



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Intangible
Cultural
Heritage

6 COM

ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/10
Paris, 25 October 2011
Original: English

**CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE
INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE
SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

Sixth session
Bali, Indonesia
22 to 29 November 2011

Item 10 of the Provisional Agenda:
Evaluation of International Assistance requests
greater than US\$25,000

Summary

At its fifth session, the Committee established a Consultative Body responsible, inter alia, for the examination of International Assistance requests greater than US\$25,000 (Decision 5.COM 9). This document constitutes the report of the Consultative Body which includes an overview of the 2011 requests and working methods (Part A), the recommendations of the Consultative Body (Part B), comments and observations on the 2011 requests (Part C) and a set of draft decisions for the Committee's consideration (Part D). It should be read together with Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7 and Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/INF.7.

Decision required: paragraph 18

1. In conformity with Chapter V of the Convention and Chapter I.4 of the Operational Directives, the Committee may receive, evaluate and approve requests for any purpose and for any form of international assistance mentioned in Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention respectively, depending on the available resources. In conformity with Paragraph 26 of the Operational Directives, examination of such requests greater than US\$25,000 is accomplished by a Consultative Body composed of six independent experts and six accredited non-governmental organizations.
2. At its fifth session (Nairobi, 2010) the Committee established a Consultative Body to examine such requests in 2011 (Decision 5.COM 9). The Consultative Body also examined nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and requests to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. According to its terms of reference, the Consultative Body shall provide the Committee with an overview of all requests and a report of its examination, and shall, in particular, include in its examination an assessment of the conformity of requests for International Assistance with the selection criteria as provided in Chapter I.4 of the Operational Directives and a recommendation to the Committee to approve or not to approve the international assistance request.
3. Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7, 'Report of the Consultative Body on its work in 2011', describes the working methods of the Body and presents its observations and recommendations on a number of transversal issues common to the three sets of files it examined (the nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, requests for international assistance and proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices). Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/INF.7 presents the 'Report of the rapporteur of the meetings of the Consultative Body in 2011'. The present document should be read together with those two; it focuses on those matters specific to the requests for International Assistance greater than US\$25,000.
4. This document thus provides an overview of all 2011 requests and of their examination by the Consultative Body (Part A), a summary of recommendations concerning the approval of requests on the basis of the assessment of each request's conformity with the inscription criteria (Part B), other observations and recommendations concerning requests for International Assistance (Part C) and a set of draft decisions for the Committee's consideration, with each draft decision addressing one requests' conformity with the criteria and whether or not to approve the requested assistance (Part D).

A. Overview of requests and working methods

5. By the deadline for submission of requests for International Assistance greater than US\$25,000 for possible approval by the Committee in 2011, the Secretariat received eight requests from nine States Parties (one State submitted two requests, and one request came from three States).
6. In light of the debates of the Committee at its fifth session in Nairobi in 2010 that emphasized the importance of the work attributed to the Consultative Body, the Secretariat endeavoured to provide the fullest possible treatment for these eight requests for International Assistance. The Secretariat processed the files and informed the submitting States of the information required to complete them. In addition to assessing the technical compliance of the requests, the Secretariat also sought to inform submitting States when the information provided was unclear, out of place or not sufficiently detailed to allow the Consultative Body, and later the Committee, to determine readily the extent to which the criteria for approval had been satisfied. In four cases, the submitting State Party decided that it was unable to revise the request in the time available, although it may wish to complete the request for a subsequent cycle; as a result the Consultative Body received four requests from six States Parties for examination.

7. As explained more fully in Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7, the Consultative Body convened two meetings, the first on 17 and 18 January 2011 to organize its work and the second from 4 to 8 July 2011 to discuss its examinations and adopt recommendations. The Secretariat established a password-protected, dedicated website through which the members of the Consultative Body could consult the requests. Also available to the Consultative Body were the original requests and the Secretariat's letters asking for additional information. The members of the Body were given the opportunity to enter their examination reports directly through the dedicated site. Each of the members of the Consultative Body examined each request and prepared a report on it that assessed the degree to which it responded to the seven criteria in Paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives and to the two additional considerations in Paragraph 10 of the Directives, and included the member's comments regarding each criterion. When it met on 4 to 8 July 2011, the Consultative Body examined each request and decided whether to recommend approval or not. The resulting recommendations and draft decisions presented below thus represent the unanimous consensus of the Consultative Body members.

