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**GREETINGS BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF BOARD MEMBERS**

**Sun-hwa Rha**

Ms. Rha declared the opening of the 5th Governing Board Meeting and requested the secretariat to report the results of the 3rd and 4th Governing Board Meeting.

**REPORT BY ICHCAP**

**Samuel Lee**

Dr. Lee summarized the results of the 3rd and 4th Governing Board Meeting.

**Sun-hwa Rha**

Ms. Rha requested the secretariat to report the result of the 4th Executive Committee Meeting.

**Hee-Ung Park**

Mr. Park reported the result of the 4th Executive Committee Meeting.

**Sun-hwa Rha**

Ms. Rha requested the secretariat to report the Centre’s programs and activities of 2014.

**Samuel Lee**

Dr. Lee presented the Comprehensive Report of the Director-General.

**Seong-Yong Park**

Dr. Park reported more detailed programs and activities of the Centre.

**Sun-hwa Rha**

Ms. Rha extended her appreciation to the secretariat for the reports and especially to Dr. Lee’s efforts to lay the foundation of the Centre as the first Director-General.

**DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE REPORTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT**

**Sipiriano Nemani Ranuku**

He thanked Dr. Lee and ICHCAP and expressed remorse that Dr. Lee is leaving. He also expressed thanks on behalf of the Pacific region because ICHCAP has given the Pacific a voice in international dialogue about intangible cultural heritage. He also acknowledged the challenges of safeguarding that Dr. Lee mentioned in the Comprehensive Report of the Director-General and expressed his gratitude to ICHCAP for its hard work in overcoming those challenges. He also said that the idea of networking is very relevant to the Pacific because the region is so widespread and that while ICHCAP has done a lot in this region in terms of networking, there is a lot of work to be done especially if we are to sustain the different projects in the Pacific. Due to geographical features, communication among the Member States is done mostly via e-mail, and sub-regional meetings are good opportunities to share information. He requested ICHCAP to update safeguarding activities at sub-regional meetings.

He also added the importance of understanding each country’s needs in the Pacific, in terms of ICH information and promotion. Thus, he suggested ICHCAP to research the demands of the Member States in the Pacific and develop appropriate strategies to meet their expectations, asking ICHCAP to implement programs and activities from the perspectives of the Member States.

**Gaura Mancarcaritadipura**

He said that Dr. Lee’s report was very comprehensive and highly appreciated. He also said that doing activities across national boundaries is not easy, and this is why there is a need to personally visit these countries again and again to set up relationships with governments and NGOs, etc. He expressed great appreciation for the work of ICHCAP and positively said that the networks are now in the process of growing. He congratulated ICHCAP on opening doors with safeguarding efforts to meet with DPRK and congratulated ICHCAP on having so many publications. He praised the efficiency of ICHCAP and holds ICHCAP up as an example for other nations in the region. In closing, he expressed appreciation to all the ICHCAP staff and chiefs for the organization of the 2014 report and offered words of thanks from Wiendu Nuryanti, who was unable to make the meeting.

**Timothy Curtis**

He congratulated ICHCAP for the submitting the proposed work plan with sufficient time for dialogue and incorporating some of the issues discussed during the Sozopol meeting, as well as providing the report on the past year, saying it is a great improvement. He also mentioned how the executive board of UNESCO has been closely examining the issue related to the Category 2 Centre system, with certain Member States being quite critical of how the Centres are being managed and run. Therefore when full and transparent reports and work plans are present, UNESCO has a better understanding of what is going on with Category 2 Centres, and is better equipped to address these concerns.

**Elnura Korchueva**

She first thanked everyone for the opportunity to be at the meeting and thanked ICHCAP for being one of the most active Category 2 Centres in the Central Asian region and for helping Central Asian countries. She also praised ICHCAP for its approach to the organizing the meeting.

**Ling Zhang**

She thanked everyone for inviting her and thanked ICHCAP for the comprehensive report indicating what the center has been doing over the past few years. Believes that all Member States and other centers can benefit from what ICHCAP has done. She also looks forward to more cooperation among other Category 2 Centers. She praised Dr. Lee’s for his leadership and for setting up the Centre for further success in the future.

