



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

11 IGC

DCE/17/11.IGC/7b
Paris, 10 November 2017
Original: French

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS

Eleventh session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
12-15 December 2017

Item 7b of the provisional agenda: Report of the external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)

This document presents the report of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), in accordance with the revised Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD (paragraph 22), Resolution 5.CP 14 of the Conference of the Parties and Committee Decisions 9.IGC5 and 10.IGC5.

Decision required: paragraph 10

1. The revised Guidelines on the use of the resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereafter "revised IFCD Guidelines") were approved by the Conference of Parties in 2013. Paragraph 22 of the Guidelines state that an evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) shall be carried out every five years. The Committee is to consider the results of said evaluation with a view to adopting, or not, the proposed recommendations (Resolution 6.CP 12).
2. To recall, the first IFCD evaluation was carried out in 2012 by the Internal Oversight Service (IOS). This evaluation covered the Fund's pilot phase and included projects financed in 2010 and 2011 (the first two funding cycles). The first evaluation made 35 recommendations that have been fully implemented (see Annex III to Document DCE/17/6.CP/10). The implementation of the recommendations over a period of five years has made it possible to improve the Fund's management while streamlining its processes and demonstrating its impact at the national and international levels.
3. The Convention's governing bodies validated and launched the second external evaluation (Resolution 5.CP 14 and Decisions 9.IGC 5 and 10.IGC 8), which was carried out by external evaluators in the first half of 2017. The evaluation covered the June 2012 to June 2017 period (the third to sixth funding cycles). The Secretariat fully cooperated with the external evaluators throughout the six-month evaluation process, providing relevant documents, information, reports and assessments, and took part in regular meetings to respond to technical questions regarding the operational and financial management of the Fund.
4. At this session, the Committee is to consider the report of the second external evaluation of the IFCD (see Annex) and identify which recommendations will need to be implemented in the future. The terms of reference for this exercise were approved by the 10.IGC and are presented in the Annex to the evaluation report.

I. Overview of the selection process

5. An international call for proposals for the external evaluation was issued by the Secretariat on 23 January 2017 and disseminated through the UNESCO website, the United Nations evaluation networks, the 2005 Convention Expert Facility and the network of funds for non-governmental organizations. Fourteen proposals were received for sums ranging from USD 29,200 to USD 242,474.
6. Following the call for proposals, *Leitmotiv* (Spain) was selected for the following reasons: a great deal of experience in the evaluation and monitoring of international programmes; very good knowledge of UNESCO and the United Nations system; previous evaluations of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) projects and UNESCO funds in the field of culture; an excellent understanding of the cultural and creative industries; proficiency in the Committee's two working languages; and a proposal that was in line with the allocated budget.

II. Key messages of the evaluation

7. Several key messages for the IFCD have emerged from the evaluation report. These include:
 - The IFCD is a unique mechanism, contributing to the implementation of the Convention, and serving as a catalyst for projects aiming medium- and long-term structural changes.
 - In terms of governance and management, the Secretariat works with diligence and professionalism in a complex administrative setting and most stakeholders have given a positive appraisal of the support received. Nevertheless, some concerns persist regarding the Secretariat's real capacity, especially in regards to fundraising.

- Processes have improved greatly since the 2012 evaluation. Some basic questions remain, however, such as the lack of financial resources for projects, the management and monitoring of projects, the role of the National Commissions, or the geographical priorities.
- In terms of progress and results, many projects have proven to have contributed to, among other things, the formulation and adoption of policies concerning culture.
- Many projects promote cultural networks and innovative models and mechanisms for the creation, production, distribution and access to cultural goods and services.
- With respect to gender issues, some projects have launched specific and positive actions in support of creators and producers that are not necessarily reflected in the project reports and are mainly presented in the form of gender-disaggregated data.
- Notwithstanding efforts to broaden and diversify income sources and to implement the fundraising strategy with the private sector, the Parties remain the primary source for IFCD financing. No partnerships have been concluded with the private sector. The challenge is to secure regular funding from Parties, in line with their 1% annual contribution to the IFCD, and to strengthen the Secretariat's capacity with a fundraising professional.
- With respect to the sustainability of the Fund, even though recent financing trends suggest that voluntary contributions are likely to continue, the overall sustainability of the Fund cannot be taken for granted.
- In regard to the sustainability of projects, while some positive strategies developed by the projects are directly linked to their prospects in the long term, the implementation period of projects is too short, activity-centred and unsuccessful in achieving a critical mass of beneficiaries and national organizations to be considered sustainable, especially at the policy level.

III. Main evaluation recommendations

8. The second evaluation report sets out the following recommendations, organized by theme. The full list is available in the evaluation report (see Annex):

Improve calls for funding requests:

- Focus support on low- and medium-income countries, with the greatest need and that have fewer opportunities to access funding in the culture sector.
- Introduce a call for concept notes involving a brief two-to-three page project proposal with a simple budget based on a summary of the proposed activities and demonstrating partners' capacities.
- Allocate extra criteria in the proposal scoring system to projects that promote strategic themes, such as gender equality and geographic regions with fewer funding possibilities. Devote more attention to the capacity of project partners and attach more importance to partnerships in the selection process to ensure greater sustainability.

Strengthen the capacities of IFCD stakeholders:

- Conduct a human resources review aimed at strengthening the Secretariat in the areas of coordination, management, monitoring, evaluation and communication/fundraising.
- Work with the National Commissions to bolster their role in the pre-selection process, including through the establishment and coordination of the Pre-selection Panel.
- Work with the Field Offices to ensure that project partners are informed about IFCD calls for funding and build their capacities to monitor the implementation of projects.
- Develop capacity-building activities for countries with fewer funding possibilities in the culture sector and countries that have never received IFCD funding.

Follow-up of IFCD's funded projects:

- Introduce measures to ensure that the IFCD becomes a learning-driven fund.
- Work with civil society actors and cultural organisations, providing more information, training and awareness-raising tools on the importance of promoting the culture sector's contribution to the development and the formulation of policies that have an impact on the implementation of the Convention.

IFCD fundraising and communication strategy:

- Revise the Committee's current fundraising strategy to ensure that it devotes greater attention, in a more personalized manner, to the contributions and involvement of Parties.
- Integrate an analytical dimension into the fundraising strategy, clearly highlighting the link between communication tools and the concrete fundraising targets.
- Change the current aim of securing contributions from 50% of the Parties to receiving regular contributions, in line with the suggested 1% minimum.
- Increase the use of communication materials and analyse the results of different phases of the communication strategy.

IV. Financial implications

9. A number of the recommendations made in the second evaluation would, if adopted by the Committee, have financial implications for the Secretariat, such as:

- Measures to ensure that the IFCD becomes a learning-driven fund, namely through the strengthening of the Secretariat's capacities for project monitoring and evaluation.
- Carrying out independent evaluations of IFCD projects with a view to building a knowledge base on projects.
- Introduce an endorsement programme for projects implemented in higher human development countries where there is less IFCD funding than in lower human development countries.

10. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 11.IGC 7b

The Committee,

1. *Having examined Document DCE/17/11.IGC/7b and its Annex;*
2. *Takes note of the report of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and its recommendations, as set out in the Annex;*
3. *Invites the Secretariat to submit the external report and its recommendations as an information document to the Conference of Parties, at its seventh session, together with a summary of the Committee's deliberations on the report and updated information on the implementation of the external evaluation recommendations;*
4. *Requests the Secretariat to prepare a plan of action for the implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Committee, as presented in the table annexed to this Decision;*
5. *Encourages the Parties to provide extrabudgetary funding for the implementation of the external evaluation's recommendations on the monitoring and management of IFCD funded projects.*

ANNEX

Final report

Evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) UNESCO



©Karl Agnee by Sundays Magazine 1

Report prepared by Itziar Gómez and Eva Otero

October 2017

This report has been produced by independent evaluators, commissioned by the 2005 Convention Secretariat. As such, the views put forward in this report should not be considered those of UNESCO. The views expressed in this report reflect the views of numerous informants and sources as well as research and analysis conducted by the evaluation team. Any comments regarding this report can be forwarded to the evaluators by email at: eva.otero@leitmotivsocial.com or itziar.gomez@leitmotivsocial.com

