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## Executive summary

This paper was prepared as input for the UNESCO workshop on developing a follow-up and evaluation mechanism for activities carried out within the context of the global capacity-building strategy for the implementation of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.[[1]](#footnote-1) In **Part I** it outlines the rationale for this mechanism in light of the obligations of States Parties and UNESCO’s role in providing capacity building as a way to support countries with the effective implementation of the Convention. It reviews each of the four modalities currently used in programme delivery, notably (i) needs assessments, (ii) policy advice, (iii) training services and (iv) pilot activities. In **Part II** the paper suggests an indicator-based conceptual framework in the form of a follow-up and evaluation matrix (Annex I) clustered into ten thematic result areas, including policy development, inventorying, safeguarding and sustainable development. **Part III** enumerates the main implementation requirements in terms of operationalizing data collection and the related organizational, technical and budgetary implications.

## Part I: Rationale

### 1. **Obligations of States Parties under the 2003 Convention**

The 2003 Convention obliges State Parties to take the necessary measures to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage (ICH) present in their territory (Article 11 a) and to identify and inventory (as well as regularly update) such ICH with the participation of non-state actors (Articles 11 b and 12.1).[[2]](#footnote-2) Of these two obligations, the ‘participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations’ is a key characteristic of this international Convention, which attributes unprecedented importance to communities as the stewards of their ICH. On the one hand, the 2003 Convention is a typical **intergovernmental instrument** relying on its adoption, ratification, and approval by States Parties. On the other hand, the implementation of the 2003 Convention also requires the **full involvement of communities**. The viability of the 2003 Convention therefore relies on **successfully working with** **two addressees** in terms of implementation: **state and society**.

### 2. **Role of the UNESCO Secretariat in implementing the Convention**

The role of the UNESCO Secretariat is therefore not only to assist the Committee with the process of evaluating, assessing and inscribing elements of ICH on either the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (RL) or the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (USL). It is not only there to assist with processing international assistance requests or proposals for the register of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. Rather, the **UNESCO Secretariat is called to support States Parties** to meet their mentioned obligations. In this regard, UNESCO’s **highest priority** for the implementation of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage is the **global capacity-building strategy**. A multi-faceted capacity-building programme has been put in place to establish and enhance the capacities of countries in view of safeguarding ICH in a sustainable manner; to harness its potential for sustainable development; and to promote broad public knowledge and support for the key concepts and main objectives of the 2003 Convention. In general terms, the capacity-building programme addresses what were initially identified as the most urgent needs:

* Redesign of the institutional infrastructure to cater to the specific needs of ICH
* Revision of cultural and other policies and legislation
* Development of inventory methods and systems
* Development of effective safeguarding measures
* Effective participation in the international cooperation mechanisms of the Convention

### 3. **Main modalities of the capacity-building programme**

UNESCO has established **four main modalities** of capacity-building activities that taken together constitute a comprehensive capacity-building programme. All of them have a **national focus**, as the individual State Party is the fundamental building block. All of them put emphasis on **strengthening capacities within countries, not on making comparisons** between countries or regions. In all of them, the **primary direct interlocutor is the State Party**, represented locally by the national counterpart maintaining close working relations with UNESCO Field Offices (FOs) which are supported by UNESCO Headquarters (HQ). However, in a variety of ways (directly and indirectly) **UNESCO addresses** **target groups other than government officials** of States Parties, since the training programme encourages participation of all key stakeholders, such as national officials, researchers, community members, and relevant NGOs. UNESCO currently draws upon a resourceful network of 80 ICH experts who are certified as facilitators in the capacity-building programme to use and adapt the guidance and training materials according to specific local contexts and audiences.

#### 3.1. Needs assessments

Under the global strategy UNESCO introduced a needs assessment prior to the beginning of a country project as **standard practice** following a recommendation of the first review meeting of the programme in 2012. UNESCO FOs and ICH experts work closely with governments to carry out needs assessments in individual countries. While these were initially carried out only by the FO through its ongoing dialogue with national counterparts, UNESCO has since mobilized funds to allow for larger participatory consultation. The standard descriptions of tasks as well as the consultants’ Terms of Reference foresee a participatory approach. However, the needs assessment reports do not always reflect evidence of a participatory approach; rather they focus more on the role of governmental actors with some involvement of local experts facilitating the consultation with national counterparts. The needs assessment questionnaire used by experts makes clear references to the whole range of stakeholders in ICH, not only governmental counterparts. The follow-up mechanism will therefore have to generate data on the effectiveness of the modalities used to carry out the needs assessment and their effects.

#### 3.2. Policy support services

Advisory services for policy and legal development have become an integral part of the capacity-building programme, as it became clear that discussions on the topic in training workshops (see Annex II for full list below) alone would not be sufficient to effectively provide policy support to beneficiary countries. While training workshops and pilot inventorying activities are geared towards the training of a larger number of stakeholders by ‘retailing’ ICH-related concepts, tools, knowledge, and skills, the policy support services have a different focus. They target the public policy and institutional level. UNESCO has introduced a Draft Guidance Note (following the 25 June 2014 one-day policy advice workshop on ICH held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris) that clarifies a number of key issues when engaging in a public policy dialogue with national counterparts in either a State Party or a non-State Party requesting capacity building. The specificity of this type of capacity building is the focus on **empowering institutions within state structures to develop institutional, legal, administrative, and outreach conditions rather than having a consultant delivering ready-made solutions.** The capacity-building follow-up needs to identify the right level in the use of indicators for an appraisal of the change such advisory inputs made in national administration.