**Mitshuhiro Ikehara**

He also thanked ICHCAP for its efforts and contributions to safeguarding and looks forward to continuous cooperation. He also called the ICHCAP’s promotional video professional and impressive and said that he will use the ICHCAP model for future presentations.

**Samuel Lee.**

He thanked the board members for their positive review of ICHCAP’s report, but he also made it clear that he did not want to sound too proud since the Centre is still working on some of its shortcomings. He also said that when we visit different nations, we do so to better understand their needs. He cautioned, however, that due to the lack of time on these visits that it is difficult to gain a full understanding of everything that is going on in a given country.

He also said that working with other C2C will enhance ICHCAP’s networking and information functions. But he also added that ICHCAP also needs to work harder at engaging with bearers and communities rather than just governments. He also expressed the Center’s plan to carry out activities after developing strategies with ICH experts.

**Dawnhee Yim**

She expressed her appreciation for being involved with so many of ICHCAP’s activities since the beginning. And she said it is a true pleasure to see all the work presented today. She said that ICHCAP has done more than other centers in the ICH field, and she reiterated Dr. Lee’s point that networking has been mostly involved with governments rather than bearers and NGOs, but she also wanted to add academia to that list.

**Timothy Curtis**

On the point of NGOs, he said that he is very happy to see ICHCAP moving in that direction of networking NGOs and communities as recommended last year, and urged ICHCAP to continue since it complements UNESCO’s work in an area where the UNESCO secretariat is less equipped to work.

**Elnura Korchueva**

She agreed with Dawnhee Yim that academia and other areas need to be involved with networking for ICH.

**Hyun-Mook Lim**

He said that he worked with Dr. Lee when Dr. Lee was Secretary-General of the Korean National Commission for UNESCO and that it is a pleasure to see that Dr. Lee has laid the groundwork for the future of ICHCAP. He congratulated Dr. Lee for his efforts. He said that since ICHCAP is still in its initial stage, there are still some future tasks that need to be addressed and they will be under the new Director-General.

**Hee -Ung Park**

He expressed agreement about Tim Curtis’s point about NGOs and said that he would also like to see the three Category 2 Centres in the Asia-Pacific region collaborate more on projects.

**Doo-Soo Kim**

He briefly gave his thanks for being invited and expressed appreciation for Dr. Lee’s work and said that he would comment more after lunch during his report

**Sun-hwa Rha**

She announced that she will be unable to make the afternoon session and named Dawnhee Yim to take over as chairperson in the afternoon session.

**REPORTING ON CLOSING ACCOUNTS OF 2013**

**Dawnhee Yim**

She announced that, on behalf of the chairperson, she would preside over the rest of the meeting in the afternoon. She requested opinions from both the board members and observers.

She requested ICHCAP to report on the closing accounts of 2013.

**Sun-Bok Choi**

He reported the closing accounts of 2013.

**DISCUSSIONS FOLLOWING THE REPORT ON CLOSING ACCOUNTS**

**Sipiriano Nemani Ranuku**

He asked about the difference between the general account and the extraordinary budget.

**Sun-Bok Choi**

He outlined the funding of the individual projects.

**Samuel Lee**

He added that the ordinary budget is set by parliament. The extraordinary budget comes as new projects are requested by different organizations and local governments such as activities to promote tug-of-war or CPI program.

**Tim Curtis**

He expressed concerns that the extraordinary budget happens outside the governing board and that the projects are bypassing approval by the board. The projects based on the general fund can be examined with the view of UNESCO’s global strategy, but projects funded with the extraordinary budget are added without the same scrutiny.

He offered a suggestion that it could be possible to include possible projects in the plan based on whether the funding is available through the extraordinary budget. Again, he mentioned that the extraordinary budget projects should be reported and approved by the governing board.

**Samuel Lee**

He said that it could be possible that the extraordinary budget activities may be made through a written resolution approved by the governing board. In the case of EXB projects last year, they happened continuously and each project could not be approved through the governing board. If the Centre’s budget is later increased in the first half of the fiscal year, it may be ideal for the governing board to approve such cases.

