



**INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION**  
(of UNESCO)

**Thirty-third Session of the Assembly**  
UNESCO, Paris, 25 June–3 July 2025

Items 5.2 and 5.4 of the Provisional Agenda

**ASSESSMENT OF IOC'S GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT PROCESSES**

Summary

This document presents an external assessment conducted by 'Farman & Partners' in response to the IOC Member States' request to '*the IOC Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Officers of the Commission, to launch an external assessment of IOC's governance and management processes, with a view to streamlining operations and optimising the use of resources so as to be truly fit for purpose in response to the fast-evolving ocean agenda and increasing demands of Member States and multilateral processes*' (IOC Resolution EC-57/2).

The document was first presented to the Intersessional Financial Advisory Group (IFAG) at its third online meeting on 16 April 2025 and then further discussed at the in-person meeting on 23 June 2025 (ref. IOC/A-33/5.1.Doc(2) – Report of the Chairperson of the IOC Intersessional Financial Advisory Group (intersessional period 2024-2025).

Decision proposed: After a brief introduction and discussion in plenary under item 5.2, the Assembly is invited to take note of this report and consider the draft decision referenced as Dec. IOC/A-33/5.2 in the Provisional Action Paper (document IOC/A-33/AP). The document will then be subject to an in-depth review by the sessional statutory open-ended Financial Committee and the decision reflected in the Draft Resolution that the Financial Committee will be submitting to the Assembly for adoption under item 5.4 in accordance with paragraph 15 of the Draft Revised Guidelines for the Preparation and Consideration of Draft Resolutions ([IOC/INF-1315](#)).



**FARMAN & PARTNERS**

## **External assessment of IOC's governance and management processes**

**28/03/2025 Final report**

### **1. Introduction. Background, scope and method of this assessment**

At its 57<sup>th</sup> session in June 2024, the Executive Council requested “the IOC Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Officers of the Commission, to launch an external assessment of IOC’s governance and management processes, with a view to streamlining operations and optimising the use of resources so as to be truly fit for purpose in response to the fast-evolving ocean agenda and increasing demands of Member States and multilateral processes.”

This decision was part of Resolution EC-57/2 on “Governance, Programming and Budgeting Matters of the Commission.” It should be seen against the backdrop of IOC’s significantly increased budgets and the determination of Member States to ensure efficient, effective and accountable execution of IOC’s mandate and responsibilities.

The scope of this assessment, as per the terms of reference, encompasses the governance structure and processes, the management and operational processes, the stakeholder engagement and collaboration, and resource optimization and sustainability.

Farman & partners, my consultancy, was contracted for this assessment, which I, Christophe Jeanteur, have carried out.

I have proceeded first by analysing the relevant documentation (C/5 budgets, previous audits, Assembly and Executive council decisions, etc. see list in Appendix 1), then by interviewing a panel of 25 IOC present and past officers, subsidiary body and secretariat staff, member state focal points and contributing agency staff (see list in Appendix 2). I also attended a meeting of the open-ended Intersessional Finance Advisory Group (IFAG) as an observer.

The interviews covered 6 processes :

1. Strategic planning and review, in connection with program and budget planning and control;
2. Human resources planning and management, especially recruitment;
3. IOC interactions with and requirements imposed by UNESCO Departments
4. Participation of IOC in relevant multilateral processes
5. Communication and dissemination of ocean research and knowledge produced by IOC and Member States (branding, intellectual property recognition)
6. IOC Executive Council and Assembly (Member States involvement)

The question of IOC's statutory "functional autonomy" within UNESCO was raised by many Member States and addressed transversally in relation to the six aforementioned processes.

## **2. Overarching conclusion**

There is a general consensus that IOC addresses issues that are all of vital importance for the planet in a way that can be replaced by no other organization - its role being clearly distinct in particular from those of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) , and that IOC has always lived on very limited, many say insufficient, resources.