#### 3.3. Training workshops

The training workshops currently build on an evolving curriculum of five thematic areas: (i) ratification, (ii) implementation, (iii) community-based inventories, (iv) nominations, and (v) safeguarding plans. They use training materials that are presented in the format of 49 thematic units, include materials on gender and intangible cultural heritage, and are administered over a variable timeframe. The addressees of this programme that UNESCO developed since 2009 are diverse. While usually following the lead of national counterparts, UNESCO clusters the target audience into three main groups: **government officials**, **experts and civil society organizations**, and **bearers or practitioners of ICH**. It has become standard practice in workshops to have these different types of addressees represented. For a workshop on implementation and nominations, UNESCO recommends about one-half government officials and the other half for experts and for bearers or practitioners. However, it is up to one-third each in inventorying workshops and in trainings on safeguarding plans, and it can even be more than a third for the bearer community members. While an end-of-workshop evaluation followed by an analytical report by the two co-facilitators is common practice, so far no systematic monitoring of the effects of the training workshops has been conducted. Systematic monitoring would allow establishing an attribution between a trainee (irrespective of the stakeholder group) and his or her subsequent engagement in activities for the safeguarding of ICH. Monitoring so far has generated gender-disaggregated data among trainees, while the effects of the fact that both males and females have been trained remain largely unassessed. Assessing the knowledge of trainees before and after the workshops has remained limited. Evidence of training is usually documented in the reports by facilitators who in turn are evaluated or rated by the participants of the training workshops. The variety in profiles and responsibilities of trainees suggests that the **potential effects on effective safeguarding of ICH are manifold and not necessarily exclusively state-focused.** The capacity-building follow-up mechanism needs to reflect this.

#### 3.4. Pilot inventorying activities

These activities are broader and deeper than the coverage of the same inventorying topic in the training workshops. The in-depth treatment of this key obligation of States Parties follows the insight that inventorying is not synonymous with merely producing lists of heritage elements within a government agency without reaching out to bearers, practitioners, groups, and communities. On the contrary, the Convention clearly underlines the approach of community-based inventorying for any effort to be recognized as such. In this regard, any drawing up of inventories without the participation of communities concerned is not considered viable. However, critical readings of the reports prepared by State Parties on the implementation of the Convention (periodic reporting) suggest that the inventories referred to by States Parties are often not the fruit of the required community-based approaches. Instead, many appear to be **expert-driven rather than community-based**. The capacity-building follow-up mechanism needs to provide modalities to generate data that would allow assessing whether inventories established subsequent to capacity building reflect a participatory approach.

### 4. **Beyond relevance: The rationale of monitoring the capacity-building programme**

The **relevance** of the capacity-building programme for the implementation of the 2003 Convention has been established and confirmed at various stages, including the UNESCO Internal Oversight Services’ (IOS) Report of 2013. However, little is known about the **degree of its effectiveness** and, to a lesser extent, its efficiency and impact. Important aspects and effects of the capacity-building programme remain unassessed. This has been due to a variety of reasons. Neglect is certainly not among them, as the theme of performance assessment permeates the documents of recent years.

In fact, as the capacity-building effort continues to grow, monitoring and evaluation have become ever more important. The Secretariat has used different modalities over the past year: reports from facilitators and from the implementing FOs, complemented by the regional review meetings in Beijing and Cusco as well as Kuwait and Sofia, provide input for six-monthly reporting to UNESCO’s governing bodies (the EX/4), reports to the governing bodies of the Convention and donor review meetings. More than 35 such facilitator’s reports have been submitted to UNESCO to date, analysing the capacity-building services delivered and commenting on policy developments. They provide a precious monitoring tool for the Secretariat and are used for the elaboration of project reports to donors and for strategy and content development. It is nevertheless clear, as pointed out by the IOS, that **there is no systematic monitoring mechanism** in place that would allow UNESCO **to follow up with participants** several months after they had been part of a workshop. Therefore no reports exist on any sustained behaviour change (different approaches or practices used) and on the ultimate impact of the programme (improved inventories, better policy and legislative environment, increased community involvement, successful nomination of elements on RL and USL etc.) resulting from stakeholders’ participation in the activities’ (Document IOS/EVS/PI/129).