CONTENTS

Contents	ii
Acronyms & Lists	iii
Acronyms.....	iii
Boxes, figures and tables	iii
Executive summary.....	iv
The evaluation process.....	1
Data collection tools and analysis.....	1
Understanding the IFCD	3
Introduction.....	3
Aims of the IFCD.....	4
Scope of the Fund	4
The IFCD in figures	4
The IFCD management and governance structure	5
The IFCD annual call for proposals	5
Findings of the evaluation	7
1. Relevance	7
1.1. Overall added value (uniqueness).....	7
1.2. Complementarity to other funds	8
1.3. IFCD implements the 2005 convention	9
1.4. Alignment of the RBM with the Convention	10
1.5. Needs and expectations of the Parties	12
1.6. Cultural needs	13
2. Governance and management	15
2.1. Decision making	15
2.2. Processes.....	18
3. Achievement of results	24
3.1. Progress	24
3.2. Contributions to medium and long term transformations	24
Outcome 1: A sustainable system of governance	25
Outcome 2: Networks around cultural goods and services.....	27
Outcome 3: Economic growth opportunities.....	27
Outcome 4: Gender equality	29
Factors contributing or hindering to the achievement of results	31
4. Income & budget.....	32
4.1. Income.....	32
4.2. Implementation of the Fundraising Strategy	33
4.3. Operational costs	35
5. Sustainability.....	38
5.1. Sustainability of the Fund.....	38
5.2. Sustainability of projects	38
5.3. contribution to the Sustainability of the sector	39
6. Conclusions	40
7. Recommendations.....	42

ACRONYMS & LISTS

ACRONYMS

CSO – Civil Society Organisation
DAC – Development Assistance Committee
IGC – Inter-governmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions
ICHF – Intangible Culture Heritage Fund
IFCD – International Fund for Cultural Diversity
IFPC – International Fund for the Promotion of Culture
INGO – International Non-Governmental Organisation
MEL – Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
RBM – Results Based Management
ToC – Theory of Change
QPR – Quadrennial Periodic Report
UFO – UNESCO Field Office
WHF – World Heritage Fund

BOXES, FIGURES AND TABLES

Box 1: IOS recommendations that have been fully implemented
Box 2: Recommendations on relevance
Box 3: Recommendations on governance and management
Box 4: Influencing policies from Civil Society. The case of TELARTES, Bolivia
Box 5: Demonstrating the value of creative industries in Serbia
Box 6: TELARTES: Promoting gender equality at different levels
Box 7: Recommendations on achievements
Box 8: Recommendations on income and budget
Box 9: Recommendations on sustainability

Figure 1: The evaluation process
Figure 2: Theory of Change (ToC) vs Logframe
Figure 3: The selection process
Figure 4: Factors that helped or hindered results

Table 1: Contributions to the IFCD
Table 2. IFCD Annual approved budgets
Table 3: Summary of recommendations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. The aim of this evaluation exercise¹ was to analyse and assess the relevance and effectiveness of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) established by UNESCO's 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. The evaluation also sought to assess progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 IOS evaluation of the IFCD, identify lessons learned and provide further recommendations for the future implementation of the IFCD.

II. The evaluation framework was designed following the parameters described in the terms of reference for this evaluation and was complemented with other elements emerging from preliminary discussions with the Convention Secretariat. Evaluation questions were clustered under different analytical themes; including relevance; governance and management, achievements of results, income & budget, and sustainability. The methodology included a desk review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, field visits to 3 selected projects, a survey for the projects implemented under cycles 3-6, a survey for UNESCO National Commissions and a short e-mail questionnaire for Permanent Delegations.

III. In terms of relevance, the findings of this evaluation suggest that the IFCD is unique for several reasons ranging from its formal statutory role in the Convention to its ability to serve as a catalyst for projects aiming to achieve medium to long term structural changes. The IFCD is also said to be complementary to other Funds operating under the cultural sector in UNESCO and there is evidence of a solid coherence between the Convention, the IFCD guidelines and the activities implemented by the projects.

IV. There is also great sense of alignment across actors as well as a dominating long-term vision shared by projects (and in line with the dispositions of the 2005 Convention) that privileges systemic changes and medium-long term goals in a wide range of contexts. However, the implications of the IFCD's direct alignment with the Convention is not fully understood by many of the cultural actors involved.

V. The implementation of the IOS 2012 recommendations has been dutifully and systematically completed by the relevant actors, bringing about various positive advances, although some may not have translated into concrete substantive changes. For example, in what concerns the revised RBM framework approved in 2016, this report concludes that in order to provide a real basis for effective monitoring, all key stakeholders would need to fully understand the RBM framework and incorporate it into their practices. At present, the level of knowledge and understanding of the RBM framework across actors is uneven.

VI. The IFCD corresponds to the needs of the Parties, since it addresses their stated priorities in the field of culture and their obligations as Parties to the 2005 Convention. However, given the IFCD's scope and limited resources it is impossible for the Fund to fully meet the needs and demands of the Parties. Evidence suggests that the IFCD may not be as relevant to high human development countries (according to the United Nations 2016 Human Development Index), which have access to other Funds and/or their own sources of funding for these types of projects.

VII. In terms of governance and management, this report concludes that the Secretariat works diligently and professionally in an administratively complex context and most stakeholders positively rated their support and praised their work. Nonetheless, there are still concerns about the appropriate capacity of the Secretariat, particularly regarding fundraising functions.

VIII. Although the application and selection processes have significantly improved since the 2012 evaluation, major issues remain (such as the lack of financial resources for both projects and administration, the role of the National Commissions; geographic priorities and the 30-point decision that automatically recommends all projects above this threshold for funding). Furthermore, no specific independent monitoring is conducted to build a body of evidence-based on what works better to inform the IFCD strategy.

¹ According to Article 18 of the 2005 Convention, the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD (para. 22) and resolutions 5. CP 14 (para. 4) and DCE/16/10.IGC/8 (para. 7), an evaluation of the IFCD must be conducted every five years.

IX. In terms of progress and results, this report concludes that the outcome under which the evaluation team has found clearer examples of concrete project contributions to impact has been 'sustainable systems of governance', particularly contributing to the development and adoption of legislation and other policies related to culture (at the local, national and regional levels). Many projects have reported promoting cultural networks, while others have developed innovative models and mechanisms for the creation, production, distribution and access to goods and services.

X. Regarding gender issues, this report concludes that projects often used gender-disaggregated data, while some actively focused on supporting women creators and producers. Powerful gender approaches were witnessed only in a few projects, such as in Telartes in Bolivia, that were not necessarily captured in the project reports.

XI. Under the section on income & budget, this report analyses the uneven trend in the contributions received during the analysed period. Despite efforts to widen and diversify the IFCD's donors, it is the States that are Parties to the 2005 Convention that clearly remain the IFCD's main source of funding. In fact, no private sector partnerships have been agreed until now and the IFCD has received very few funds from the private sector².

XII. In terms of the IFCD's sustainability, even if the funding trend of the analysed period suggests that voluntary contributions can be expected to continue to fund the IFCD, the overall sustainability of the Fund is far from guaranteed. As to the sustainability of projects, although some positive approaches and strategies developed by projects are directly linked to their sustainability prospects, projects are too short and activity-focused to be fully sustainable, especially at the policy level.

XIII. The final section of each section provides a series of recommendations that aim to strengthen the IFCD by making it operationally more effective and maximising its potential to play a more vocal role in cultural development processes in countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention.

XIV. The 21 recommendations presented in this document cover the five main themes that structure this evaluation, namely: a) relevance; b) governance and management; c) achievements of results; d) income and budget; e) sustainability. Under relevance, the possibility of refocusing efforts on developing countries is presented, coupled with the promotion and/or prioritisation of regional initiatives to encourage greater international cooperation and impact in more countries. Regarding governance and management issues, the evaluation team suggests actions that would help the IFCD strengthen its application and selection processes (such as streamlining procedures and resorting to a concept-note based selection process). Different measures aimed at improving the capacity of different actors (including countries that have not received IFCD support to date) are also suggested under this section.

