionally, for the internal communication a set of meeting formats and their respective purpose should be defined, as well as the participants, including their functions.	Agreed	Upon the identification of the barriers and existing limits for communication, the Programme will establish a Communication Strategy for both internal and external needs, indicative of budgetary and human resources needs. The set of meetings including their scope and purpose will also be further defined.
The Programme should start a discussion about how to establish additional formal means of communication to reach public authorities, States Parties, and public agencies. It is difficult to share the current form of news via social media within the networks of public authorities. To gain further visibility, it is advisable to create a periodic newsletter (once or twice a year) which can be shared and forwarded in formal networks. Further digital solutions and central platforms (messengers, broadcasting of training activities, etc.) should be provided to inform, integrate and reach a higher proportion of the target group and stakeholder group.	Agreed	Such measures will be included in the Communication strategy for the Programme, specifically under external measures.
Recommendation 7: Adapting to new dynamics and requirements		

Recommendations of the Evaluation	Response from IUCN/ICCROM Programme Management	Comment
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).	Agreed	<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 staff configuration, but encourages the Programme management to try to attract “helping hands” with an option of calling for assistance/services from Advisory Bodies/institutions in the countries/working groups. Alternatively, or maybe in a next phase, the Programme management should closely cooperate with the donor to discuss the pros and cons of separating the project management into administrative and content elements.	Agreed	We agree with this proposal, but note that implementation needs to be considered in conjunction with the above recommendation, since any volunteered partnerships will still bring time commitments from the Programme Coordinator to ensure coherence and supervision of additional work.
A separate public relations responsibility or resource allocation would be helpful for dealing with the expected increase in managing the dissemination, publication and communication of the content that are about to be finalised. However, consideration needs to be given to the fact that this requires the allocation of adequate resources for the management.	Agreed	This will be further explored relating to the possible new phase of the programme in accordance with the Communication strategy established above.

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

Table 2 Desirable Actions to be taken

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
Priority 1: Action within 3-6 months, within 2020	The Programme management should introduce a fully-fledged and documented Theory of Change.	A1. WHL will establish a documented Theory of Change. A2. Measurable indicators for short, medium and long -term impacts will be established together with the Theory of Change.
	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 the progress and success of the Programme within the next three months.	B1. WHL will establish the indicators and initiate consultations with the Advisory Group, donors and partners. B2. WHL to develop long term surveys to collect data for measuring long-term impacts within ICCROM.
	Make use of concrete success stories for awareness raising, promotion and communication.	C1. Prepare and launch the PANORAMA platform to systematically collect and present case studies. C2. Ensure continuous case studies upload on to the N-C thematic community on PANORAMA. (ongoing)
	Programme management should cooperate with all the Advisory Bodies and the WH Centre to seek clarification on the intended status of the elaborated deliverables (guidelines, manuals, knowledge framework, training syllabuses) in the setting of the World Heritage Convention and the management of World Heritage Sites respectively.	D1. Continue to report programme progress to WH Committee meetings, WHC/ABs meetings. D2. Convene Programme meetings with the Advisory Group and partners to confirm, design and communicate the status of the products.
	The Programme management should coordinate with the Advisory Bodies and the Advisory group to prepare a communication strategy that differentiates between internal and external communication measures. Such a communication strategy should clearly state the purpose of the communication measures to be taken, define the sender and receiver, and outline the content planned as well as the communication channels to be used.	E1. Establish a communication strategy with internal and external actions identified. E2. Estimate budgetary implications for enhancing communications. E3. Set up administrative document on defining the purpose, scope, participation and content of different types of meetings being implemented in the Programme.

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
	<p>Additionally, for the internal communication a set of meeting formats and their respective purpose should be defined, as well as the participants, including their functions.</p>	
	<p>The Programme should start a discussion about how to establish additional formal means of communication to reach public authorities, States Parties, and public agencies. It is difficult to share the current form of news via social media within the networks of public authorities. To gain further visibility, it is advisable to create a periodic newsletter (once or twice a year) which can be shared and forwarded in formal networks. Further digital solutions and central platforms (messengers, broadcasting of training activities, etc.) should be provided to inform, integrate and reach a higher proportion of the target group and stakeholder group.</p>	<p>F1. Revise and update the ICCROM webpage on the Programme to make it more accessible, with all content derived from the programme organized in a systematic way. F2. Establish additional formal means of communication in addition to the current methods in conjunction with the development of the web platform on a programme level but also in coordination with all the institutional communications.</p>
<p>Priority 2: Action within 12 months, within 2021</p>	<p>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 Programme’s duration and a potential second phase, as well as long-term impacts should be identified.</p>	<p>G1. Continue convening Advisory Group meetings, working group meetings for the Programme and present the programme progress to the WHC/ABs meetings. (ongoing) G2. Continue reporting the progress which include sections on impacts of the programme to the relevant Committee documents.</p>
	<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>H1. Establish a survey system targeted at programme participants. H2. Implement the phased survey system to course/programme participants as appropriate. H3. Establish a specific session/survey during the Site Managers Forum to collect feedback on the overall programme.</p>
	<p>The Programme management should revise the programme process plan and consider integrating a phase which deals with the “regionalisation” of the globally worked out results (e.g. EIA, DRM, etc.), ideally systematically linked with the training activities and courses in close collaboration with the Advisory group and interested donors.</p>	<p>I1. Formalize MOUs/Agreements with the WH related C2Cs on hosting programme courses and activities to ensure full regional coverage of activities and translations. I2. Prepare a Regional Implementation plan for all programme courses and activities for 2022 and onwards. I3. Actively seek to host courses in ARB, LAC, AFR regions as a priority for new activities.</p>