Thus, IOC's effectiveness is not a matter of leanness of its secretariat and programs nor of allocating its limited resources only to worthwhile activities. It is firstly about IOC's membership effectively exercising their common ownership, and secondly about being free to go about fulfilling its specific mission in accordance with its Statutes.

## **3. General background on IOC**

IOC has a dual governance and management structure. On one hand, IOC is established within UNESCO and subject to the UNESCO framework: General Conference (UNESCO-GC), Executive Board (UNESCO-EB), Director-General (DG), Secretariat and Regular Budget (RB). On the other hand, it consists of the IOC Assembly (IOC-A) of now 150 member States (IOC membership is distinct from UNESCO membership although in fact almost all IOC member States are also UNESCO members), the Executive Council (IOC-EC) of 40 member States, the IOC Secretariat and subsidiary bodies (programmes or regional sub-commissions).

IOC's "functional autonomy" within the UNESCO framework has been repeatedly emphasised since it was first granted in 1987, with the 2<sup>nd</sup> revision of its statutes. In 1995, UNESCO merged its other oceanography-related activities with the IOC Secretariat. In 1999, with the 3<sup>rd</sup> revision of the IOC statutes, the post of IOC Secretary became IOC *Executive Secretary* (ES), "at the level of UNESCO Assistant DG (ADG), appointed by the DG following consultation with the IOC-EC". The same revision of the IOC statutes formalized the fact that "voluntary contributions may be accepted and established as trust funds in accordance with the financial regulations of the special account of IOC". Since the 2018-2019 biennium, following the recommendation of the UNESCO External Auditor,<sup>1</sup> IOC has its own line in UNESCO's program and budget ("C/5") and is no longer a part of Major Program II Natural Sciences. This has enhanced IOC visibility but on the other hand might have created among many the impression that the IOC is a "UNESCO sector" on par with education, sciences and culture, which do not have distinct Member States and governing bodies.

For its resources, IOC depends partly (44% in 2024-2025) on the allocation of a fixed percentage of UNESCO's regular budget (3% since 2024-2025; 2% before), which itself is funded by UNESCO's Member States collectively, and partly on direct, voluntary contributions from individual IOC Member States (28%), other UN organizations (19%) and private donors (9%)<sup>2</sup>, as well as in-kind contributions from member States and technology providers. When these are taken into account (on the basis of 2022-2023 amounts) the total contribution of

---

<sup>1</sup> 200 EX/20 and INF

<sup>2</sup> The breakdown of voluntary contribution between member States, other UN organisations and private donors is that of the Signed funding agreements 1 January 2022-31 December 2023 (source : IOC/EC-57/3.1.Doc(2))

Member States amounts to 79%: 47% of the grand total in direct contributions and 32% collectively through UNESCO's regular budget.

It is worth noting that “there is no Convention underpinning the operation of IOC, so decisions are not binding or enforceable”<sup>3</sup> and direct, voluntary contributions are less dependable than UNESCO's regular budget. One must also bear in mind that the USA, who is the biggest single contributor both to UNESCO regular budget and to IOC's, stopped or held funding UNESCO in 1984-2003 and again in 2011-2023, which led UNESCO to reduce proportionally the IOC line on its budget. On both occasions, though, the USA chose to remain a member of IOC, and in 1984-2003 they continued their voluntary contribution, on the grounds of IOC's functional autonomy within UNESCO.