It is rather the complexity of the capacity-building programme (its four main intervention modalities; its variable target groups; etc.) and the diversity of countries (levels of development; stages of preparedness; etc.) in which it has been operating that makes the follow-up particularly challenging. A key issue is the absence of data and information that would allow assessing the effects of the programme at country level in a way to capture the effects of the capacity-building activities over time and beyond the self-evaluation that UNESCO undertakes at the end of a project, assessing the project implementation against a results-based framework. Appraising **primarily the** **effectiveness**, and later on the efficiency, and impact, is crucial to ensuring the sustainability of the effects of the capacity-building programme that would ultimately be taken over by the States Parties so that they can move on without direct support from UNESCO HQ. The follow-up mechanism thereby fulfils a triple purpose:

* First, it establishes **accountability**. There is growing demand for results-oriented work by stakeholders, funding entities, and auditing authorities at various levels, covering UNESCO, individual Member States, and different sectors of activities. The capacity-building follow-up mechanism is a unified instrument facilitating the necessary results reporting.
* Second, it improves **management**. Once results are presented in a structured way, they can better inform management decisions. This does not (necessarily) imply a focus on comparative analysis between well-performing countries and others. Rather, it addresses the capacity-building performance as a whole, providing reliable information on the key question: Is UNESCO at the corporate level on the right track towards empowering actors at national level entities?
* Third, it **supports the beneficiary countries** (States Parties) in their own implementation of the Convention by verifying to which degree competencies have been created or knowledge has been transferred. This underpins the deconcentration approach.

Beyond the immediate task of following up on the effects of the capacity-building programme, the provisions can be **useful with regard to wider monitoring frameworks** under consideration at UNESCO. A plan for the development of an overall **Results Framework of the 2003 Convention** is currently discussed by the Committee (see document ITH/14/9.COM/13.e). However, it does not necessarily need to be finalized in order to develop a monitoring apparatus for the capacity-building programme. Both must be aligned, of course, but the **follow-up and evaluation framework for the capacity-building programme can in fact contribute to further developing the overall Results Framework of the 2003 Convention**. Furthermore, the capacity building specific follow-up and evaluation mechanism would facilitate the reporting of the UNESCO Secretariat on the implementation of the capacity-building programme to the governing bodies of the Convention and UNESCO, as data would be generated in a more coherent and proper way.

Furthermore, the current results framework of the capacity-building programme in UNESCO programme reporting puts the **individual countries as principle units for the indicators**, as all four types of administering capacity building have been targeting national capacity building. This is in line with the long-term goal of achieving sustainable ICH safeguarding by and within State Parties as further explained below:

* First, and foremost, meaningful capacity building solidifies and **increases the safeguarding capacity in countries at the different levels where ICH ‘occurs’**, applying the **principle of subsidiarity**. Therefore, matters should be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority. Improving the effectiveness and efficiency of capacity building through a follow-up and evaluation mechanism fulfils the purpose of strengthening States Parties’ competencies and ownership.
* Second, effective capacity building within states (and their different levels of administrative organization) **will eventually lead to a situation where UNESCO’s direct intervention is no longer required, but where responsibilities** in administrative and financial terms are taken on by the countries. This corresponds directly to the issue of risks to sustainability, with UNESCO interventions always striving to empower and accompany States in order to gradually move out, especially in times where **UNESCO HQ and FOs cannot shoulder more responsibilities due to limited available funds** and human resources.
* Third, when States Parties increasingly take over capacity-building responsibilities, **UNESCO can sharpen its conceptual profile and anticipate addressing emerging needs in the future rather than widening its operational role**. This also requires a clearer division of labour between UNESCO HQ on the one hand and UNESCO FOs on the other hand. Operations should be run primarily by States Parties, while UNESCO FOs and HQ should adopt monitoring and facilitation roles that rest, of course, firmly on reliable collaboration with national counterparts.

## Part II: Conceptual framework

### 5. Follow-up and evaluation mechanism **for capacity building**

5.1. Indicators: Levels of monitoring

The follow-up mechanism suggests focusing on so-called **Level 2 indicators** that assess performance at the output and, outcome levels. At a higher abstraction (Level 1 indicators), more general signals of progress in countries adhering to the 2003 Convention would be measured. An example would be on how the safeguarding of ICH impacts on sustainable development in a given area or community. Further down, at Level 3, input and process indicators would mainly assess how UNESCO manages its organizational performance. At **Level 1,** there are multiple policies leading to broader results that are difficult to attribute to individual programmes. At **Level 3**, UNESCO has the highest level of control, but it is restricted to the corporate level, i.e. the internal workings of the organization or, in other words, how UNESCO operates.

At **Level 2**, UNESCO captures the **immediate** **deliverables** (outputs) of its activities (e.g. needs assessment conducted; policy support services extended; persons trained in workshops; pilot inventorying activities supported) as well as the **expected lasting change** (outcomes) induced by these deliverables (how persons use the training they received in specific work circumstances to contribute to ICH safeguarding; how advisory services led to organizational change in a ministry; how a needs assessment enabled a State Party to plan capacity building and next steps of implementation; how pilot inventorying gained traction in society among a wider constituency bearers/practitioners of ICH).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator type | Levels of monitoring | Rationale |
| Impact | Level 1: What is the broader political / societal impact of adhering to the 2003 Convention?  | Higher abstraction. Impact of ICH safeguarding on sustainable development in a given area/community as measured, e.g. reduction of unemployment; availability of a wider choice of health services (including traditional health practices) |
| Outcome*‘Expected Results’**(What is to be different? What is the expected behavioural change)* | Level 2: How does the capacity-building programme contribute to implementing the 2003 Convention? | Monitoring the ‘longer term’ results of needs assessment / policy support services / training workshops / inventorying piloting activities **as applied** by capacity-building programme beneficiaries |
| Output*‘Deliverables of activities’**(What needs to be done)* | Monitoring the immediate deliverables of needs assessment / policy support services / training workshops / inventorying piloting activities **as administered** by UNESCO capacity-building programme to the programme’s beneficiaries |
| Process | Level 3: How is UNESCO managing its organizational performance? | Assessing UNESCO effectiveness and efficiency at the corporate level |
| Input |