XV. Under achievements and contributions to changes, strengthening the gender dimension of projects emerged as a key recommendation. This evaluation suggests positively discriminating project proposals that include concrete actions aimed at enhancing women's representation in cultural sectors and challenging traditional gender roles. In terms of income and budget, a series of recommendations consider ways of strengthening the current fundraising strategy and call on the Parties to the Convention to regularly contribute to the Fund. Under sustainability, reference is made to the importance of giving more weight to the notion of 'capable partners' to ensure more sustainable results. Finally, this report also concludes that steps should be taken to turn the IFCD into a 'learning-driven fund' by building a knowledge base and creating spaces for reflecting, sharing and learning.

² Private individuals have contributed to a total of USD 21 353,93 since 2009.

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

1. The evaluation of the IFCD was launched in April 2017. It started with a desk review and the preparation of an inception report. After the submission of the inception report, the data collection process took place between May and June 2017 (including surveys, interviews and field work). A preliminary findings session was held on the 7th July with the participation of the 2005 Convention Secretariat and the first draft was submitted to UNESCO on the 17th July. Comments were shared between UNESCO and the evaluation team between August and October 2017 and incorporated into the final evaluation report.

FIGURE 2: THE EVALUATION PROCESS



2. The results of the evaluation will be presented to the Inter-Governmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (IGC) in December 2017.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND ANALYSIS

FIELDWORK AND CASE STUDIES

3. Four field visits were conducted to Paris, Bolivia, Burkina Faso and Serbia. The objective of the first mission to Paris was to interview key actors with the objective of compiling background information about the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and soliciting inputs and insights from a selection of key stakeholders (2005 Convention Secretariat, other UNESCO Staff and Permanent Delegations) before visiting the three selected IFCD-funded projects. These three projects were the following:
 - **'Strengthening civil society participation in policy advocacy for Bolivia's culture sector'** (Bolivia);
 - **'Decentralisation and cultural policies: a new model of governance for culture'** (Burkina Faso);
 - **'Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies'** (Serbia).
4. The projects were selected on the basis of the criteria defined in the evaluation contract, including the following:
 - a) Three projects from different calls for proposals
 - b) At least one project in which the project holder is a governmental organisation
 - c) At least one project in which the project holder is an NGO
 - d) 1 field visit to an IFCD project in Africa
 - e) 1 field visit to an IFCD project in Latin America
 - f) 1 field visit to an IFCD project in Central and Eastern Europe
 - g) 1 visit to UNESCO Headquarters in Paris to conduct interviews- 2-3 day mission (see details above).

5. Hence, the project selection covered three continents (Africa, Europe and Latin America), three languages (English, French and Spanish), three different calls for proposals (2013, 2014 and 2015) out of the four calls covered by this evaluation exercise (2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016) and included both NGO and government project holders (NGOs in Bolivia and Serbia and government in Burkina Faso). The concrete projects were agreed in consultation with the Convention Secretariat.

DESK REVIEW

6. UNESCO provided a large body of documents, including IGC meeting reports, strategy documents, application forms, quadrennial periodic reports on the Convention, mid-term and final reports and other IFCD communication products and

publications that were examined together with documentation gathered during each of the field missions. The evaluation team also reviewed a number of third party documents and reports (such as academic reports or press clippings) and official documents. In total the evaluation team reviewed over 140 documents (see Annex 1).

STAKEHOLDER INVENTORY

7. The evaluation team compiled a general stakeholder inventory to identify and classify IFCD partners and beneficiaries, as well as the staff members involved in the management and implementation of the Fund. This mapping exercise served two purposes: it provided a snapshot of the range of the Fund's partners and it served to select potential evaluation participants under the different data collection tools. The stakeholder inventory was completed and validated by the Convention Secretariat during the inception phase. The inventory categorised stakeholders under a) UNESCO staff in HQ; b) Parties to the Convention; c) National Commissions for UNESCO; d) IFCD key consultants; e) IFCD expert panel members; f) Managers of beneficiary projects; and g) key project stakeholders (in the case of visited projects).

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUPS

8. The evaluation team conducted semi-structured interviews and small focus group discussions in Paris, Bolivia, Burkina Faso and Serbia during the field missions. Efforts were made to ensure that voices covering all the categories included in the stakeholder inventory were included. Additional interviews via Skype were also conducted. A total of 127 people were consulted (see Annex 2 for a complete list of people consulted).

9. For each of the potential interview groups, questions were drawn up addressing the core evaluation questions and intersecting with the informants' background (see Annex 3 for the interview guideline tool). Although the interview sheets were highly structured, the evaluators freely followed-up on any emerging issues that appeared relevant to the core questions.

ON-LINE SURVEY

10. A web survey was conducted in French, English and Spanish to ensure that a maximum number of views could be analysed and to include quantitative data. It was sent to 33 projects co-financed by the Fund in 2013, 2014 and 2015 and 17 projects responded.

11. A survey was also sent to 38 National Commissions and 9 responded. A channel of communication was also opened with Permanent Delegations. Three were interviewed and 26 were contacted by e-mail to solicit their inputs on three short questions. Only one of the Permanent Delegations responded via e-mail.

DEBRIEFING MEETINGS

12. Sharing preliminary conclusions with informants as often as possible before they became final was a critical part of the analytical process. To this end, the evaluation team organised various debriefing meetings with project holders at the end of the field missions. The evaluation team also organised a session with UNESCO Paris to discuss the preliminary findings of this evaluation (07/07/2017).

INTRODUCTION

13. According to Article 18 of the 2005 Convention, the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD (para. 22) and resolutions 5. CP 14 (para. 4) and DCE/16/10.IGC/8 (para. 7), an evaluation of the IFCD must be conducted every five years. The aim of this evaluation exercise was to analyse and assess the relevance and effectiveness of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) established by UNESCO’s 2005 Convention. The evaluation also sought to assess progress made in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 IOS evaluation of the IFCD, identify lessons learned and provide further recommendations for the future implementation of the IFCD. Hence, this evaluation process has generated findings and concrete recommendations that will inform the management and governance of the IFCD in the future, as well as the Secretariat’s support to project implementation.

14. The IFCD was created under Article 18 of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and became operational in 2010. This evaluation exercise covered the last four funding cycles (3 to 6). The initial pilot phase composed of cycles 1 and 2 (2010-2011) was analysed within the framework of the above-mentioned 2012 IOS evaluation.

15. The final report of the IOS 2012 Evaluation included a series of 35 recommendations³. Thirty of these recommendations were accepted (with the exception of recommendations 9, 24, 29, 33 and 34). At the 10th Ordinary Session of the IGC held in December 2016, the following 13 recommendations were considered fully implemented through their integration in the IFCD Guidelines:

Box 1: IOS recommendations that have been fully implemented

Recommendations
3. Define “institutional infrastructures” and include the definition in the IFCD Guidelines. (IGC)
4. Remove “capacity-building” as a separate field of activity and link it to the other fields of activity related to cultural policy and cultural industries; and/or make capacity-building part of the over-arching purpose of the Fund. (IGC)
5. Widen the policy related field of activity from cultural policies to “cultural and other policies and measures that have a direct effect on the creation, production, dissemination, distribution of and access to cultural activities, goods and services”. (IGC)
10. Ensure that future projects chosen for IFCD funding include both short and long-term targets at the output and outcome levels in their planning and that results are reported on at both these levels. (IGC)
11. Ensure that the project duration of IFCD-funded projects is adapted to what they are trying to accomplish. This might require two-year periods for projects that aim to achieve sustained cultural change, including a shift in beliefs, values and behaviour, or policy impact. (IGC)
14. Include the promotion of gender equality as a criterion in the assessment forms used by the Panel of Experts and in the IFCD Guidelines. (IGC)
17. Establish clear criteria for the selection of a gender-balanced Panel of Experts with complementary expertise in the following areas: a) specialisation in cultural policy and/or cultural industries; b) experience in assessing projects; c) work experience in international technical cooperation; d) in-depth work experience in one of the regions; e) understanding of gender mainstreaming and gender-specific programming; f) fluency (oral and written) in English and/or French with a good understanding of the other language. Spanish is an asset.
18. The members of the Expert Panel should be proposed by the Secretariat and approved by the IGC. (IGC)
21. Launch for the call for applications at least six months before the June 30 th deadline to ensure that organisations have enough time to prepare their applications. Request National Commissions to give applicants at least two months to prepare their application files. (Secretariat)
25. To avoid any conflict of interest, exclude National Commissions and any other organisations participating in the selection panel, from the list of stakeholders eligible to apply for IFCD funding. (IGC)
27. Rotate members of the Panel of Experts (while ensuring continuity of the work of the Panel) by replacing at least one expert per year, and allowing each expert to serve a maximum of four years. Provide training to experts on the priorities of the IFCD and the Convention and allow them to ideally meet at least once face-to-face. (IGC)
30. Consider removing “preparatory assistance” from the fields of activity in the IFCD Guidelines for the reasons outlined above. (IGC)
35. Plan for another evaluation exercise of the IFCD in 2017 or 2018. (IGC)

³ Please refer to Annex 4 for full list of IOS Recommendations.