B. Recommendations

Recommendations not to approve

8. The Consultative Body recommends to the Committee not to approve the following International Assistance requests at this time:

Draft Decision	Submitting State(s)	Request	File No.
6.COM 10.1	Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Peru	Safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru	550
6.COM 10.2	Mongolia	Safeguarding and revitalizing the Mongolian traditional epic	549
6.COM 10.3	Uganda	Inventorying the intangible cultural heritage of four communities in Uganda	557
6.COM 10.4	Uruguay	Documentation, promotion and dissemination of the Candombe traditional drum calls, expressions of identity of the Sur, Palermo, and Cordón neighbourhoods in the city of Montevideo	555

C. Observations on the 2011 requests and additional recommendations

9. In contrast to the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List or Representative List, all of which must be fully satisfied before an element is inscribed, the criteria for International Assistance (like those for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices) are not all obligatory. In the words of the Operational Directives, the Committee is to 'base its decisions on granting assistance on the following criteria [in Paragraph 12]' and it 'may also take into account' two additional factors in Paragraph 10. The draft decisions are therefore presented in a format different than that used for the two Lists, since the overall recommendation is based not on fully satisfying all

criteria but instead on the degree to which the request responds to the criteria in their totality.

10. As noted above, the Consultative Body found that it was not able for any of the four requests to offer a recommendation to the Committee that the request should be approved at this time and in its present form. The draft decisions below nevertheless offer the Committee the possibility to delegate to its Bureau the authority to approve requests that might be submitted by the States Parties in revised form, remedying the specific shortcomings that the Consultative Body has identified. The Secretariat explained to the Consultative Body that if the Committee were to approve a request for International Assistance, that would lead to a contract between UNESCO and the implementing body designated by the submitting State. That contract would have to reflect strictly the scope of work proposed in the approved request, the Secretariat explained, and correspond exactly to its timetable and budget. Because the Consultative Body noted certain problems in each of the four requests, it concluded that they could not yet serve in this manner as the basis for a contract between UNESCO and the State body. However, the Consultative Body also found that each of the requests could – with proper revision – respond adequately to the criteria for selection and could then serve as the basis for a contract. The Committee may wish to delegate to its Bureau the authority to approve such revised requests, so that the submitting States need not wait for the seventh session of the Committee itself.
11. The concerns that the Consultative Body noted with regard to each request are detailed more specifically in the draft decisions below. There were nevertheless a number of tendencies that were common to several or to all of the requests, and the Consultative Body wishes to offer general advice that can be taken into account both by these States Parties in revising their requests and by other States Parties in subsequent cycles.
12. All of the submitting States had difficulties designing safeguarding plans that could simultaneously satisfy both criterion A.2 ('the amount of assistance requested is appropriate') and criterion A.3 ('the proposed activities are well conceived and feasible'). In one case the Body found the activities to be sound but the budgetary detail was inadequate. In other cases the Body was concerned with the nature of the activities themselves or regretted that certain activities it deemed essential were not included.
13. It was not always clear to the Consultative Body how the proposed activities would contribute to safeguarding in the spirit of the Convention, which emphasizes that the aim is **to ensure the viability of an element**, its continued transmission from the practitioners to the next generation, and not its documentation or registration as archival material, as this alone may lead to fossilization. Some requests assumed that documentation was sufficient to safeguard the element, but the Body deemed it important that requests demonstrate how the measures proposed for funding contribute to a rounded, overall safeguarding strategy. As it points out in its general report (Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7), requests typically did not give sufficient prominence to transmission and to formal and non-formal education. The Consultative Body encourages States to devise broad and diversified safeguarding strategies that include efforts aimed both at strengthening the knowledge and skills of young members of the practising communities and at creating a broader public awareness of the significance of the intangible cultural heritage concerned.
14. With regard to the activities, timetable and budget, the Consultative Body often had difficulty to match specific activities to larger goals and objectives, and was similarly unable in certain cases to match the activities described against specific budgetary items. In other cases the timetable did not conform to the description of activities. **The Consultative Body emphasizes the crucial importance of coherency and**