#### 5.2. Indicators: Clustering by main results areas

The capacity-building programme composed of needs assessments, policy support services, training workshops, and pilot inventorying activities covers key aspects of the entire spectrum of safeguarding ICH. The multiplicity of these four main intervention modalities leads to some overlap. First, more than one type of intervention pursues the same or similar ICH themes. Second, this makes it more difficult to attribute a potential result to precisely one of the four modalities of capacity building. Third, this potentially blurs the line between output and outcome indicators. *(Example 1: An inventory established independently by trainees of the training workshops could be considered an outcome of the training, while it could be a direct output if the developed during a pilot inventorying activity. Example 2: A national strategy document could be an outcome of a training workshop involving government officials who would draft it on their own, while it could be a direct output if achieved within the framework of the policy support services modality.)*

For the assessment of overall effectiveness at the country level, it is suggested to establish **content-focused clusters of main results areas**. These are broader themes that **describe the main topics of ICH capacity building across the four main modalities** and that reflect items formulated at the levels of both expected results (outcomes) and activities (outputs).

These main thematic areas have been identified and clustered as per the list below. **It represents a suggestion and is open to discussion**:

* Ratification / Policies / Institutions
* Inventorying
* Research
* Awareness / Media
* Education
* Regional Cooperation
* Nominations / Inscriptions
* Safeguarding
* Sustainable development
* International Assistance

It should be noted that **not all of these areas have so far been equally addressed** in the capacity-building programme, notably those related to awareness raising, research, media as well as education. However, it is necessary to **include them in the initial design** of the follow-up and evaluation mechanism for future referencing, even if this means **zeroing baselines in certain areas as of 2015**.

The **four modalities** of delivering capacity building (needs assessments; policy support services; training workshops; pilot inventorying activities) **all need to be checked** in terms of their **effectiveness**, **depending on their relative role or added value in each of these thematic areas**.

Some of the potential **inaccuracies in terms of attributing effectiveness across the four main capacity-building modalities can be mitigated by employing tracing tools at the individual level** that would aim at establishing a causal relationship between receiving a particular type of capacity building and its contribution to ICH safeguarding.

#### 5.3. Indicators: Criteria for selection

Other than being organized in clusters of main results areas, indicators need to be reflective of, or in line with, the overall Results Framework of UNESCO. They need to be **informed by the 2003 Convention and the Operational Directives**. Both represent a significant institutional consensus, and both can therefore help **ensure ownership**. In a corporate environment like UNESCO’s, this identification task should be done in a participatory way, including inter alia all those who will have to collect data, use them, and have the necessary expertise to understand strengths and weaknesses (or limitations) of specific indicators.

* *Definition*: Indicators need to be chosen in a way that they can be **clearly defined**. This entails further detailed work once indicators for the capacity-building programme have been prioritized. It is important to **avoid compounded structures**, generally adopting single indicators.
* *Clarity*: Indicators should manifest the **most direct evidence** of what is to be measured. This concerns outputs at the level of activities as well as outcomes at the level of expected results or areas of wider impact.
* *Consistency*: Indicators need to be chosen bearing in mind that data can be defined and collected in the same way over an **extended period of time**. Meaningful time series of data rest on reliable parameters and collection protocol.
* *Frequency*: Indicators need to be identified in a way that their underlying data are collected at **regular and meaningful intervals**. Data on deliverables of activities (outputs) are often available immediately (e.g. after an event), while data assessing outcomes are usually available only over a longer period of time with time series typically taking an annual rhythm. The 2003 Convention foresees, e.g. a six-year interval for periodic reporting.
* *Usefulness*: Indicators need to be **important to the stakeholders using** them. At the level of national counterparts, UNESCO FOs or HQ, there needs to be consensus that particular data is meaningful and valuable to assess the capacity-building programme.
* *Quantitative / qualitative Indicators*: Indicators should **preferably be quantitative** in order to be measurable, fit for aggregation for various purposes (see below), and possibly in line with indicators used, e.g. by States Parties as per their own national monitoring arrangements. In a number of circumstances, **methods to quantify an initially qualitative analysis can be applied**.
* *Prioritizing*: In a first step, a long list of indicators is created, from which a **reduced list of key performance indicators** needs to be derived. This short list would ideally identify indicators that can be used *pars pro toto*. This means privileging some indicators over others. To define these indicators, **the experience of workshop participants from different backgrounds will be essential**.