The remaining 17 IOS recommendations are considered work in progress (being acted upon and ongoing) and will be referenced and discussed under relevant sections throughout the report.

AIMS OF THE IFCD

16. The IFCD was created with the general objective of promoting sustainable development and poverty reduction in developing countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention. The Fund was created, as mentioned above, as part of the 2005 Convention by Article 18, which states that *'the Fund shall consist of funds-in-trust established in accordance with the Financial Regulations of UNESCO'* and that *'the use of the Fund shall be decided by the IGC on the basis of guidelines determined by the Conference of Parties referred to in Article 22'*.

17. The IFCD invests in projects that lead to structural change through the development of policies and strategies that have a direct effect on the creation, production, distribution and access to a diversity of cultural expressions including cultural goods, services and activities, as well as through the reinforcement of institutional infrastructures deemed necessary to support viable cultural industries at the local and regional levels⁴.

SCOPE OF THE FUND

18. The Fund supports projects in countries that are parties to the UNESCO 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions and are defined by UNCTAD as developing economies, economies in transition and least developed countries.

19. The following actors are eligible for funding⁵:

- a) Parties to the 2005 Convention (public authorities or institutions) from developing countries⁶;
- b) Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from developing countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention and meet the definition of civil society and related criteria regulating admission of their representatives to meetings of organs of the Convention as mentioned in the Operational Guidelines relating to the role and participation of civil society;
- c) International non-governmental organizations (INGOs) that meet the definition of civil society and related criteria regulating admission of their representatives to meetings of organs of the Convention as mentioned in the Operational Guidelines relating to the role and participation of civil society, and which present projects with impact at the sub-regional, regional or inter-regional level.

20. In addition to these beneficiaries, the Guidelines also state that micro, small and medium enterprises (SMEs) active in the cultural field of developing countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention are entitled to benefit from the IFCD (on an exceptional basis and to the limit of the funds available from contributions provided by the private sector). In the absence of private sector contributions to date, no SMEs have benefitted from the IFCD until now.

THE IFCD IN FIGURES

21. Since it became operational in 2010, the IFCD has funded 90 projects in 51 countries, disbursing over USD 6 million. The maximum amount that can be requested by the IFCD per project is USD 100,000⁷ and the funding is to be distributed in three *instalments*: a) 50% at the beginning of the project; b) 30% mid-way; and c) 20% upon activity completion and after the final report has been submitted. This payment distribution is determined by UNESCO's Administrative Manual, which states that *'payments may be scheduled in two or more instalments'* and the last payment is to be paid *'after the contractor produces an itemised financial statement, certified by the contractor, showing the use of the funds provided by UNESCO together with any supporting documentation required'* (Article 3.6. a).

⁴ Paragraph 2 of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

⁵ Paragraph 10 of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

⁶ 108 countries under the following categories as defined by UNCTAD: developing economies, economies in transition and least developed countries.

⁷ Paragraph 11.1 of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

22. The allocation of IFCD resources is determined by the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (IGC) as established by Article 18.4 of the Convention and specified in the Guidelines on the Use of Resources of the IFCD (para.18-19.8).

THE IFCD MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

23. The management and governance structure of the IFCD is defined in the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD. The Inter-Governmental Committee (IGC) of the 2005 Convention is responsible for ensuring that the use of resources meets:

‘the established programmatic and strategic priorities; the needs and priorities of beneficiary developing countries; promotes South-South and North-South-South cooperation; contributes to achieving concrete and sustainable results as well as structural impacts in the cultural field; respects the principle of ownership by beneficiaries; respects to the extent possible, an equitable geographical distribution of the resources of the IFCD and gives priority to Parties who have not yet benefitted or who have benefitted the least from these resources; satisfies the principle of financial accountability, as understood within the United Nations system; satisfies the need for funds to be spent principally on project activities and ensuring minimum overhead costs as referred to in paragraph 15.7; avoids spreading resources too thinly or supporting sporadic activities; promotes gender equality; promotes the participation of various social groups as identified in Article 7 of the Convention in the creation, production, dissemination, distribution and enjoyment of diverse cultural expressions; complements other international funds covering similar fields without, however, compromising the IFCD’s possibility to provide funding to projects that have already received or could receive financial assistance from a third party’ (paragraph 6.1-6.12 of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD).

24. The Secretariat to the 2005 Convention is part of UNESCO’s Section for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which supports the work of the Convention’s governing bodies. Its main tasks include managing the IFCD. A Panel of Independent Experts composed of 6 members with a four-year mandate is responsible for evaluating the funding requests submitted to the Secretariat, taking into consideration the overall objectives of the IFCD and the criteria established in the IFCD Guidelines. UNESCO field offices designate focal points to liaise with the Secretariat and their role involves lending support to project monitoring at the country level, as well as facilitating experience sharing between IFCD project partners and potential donors⁸.

THE IFCD ANNUAL CALL FOR PROPOSALS

25. IFCD calls for proposals are launched on an annual basis⁹. National Commissions play a leading role in the dissemination of the information about the call and share information about the application process among their networks in their respective countries¹⁰. Applicants develop and present their applications and supporting documents to be reviewed within the set deadline¹¹.

26. National Commissions form a pre-selection panel that includes Ministries of Culture and/or other ministries responsible for cultural industries as well as CSOs specialised in culture to undertake a preliminary review and draw up a shortlist including a maximum of four funding requests (a maximum of two from NGOs and two from public authorities/institutions) per country¹². Each INGO may present a maximum of two project proposals to be considered by the Convention Secretariat directly, without going through the pre-selection process involving the National Commissions¹³.

⁸ Paragraph 21 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

⁹ Paragraph 13.1 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

¹⁰ Paragraph 12.2 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

¹¹ Paragraphs 13.2 and 13.3 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

¹² Paragraphs 11.3 and 12.2 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

¹³ Paragraphs 11.4 and 13.3 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

27. A new system was introduced in 2015, involving an online platform for UNESCO National Commissions to provide information about each of the screened projects. This has served to increase the transparency of the selection process since it allows the Convention Secretariat to monitor the entire process.

28. Once all the pre-selected project proposals are received from the National Commissions, the Convention Secretariat carries out a technical assessment to determine if the applications are complete and correspond to the IFCD basic requirements and areas of intervention.

29. The pre-selected eligible requests are then evaluated by an international panel of experts composed of representatives of the six UNESCO regions. Two experts review each of the proposals by applying IFCD evaluation criteria. Finally, the Panel of Experts presents its final recommendations to the Inter-Governmental Committee (IGC) of the 2005 Convention for consideration and final approval.

30. In order to rationalize the work, the Convention Secretariat publishes the results of all the stages of the selection process, including pre-selection and technical assessment (together with the recommendations)¹⁴ in November. It is worth noting that before 2016, the Secretariat communicated the results of the technical assessment to each National Commission in August.

¹⁴ See results page on IFCD website: <http://en.unesco.org/creativity/ifcd/apply/results>

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

1. RELEVANCE

1.1. OVERALL ADDED VALUE (UNIQUENESS)

31. The IFCD is considered a unique fund for several reasons that range from its formal statutory role under the 2005 Convention (which effectively makes the IFCD the ‘operational arm of the 2005 Convention’) to its ability to serve as a catalyst for a wide array of initiatives that seek to achieve medium to long term structural changes in their promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions.