Despite the above-mentioned evolution, the practical understanding of IOC's “functional autonomy” has always remained an issue which was raised repeatedly in internal and external reports.<sup>4</sup> For example, IOC is quite constrained in the recruitment criteria and process for international professional posts : today, the final decision is made by the DG for all posts, and the Human Resources Management (HRM) Director reviews IOC's choice in terms of due priority to internal mobility, member state and gender representativity.<sup>5</sup> In contrast, in 1995 the UNESCO DDG had given a delegation of authority to IOC's Secretary, covering (among other points) the appointment of grades P/1 to P/3, grades P/4 and P/5 being appointed by the DDG upon recommendation of IOC (without interference of HRM). Thus, IOC organs have less weight in the appointment of P-1 to P-5 than in the appointment of its Executive Secretary.<sup>6</sup>

The imbalance between IOC's membership and UNESCO control has also manifested itself in planning processes. When the IOC's share of UNESCO's regular budget was raised from 2% to 3%, upon Member States' request, and the United States returned to UNESCO and resumed payments, IOC Member States found it all the more critical to check that this effectively lead to the enhanced programme delivery. What happened was that the window of opportunity to submit a revised regular budget to the UNESCO-EB and GC opened just after the June 2023 IOC-EC and Assembly ordinary sessions, and for only 3 weeks, which was too short to involve special IOC-EC and IOC-Assembly sessions. These circumstances “did not provide the most optimal conditions for quality consultations with IOC Member States”<sup>7</sup> on how to most effectively and responsibly manage what was otherwise a long-awaited blessing for IOC.

IOC Member States have had a similar experience of insufficient opportunity for consultation in the ongoing preparations of the upcoming 2026-27 programme and budget.

---

<sup>3</sup> SMITH Neville, « The future », in HOLLAND Geoff and PUGH David, *Troubled waters. Ocean science and governance*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2010, p.289

<sup>4</sup> See at least the following reports. 1) IOC working group on the Future of IOC, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 19-20/02/2008; 2) UNESCO External Auditor, Audit Report on the IOC, doc. 200 EX/20.INF.2, 23/08/2016, point 20 “20. The Commission's statutory autonomy does not seem to be sufficiently reflected in UNESCO's budgetary documents. The elements of this autonomy are nonetheless clearly stated in several articles of its Statutes.”; 3) UNESCO Internal Oversight Service (IOS) « Evaluation of the strategic positioning of IOC-UNESCO », doc. IOS/EVS/PI 197, August 2021, page 10 « The optimal institutional relationship between UNESCO and IOC-UNESCO is yet to be clarified »

<sup>5</sup> See UNESCO HR Manual 5.3.83

<sup>6</sup> See OC/INF-1316 Consultation for the appointment of the Executive Secretary of the IOC: process for the establishment of a short-list of applicants for submission to the DG of UNESCO (2/05/20214)

<sup>7</sup> OC/EC-57/5.2.Doc(2) report of the chairperson of the IOC Intersessional Financial Advisory Group (IFAG) to the IOC-EC June 2024 session.

This background highlights the fact that the status and relationship of IOC relative to UNESCO, its functional autonomy and its dual governance and management processes, is at the heart of the matter.

#### 4. Findings from the interviews

Regarding Process 1. Strategic planning and review, in connection with program and budget planning and control

- Most of those interviewed said that IOC's budget and Secretariat staff number are not up to the demands of its mission and the challenges facing the ocean in today's world.
- Several pointed out that IOC, struggling to meet the ever-increasing demands of so many countries, get drawn into launching new projects without being able to terminate existing ones.
- As voluntary contributions are almost entirely earmarked for specific programs, the budgeting process essentially revolves around the allocation of IOC's normally fixed share of UNESCO's regular budget to its various functions, programs and locations or sub-commissions, and is constrained, for the staff/post part, by UNESCO's staffing criteria (decentralization, diversity).
- Given this highly constrained budgetary process framework, it is hardly surprising that most interviewees who had experienced the budgetary process stressed the lack of strategic control left to IOC's governing bodies, feeling that they are only expected to "tick and flip" and sign off. All the more so as they generally receive the documents well after the normal deadline (often due to the Secretariat's lack of personnel and delays in the timing of meetings of subsidiary bodies), too late for the various agencies and ministries of a given State to elaborate a common position.
- Several interviewees pointed to IOC's weakness in terms of program management control (definition of objectives, key performance indicators) and over-optimistic costing.
- Several member states interviewed could not afford to second staff or interns to Paris due to the cost of living, but would be happy to do so locally.
- Other issues were raised individually:
  - "The overheads charged by UNESCO (9% normally) to cover indirect costs of central services: treasury, legal counsel, grants management and negotiations, internal oversight etc. are excessive"
  - "Secretariat costs exceed program costs",
  - "IOC is too dependent on Flanders/Ostende for core IODE functions."
  - Opportunity to involve more private companies with an interest in ocean currents, swell, etc., and with data on the subject, e.g. oil companies, fisheries, carriers, etc.
  - "In capacity building services (education and training), the IHO does more with less."