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
	<p>Consider formalising the partnerships with partner organizations to create more tangible institutional bonds (e.g. MoUs or partnership agreements).</p>	<p>J1. Establish MOUs with ICOMOS and IAIA on current and potential scope of collaboration. J2. Establish formal partnerships with other organizations and partners in the future for more tangible bonds.</p>
<p>Priority 3: Action within 24 months, within 2022 (End of Phase 1 of WHL)</p>	<p>To consider the standardised evaluation reports (e.g. SOC [State of Conservation] reports) to assess the long-term conservation impact of its activities.</p>	<p>K1. Continuously follow up with the SOC process of relevant programme activity sites to utilize the SOC reports to measure impacts of the programme and to follow up on providing support to the learning sites. K2. Encourage sites involved with the programme to upload case studies to the PANORAMA platform.</p>
	<p>The Programme management should revise the programme process plan and consider integrating a phase which deals with the “regionalisation” of the globally worked out results (e.g. EIA, DRM etc.), ideally systematically linked with the training activities and courses in close collaboration with the Advisory group and interested donors.</p>	<p>I1. Formalize MOUs/Agreements with the WH related C2Cs on hosting programme courses and activities to ensure full regional coverage. [See above] L1. Establish a regional rollout plan of the three main courses of WHL to disseminate the knowledge products established during Phase 1. L2. Seek further financial partners to sponsor these regional activities.</p>
	<p>The Programme management should target the cooperation with the networks that facilitate training (e.g. C2C, UNESCO Chairs and WH-related master Programmes) to ensure long-term integration of the content developed.</p>	<p>M1. Establish a work plan for activating a research network amongst Universities operating WH-related programmes. M2. Implement pilot activities for the research network.</p>
	<p>Programme management should identify and implement a process for legitimising and embedding relevant results and outputs into the WH environment in close cooperation with relevant members of the Advisory group and the WHC.</p>	<p>D2. Convene Programme meetings with the Advisory Group and partners to confirm, design and communicate the status of the products. [See above]</p>
	<p>Programme management should closely collaborate with relevant stakeholders to identify ways and resources to formalise the SMF [Site Managers’ Forum] by the end of the current phase. A potential second phase should include measures for strengthening partnerships and networks on their way to more formalised settings. The Programme should try to formalise the SMF in collaboration with the relevant organizations in a long-term perspective, and seek geographical balance. The Programme management should closely collaborate with the relevant</p>	<p>N1. Formalize the element of coordinating the SMF through the MOUs and Agreements with partner organizations. N2. Facilitate the regular interlink between the SMF and Youth Forum for future sessions with WHC focal point on Youth Forum. N3. Ensure organized SMF participants’ inputs in designing the SMF sessions and implementation by region.</p>

Priority & Timeframe	Recommendation	Desirable action to be taken
	stakeholders to promote the successive linking of the SMF to the WHC as well as possible, and encourage partnerships with relevant organisations (e.g. Youth Forum)	
	Programme management has succeeded in creating a huge professional network of different actors, institutions, the Advisory Bodies, experts, and site managers. However these networks need to be formalised in some way, as self-maintaining approaches will hardly work. The formalisation of those networks needs a joint effort to be undertaken, including the officially responsible institutions. The recognised gap between the statutory level and the site level seems to be a major barrier which needs to be overcome in order to find a long-term solution.	O1. Organize targeted activities for AB networks, Site managers, National Focal points, University Researchers on the module themes to supply audience relevant content.
	Recognize necessity to include further resources and/or a corresponding sharing of tasks and responsibilities to ensure continuity and further strengthen the still fragile networks.	P1. Collect information on existing regional networks and analyse best supportive actions for each region. P2. Prepare implementation action plan for second phase.
	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).	Q1. Prepare budgetary and programmatic plans for hiring an additional programme manager for the second phase to ensure spread of the workload, enhance communication aspects of the programme, and seek a separation of programme content and administration.
Additional : Actions that could be considered for a potential 2nd phase, after 2022	The Programme management should set up a separate implementation plan for field testing, ground truthing and adoption of the key deliverables in collaboration with the target audience at local level.	I2. Prepare a Regional Implementation plan for all programme courses and activities for 2022 and onwards. (see above)
	The Programme management should plan to translate the most relevant outputs into the 6 languages of the WHC.	R1. Prepare a translation campaign for different products through the MOUs and Agreements to be established with the regional partners.
	Programme management should closely collaborate with the relevant members of the Advisory group to identify the potential for alignment and synergies with other Programmes and initiatives (e.g. the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme), which should also be considered in the context of the Knowledge framework.	S1. Continue collaboration with Renewable Energy Facilities guidance project, Climate Change policy. S2.Existing programmes and initiatives within the WH sector will be considered for forging synergies in the potential 2 nd phase of the programme.
	Support the initiative for the establishment of an African Regional Site Managers Forum and explore the options to establish similar subforums in other regions.	T1. Continue to collaborate with AWHF to co-organize the possible African Regional SMF.

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