32. ‘The Fund is structuring and structural’¹⁵: the IFCD’s focus on structural change as opposed to immediate ‘product-focused’ results (such as concrete cultural events or productions) constitutes a defining aspect of the Fund that differentiates it from other UNESCO Culture Sector Funds (see discussion under 1.2.).

33. The IFCD covers the entire value chain (from public policies to strengthening institutional infrastructures in the culture sector¹⁶). In fact, it is the only UNESCO Fund that focuses primarily on supporting efforts to strengthen the public cultural sector as a whole through projects that bring together a diverse variety of actors (institutions and civil society) and are cross-cutting in nature, since they combine different sectors and themes under a single umbrella in pursuit of medium to long term changes.

34. Link between culture and sustainable development: another important factor that makes the IFCD unique is its status as a Fund created under a Convention that integrates culture into sustainable development explicitly for the first time¹⁷, thereby establishing culture as an engine of growth in development processes. The results of the projects analysed within the framework of this evaluation exercise suggest that the support lent by the IFCD serves as effective leverage for cultural development, civil society engagement and poverty reduction. Part of the uniqueness of the IFCD hinges precisely on this aspect (see section 3 for details of project results and contributions to change).

35. The IFCD has strong potential as an advocacy tool: several actors have stressed the important role that IFCD projects have played in helping to break existing stereotypes and demonstrate the dynamism of creativity that portrayed cultural and creative industries in the global South. As part of these efforts, a number of stakeholders (particularly from projects) have also highlighted the potential of the Fund as an advocacy tool for the promotion of cultural industries from a less traditional perspective.

36. The IFCD supports CSO engagement: the fact that it provides a space for direct engagement between governments, civil society and artists constitutes another unique feature of the Fund. The IFCD allows for applications from both public authorities/institutions and NGOs. Furthermore, the 2005 Convention is the first UNESCO standard setting instrument in the culture sector to explicitly mention the role and participation of civil society¹⁸. The participation of CSOs, as observers to the governing bodies of the Convention is established under paragraphs 7 to 9 of the Operational Guidelines on the Role and Participation of Civil Society. Recognising their role in the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions and as part of ongoing efforts to better involve CSOs in the implementation of the 2005 Convention¹⁹, the first CSO Forum was held in Paris during the Conference of Parties in June 2017. The objective of this first edition was to ‘enable

¹⁵ The Convention Secretariat, UNESCO.

¹⁶ Paragraphs 2 and 7.1.2 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.

¹⁷ ‘Article 13 of the 2005 Convention: Parties shall endeavour to integrate culture in their development policies at all levels for the creation of conditions conducive to sustainable development and within this framework, foster aspects relating to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions’.

¹⁸ Article 11 of the 2005 Convention states the following: ‘Parties acknowledge the fundamental role of civil society in protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions. Parties shall encourage the active participation of civil society in their efforts to achieve the objectives of this Convention’.

¹⁹ See ‘Assessment of the participation of civil society in the implementation of the Convention’, CE/15/9.IGC/9, ninth sessions of the IGC, October 2015.

representatives of CSOs that have interests and activities in the field of the Convention to structure their participation, to define specific cooperation activities and to mobilise support for the preparation and presentation of their first report to the 11th session of the IGC²⁰. These new annual CSO Reports *'should highlight the main activities and actions they have undertaken to implement the Convention'* it will also *'enable CSOs to identify concrete proposals and recommendations that could inform the Parties' future actions²¹*. However, certain critical voices question whether UNESCO should be funding CSOs at all, arguing that the organisation lacks the required capacity to support NGO-led projects in the field of cultural and creative industries in particular, and that the structural changes sought by the IFCD are best addressed at the public policy level through public institutions.

37. The IFCD is innovative: diversity of cultural expressions is still considered to be a relatively new area of work for UNESCO. It lies at the heart of the IFCD and has been gaining ground and increasing recognition both internally and among Parties. It can also be argued that procedural aspects of the IFCD have also been innovative and unique from the outset, driven by a quest for greater participation, transparency and involvement of the Parties through measures promoting wider discussions and more transparent decision-making processes.

38. The IFCD is strategic for UNESCO: certain actors argue that the Fund is politically relevant for attracting non-Parties to ratify the Convention. It also contributes to ensuring that the public perception of the organisation does not limit UNESCO's work to heritage-focused actions ('an organisation that puts things on lists') but embraces more complex development processes by supporting structural changes in the realm of culture.

39. Nonetheless, despite targeting structural change, evidence from implemented projects also suggests that some project holders have not fully understood this long-term vision of structural change and have not maximised opportunities at this level. The promotion of medium to long term change can sometimes appear abstract and hence requires more guidance and sensitisation on what it is that projects should seek to achieve with the support of IFCD funding, especially given the contrast with other more concrete cultural production initiatives that project holders may have prior experience in.

1.2. COMPLEMENTARITY TO OTHER FUNDS

40. The IFCD focuses on funding a type of project (support to structural, systemic changes in the realm of cultural policies and institutional infrastructures) that is at the heart of very few Funds worldwide. This is especially true in certain regions of the world (such as Africa) where funding options for the culture sector are particularly limited as well as in countries with particularly challenging political contexts (e.g. where CSO activity is restricted and/or INGOS are absent for political reasons).

41. A number of IFCD stakeholders (including key consultants, bellwethers and stakeholders from projects) have positively valued the Fund in comparison to other Funds such as the Creative Europe Programme or Soros Foundation (particularly in terms of their management and organisational set-up) but have regretted the limited funding made available through the IFCD in comparison to these other better-endowed cultural funds.

42. The IFCD's complementarity with other UNESCO Culture Sector Funds constitutes an important aspect of the Fund's relevance for UNESCO. UNESCO's Culture Sector manages several funds apart from the IFCD: a) the Intangible Cultural

20 Concept Note: First Civil Society Forum on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2017.

21 Concept Note: First Civil Society Forum on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2017.

Heritage Fund²² (ICHF), b) the World Heritage Fund²³ (WHF), c) the International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC)²⁴; d) the Fund of the Intergovernmental Committee for Promoting the Return of Cultural Property to its Countries of Origin or its Restitution in Case of Illicit Appropriation; e) Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; f) the Heritage Emergency Fund. The existing Funds managed by the Culture Sector can be said to be complementary since they have distinct objectives and contribute to different aspects of UNESCO's mandate and vision. Each Fund promotes a different dimension of UNESCO's work (from cultural and artistic expressions to the safeguarding of heritage) and targets different audiences through a range of different instruments with distinct operational and procedural characteristics.

43. As part of the implementation of Recommendations 1 & 2 of the IOS Evaluation (2012), the Convention Secretariat maintains regular contact with the IFPC Secretariat to avoid overlaps and attends meetings of the sub-working group dedicated to international assistance under the Cultural Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG) (which is also regularly attended by the Secretary of the 2005 Convention).

44. Hence, the IFCD can be said to complement the other UNESCO Funds operating under the Culture Sector by addressing a different dimension of UNESCO's mandate and serving a particular type of target group.

1.3. IFCD IMPLEMENTS THE 2005 CONVENTION

45. Article 18 of the 2005 Convention establishes the IFCD as its operational arm with the aim of supporting its implementation. The IFCD allows for the development of a structured approach to issues that were always part of UNESCO's mandate but not directly addressed through other Funds.

46. The Secretariat of the Convention has engaged in major efforts to align and make the implementation of the Convention more visible to Parties and the general public through the introduction of the Monitoring Framework, Global Reports, operational guidelines and other related products. However, the implications of the IFCD's direct alignment with the Convention are not always fully understood by the cultural actors involved, who perceive the Fund as a fund that only focuses on the promotion of cultural industries. Partly as a result of this limited understanding of the Fund, other cultural areas also under the Convention are not receiving the same attention and hence the Fund is not being developed to its full potential.

47. Furthermore, certain Parties to the Convention believe that the efforts currently devoted to selecting IFCD projects and overseeing their adequate implementation divert attention and resources away from other more strategic tasks linked to promoting the 2005 Convention and overseeing its effective implementation across the globe.