**Sun-Bok Choi**

He provided additional information on this matter. He asked for the board members to refer Article 22 of the Constitution regarding the revised supplementary budget. As mentioned in the Constitution Article 22 Clause 2 Sub-clause 6, the governing board may delegate the resolution on revised supplementary budgets to the executive committee.

**Tim Curtis**

The point here is not the amount of budget, but the project funded with the extraordinary budget. He mentioned that the Centre’s activities should be reported and approved by the governing board. Even though communities may offer a budget, the project should conform to UNESCO’s strategies and objectives and these matters need to be considered by the governing board. Thus, it is immensely important to find ways for the governing board to monitor the Centre’s projects funded with the supplementary budget.

**Elnura Korchueva**

Agrees with Mr. Tim Curtis, the projects that are not in line with UNESCO’s strategy should be monitored.

**Samuel Lee**

He mentioned that he suggested that perhaps ICHCAP can give a report based on the extraordinary budget to the board members every three months or six months. In the case where there are urgent matters, per Director-General and/or secretariat’s discretion, resolutions may be delegated to the executive committee.

**Seong-Yong Park**

Agrees that it is an important issue. The matter cannot be decided on right away, so the Center will take it under advisement. We will prepare the list of possible projects funded with the extraordinary budget as an example and discuss with the governing board members in the near future.

**Tim Curtis**

He suggested that we include projections or guidelines on the agenda for the next meeting, stressing that irrespective of the budget amount that it is crucial that the governing board also have programmatic oversight over EXB projects, in particular when we now see that EXB projects make up almost 50 percent of the Centre’s activity funds

**Dawnhee Yim**

She second that the matter of the extraordinary budget be determined at the next meeting.

**REPORTING ON THE AUDIT REPORT**

**Doo-Soo Kim**

He presented the audit report.

**DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE AUDIT REPORT**

**Gaura Mancarcaritadipura**

He asked to clarify whether the remaining and returned budgets are both from the regular budget and the extra ordinary budget.

**Doo-Soo Kim**

He explained that all the remaining budget information is accounted for from both budgets in the report and that interest is included and combined but that it is returned to the national treasury in its entirety.

**Sipiriano Nemani Ranuku**

He expressed appreciation for incentivizing work for the staff. He also complimented the work of the staff and thinks the governing board should look into indicators to measure the work of the staff.

**Tim Curtis**

He suggested that there is probably already a certain method of incentivizing in the Korean government and that ICHCAP could probably follow what is already being done.

**Hee-Ung Park**

He confirmed that government does have a system in place and that ICHCAP does as well according to its constitution, but he added that ICHCAP is not really big enough to feasibly incorporate it.

**Samuel Lee**

He reiterated the comments by Hee-Ung Park and added that there is a need for improvement in this area.

**Ling Zhang**

She asked whether ICHCAP had to use all the available funding in the current year and if some funds are not used and returned, whether it would influence the budget for the following year.

**Hee-Ung Park**

He informed the board that if there are some funds available after the projects have been implemented, then there is generally no problem. However, if the excess funding is a result of canceled projects, then this may affect the amount offered in the following year. He also stated that for ICHCAP, the amount remaining has been quite low, so there is no issue there.

**REPORTING ON THE WORK PLAN AND BUDGET PLAN FOR 2015**

**Seong-Yong Park**

He reported the work plan and budget plan for 2015.

**DISCUSSION FOLLOWING THE WORK PLAN AND BUDGET PLAN FOR 2015**

**Gaura Mancarcaritadipura,**

He said that the projects are logically following on from the projects of previous years and that the amounts allocated to the budgets seem reasonable.

**Tim Curtis**

He said that UNESCO appreciates the prior consultation, and because of these prior consultations, most of the suggestions he had have already been implemented. He thanked ICHCAP for working hard to incorporate his ideas. He also said that many of ICHCAP’s projects have been ongoing and that we can see how things have progressed. He also said that it is now the time to start thinking about when some of these projects will end. He said that ICHCAP should consider four- or five-year medium-term plans to see how individual annual work plans fit in.

**Dawnhee Yim**

She appreciated the suggestions.