#### 5.4. Indicators: Data sources

The data sources used for indicators reflect (a) the four different main modalities of the capacity-building programme delivery; (b) their different target groups; (c) the different layers and levels involved, including capacity-building measures by States Parties themselves that are inspired by, though not identical with, the UNESCO capacity-building programme.

Data sources are official instruments, policy documents, reports, statistics, records, questionnaires, etc. that are created (or to be created) by the variety of actors and stakeholders involved in the capacity-building programme, including, but not limited to:

* The Intangible Cultural Heritage Section and field offices
* The General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
* The Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage
* National counterparts of States Parties
* Line Ministries of States Parties
* Trainees of training workshops
* Facilitators of training workshops
* Recipients of policy advisory services
* Providers of policy advisory services
* Recipients of needs assessment support
* Providers of needs assessment support
* Recipients of pilot inventorying activity support
* Providers of pilot inventorying projects support

#### 5.5. Baseline and target issues

The follow-up mechanism proposed refers to a number of activities performed in the **past**. It also contains some references to **future** programming. As a result, the establishment of a baseline will not be the same across the different indicators. Some values for past activities might be extractable from existing records. Others would need to be captured through retroactive questionnaires and surveys as well as by means of qualitative analysis that could result in a quantitative grading, based on a set of key criteria for qualitative analysis. Furthermore, indicators related to activities and programme components not yet active (such as, e.g. education), would receive a **zero baseline** as of 2015.

Target issues need to be considered in a parallel manner by distinguishing activities and programming carried out in the past and projected for the future. In addition, there might be a need to adapt adopted target values for indicators whose definition may slightly vary from the formulation adopted in relevant UNESCO documents.

#### 5.6. Data aggregation issues

Data aggregation is an item primarily of interest to UNESCO HQ. It relies, as described above, on key indicators being uniform, well-defined, generated at the same frequency, quantifiable as much as possible, or graded based on qualitative analysis where this is not possible. The aggregation of data may thereby ultimately benefit UNESCO FOs and, of course, States Parties as well, in addition to a variety of other potential stakeholders. The purposes of aggregating data are manifold. **First** and foremost, the aggregation of data is necessary to track the **performance of all the incumbent global indicators** (the so-called ‘number of countries’ indicators) adopted by UNESCO HQ (such as: ‘number of countries’: having ratified the Convention; having integrated ICH into their policies; having adequate institutional infrastructure; etc.). **Second**, UNESCO can make use of aggregated data to analyse its effectiveness in terms of **geographical scope** (global, regional, sub-regional) beyond the national level. **Third**, data aggregation may enable UNESCO to monitor its **impact in ICH on particular groups**, such as youth, women, Least Developed Countries, Small Island Developing States, disadvantaged and excluded groups, most vulnerable segments of society, or indigenous peoples. **Fourth**, aggregated ICH data may further be cross-tabulated with specific programme issues addressed, e.g. in UN Decades / Years, Dialogue among Civilizations and Cultures, South-South Cooperation, post-conflict/post-disaster situations, etc.

## Part III: Implementation requirements

### 6. Data collection and operational considerations

#### 6.1. Data collection methods

Up until now, data collection has remained limited and largely driven by reporting requirements at UNESCO HQ. They have followed core activities (the four main modalities of administering capacity building) and focused on individual events (notably training workshops) or entire project implementation. A more comprehensive follow-up mechanism requires verifying to which degree data identified as important is currently being collected. If yes, it would be useful to explore how and by whom. If not, the challenge is to **develop effective and efficient instruments for data collection**.

Within the suggested thematic clusters indicated above, the method would need to follow the nature or characteristics of the data source. Official instruments (such as ratification records) would need to be reviewed to confirm availability, while policy documents (strategies, legislation) would need to be reviewed and subject to qualitative analysis. A **number of issues to be monitored can be captured through questionnaires and surveys**. These would ideally be **administered in a centralized (uniform) way using the internet**. Different addressees of questionnaires could thereby be targeted in customized sets of questions, separating, e.g. the key categories of government officials, experts, bearers, etc.

One way of conducting such results reporting surveys could be achieved by using the internet platform www.surveymonkey.com. This would be of particular benefit to trace former and future beneficiaries of the capacity-building programme, **in particular participants in the training workshops**. Up until now, it appears that only facilitators and, in some cases, field offices, may have entertained long-lasting working relationships with trainees, though this has been uneven, too. The suggested internet-based reporting system allows different languages of enquiry to be used for questions that can be coded in a uniform way (and that would therefore be fit for aggregation irrespective of the language).

In this scenario, the knowledge management team and the Capacity Building and Heritage Unit within the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section at UNESCO HQ could play an important role in setting up the key questionnaires for the different target groups and sending out the invitations to participate in the survey through the system. The follow-up on data entry could then be delegated to the UNESCO FOs who entertain closer working relations with the national counterparts, while UNESCO HQ could monitor the gradual completion of questionnaires by addressees and request support / intervention from UNESCO FOs wherever there would be a shortcoming.