22 The Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (ICHF) supports activities aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage as defined in the 2003 Convention (Article 20). Hence, the ICHF funds efforts to: a) safeguard elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List; b) prepare inventories; c) support programmes, projects and activities aimed at safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage at the national, sub-regional and regional levels; and d) any other purposes the Committee may deem necessary, including capacity building and preparatory assistance. The ICHF is governed by an Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. Its support may take different forms (Article 21) (including the provision of expertise and trainings, the elaboration of standard-setting frameworks, or other forms of financial and technical assistance). Any State Party may apply for international assistance to the Intergovernmental Committee which will prioritize requests for support from developing countries (paragraph 10 of the Operational Guidelines).

23 The World Heritage Fund was established under Article 15 of the Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage with the objective of protecting sites and properties that are part of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of Outstanding Universal Value. The International Assistance provided by the Fund can support projects falling under one of the following three categories: a) emergency assistance, conservation and management and c) preparatory assistance. Priority is given to the most endangered sites. In principle, the Fund is open to all States that are Parties to the World Heritage Convention. Individuals, foundations, INGOs and NGOs are not eligible. International assistance requests must be submitted by a National Commission from UNESCO, a Permanent Delegation to UNESCO, or an appropriate governmental Department or Ministry from a State Party to the Convention (see World Heritage Website).

24 The International Fund for the Promotion of Culture (IFPC) was established in 1974 and revitalized in 2011 to lend support to projects promoting arts and creativity by providing technical assistance and financial support to artists worldwide. The overall goal of the IFPC is to support the artistic expression and professionalization of young artists worldwide by lending financial and technical support to the production of cultural and artistic works and events. The aims of the Fund are to use the resources to promote: 'a) cultures as sources of knowledge, meanings, values and identity; b) the role of culture for sustainable development; c) artistic creativity in all its forms, while respecting freedom of expression; d) international and regional cultural co-operation (art.2 IFPC Statutes).' The Fund is open to proposals from individuals, public bodies, NGOs and non-profit private bodies whose objectives are in conformity with those of the Fund and whose activities contribute to the promotion of culture and artistic creation.

48. A number of critical voices go as far as to question whether UNESCO should be managing this type of Fund at all, arguing that the organisation's added value in this type of initiative is not always clear and other organisations (such as INGOs) would be better placed to manage this type of activity as a programme.

49. There is extensive evidence of an exceptional coherence between the Convention, guidelines and the activities implemented by the projects. In addition, there is also great sense of alignment across actors as well as a dominating long-term vision shared by projects (and in line with the dispositions of the 2005 Convention) that privileges systemic changes and medium-long term goals in a wide range of contexts.

50. This coherence between the Convention and the IFCD can also potentially serve a variety of purposes: a) IFCD projects can contribute to enhancing the visibility of the Convention; b) they can provide non-Parties with an incentive to ratify the Convention; and c) they can serve to showcase concrete examples of how the principles of the 2005 Convention can be pursued and implemented in practice.

51. Beyond this coherence, IFCD-funded projects have also helped to increase general understanding about the 2005 Convention (among both the general public and decision-makers at the national and local levels). The projects also have demonstrative value by serving as illustrations, since they provide evidence of what the Convention pursues through activities that can be regarded as examples of the 'Convention in action', addressing various dimensions of the Convention's mission and goals. Several powerful illustrations have been identified across projects:

52. In Burkina Faso, 'Decentralisation and cultural policies: a new model of governance for culture' has sensitised target groups (namely local authorities) on the importance of culture as an economic sector and has provided *communes* with a concrete tool for integrating culture into local development plans (*Plans Communaux de Développement*) in the form of a guide (*Guide d'Élaboration de Stratégies Locales de Développement Culturel*).

53. 'Strengthening civil society participation in policy advocacy for Bolivia's culture sector' included efforts aimed at creating an enabling environment by influencing public policy and strengthening the sector. The project recognised the role of culture as an engine for economic growth (one of the key ideas at the heart of the Convention), recognising that 'culture is a powerful enabler of sustainability both in terms of meaningful economic growth and social inclusion'. The project's work to give a symbolic economic value to the voluntary work and efforts that went into the activities to highlight their contribution to the sector in economic terms provided another interesting illustration.

54. In Zimbabwe, one of the project components of 'Strengthening local cultural policy', was the establishment of local, regional and international market linkages for cultural goods, products and services created by rural creative practitioners. Other relevant examples of links between IFCD projects and the promotion of different cultural sectors have been identified in Brazil, Cameroon, Malawi, Mexico and El Salvador (ranging from promoting e-book publishing to strengthening the film industry).

55. In Peru, the project 'Funding culture in Peru: unveiling challenges and opportunities' facilitated a space for dialogue between the government sector and different stakeholders from civil society (NGOs independent experts, professional associations, universities, local government, etc.).

56. In Haiti, the mapping of the national music industry conducted by the IFCD-funded project provided statistics and qualitative data to inform the cultural sector and government about the sector with the aim of informing the development of cultural policy in support of the sector.

1.4. ALIGNMENT OF THE RBM WITH THE CONVENTION

57. The introduction of the overarching 2005 Convention Monitoring/Indicators Framework in 2015 provided an adequate tool for monitoring the implementation of the 2005 Convention and assessing the coherence of IFCD projects with the Convention's guiding principles, goals and expected results.

58. The IFCD-RBM Framework constitutes a useful and comprehensive tool that is positively valued by the Convention Secretariat and considered crucial as part of ongoing efforts to measure the contribution of culture to sustainable

development. The objective of the IFCD-RBM was to introduce a more robust way of planning and monitoring projects by bringing in a set of results that would allow the Fund to measure its work more effectively.

59. The first IFCD-RBM framework was developed in 2014, following Recommendation no.7 of the 2012 IOS evaluation and as per the relevant Committee decisions. The framework was developed by an external consultant (in consultation with the Secretariat and BSP) and proved challenging since it entailed combining and matching IFCD cycles with other UNESCO strategic planning frameworks and timeframes. However, just as activities to introduce RBM elements in the call, monitoring activities, etc. were underway, a similar process was initiated at the Convention level, following recommendations in the IOS evaluation on the implementation of the Convention overall. A broader Monitoring/Indicators Framework that was to serve as an umbrella for monitoring all Convention-related work was developed as a result.

60. This led to a revision in 2016 of the Fund's RBM at the IFCD level to align it with the Convention's Framework. The main changes introduced involved adapting the IFCD's outcomes to the four 2005 Convention's goals, namely:

1. *'A sustainable system of governance for culture that promotes the diversity of cultural expressions is created through targeting structural change'.*
2. *'A more balanced North-South and South-South flow of cultural goods and services, and increased international mobility of artists and cultural professionals from the Global South, are demonstrated'.*
3. *'The value and opportunities that cultural and creative industries contribute to sustainable development are clearly demonstrated to relevant authorities involved in national development planning'.*
4. *'Gender inequalities in the cultural sector are addressed and more equitable access to and participation in cultural and creative industries are demonstrated'.*

61. As part of the RBM revision, efforts were also made to align this monitoring framework with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), with the objective of reporting in terms of achievements under the following seven goals: education and vocational training; gender equality; economic growth and decent work; sustainable cities and communities; reduction of inequalities; promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies; new partnerships for sustainable development. In order to ensure full coherence between the different IFCD application documents, project call documents, guidelines, guides and background materials were re-edited, integrating these new elements.

62. The harmonization between the two frameworks constitutes another clear illustration of how the Convention Secretariat has been able to align its various operational activities at every level. This coherence was also sought through the inclusion of RBM in the existing guides and training modules on the IFCD application process.

63. The RBM framework was revised again in 2016 (together with the online application form, evaluation form and National Commission Review form). Given its recent introduction, it is not yet possible to fully assess its impact on project monitoring. However, it seems clear that in order for the RBM framework to provide a real basis for effective monitoring, all key stakeholders must fully understand it and incorporate it into their practices. The level of knowledge and understanding of the RBM framework ranges across actors from those who actively refer to it and consider it crucial for their work to others who claim that they were not informed about it and/or argue that it is not relevant to their work. In practice, the extent to which the RBM is considered by Panel Experts in their analysis of project proposals is highly variable: some describe it as key to the selection process whilst others in the Panel consider it 'irrelevant' to their role and tasks. At the level of the National Commissions, evidence suggests that although information²⁵ on the RBM was issued, their use of the framework to date remains limited.