**Hyun-Mook Lim**

He said that it is appropriate that ICHCAP has given priority to UNESCO’s concerns, especially given the renewal process next year. He said that we need to emphasize not only cooperation, but also consultation concerning activities and programs with UNESCO. He also reiterated points made in the work plan in terms of working closely with UNESCO Bangkok. He emphasized that it is also important to work with other Category 2 Centers. And he brought up a point about whether the other Category 2 Centers could be included in the next Northeast Asian sub-regional meeting.

As a final note, he asked about website development for Central Asia and how ICHCAP is planning to develop two websites for two countries.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He addressed Tim Curtis first by saying that that ICHCAP handles medium- to long-term projects with certain kinds of principles, and ways of getting feedback are important. He also said that ICHCAP is going through studies on information and networking in addition to preparing for the UNESCO evaluation next year.

He then addressed Hyun-Mook Lim’s comments about collaborating work with other Category 2 Centers by saying that ICHCAP has already initiated participation with our activities in terms of the Northeast Asian sub-regional networking meetings and that ICHCAP invitations to the meeting last year were not realized. He also emphasized that ICHCAP is willing to work with other Category 2 Centers. He talked about the special meetings for Category 2 Centers that were held in cooperation with the Bangkok office. He closed the topic by saying that there are other occasions, such as intergovernmental meetings, to work with other Category 2 Centers.

**Sipiriano Nemani Ranuku**

He asked first about whether there are plans to hold a sub-regional meeting in Asia in 2015 and he also asked whether there will be enough budget funds to upgrade ICHCAP’s website.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He confirmed that there are plans to hold sub-regional meeting in Central Asia to finalize their collaborative project in the region. At the same time, the meeting may provide an opportunity to discuss how to further collaborate in the future. For the second question, he gave the floor to Kijong Park.

**Kijong Park**

He confirmed that updating the website is part of the plan to update our database system and hardware.

**Sipiriano Nemani Ranuku**

My point is whether the budget is allocated for website maintenance in 2015. From the agenda book, it seems that there is budget to update hardware and construct database system.

**Seong-Yong Park**

As in the agenda book, we are planning to construct ICH database and archives and they are directly related to the Center’s website. Through these projects, we will try to upgrade the website and strengthen our capacity.

**Tim Curtis**

He said that there has been improved collaboration all around. However, he also mentioned that it is unfortunate that they have not held a meeting for the Category 2 Centers in close to three years and that they should look into finding time to have a new meeting.

He also said that in the past, ICHCAP’s work plans have not been very clear, but they are now improved. He suggested that it might be a good idea, as we move forward, to be more specific about what the meetings are for, so instead of just mentioning that there will be sub-regional meeting, state the purpose of the meeting in the work plans.

He also told the board that the UNESCO evaluation will mainly be concerned about whether the Centre’s work is helping to support UNESCO’s mandates and global strategies, not just about cooperation or performance. So ICHCAP’s medium- to long-term projects should be linked to UNESCO’s C4 and C5 programs.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He mentioned that the Center will reflect on the discussion and opinions and will make sure that the issue is reflected on the work plan and mid- and long-term projects

**Samuel Lee**

He said that it is necessary to hold meetings to discuss safeguarding and promoting ICH with China and Japan who have similar cultural backgrounds and heritage. Also, he offered a suggestion that four C2 centers, including Tehran Center in Iran, need to hold meetings such as co-hosted seminars to discover the demands of the Member States in the Asia-Pacific region.

**Akio Arata**

He said he is impressed by how ICHCAP has organized meeting and expressed thanks for willingness to collaborate with the other Category 2 Centers. His center, IRCI, is about promoting research. He said that he has used ICHCAP’s reports in his work. He expressed wishes to collaborate more in the future and that IRCI may be able to participate in sub-regional meetings, especially if the meeting is based on academia. He added, however, that funding at his center is restricted, so it is not possible to attend all annual meetings.

**Samuel Lee**

He said that it would be a great opportunity to work together during a Northeast Asian sub-regional meeting. He also said that ICHCAP is working on a number of specific projects. So if IRCI would like to participate, then ICHCAP can extend invitations.