consistency between the activities proposed, their timetable and their expected costs. As it understands from the Secretariat's explanation of UNESCO's contracting requirements, these must correspond precisely or a contract cannot be executed. As examiners, therefore, the Consultative Body sought to see a clear correspondence between activities, budget and timetable; when this was not evident the Body could not conclude that criteria A.2 and A.3 were both satisfied.

15. As is pointed out below with specific reference to two requests, the Consultative Body reminds States Parties of the importance of properly reflecting in the budget their own in-kind investments in the proposed activities. The Operational Directives provide that 'International Assistance provided to States Parties for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is supplementary to national efforts for safeguarding' (Paragraph 8, see also Article 14.2 of the Convention), and it is therefore essential that submitting States demonstrate that they will contribute, within the limits of their resources, to the success of the proposed activities. These contributions may take various forms, and **States are encouraged to give due attention to describing their expected in-kind services and support.**
16. In its general report (Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7), the Consultative Body emphasizes the essential role of communities in any safeguarding efforts, whether connected to an Urgent Safeguarding List nomination, a Register of Best Safeguarding Practices proposal, or an International Assistance request. Here it wishes to re-emphasize the importance of designing safeguarding activities so that there is a solid collaboration between communities and other stakeholders – government institutions, officials, experts, non-governmental organizations and others. **Knowledge transfer needs to be built into every project so that the activities can be sustained after the International Assistance funds have been completed.** The Body hastens to add that this knowledge transfer is multi-directional. In one case for example it was concerned that local, community-based interventions might not sufficiently involve central authorities and that the long-term sustainability of the effort might therefore be less than if there were greater involvement of officials who could ensure the assistance would have a multiplier effect in the future.
17. Finally, the Consultative Body reiterates the points raised in Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7 concerning the importance of sustainable development, which should be at the heart of safeguarding activities proposed for International Assistance. Criterion A.4 requires that the project may have lasting results, and integrating activities that aim at sustainable development is one good means of responding to this criterion.
18. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 6.COM 10

The Committee,

1. Recalling Chapter V of the Convention and Chapter I of the Operational Directives, as well as its Decision 5.COM 9,
2. Having examined Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/10 and Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/7, as well as the international assistance requests submitted by the respective States Parties,
3. Taking note of Document ITH/11/6.COM/CONF.206/INF.7,
4. Thanks the Consultative Body for its examination and recommendations concerning International Assistance requests greater than US\$25,000;

5. Encourages States Parties to propose diversified safeguarding strategies that include efforts aimed both at strengthening the knowledge and skills of young members of the practising communities and at creating a broader public awareness of the significance of the intangible cultural heritage concerned;
6. Reminds States Parties of the importance of submitting requests that are well-presented and that show a clear correspondence between the overall safeguarding objectives, the specific activities, the responsible parties, the estimated costs and the timetable.

DRAFT DECISION 6.COM 10.1

The Committee

1. Takes note that the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile and Peru have requested international assistance for the project entitled **Safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru**, described as follows:

This project intends to contribute to safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru through the identification, promotion and recognition of their music and oral traditions. The project is to be realized in twenty-seven communities from the Altiplano plateau and areas around Lake Titicaca. The Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Latin America (CRESPIAL) is responsible for its implementation, with the support of national technical teams in each country. The project aims to train representatives and bearers of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru in compiling and recording Aymara music and oral traditions. Local authorities and the communities concerned are to participate in the identification of musical genres at risk and the compilation of oral traditions. The project also plans to work with primary school teachers to encourage children to continue to practise and transmit Aymara intangible cultural heritage. The project's publications (on CD and in print) will be widely disseminated to public schools throughout the region. This project is an outgrowth of multinational collaboration involving dialogue and cooperation between the three countries, and was recognized by the Committee in 2009 for its potential contributions to safeguarding.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in File 00550, **Safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru** responds as follows to the criteria for international assistance in Paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives and to the additional considerations in Paragraph 10:
 - A.1 While the sub-regional cooperation between the three countries and their combined and concerted effort in formulating a programme of safeguarding are commendable, the active participation by the Aymara community in the preparation of the request and their future involvement in its implementation have not been elaborated in sufficient detail;
 - A.2 The budget is well conceived and clearly structured with an overview of individual activities and shares of costs; the amount of assistance appears to be appropriate;
 - A.3 The proposed activities are well conceived, methodical and feasible, presented in a logical step-by-step procedure, and there is consistency between the activities planned, the timetable and the budget; monitoring and evaluation of the program are built in; nonetheless it is necessary to

bear in mind that its aim should not only be documentation but should include as well the transmission and viability of Aymara music and oral traditions;

- A.4 Sustainability of the project can potentially be secured in many ways, by thorough documentation followed by dissemination which can serve for promotion and educational activities on State and private levels; for this to be effective, however, it is fundamental to mobilize community participation, transfer know-how and revitalize intergenerational transmission as key prerequisites for sustainability;
 - A.5 The support requested from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund is less than one-third of the total, with the remaining costs to be borne by the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Latin America (CRESPIAL) and the respective State Parties;
 - A.6 Financial assistance is to be used to reinforce the skills for identifying, documenting and disseminating music and oral traditions, and the participants are to become trained multipliers and experts; nevertheless, capacity building of the Aymara communities is not sufficiently explained; except for schoolteachers, no bearers or other members of the communities will be trained in the skills necessary to contribute to the transmission of their own heritage, and although schoolchildren are mentioned they are not visible in the activities, budget or timetable;
 - A.7 The States Parties received financial assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the elaboration of a proposal for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices concerning the project 'Aymara Cultural Universe' in 2009; the work stipulated by the terms of reference of the contract was successfully carried out and, following UNESCO's regulations, the contract was duly completed;
- 10(a) The project is to involve cooperation on the sub-regional level; State institutions as well as regional organizations including educational institutions will participate and CRESPIAL will share the costs;
- 10(b) Assistance can produce a multiplier effect by attracting other partners and possibly private sources to the project as has already been the case for the association Aymara Without Borders that is a partner of the program.
- 3. Commends the three States Parties for their joint efforts to prepare and implement a project aiming to benefit a transboundary community and to safeguard components of its intangible cultural heritage, and for its well conceived and methodical plan and budget;
 - 4. Strongly recommends that the States fully involve the Aymara communities in the implementation of the project by emphasizing their empowerment and the reinforcement of their capacities in order to encourage the revitalization and traditional transmission of their music and oral traditions and to promote a solid and sustainable future-oriented development;
 - 5. Recalls that, in line with the Convention, the aim of recording and documentation should be to ensure the viability of the intangible cultural heritage concerned and they must therefore be complemented by other appropriate safeguarding measures;
 - 6. Decides not to approve international assistance in the amount of US\$98,000 for the project **Safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Aymara communities in Bolivia, Chile and Peru** at this time;

7. Invites the States Parties to revise the request, including its timetable and budget;
8. Delegates to the Bureau of the Committee the authority to approve a revised request for international assistance in an amount not to exceed US\$98,000, on condition that the States Parties submit a revised request responding to the concerns laid out above;
9. Requests the Secretariat to work with the submitting States Parties in their revision of the request.