64. Beyond this alignment, it is important to stress that in practice, while attention to every detail is paid at the procedural project level (including RBM), at the more substantive level that affects the real contribution of projects to processes of change and transformation, there appears to be a 'missing middle' between the alignment at the project level and their real contribution to the Convention. This 'missing middle' contains a number of assumptions that need to be unpacked in order to effectively connect projects with the RBM and understand the wider process of change. This issue will be analysed throughout this report.

²⁵ The new RBM was communicated through a committee document (DCE/16/10.IGC/8), Brochure 2016 and presented to the 6th Conference of Parties.

1.5. NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS OF THE PARTIES

65. The IFCD corresponds to the needs of the Parties, since it addresses their stated priorities in the field of culture and under the 2005 Convention. However, given the IFCD's scope and limited resources it is impossible for the Fund to *fully* meet the needs and demands of the Parties. The IFCD is often described as 'a drop in the ocean', since very few projects are funded and the identified needs remain immense.

66. Expectations are always high. Proposed projects have few chances of being selected, which weighs heavily on the Parties: they express high expectations and their failure to fund more projects generates frustration among applicants and Parties alike. It must also be noted that this high level of expectations is also directly related to the high amount of work that applicants must complete in order to prepare and submit the applications.

DEVELOPING COUNTRY FOCUS IN PRACTICE

67. Another issue that is worth highlighting is the fact that despite the reference to developing countries (as defined by UNCTAD) in the guidelines (para. 1), 16 out of the 36 projects funded under cycles 3-6 (44%) have benefited countries with a high level of human development according to the United Nations 2016 Human Development Index (HDI)²⁶.

68. It seems evident that the capacities of cultural actors vary across Parties to the Convention, playing in favour of certain countries versus others. Although in principle, the IFCD was created to fund projects in 'developing countries', the approach has been a 'one-size-fits-all' formula that does not take into account the different needs of the Parties.

69. The evidence from this evaluation suggests that in fact the IFCD may not be as relevant to some of these high human development countries, which have access to other Funds and/or their own sources of funding to cover this type of work. Other links to the Fund could be explored (such as the type of project/activity endorsement that will be discussed in section 7).

69b. It is worth noting that in the framework of the UNESCO 2003 Convention, the DAC List of ODA Recipients is used as the reference for the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (ICHF). A comparative table of the countries considered as eligible according to the three references (UNCTAD, HDI and DAC) is available in Annex IX.

UNEVEN UNDERSTANDING OF THE 2005 CONVENTION

70. The evaluation has not found evidence of the 2005 Convention being thoroughly understood across countries. Despite considerable advances since the Convention was adopted, in many cases national governments are still to comprehend the existing links between culture and development.

71. In principle, one could assume that IFCD-selected projects would meet the national priorities in the realm of culture because they are preselected by UNESCO National Commissions and ultimately approved by the Committee, hence reflecting the needs and expectations of Parties. However, in some of the countries implementing IFCD projects, the objectives of the 2005 Convention were not among the national cultural priorities of the country.

72. This factor does not necessarily imply that in such cases the IFCD should not invest in these countries, since several testimonies indicate that these investments have in fact become important starting points for raising awareness and interest about the Convention among Parties. On the other hand, certain Parties argue that in a context marked by limited resources, the different Funds under UNESCO's Culture Sector are in fact competing against each other for contributions and given the IFCD's status as a voluntary fund, it will continue to receive less support. They argue that given the IFCD's limited resources, the Fund only has the capacity to fund very few projects that have limited impact, since the results and impact of the type of structural change it pursues are difficult to measure. This contrasts with heritage-focused funds, which have more easily measurable results due to their very nature.

²⁶ The HDI divides countries in "very high human development"; "high human development"; "medium human development" and "low human development".

73. In most countries, culture does not constitute a key national priority and as a result, there is a tendency to see actions in the realm of culture as expenditure as opposed to investment. Despite the IFCD's potential to convey powerful messages about the Convention that illustrate its content to the Parties, as well as UNESCO's significant progress introducing and supporting sustainable development within the international agenda for culture²⁷, evidence suggests that this potential is not being maximised. In fact it appears that bridging the gap from abstract diplomatic language to action remains a challenge for many Parties at the country level.

74. Key civil society actors have also shared concern that their governments ratified the 2005 Convention without fully understanding its implications. Furthermore, it would seem that the countries that have ratified the Convention have not totally succeeded in rolling out its implications to entities in the sector. As a consequence, many cultural entities (as well as certain government bodies) do not seem to have fully understood the content of the Convention and hence often do not use its dispositions as leverage for pursuing their goals in the realm of culture, despite the fact that in some cases these entities are already working in alignment with the Convention (without making the link explicit in their work). This suggests that the Convention's potential as an advocacy tool is not being maximised by the cultural sector.

75. Evidence from IFCD projects shows that when countries that have ratified the Convention link it to their own national development or political processes, both the Convention and IFCD-funded projects acquire greater relevance and their use as a leverage tool is strengthened. In fact this evaluation exercise has collected evidence of situations where the contribution of the IFCD has clearly given impetus to an ongoing political process and/or built on existing laws to amplify its scope and impact. For example, this was observed in the case of Serbia, where the IFCD project 'Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies in Serbia' gained relevance within the framework of the EU accession process²⁸ or in Burkina Faso, where the support to local cultural development strategies builds on the decentralisation process initiated in 2004.

1.6. CULTURAL NEEDS

76. In general terms, the vast majority of projects address the cultural needs of the population in the countries where the activities have been implemented.

77. In Brazil and Guatemala, projects strengthened indigenous cultural entrepreneurs in a range of ways (from promoting new cultural sectors such as e-books and digital culture to strengthening the skills of cultural entrepreneurs). In other projects, it was also noted that actions responded to very focused cultural needs of concrete groups (e.g. allowing women to gain the right to play the balafon in Côte d'Ivoire). The contribution of projects to gender equality is explained under section 3.1.

THE CONVENTION AS AN ADVOCACY TOOL

78. Although the actual standing of the 2005 Convention in each country is beyond the scope of this evaluation, it constitutes the backdrop of the IFCD and is thus crucial for understanding the Fund.

79. It is significant to note that even if projects share aims with the Convention, they do not always use the Convention as an advocacy tool. Experiences vary across countries: the evaluation exercise has identified countries that did not link the IFCD-funded project to the Quadrennial Periodic Report (QPR) and hence did not acknowledge the work of the project in this key document; and countries that did make references to the existing links between the IFCD and the Convention. For example, the latest QPR report presented by Bolivia does not mention the project financed by the IFCD, whilst for instance Serbian reports have systematically acknowledged IFCD projects financed in the country. In section 3.1. (under outcome 1) further examples from the Bolivian project are provided on the use of the Convention as an advocacy tool.

²⁷ <https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/english.pdf>

²⁸ The EU has asked Serbia to report on advancements around the 2005 Convention and the country has mentioned the IFCD project to illustrate these advancements.

80. The fact that these links are not systematically referenced across the board suggests that although several actors have stressed the potential of the IFCD as an advocacy tool for the Convention (and for the promotion of dynamic cultural sectors in developing countries from a less stereotypical perspective), this potential is not being maximised at the country level. Some of the Parties have clearly missed interesting opportunities to showcase relevant work being done in support of the implementation of the 2005 Convention through IFCD projects.

Box 2: Recommendations on relevance

Refocusing efforts on developing countries

Recommendation 1: The Committee could consider focusing IFCD support on low/middle income countries that have less funding opportunities in the realm of culture at their disposal. Despite 'developing countries' being formally eligible, the wider definition of this concept applied by the IFCD (namely UNCTAD's list of developing economies, economies in transition and least developed countries) implies that in fact 16 out of the 36 projects selected in the analysed period were implemented in high human development countries (HDI 2016). The evidence from this evaluation suggests that the IFCD is less relevant in countries where there are other funding opportunities available and hence focusing on countries with greater needs would allow the Fund to maximise its impact. In this sense, the Committee could consider using another reference, such as the HDI or DAC, to establish which countries are eligible for IFCD funding.

Recommendation 2: The Committee could consider actively promoting and/or prioritising regional initiatives through the IFCD in order to promote greater international cooperation (in line with article 12 of the Convention) and to also impact more countries, thereby meeting the needs and expectations of more Parties and potential project holders. The regional project option currently exists but is not being actively promoted.