Regarding Process 2. Human resources planning and management, especially recruitment

- In 2023, the delegation of authority granted by the UNESCO DG to all ADGs to appoint Professional staff up to P-4 level was revoked, and it is currently the DG who appoints all Professional staff within the UNESCO Secretariat, including for IOC. Most interviewees feel that UNESCO's recruitment criteria constrain organizational efficiency (cost of decentralization) and, sometimes, individual skills (cost of diversity). The recruitment

process is considered excessively long (over 6 months) and somewhat opaque for people far from the centre.

- Regarding field offices, some pointed to the lack of coordination between local IOC staff, IOC programme hierarchy, UNESCO office management and host country agents.
- Other issues raised and suggestions made individually:
  - Africa is underrepresented among Secretariat staff (2 posts currently)
  - IOC/UNESCO should subsidize the cost of living in Paris for interns (particularly from small island states).
  - IOC should be flexible in employing seconded staff locally rather than in Paris.

Regarding Process 3. IOC interactions with and requirements imposed by UNESCO Departments

- UNESCO requests not directly related to IOC's mission take up an estimated 10 - 25% of the time of an IOC secretariat section head : writing ad hoc notes, double reporting (as UNESCO's reporting format often does not correspond to the relevant IOC breakdown), participation in UNESCO meetings that have little to do with IOC's mission (for example, UNESCO's Science Sector deals with terrestrial hydrography, which has nothing to do with marine science and policy, as terrestrial waters are entirely under national jurisdiction, unlike oceans).
- One interviewee suggested that IOC review the format of the C/5 jointly with UNESCO and agree on a common format for the IOC section that meets both IOC and UNESCO requirements, so as to put an end to double reporting ;

Regarding Process 4. Participation of IOC in relevant multilateral processes

- Among the multilateral organizations and processes most relevant to IOC (and more so than UNESCO) are: WMO (World Meteorological Organization), FAO (UN Food and Agricultural Organisation), IHO (International Hydrographic Organization), DOALOS (the UN Secretariat's Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea), UNFCCC (UN Framework Convention on Climate Change), CBD (UN convention on Biological Diversity) and BBNJ (Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction). Interviewees reported cases where IOC is accredited independently of UNESCO, but where UNESCO has assumed management over the IOC delegation and contributions. In recent years, IOC has not received independent accreditation for some relevant UN processes, including paradoxically the UN Ocean Conferences (UNOC).
- Almost all those interviewed considered the restrictions or prior authorization imposed by UNESCO, and granted only at the last minute, for IOC delegations and/or Executive Secretary's travels to be impractical and, in principle, unacceptable.
- One interviewee suggested that IOC should take an interest in disciplines other than oceanography: education, heritage, society.

Regarding Process 5. Communication and dissemination of ocean research and knowledge produced by IOC and member State (branding, intellectual property recognition)

- All those interviewed have noted that UNESCO now systematically eliminates the IOC name from all communications : press releases and interviews, Twitter/X, brochures and posters. They consider this unjustified, since UNESCO has no real ocean competence outside IOC. In addition, UNESCO's "heavy hand" in organizing the StOR 2024 launch

event was very badly perceived by Iceland as a sign that IOC in fact has no functional autonomy.