**Hee-Ung Park**

He reiterated the points Tim Curtis made about the importance of mid- and long-term projects. He said that it is important to see annual progress and see how the mid- to long-term plans will work. Mid- and long-term planning is important in that Member States and CHA (government) may need to discuss the projects needed by the Member States and how much support the government will be able to provide for them. And in terms of the extraordinary budget, if we include the mid- and long-term plan with the extraordinary budget, then there will be no need to elaborate further since it would already be a part of the plan.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He restated the importance of a mid- to long-term strategy being based on consensus and that once ICHCAP establishes these plans, then the Centre can go forward more stably. He also commented that Category 2 Centers need to take a certain middleman approaches and that the past few years have been a period of growth for ICHCAP. He said that outside experts have been brought in to evaluate and assess the direction of ICHCAP for the mid- to long-term and that UNESCO Headquarters and other offices will be consulted.

**Dawnhee Yim**

She stated that all the members have raised good points about mid- to long-term plans and that there is a need to collaborate more with the other Category 2 Centers. She also said that the projects are laid out in detail, but she cautioned that ICHCAP may have been focusing too much on networking and suggested that perhaps more budget funds should be allocated to database building. She said that ICHCAP seems to put a lot of resources into Central Asia, so perhaps some of these funds could be allocated to some of the areas that may have been overlooked.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He said that the points raised are important and relevant. He added that the Central Asian projects include a lot of IT experts involved with database development, so as far as the Central Asia project, it is a three-year project that includes database building and it is the last year of the project.

**Samuel Lee**

He reiterated many of the same points made, but added that ICHCAP is specialized in information and networking. He admitted that a lot of the information activities have involved information activities involving collecting data but he also said there is a need to think about what to do with this information, think about how to use the information, and think about what kind of information should be included. He also emphasized the challenge of information dissemination related to language issues, where so many nations have different languages, so it is difficult to satisfy the needs of all people.

He said that building a system that many countries can share information and system is the Center’s mid- and long-term task and that we need to start to have a meeting to discuss strategies with experts and that we will try to allocate the fund to this project.

**Dawnhee Yim**

She asked about whether additional funds need to be allocated for the digital information work.

**Samuel Lee**

He said that the budget is created in clumps so there is room for additional use of the budget as needed.

**Seong-Yong Park**

He said that the project with ICH and IT experts needs to be arranged.

**Dawnhee Yim**

*Agenda 1 adopted as presented.*

**DISCUSSION FOLLOWING AGENDA 2 AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION**

**Tim Curtis**

By February next year, only the closing account should be reported, not the audit report. As February is the beginning of the year, he wondered whether the closing account and the audit report are presented in the same year or the following year.

**Sun-Bok Choi**

In the case of 2014, the allocated budget should be executed by 31 December and the balance sheet shall be approved by CHA by the end of February 2015. The closing account will be reported to the sixth Governing Board Meeting in 2015. In the current Constitution, it is mentioned that the balance sheet of the year shall be audited by the auditor and reported to CHA. As the time is not enough to audit and submit by February, we request to amend the Constitution.

**Dawnhee Yim**

*Agenda 2 adopted as presented.*

**DISCUSSION FOLLOWING AGENDA 3 AMENDING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.**

There were a couple of minor questions of terminology, nothing to report.

**Dawnhee Yim**

*Agenda 3 adopted as presented.*

**OPEN\_ENDED DISCUSSIONS**

**Tim Curtis**

He expressed a real appreciation for this new format of the governing board meeting because it offers an opportunity for real discussion.

**Akio Arata**

He asked to take the floor for a moment to say that he is very impressed with the activities of the Centre and the organization of the governing board meeting. He congratulated Samuel Lee for raising the standards to such a high level and he expressed sadness to see that Samuel Lee is leaving.

**Tim Curtis**

He also acknowledged Samuel Lee’s accomplishments and gave thanks.

**Samuel Lee**

He thanked everyone for their kind words and talked briefly about his work experiences with UNESCO and he closed by saying that he will always remember the warm people and engaging activities.

**Dawnhee Yim**

Dr. Yim declared the end of the governing board meeting.