The limitation to the availability of internet is thereby an important factor for the viability of using virtual networking and decentralized reporting tools. The suggested framework takes note of different degrees of connectivity across the globe. In particular, **Africa shows all dimensions of the digital divide**. At an average **internet penetration rate of 26.5 percent**, gaps remain substantial. However, this should not deter UNESCO from developing web-based reporting. Already, the bigger countries like Egypt, Morocco, Nigeria, and South Africa show good internet usage data between close to 40 and over 60 percent. These penetration rate data are even surpassed in a number of states with **lower population** figures that are in fact **high performers**. Moreover, across the continent, the **speed of change** has been enormous, outpacing all other major regions in the world. **In Africa, internet connectivity has increased almost 66 times from December 2000 to June 2014** (see below 9. Annex III).

#### 6.2. Data collection responsibility

As repeatedly indicated, the variety of modalities in the administration of the capacity-building programme as well as the diversity of beneficiaries of this knowledge and skills transfer creates a pool of sources for data.

At this point, a strategic decision regarding data collection responsibility needs to be discussed and taken based also on budgetary considerations. The long-term vision of the proposed framework is to have national counterparts fully in charge of the capacity-building programme and the related results reporting. However, in order to ensure leadership at the beginning and coherence over a longer timeframe, it is more appropriate to actively involve UNESCO HQ and FOs in establishing the main parameters for data generation in a centralized way. This is not meant to last forever. Rather, it would oblige UNESCO to lead the initiative, thus reflecting one of its key tasks, namely providing policy advice and capacity building in the culture sector. In an open and participatory consultation with FOs and national counterparts, UNESCO HQ would develop the details of the general follow-up mechanism for the capacity-building programme that would then ideally be applied in a largely uniform manner across the different countries. The participants in the June 2015 workshop should discuss the issue, also in conjunction with the data collection method of administering internet-based results reporting via www.surveymonkey.com or www.limesurvey.com to a larger number of respondents. Ideally, the key data collection instruments should be developed centrally using where available existing local inputs as well as incumbent forms and reporting formats (periodic reports, etc.). This would entail making slight amendments to some of these currently employed reporting formats.

#### 6.3. Organizational, technical, and budgetary implications

In *organizational* terms, the proposed framework relies on the existing structure of UNESCO HQ, FOs, and national counterparts. It does not change any mandates, but it aims at clarifying for the purpose of data collection and analysis the specific division of labour for the follow-up mechanism. It is expected that the results reporting method suggested here will only initially represent an increased workload. Ultimately, the efficiency gains should offset in the medium-term (within less than two years) any increase in tasks. This will be discussed further based on the suggestions made above during the June 2015 workshop in Paris.

In *technical* terms, the monitoring of most issues listed in the follow-up and evaluation matrix does not require skills or competencies that would exceed those that should currently be in place. However, some of the concepts introduced are new and would require a certain familiarization among the entire network (UNESCO and national counterparts) involved in ICH. This might also apply to skills in the knowledge management team of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section, notably in setting up and administering online questionnaires, surveys, and tracer studies.

In *budgetary* terms, the implementation requirements have to be cost-effective. They would entail possibly some software development (or software usage) fees as well as some technical assistance related to designing the initial questionnaires and surveys as well as to the preparation of UNESCO FOs and UNESCO HQ Regional Officers. Assistance for gathering data in contexts where the direct beneficiaries do not have internet access, might also bear some costs. In addition, certain in-depth studies focusing on impact issues would require allocating a budget for conducting qualitative studies by experts. Again, the participants of the June 2015 workshop might suggest other budget items, which may emerge in the discussions.

### **Annex I: Draft follow-up and evaluation matrix**

**Please see the separate file: ITH-15-WOR-5\_Annex I Draft follow-up and evaluation matrix-EN.xlsx**

### **Annex II: List of training workshop units**

Unit 1:Workshop on Implementing the Convention at national level (IMP): Introduction

Unit 2: Introducing the Convention

Unit 3: Key concepts in the Convention

Unit 4: Who can do what in implementing the Convention?

Unit 5: Raising awareness

Unit 6: Identification and inventorying

Unit 7: Involving the communities concerned

Unit 8: ICH and sustainable development

Unit 9: Safeguarding

Unit 10: ICH policies and institutions

Unit 11: Nominations: overview

Unit 12: International cooperation and assistance

Unit 13: The Intangible Heritage Convention and the World Heritage Convention

Unit 14: Concluding session: Workshop on Implementing the Convention at national level

Unit 15: Evaluation

Unit 16: Workshop on ratifying the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (RAT): Introduction