- Most of those interviewed consider this situation to be potentially damaging, for two reasons.
  - It discourages member states (e.g. India for the IOTWMS) and other partners (e.g. the Nippon Foundation for the Seabed 2023 program, the ISC...) from making an intellectual or financial contribution, as they consider that only IOC (not UNESCO) is competent to make good use of their contribution.
  - it could prompt Member States that are not members of UNESCO to also leave IOC on the grounds that the functional autonomy is not real and the IOC Statutes not respected.
- All those interviewed insisted that for IOC to optimise its effectiveness as an ocean expertise body, it should promote itself as IOC. . “UNESCO is better known to the general public and politicians, but IOC is more respected in the ocean community.”
- Several interviewees suggested that IOC should develop a strategy to increase its visibility.

Regarding Process 6. IOC Executive Council and Assembly (member states involvement)

- One respondent pointed out that the decisions of the Assembly and the Executive Council are not really binding on Member States, since IOC, unlike WMO, is not based on a UN convention. But no one suggested seeking a UN convention.
- One interviewee pointed out the unequal representation of Member States on the Executive Council according to their electoral group: Group 1: 10 seats/24 States; G2: 3/14; G3: 9/30; G4: 9/35; G5: 9/47
- Almost all member State representatives interviewed complained that they always receive the documents well after the normal two-month deadline, too late for the various agencies and ministries their State to reach a common position. This situation can be partly explained by delayed input from subsidiary bodies and working groups, but also by slim staff capacity.
- Attendance and active participation in the Assembly and Executive Council are too low, even if they have increased in recent years. Possible causes : the discussions are “boring”, too focused on wording and not enough on substance; Member States with limited resources cannot afford to send experts as delegates.
- Ongoing difficulty in involving Member State policy makers beyond scientists.
- One respondent raised the issue of the role and position of the Secretariat in relation to Member States and governing bodies. "It has become more than a secretariat, it has its own agenda and its own programs unlike the WMO Secretariat and the DOALOS (Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea). The IOC Secretariat should stick to its role."
- Practical suggestions
  - Circulate background information before meetings; have Programs ask Member States for their position before finalizing decision proposals.
  - Send a draft version of documents, without waiting for translation. If documents are not ready at all, remove the topic from the agenda.
  - Invite Member States to submit their statements in writing rather than reading them at the meeting.



- Allow remote participation (by video)
- Involve regional offices
- Better integrate newcomers (new delegations, new members of experienced delegations).
- Schedule a one-hour introduction at the beginning of the Assembly's session week to explain the program, which is intensive, and the organization, which is complex.

#### About Functional autonomy

- For some respondents, the functional autonomy provided for in the IOC statutes is fundamental because it is linked to the independence of IOC membership from UNESCO membership, and it needs to be defended because what is at stake is crucial.
  - Some States are members of IOC and not of UNESCO. This is the case of Israel currently and, at certain times in the past, of the United States, the United Kingdom, Singapore and others. This situation could arise again. States in such situation obviously cannot finance IOC through UNESCO's regular budget but can still do so 1) through direct voluntary contributions, 2) in kind (56% of the Argo floats – 2 286 out of 4 091 - were provided by the United States), 3) through partners such as the WMO.
- For others, the question of functional autonomy, although raised again and again, seems to be a claim of status rather than substance, too minor or too vague to be defended within UNESCO.
  - UNESCO's tendency to micro-manage depends on the person in charge.
  - The infighting within UNESCO only benefits UNESCO's enemies.
- All agree to strongly defend the following concrete points
  - Respect and protect the IOC brand
  - IOC's Executive Secretary has the same rank as a UNESCO assistant director general (ADG) but is not one and should not be managed as one. In particular, he should be free to travel and participate in external meetings without prior authorization, and to authorize Secretariat staff to travel and participate in meetings on his own initiative.
  - More autonomy and flexibility in post location and in candidate selection.