DRAFT DECISION 6.COM 10.2

The Committee

1. Takes note that Mongolia has requested international assistance for the project entitled **Safeguarding and revitalizing the Mongolian traditional epic**, described as follows:

The Mongolian traditional epic, or Tuuli, constitutes a living oral encyclopaedia of Mongolian histories, myths, legends and folk songs, and has been inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. Epics are learnt by rote and transmitted from fathers to sons within kinship circles. Singers are renowned for their remarkable memory, imagination and commitment. They traditionally perform during events such as State affairs, weddings, the Naadam festival, a child's first haircut, hunting expeditions and worship of sacred sites. Mongolian epic performers endeavour to transmit their knowledge to the younger generation, but changing socio-economic conditions and the proliferation of mass entertainment media have placed the epic at severe risk. International assistance is requested to allow the Centre for Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, together with the Association of Mongol Tuuli, to implement a safeguarding plan that emphasizes training young performers to sustain intergenerational transmission; raising awareness among the general public; promoting and enhancing the skills of performers and enriching their repertoire; and creating a socio-economic and legal framework for safeguarding the element. The plan aims to revitalize and safeguard the epic and ensure its viability through training courses, exhibitions, festivals, seminars, documentary and training videos, guidebooks, and home-tutoring and training centres.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in File 00549, **Safeguarding and revitalizing the Mongolian traditional epic** responds as follows to the criteria for international assistance in Paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives and to the additional considerations in Paragraph 10:
 - A.1 The project will be implemented by central governmental institutions together with regional and non-governmental organizations; and relies upon the full involvement of current bearers; the participation of local and regional stakeholders will enable involvement of other community members whose knowledge of local situations and traditions can be fully used;
 - A.2 The budget breakdown is realistic and the largest amounts are dedicated to safeguarding activities; the financial resources are divided among short-term and long-term activities and activities with lasting results, and the amount requested is appropriate; however, there are discrepancies that need to be resolved between the budget, timetable and proposed activities;
 - A.3 The character and content of the activities are well conceived; however, the request needs to demonstrate greater coherence between the objectives

and the proposed activities, and ensure that this is fully reflected in the budget and timetable;

- A.4 Lasting results can be expected from a well-working system of training of new bearers, based upon a sound methodology, and enhanced awareness of traditional epic in Mongolian society can be promoted by publication and documentation; the activity may also attract potential bearers from the younger generations, and the creation of a national safeguarding system should encourage sustainability of this cultural element;
 - A.5 The budget clearly distinguishes the amount requested from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and that to be contributed by the State Party; although its cash contribution is relatively low, the State is encouraged to take into account the expected in-kind contributions from Government institutions and officials when revising the request;
 - A.6 The project involves strengthening the skills of bearers and increasing their numbers through formulating a training system for the element's transmission; it further aims to strengthen the capacities of cultural officers involved in identification and registration of epic performers;
 - A.7 The submitting State received financial assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2008-2009 for the elaboration of two nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List for Mongolian traditional heroic epic, and for Mongolian folk dance, Bii biyeleg, and in 2009-2011 for the elaboration of the inventories of the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List in Mongolia; Mongolia provided the work stipulated by the terms of reference of the respective contracts and these contracts were duly completed in conformity with UNESCO regulations;
- 10(a) The scope of the project is national, but the submitting State should be encouraged to envisage broader partnerships and to consider expanding the project at the regional level;
- 10(b) The submitting State has not clearly identified possible multiplier effects, except for the general stimulus to greater national, local and institutional interest in the safeguarding of the Mongolian epic and other intangible cultural heritage.
3. Decides not to approve international assistance in the amount of US\$107,400 for the project **Safeguarding and revitalizing the Mongolian traditional epic** at this time;
 4. Invites the State Party to submit a revised request with a more detailed workplan and budget reflecting a clearer correspondence between the objectives and the planned activities, their timetable and the amounts required for each activity;
 5. Further invites the State Party to describe more clearly its in-kind contribution, in particular regarding the costs to guarantee the monitoring of the project, and to address its sustainability beyond the activities to be financed by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund;
 6. Delegates to the Bureau of the Committee the authority to approve a revised request for international assistance in an amount not to exceed US\$107,400, on condition that the State Party submits a revised request responding to the concerns laid out above;
 7. Requests the Secretariat to work with the submitting State Party in its revision of the request.