Unit 17: Ratifying the Convention

Unit 18: Workshop on community-based inventorying (INV): introduction

Unit 19: Inventory A without any system

Unit 20: Inventory B with system

Unit 21: Ethics & responsibilities in inventorying

Unit 22: Community consent in inventorying

Unit 23: Methods & techniques of inventorying

Unit 24: Audio recording in inventorying

Unit 25: Interviewing in inventorying

Unit 26: Photography in inventorying

Unit 27: Participatory video in inventorying

Unit 28: Participatory mapping in inventorying

Unit 29: Ground preparations in inventorying

Unit 30: Fieldwork practicum plan in inventorying

Unit 31: Fieldwork practicum in inventorying

Unit 32: Fieldwork debriefing in inventorying

Unit 33: Organizing information in inventorying

Unit 34: Concluding session: Workshop on community-based inventorying

Unit 35: Access & dissemination

Unit 36: Documentation & inventorying

Unit 37: Inventories for safeguarding

Unit 38: Organizing information & archiving

Unit 39: Workshop on preparing nominations (NOM): Introduction

Unit 40: Introducing the nomination forms

Unit 41: Assessing initial sample nominations

Unit 42: Evaluating final sample nominations

Unit 43: Describing an element in nominations

Unit 44: Concluding session: Workshop on preparing nominations

Unit 45: Workshop on safeguarding plans: Introduction

Unit 46: Developing safeguarding plans: a role-play simulation

Unit 47: Concluding session: Workshop on safeguarding plans

Unit 48: Gender and intangible cultural heritage

Unit 49: A gender-responsive approach to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage

*Note: UNESCO is currently developing more thematic topics in the form of training workshop units, such as material on gender responsiveness and a guidance note on policy advice, etc. This additional material is under development and in the process of either being tested or finalized. It is therefore not yet part of the main curriculum available on the website.*