## 5. Recommendations

In requesting an external assessment of IOC governance and management processes, the Executive Council was aiming at *“streamlining operations and optimising the use of resources so as to be truly fit for purpose in response to the fast-evolving ocean agenda and increasing demands of Member States and multilateral processes.”*

The main conclusion of this assessment is that there are significant opportunities for such streamlining and optimisation. At the heart of the challenge are the dual governance and management practices in the relationship between the IOC and UNESCO. Several examples of these practices are described above. They result in unclarity of accountability, duplication of work and inefficiencies in resource allocation and use.

The overarching recommendation of this assessment is that in order to achieve the desired streamlining and optimisation, Member States need to clarify and apply the principles and practices of IOC governance and management as defined in the IOC Statutes. According to the IOC Statutes “the Assembly is the principal organ of the Commission and shall perform all functions of the Commission.” Therefore the upcoming IOC Assembly is an opportunity for

Member States to determine how, on the basis of the situation described in this report, they want to optimise governance and management for the improvement of programme planning and execution, human and financial resource allocation, communications and visual identity, and the IOC's role and identity in the multilateral system.

Through ensuring in this way more clarity of accountability and more efficient governance/management processes, there is also an opportunity of making future sessions of the IOC Assembly and Executive Council more engaging and results-oriented for Member States.

\* \* \*

#### **Appendix 1 : documents reviewed**

- 1999-05-04 UNESCO Executive Board 156<sup>th</sup> Session
  - 1999-05-04 156EX/9 Report on the administrative and financial arrangements consistent with the status of the IOC
  - 1999-05-04 156EX/Decisions
- IOC statutes,
  - Initial version (1960)
  - 1970 revision
  - 1987 revision
  - last revision adopted by the UNESCO General Conference 30th session, 27/10/1999.
- 1991-01-17 DG/Note/91/3 Delegation of authority to the Secretary of the IOC
- 1995-03-01 DDG92/Memo 66 Experimental functional autonomy
- IOC rules of procedure, last version adopted by the IOC Assembly 21st session, 11/07/2001
- UNESCO Approved Programme and budget 2022-2023 (41/C5) and 2024-2025 (42/C5)
- 1992-17-27, Ad hoc Study Group on IOC Development, Operations, Structure and Functions 3rd Session, Summary report “Quo vadis IOC ?” (48 pages)
- 2008-02-19, IOC Working Group on the Future of IOC 1st session, Reports of Meetings of Experts and Equivalent Bodies (74 pages)
- 2009-12-16 UNESCO HR Manual, 5.3. Recruitment for International Professional posts and above
- 2010 Geoff HOLLAND and David PUGH (ed.), Troubled waters. Ocean science and governance. Cambridge Press ISBN: 978-0-521-76581-7, [Reference text on the history of the IOC] (315 pages)
- 2014-05-01 OC/INF-1316 Consultation for the appointment of the Executive Secretary of the IOC: process for the establishment of a short-list of applicants for submission to the DG of UNESCO
- IOC Executive Council 47th Session (01-04/07/2014)
  - 2014-07-02 IOC-EC-XLVII/Dec. 4, *The Future of the IOC* (2 pages)
- IOC Assembly 28<sup>th</sup> Session (18-25/06/2015)