DRAFT DECISION 6.COM 10.3 

The Committee

1. Takes note that Uganda has requested international assistance for the project entitled **Inventoring the intangible cultural heritage of four communities in Uganda**, described as follows:

Uganda is home to more than forty ethno-linguistic communities, each with its distinct traditions and practices. The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development proposes to begin inventoring the intangible cultural heritage present on Uganda's territory and to raise awareness of its importance through pilot community-based inventories in four locations. The programme will be undertaken in six phases: the establishment of a national strategy for inventoring intangible heritage; community and district consultation; capacity-building workshops on community-based inventoring; fieldwork to identify elements; compilation of four inventories; and final workshops and dissemination. The beneficiary communities will choose elements for inventoring, provide detailed information on them and prioritize those in need of urgent safeguarding. They will also identify community resource persons, opinion leaders and tradition bearers; introduce the project to the communities; review the methodology for inventory-making; identify community representatives to attend training; and select a non-governmental, community-based organization to act as local coordinator. At its end, the project will have identified elements in need of urgent safeguarding. The skills acquired by district culture officers can be utilized to train officers from other districts in inventoring intangible cultural heritage in other Ugandan communities.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in File 00557, **Inventoring the intangible cultural heritage of four communities in Uganda** responds as follows to the criteria for international assistance in Paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives and to the additional considerations in Paragraph 10,
 - A.1 The proposal lays out a central role for communities in the future implementation of the project but does not make clear how and why these four target communities are selected to participate; it is important that the communities and local partners be fully involved in the project from its earliest stages;
 - A.2 There are several inconsistencies in the budget regarding costs and their relation to the activities proposed, which makes it difficult to determine that the amount of assistance requested is appropriate;
 - A.3 The request presents a complete plan of activities aimed at designing strategies, training, community involvement and raising awareness, aiming at replicating the experience with other communities; however, the timetable is very short and does not seem likely to permit the realization of all these activities; additional information is needed on project management and the specific responsibilities of central authorities;
 - A.4 The lasting results of the project will include an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of four pilot communities, a corps of trained local trainers and culture officers, and greater public awareness about intangible cultural heritage; however, it would be useful to specify the resources for the longer-term updating and subsequent stages of inventoring in other communities;
 - A.5 The beneficiary State Party shares the cost of the activities, but the amount it is to contribute seems rather low (below two percent of the overall

budget); the State is encouraged to take into account the expected in-kind contributions from Government institutions and officials when revising the request;

- A.6 An elaborate system of strengthening capacities in intangible cultural heritage inventorying is proposed by the project, which aims to empower and build the capacity of communities and district officials in identification and safeguarding; it appears that the project can be effective in raising awareness as well inventorying, within the scope of the current request as well as in the future;
- A.7 The State Party has not previously received financial assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund;
- 10(a) The project does not imply cooperation with other countries, although it results from a regional activity supported by the UNESCO/Flanders Funds-in-Trust to strengthen capacities for community-based inventorying;
- 10(b) The assistance has the potential to stimulate similar efforts in other communities in Uganda, as well as local financial and technical contributions from other sources.
3. Recognizes the importance and relevance of the elaboration of an inventory, but invites the State Party to improve the methodologies to lay a more solid groundwork before the project starts and in particular to explain the choice of these four pilot communities in the context of a future expansion of the project, to reinforce the in-depth training and broad participation of the communities in the elaboration of the inventories, and in particular, to identify more clearly the technical support that this may require;
 4. Encourages the State Party to review and consistently articulate the activities, budget and timetable to ensure they are mutually coherent;
 5. Decides not to approve international assistance for the project **Inventorying the intangible cultural heritage of four communities in Uganda** in the amount of US\$216,000, at this time;
 6. Further invites the State Party to re-submit a request in which its nature as a pilot project is more clearly described, including greater attention to how the effort can be sustained in the future within the pilot communities and elsewhere;
 7. Delegates to the Bureau of the Committee the authority to approve a revised request for international assistance in an amount not to exceed US\$216,000, on condition that the State Party submits a revised request responding to the concerns laid out above;
 8. Requests the Secretariat to work with the submitting State Party in its revision of the request.