### **Annex III: Africa 2014 population and internet users statistics for 2014 Q2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Africa 2014 population and internet users statistics for 2014 Q2** |
| **Country** | **Population** | **Internet users** | **Internet users** | **Penetration** | **Internet** | **Facebook** | **% Growth users****31 Dec 00 - 30 Jun 14** |
|  | **2014 Estimate** | **31-Dec-00** | **30-Jun-14** | **% Population** | **% Africa** | **31-Dec-12** |  |
| Algeria | 38,813,722 | 50,000 | 6,669,927 | 17.20% | 2.20% | 4,111,320 | **13,340** |
| Angola | 19,088,106 | 30,000 | 4,286,821 | 22.50% | 1.40% | 645,460 | **14,289** |
| Benin | 10,160,556 | 15,000 | 497,867 | 4.90% | 0.20% | 171,780 | **3,319** |
| Botswana | 2,155,784 | 15,000 | 323,368 | 15.00% | 0.10% | 294,000 | **2,156** |
| Burkina Faso | 18,365,123 | 10,000 | 808,065 | 4.40% | 0.30% | 141,740 | **8,081** |
| Burundi | 10,395,931 | 3,000 | 405,441 | 3.90% | 0.10% | 41,900 | **13,515** |
| Cameroon | 23,130,708 | 20,000 | 1,486,815 | 6.40% | 0.50% | 562,480 | **7,434** |
| Cabo Verde | 538,535 | 8,000 | 201,950 | 37.50% | 0.10% | 107,340 | **2,524** |
| Central African Rep. | 5,277,959 | 1,500 | 184,729 | 3.50% | 0.10% | 163,780 | **12,315** |
| Chad | 11,412,107 | 1,000 | 317,197 | 2.80% | 0.10% | 43,120 | **31,720** |
| Comoros | 766,865 | 1,500 | 49,846 | 6.50% | 0.00% | 19,940 | **3,323** |
| Congo | 4,662,446 | 500 | 307,721 | 6.60% | 0.10% | 107,640 | **61,544** |
| Congo, Dem. Rep. | 77,433,744 | 500 | 1,703,542 | 2.20% | 0.60% | 903,020 | **340,708** |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 22,848,945 | 40,000 | 968,000 | 4.20% | 0.30% | n/a | **2,420** |
| Djibouti | 810,179 | 1,400 | 80,378 | 9.90% | 0.00% | 50,140 | **5,741** |
| **Egypt** | **86,895,099** | **450,000** | **46,200,000** | **53.20%** | **15.50%** | **12,173,540** | **10,267** |
| Equatorial Guinea | 722,254 | 500 | 124,035 | 17.20% | 0.00% | 32,980 | **24,807** |
| Eritrea | 6,380,803 | 5,000 | 377,363 | 5.90% | 0.10% | 20,940 | **7,547** |
| Ethiopia | 96,633,458 | 10,000 | 1,836,035 | 1.90% | 0.60% | 902,440 | **18,360** |
| Gabon | 1,672,597 | 15,000 | 657,928 | 39.30% | 0.20% | 132,000 | **4,386** |
| Gambia | 1,925,527 | 4,000 | 271,711 | 14.10% | 0.10% | 97,280 | **6,793** |
| Ghana | 25,758,108 | 30,000 | 5,171,993 | 20.10% | 1.70% | 1,630,420 | **17,240** |
| Guinea | 11,474,383 | 8,000 | 205,194 | 1.80% | 0.10% | 68,780 | **2,565** |
| Guinea-Bissau | 1,693,398 | 1,500 | 57,764 | 3.40% | 0.00% | n/a | **3,851** |
| Kenya | 45,010,056 | 200,000 | 21,273,738 | 47.30% | 7.10% | 2,045,900 | **10,637** |
| Lesotho | 1,942,008 | 4,000 | 110,065 | 5.70% | 0.00% | 51,440 | **2,752** |
| Liberia | 4,092,310 | 500 | 188,246 | 4.60% | 0.10% | n/a | **37,649** |
| Libya | 6,244,174 | 10,000 | 1,362,604 | 21.80% | 0.50% | 781,700 | **13,626** |
| Madagascar | 23,201,926 | 30,000 | 17,321,756 | 74.70% | 5.80% | 282,880 | **57,739** |
| Malawi | 17,241,754 | 15,000 | 12,150,362 | 70.50% | 4.10% | 203,840 | **81,002** |
| Mali | 16,455,903 | 18,800 | 11,862,559 | 72.10% | 4.00% | 212,020 | **63,099** |
| Mauritania | 3,516,806 | 5,000 | 455,553 | 13.00% | 0.20% | 106,200 | **9,111** |
| Mauritius | 1,331,155 | 87,000 | 519,150 | 39.00% | 0.20% | 367,900 | **597** |
| Mayotte (FR) | 217,909 | n/a | 107,940 | 49.50% | 0.00% | 19,500 | **#VALUE!** |
| **Morocco** | **32,987,206** | **100,000** | **20,207,154** | **61.30%** | **6.80%** | **5,091,760** | **20,207** |
| Mozambique | 24,692,144 | 30,000 | 1,467,687 | 5.90% | 0.50% | 362,560 | **4,892** |
| Namibia | 2,198,406 | 30,000 | 347,414 | 15.80% | 0.10% | 231,340 | **1,158** |
| Niger | 17,466,172 | 5,000 | 298,310 | 1.70% | 0.10% | 63,500 | **5,966** |
| **Nigeria** | **177,155,754** | **200,000** | **70,300,000** | **39.70%** | **23.60%** | **6,630,200** | **35,150** |
| Reunion (FR) | 867,687 | 130,000 | 300,000 | 34.60% | 0.10% | 240,040 | **231** |
| Rwanda | 12,337,138 | 5,000 | 1,110,043 | 9.00% | 0.40% | 188,800 | **22,201** |
| Saint Helena (UK) | 4,255 | n/a | 1,600 | 37.60% | 0.00% | n/a | **#VALUE!** |
| Sao Tome & Principe | 190,428 | 6,500 | 48,806 | 25.60% | 0.00% | 6,940 | **751** |
| Senegal | 13,635,927 | 40,000 | 3,194,190 | 23.40% | 1.10% | 675,820 | **7,985** |
| Seychelles | 91,650 | 6,000 | 50,220 | 54.80% | 0.00% | 27,600 | **837** |
| Sierra Leone | 5,743,725 | 5,000 | 97,643 | 1.70% | 0.00% | 76,880 | **1,953** |
| Somalia | 10,428,043 | 200 | 163,185 | 1.60% | 0.10% | 123,480 | **81,593** |
| **South Africa** | **48,375,645** | **2,400,000** | **24,909,854** | **51.50%** | **8.40%** | **6,269,600** | **1,038** |
| South Sudan | 11,562,695 | n/a | 100 | 0.00% | 0.00% | n/a | **#VALUE!** |
| Sudan | 35,482,233 | 30,000 | 9,307,189 | 26.20% | 3.10% | n/a | **31,024** |
| Swaziland | 1,419,623 | 10,000 | 350,647 | 24.70% | 0.10% | 89,500 | **3,506** |
| Tanzania | 49,639,138 | 115,000 | 7,590,794 | 15.30% | 2.50% | 705,460 | **6,601** |
| Togo | 7,351,374 | 100,000 | 356,300 | 4.80% | 0.10% | 117,420 | **356** |
| Tunisia | 10,937,521 | 100,000 | 5,053,704 | 46.20% | 1.70% | 3,328,300 | **5,054** |
| Uganda | 35,918,915 | 40,000 | 6,523,949 | 18.20% | 2.20% | 562,240 | **16,310** |
| Western Sahara | 554,795 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0.00% | n/a | **#VALUE!** |
| Zambia | 14,638,505 | 20,000 | 2,313,013 | 15.80% | 0.80% | 327,600 | **11,565** |
| Zimbabwe | 13,771,721 | 50,000 | 5,348,433 | 38.80% | 1.80% | n/a | **10,697** |
| TOTAL AFRICA | **1,125,721,038** | **4,514,400** | **297,885,898** | **26.50%** | **100.00%** | **51,612,460** | **6,599** |
| Source: http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats1.htm. (1) Africa internet statistics were updated for June 30, 2014. (2) Africa Facebook subscribers were updated for December 31, 2012. (3) Africa Population numbers are mid-year 2014 estimates. (4) Africa internet usage information comes mainly from data published by WWW, ITU, Facebook, and other trustworthy sources. (5) For internet growth comparison purposes, baseline internet usage data for the year 2000 is displayed. (6) Data from this table may be cited, giving the due credit and establishing an active link back to internetworldstats.com Copyright 2014, © Miniwatts Marketing Group. All rights reserved worldwide. |

1. . For more information, please see the Workshop background note (document ITH/15/WOR/1) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . States Parties also have to pay contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (Article 26.1) and fulfill periodical reporting requirements under the 2003 Convention (Article 29). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)