- 2015-06-17, IOC-XXVIII/2 Annex 4 Provisional agenda item 4, Report of the chair of the intersessional working group on “The future of the IOC” (87 pages)
- 2015-06-25, IOC Resolution XXVIII-3 *Financial matters of the Commission* (6 pages)
- IOC Executive Council 49<sup>th</sup> Session (07-10/06/2016)
  - 2016-05-09 IOCEC-XLIX/2 Annex 9 Rev. Provisional agenda item 5, *Contribution to the future of the IOC Executive roadmap* (43 pages)
  - 2016-06-02 IOC/EC-XLIX/2 Annex 10 Provisional agenda items 3.1, 5 & 6.2 Follow-up on the recommendations on the Report on Governance of UNESCO and dependent funds, programmes and entities (16 pages)
  - 2017-03-01 Reports of Governing and Major Subsidiary Bodies (135 pages), in particular Annex V The future of the IOC: notes on its functional autonomy (2 pages)
- 2016 IOC/EC-XLIX/2 Annex 9 Rev. -08-23, Cour des Comptes, “Audit report on the IOC 2013-2016”, in External Audit of the UNESCO 200 EX/20.INF.2 (81 pages)
- 2017-06-19 UNESCO document: Sub-Group 2: Structure, composition and methods of work of UNESCO’s International and Intergovernmental Bodies (IIBs) Draft Recommendations (11 pages)
- IOC Assembly 29<sup>th</sup> Session (21-29/06/2017)
  - 2017-05-23 IOC-XXIX/2 Annex 8 Provisional agenda item 4.1 *Contribution of the future IOC Executive roadmap* (59 pages)
  - 2017-06-13 IOC-XXIX/2 Annex 3 Provisional agenda items 3.2.2 and 11.1 *Audit of IOC by external auditors of UNESCO: draft implementation plan* (22 pages)
  - 2017-06-13 IOC-XXIX/2 Annex 3 Add.1 Provisional agenda items 3.2.2 and 11.1 Audit of IOC by external auditors of UNESCO: draft implementation plan \ A review of the potential for pooling reports of the IOC to its governing bodies (18 pages)
  - 2017-06-20 IOC-XXIX/2 Annex 4 Provisional agenda items 3.2.3 and 11.1 Report of the chairperson of the Executive Council Working Group on the recommendations, working methods and procedures of the Commission (3 pages)
- IOC Executive Council 51<sup>st</sup> Session (03-06/07/2018)
  - 2018-04-19 IOC/EC-LI/2 Annex 13 Revised provisional agenda items 6.1 and 6.2 IOC governance Draft implementation plan of the recommendations of the UNESCO open-ended working group on governance (16 pages)
- IOC Assembly 31<sup>st</sup> Session (14-25/06/2021)
  - 2021-06-14, *IOC Medium-Term strategy 2022-2029*, adopted by the Resolution A-31/2 of the IOC Assembly 31<sup>st</sup> Session (commonly referred to as “Optimal IOC”) (30 pages)
- 2021-08-16, IOC Executive Board 212<sup>th</sup> Session
  - 2021-08-16, 212X/9 Provisional agenda item 9, International Oversight Service (IOS) evaluation of the strategic positioning of the IOC (Summary and IOC management response) (9 pages)
- 2021-08-01, UNESCO Internal Oversight Service (IOS), Evaluation of the strategic positioning of IOC-UNESCO (61 pages)
- 2022-06-04 IOC/INF-1322 Rev. Update on the status of IOC subsidiary bodies, 2015 (7 pages)
- IOC Executive Council 57<sup>th</sup> Session (14-17/06/2022)