DRAFT DECISION 6.COM 10.4

The Committee

1. Takes note that Uruguay has requested international assistance for the project entitled **Documentation, promotion and dissemination of the Candombe traditional drum calls, expressions of identity of the Sur, Palermo, and Cordón neighbourhoods in the city of Montevideo**, described as follows:

Candombe traditional drums calls, or *llamadas*, of the Sur, Palermo and Cordon neighbourhoods of Montevideo, Uruguay, originated with African slaves. They are performed in neighbourhood streets and at carnivals by drum groups,

accompanied by dancing and singing. Candombe is usually transmitted through families respected for their drum skills. However, since the 1990s, rising house prices have dispersed Candombe communities, leading to the loss and dilution of their heritage. The project plans to strengthen Candombe by recovering historic material about the heritage, making new recordings, conducting awareness-raising activities at education centres, holding training workshops, and producing a documentary film and audio CD to be broadcast and disseminated at Candombe performances and talks countrywide. A travelling exhibition will also be organized. The bearer community has taken part in the design of safeguarding actions through the Advisory Group for Candombe. The advisory group has links with other associations of people of African descent, who will assist in the gathering of written, oral, and musical information, cooperate in organizing and implementing educational activities, and foster the transmission and dissemination of Afro-Uruguayan culture.

2. Decides that, from the information provided in File 00555, **Documentation, promotion and dissemination of the Candombe traditional drum calls, expressions of identity of the Sur, Palermo, and Cordón neighbourhoods in the city of Montevideo** responds as follows to the criteria for international assistance in Paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives and to the additional considerations in Paragraph 10:
 - A.1 The community of Candombe practitioners and experts was involved in the elaboration of the nomination submitted for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and continued its participation in elaborating this request for international assistance; it is to have a central role in the implementation of the proposed activities;
 - A.2 The budget does not provide sufficient detail to determine whether the amount of assistance requested is appropriate; certain large costs seem to be overstated, particularly in the absence of concrete details to support the estimates;
 - A.3 The proposed activities are well conceived and feasible, especially the timetable; the project will be monitored by means of four quarterly assessments and a final evaluation that will result in a final report;
 - A.4 Potential impacts of the project need to be elaborated in greater detail and with more thought regarding the next phase of the programme to ensure its sustainability once the 18-month project is completed;
 - A.5 The beneficiary State Party shares the cost of the activities, contributing around one-fifth of the total budget, although the longer-term sustainability of the project is not clearly described;
 - A.6 Insufficient information is provided on the building up of capacities; although the community of musicians is involved, it is not demonstrated how the project aims to develop their capacities, except for their involvement in the school activity which represents a very small portion of the whole project;
 - A.7 The State Party has not previously received financial assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund;
- 10(a) There is little discussion of bilateral, regional or international cooperation in the implementation of this project, and only a brief mention of some ongoing activities for people of African descent;

- 10(b) The project develops from the inscription of Candombe on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2009 and can be expected to stimulate complementary activities in the future.
3. Draws the attention of the State Party to the importance of requesting reasonable amounts and clearly detailing the basis for estimating all costs;
 4. Expresses its concern about the sustainability of the project considering the time-limited commitment of the State to support crucial positions such as the coordinator of the project;
 5. Decides not to approve international assistance in the amount of US\$218,800 for the project **Documentation, promotion and dissemination of the Candombe traditional drum calls, expressions of identity of the Sur, Palermo, and Cordón neighbourhoods in the city of Montevideo** at this time;
 6. Invites the State Party to revise the request, giving particular attention to the amount and costs of the budget;
 7. Further invites the State to focus in the revised request on expected results and feasibility rather than general objectives and to reinforce training programmes as well as to specify the dissemination strategy for the products;
 8. Delegates to the Bureau of the Committee the authority to approve a revised request for international assistance in an appropriate amount, not to exceed US\$218,800, on condition that the State Party submits a revised request, responding to the concerns laid out above;
 9. Requests the Secretariat to work with the submitting State Party in its revision of the request.