**Overview and rationale**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **22. Extent to which civil society contributes to monitoring of ICH safeguarding** | |
| **Assessment factors** | This indicator is assessed on the basis of three country-level factors monitored and reported by each State Party: | |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for communities, groups and individuals concerned to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. | OD 85,  OD 151,  OD 153(b)(ii) |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for NGOs, and other civil society bodies to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. | OD 83,  OD 151,  OD 153(b)(ii) |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for scholars, experts, research institutions and centres of expertise to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. | OD 83, OD 84, OD 151,  OD 153(b)(ii) |
| **Relation with SDGs and other indicators** | **Sustainable Development Goals:** Like Indicator 21, the present indicator supports SDG Target 16.7 ‘ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels’, as well as SDG Target 17.17, ‘encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships’. Like all of the indicators, the present indicator also responds to SDG Target 11.4, ‘strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.’  **Relation to other indicators:** Where Indicator 21 refers to the widest possible participation by a number of diverse actors in ICH safeguarding, here the focus turns to their participation in the monitoring of ICH safeguarding. Additionally, the present indicator complements Indicator 9, which also looks at scientific, technical and artistic studies, but there the focus is on ICH itself and here the focus is on studies of ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. | |
| **Rationale for action** | The effectiveness of ICH safeguarding programmes and measures can be increased and improved through regular monitoring and through scientific, technical and artistic studies of them. Such monitoring and studies provide feedback about which programmes and measures are having positive impacts. Non-governmental organizations and other civil society bodies often bring together expertise and experience that makes them important actors to carry out such monitoring and studies. Research institutions and centres of expertise may be governmental or non-governmental, according to each country’s own situation, and scholars and experts may be government officials or private individuals. However, in any case such actors also have a vital role to play in monitoring the ongoing implementation of the Convention at the country level. | |
| **Key terms** | * Civil society * Enabling environment * Communities, groups or, in some cases, individuals * Scientific, technical and artistic studies * NGOs * Research institutions * Centres of expertise | |

**Specific guidance on monitoring and periodic reporting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Benefits of monitoring** | Monitoring of this indicator turns the spotlight onto the monitoring process itself, and can help a State determine whether that process is benefitting from the participation of the broad range of civil society actors involved in ICH, as well as whether the process is informed by studies of ICH safeguarding conducted from various perspectives. Monitoring this indicator can identify other opportunities for fuller involvement by such actors in ongoing and future monitoring and studies. Monitoring of this indicator at the global level can offer examples of effective mechanisms to involve civil society in the monitoring process and related studies and can determine whether States are taking advantage of the knowledge and perspectives of civil society actors. |
| **Data sources and collection** | Because this indicator focuses on the monitoring process itself, those responsible for monitoring and reporting on behalf of the State may need to consult with communities, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders who may be contributing to the monitoring exercise at different levels. A consultative body or coordination mechanism, if such exists, will provide an important forum for bringing together diverse actors to plan, supervise, conduct and evaluate monitoring activities.  **Possible data sources**   * Work plans of the body responsible for monitoring and reporting * Work plans, agendas and minutes of a consultative body or coordination mechanism * Bibliographies, publishers’ catalogues, or reviews of published works * Conference agendas or proceedings, as well as documents describing other public presentations and events of non-governmental organizations or other civil society actors * Reports of studies undertaken by non-governmental organizations or other civil society actors |