- 22-05-19 Provisional Agenda item 3.2 Draft action plan in response to the IOS evaluation of the IOC strategic positioning (14 pages)
- 2022-11-14, IOC Circular Letter No 2912 to National Coordinating Bodies for liaison with the IOC (IOC Member States) re Follow-up to Internal Oversight Service Evaluation of the Strategic Positioning of IOC (known as “Optimal IOC”) (18 pages)
- IOC Assembly 32nd Session (21-30/06/2023)
  - 2023-05-15, IOC-32/5.Doc(1) Provisional agenda item 5 IOC and the future of the ocean: sustainable delivery and expansion of IOC activities (19 pages)
  - 2023-06-29, Draft Resolution A-32/DR.[6.4] submitted by 30 IOC Member States (17 pages)
- 2024-01-01 IOC organization chart
- 57<sup>th</sup> Session of the IOC Executive Council (25-28/06/2024)
  - 2024-04-25, Provisional Agenda Items 3.1 and 5.4 “Financial situation of the IOC special account at year-end 2023; and forecast for 2024-2025”, IOC/EC-57/3.1.Doc(3) (10 pages)
  - 2024-04-25, Provisional Agenda Item 5.1 “Revised program and budget 2024-2025 (42 C/5) and preliminary proposals for 2026-2029 (Draft 43/C5) (27 pages)
  - 2024-05-13, Provisional Agenda Items 3.1 and 5.4 “Report on 2022-2023 (41 C/5) Budget implementation as at 31/12/2023” (11 pages)
  - 2024-05-13, Provisional Agenda Items 3.1, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 “Report of the chairperson of the Intersessional Financial Advisory Group (IFAG) Intersessional period January-June 2024” (17 pages)
  - 2024-06-28 Adopted Decisions & Resolutions (22 pages)
- 2024-08-06 IOC Circular Letter No 3003 to IOC National Official Coordinating Bodies for Liaison with IOC re Re-constitution of the Open-ended Intersessional Financial Advisory Group for the period September 2024 – June 2025 (1 page)
- 2024-09-01, IOC Events Calendar (“Planning wheel”)
- 2024-09-13 IOC management retreat
  - 2024-08-28 (pre-retreat) Research for purpose (consultants), *UNESCO IOC\_insight from 121s and recommendations* (10 pages)
  - 2024-1-07 Research for purpose (consultants), *Retreat report* (27 pages)
- 2024-10-22 IOC Circular Letter No 3009 to Member States of the IOC Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific (WESTPAC) re Invitation to the 15th Intergovernmental Session of the IOC Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific (WESTPAC-XV), Tokyo, Japan, 11–13 March 2025 (8 pages)
- 2024-06-01, IOC of UNESCO, State of the Ocean report (89pages)
- 2024-10-01, IOC-2022/WS/2/REV03 «UNESCO Ocean Programmes » brochure (40 pages)
- 2024-10-22, *National contact manual* (47 pages)

## Appendix 2. Interviewees

- Secretariat
  - Vladimir RYABININ (former IOC Executive Secretary)
  - Bernardo ALIAGA (Secretariat, Tsunami Resilience section)
  - Julian BARBIERE (Secretariat, marine policy & regional coordination section)
  - Srinivasa Kumar TUMMALA (India, IOT WMS)
- Regional subsidiary bodies
  - Mark ODUBER (Aruba/NL, IOCARRIBE)
  - Kentaro ANDO (Japan, WESTPAC)
  - Kouadio AFFIAN (Ivory Coast, IOC AFRICA)
- Member state focal points, also representatives of contributing agencies
  - Matthias WUNSCH, Deutschland, Bundesamt Schifffahrt und Hydrographie-Hydrologie
  - Gert VERREET, Belgium, Flanders
  - John SIDDORN and Allan EVANS, UK, National Oceanography Centre
  - Nichole BRINSMEAD & Louise WICKS, Bureau of Meteorology, Australia
  - Hrönn EGILSDÓTTIR (HAFRO); Auðbjörg HALLDÓRSDÓTTIR, Kristín HALLA and Guðrún ÞORSTEINSD (delegation to UNESCO), Iceland
  - Arran McPHERSON (Assistant deputy minister), Keith LENNON (Senior Advisor, dir. ocean science program), Andrew STEWART, Fisheries and Oceans Canada; Dominique LEVASSEUR (permanent delegation to UNESCO); Canada
  - Luis PINHEIRO (Portugal)
- Former Governance
  - Peter M HAUGAN, ex chair IOC
  - Neville SMITH, ex Australia delegate and Vice chair
- Other
  - Albert FISCHER, WMO and ex-IOC Secretariat Observation Department head.

Nine more persons were contacted for interview but did not respond or declined.

\* \* \*