Recommendation 3: The Committee should consider introducing an IFCD endorsement scheme (a form of certification for projects that promote the 2005 Convention) for projects implemented in high human development countries where IFCD funding is not as relevant as in countries with low human development countries with fewer funding opportunities.

2. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT

2.1. DECISION MAKING

DECISION MAKING MECHANISMS: THE COMMITTEE AND THE SECRETARIAT

81. The management and governance structure of the IFCD is defined in the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD. The Intergovernmental Committee (IGC) of the 2005 Convention is responsible for ensuring that the use of resources of the Fund meets the established programmatic and strategic priorities. The IGC is composed of representatives of 24 States that are Parties to the Convention. They are elected for a period of 4 years by the Conference of Parties and the election is based on '*principles of geographic representation as well as rotation*' (art. 25 of the 2005 Convention).

82. The Secretariat of the 2005 Convention is in charge of monitoring the administration and implementation of all ongoing IFCD projects, including the processing of contracts, deliverables and payments for all funding cycles. It also manages all correspondence with the IFCD-funded projects holders²⁹. The Secretariat manages all communications with the Expert Panel, including their administrative relation with UNESCO.

83. Furthermore, the Secretariat coordinates all administrative, communication and fundraising efforts. This includes the management of all relevant consultants and the oversight of deliverables emerging from these engagements, such as developing and revisiting guidelines and strategies or designing communication products. It is also part of its functions to implement the discussions of the governing bodies of the 2005 Convention, including convening and organising the meetings of the IGC and Conference of Parties.

84. These tasks are professionally and effectively conducted in what is unanimously described as an 'administratively complex context'. It is particularly remarkable the way the Secretariat has attentively, persistently and proactively followed up on the implementation of the recommendations of the IOS 2012 Evaluation. At the Seventh ordinary session of the IGC held in December 2013, it was reported that 17 recommendations were being acted upon and ongoing (CE/13/7.IGC/8). When the 10th IGC session was held in December 2016, it was noted that most IOS recommendations had already been fully implemented by the Secretariat. In fact, at the time of this evaluation, IOS considers all recommendations to be closed.

85. This painstaking process of complying with the recommendations of the IOS Evaluation has produced a number of high quality products that have generally improved the IFCD, as it is noted in section 2.2. However, a legitimate question has strongly surfaced about whether some of these actions have been aimed more at dutifully responding to the recommendations than at producing real concrete improvements. For example, in response to Recommendation no.8 '*establish clear resource mobilisation targets that are linked to the objectives specified in the results framework*', the Secretariat commissioned a comprehensive strategy to expand the donor base to include the Private Sector. This strategy has not been fully implemented due to the Secretariat's limited capacity both in terms of time and human resources.

86. The feedback received on the work of the Secretariat from all stakeholders is very positive. Within UNESCO, various colleagues and Permanent Delegations commented that it produced excellent work within the CLT Sector. All consultants, and most significantly the expert panel, praised their professionalism, their technical capacity and their responsiveness. Many project holders also commended the work of the Convention Secretariat. 15 out of 16 survey respondents declared that they got the support they needed from the Secretariat during the implementation of their projects. This sentiment was generally shared by the projects visited by the evaluation team. Nonetheless, three issues deserve attention and could be improved.

- The Secretariat seems to have established a type communication with the projects that is mainly demand-driven. This is understandable due to the large amount of work and limited staff capacities, however projects would have benefited from a more proactive approach in their communications. In fact, the evaluation team has encountered

²⁹ 10. IGC. 8 IFCD Report on the Implementation of IFCD.

instances where the Secretariat has not given substantive feedback on mid-term reports that contained significant modifications (this will be tackled under section 2.2.3. on monitoring).

- When the Secretariat and other departments of UNESCO have contacted project holders outside the strict framework of the implementation of the projects, communications have been of an extractive nature. For example, the evaluation team has documented a case where after the completion of the project, UNESCO contacted the project holder up to five times in less than a year from different departments and/or associated consultants requesting to complete reports or questionnaires for several purposes that sometimes appeared to overlap.
- The issue of the Secretariat's capacity has constantly been raised since 2010 at the fourth IGC (4.IGC 10B and 4.IGC 16) and reaffirmed in the 2012 IOS Internal Evaluation that suggested strengthening '*the capacity of the Convention Secretariat so that it can undertake all actions required to improve the work of IFCD and to ensure its full performance in line with the recommendation of this evaluation report*'. However, in 2017 there are still some capacity gaps as pointed out previously, the most obvious one being the need for project monitoring and evaluation as well as a professional and specialised fundraiser.

THE EXPERT PANEL

87. The Expert Panel is composed of six international independent experts. They are responsible for assessing all project proposals that have been recommended by the UNESCO National Commissions in the beneficiary countries and that have passed the technical assessment conducted by the Secretariat. Each project application is assessed by two experts using the guidelines, templates and tools provided by the Secretariat. The Panel subsequently recommends projects for possible funding to the IGC at their annual meeting. One of the members of the Expert Panel, who serves as Coordinator, is invited to the Committee's ordinary session when it examines the recommended projects.

88. Several aspects related to the Expert Panel have improved significantly since the previous evaluation was conducted. Hence further to the rotational system introduced to ensure the transparency and continuity of the process through a four-year mandate (half of the experts are renewed every two years to guarantee the continuity of the work).; it should also be noted that the overall quality of the Expert Panel's feed-back on projects has increased during these years as the selection process has also become more solid.

89. It is also important to point out that the Expert Panel members consulted showed a remarkable coherence and common understanding about key aspects they considered when assessing projects. For example, it seems clear that the key criterion of '*contributing to structural change*' has fully permeated and all panel experts are aligned with it.

UNESCO NATIONAL COMMISSIONS

'Each National Commission is a world of its own' (former UNESCO staff)

90. The role of UNESCO National Commissions remains the weakest link in the application and selection process of the IFCD, as was already highlighted in the 2012 IOS Evaluation.

91. National Commissions are required to disseminate the annual call for proposals in their respective countries among potential applicants³⁰, although in our survey, only 4 out of 16 respondents clearly identified the National Commission as the source from which they learned about the IFCD.

92. However, their most significant role in the IFCD is recommending up to four projects for the final assessment. This is problematic, as analysed under section 2.2. on the application process. National Commissions are entrusted with an enormous responsibility. For example, around 60% of projects rejected for funding in 2016 have been their decision. However, National Commissions' capacities and resources vary greatly among countries and are often very limited. In countries with stronger institutions such as Cuba, the National Commission plays a very prominent role providing well informed and substantive feedback on all reviewed projects. Others lack the capacity to perform this role consistently for various reasons. Consequently, there is widespread concern among stakeholders (inside and outside UNESCO) that the

³⁰ As stated in paragraph 12.1 of the IFCD Guidelines.

quality of the screening conducted by National Commissions is not always up to the required standard and as a result, a number of high quality projects may have been excluded too soon in the selection process.

93. A common factor affecting the capacity of National Commissions is where it is placed within the governmental architecture of the country. For example, in cases like Bolivia, the National Commission is in the Ministry of Education and not in the Ministry of Culture. Consequently, the type of communications established with UNESCO in the Education Sector is more fluid and substantive than with the Culture Sector where the IFCD belongs.

94. The proactiveness of National Commissions in disseminating the call for proposal directly depends on how relevant the given Party sees the Fund. As the Evaluation Team mentioned under section 1 on relevance, this varies among countries depending, among other factors, of the access they have to another Cultural Funds, or the country's commitment to the 2005 Convention.

95. In any case, despite having very detailed guidelines, there is an apparent lack of consistency in the type of concrete tasks the National Commissions are expected to perform regarding the IFCD. For example, it is not clear how much effort they should devote to disseminating the calls and to training potential applicants and how this is to be measured.

96. The accountability system is also unclear, which implies that it is difficult to understand how to hold National Commissions accountable. This is partly to do with the fact that any task performed for the IFCD is done on a voluntary basis and in addition to what are usually numerous tasks. National Commissions have also voiced concern related to how taxing this task is and have asked for a reduced application and for a longer period for conducting their assessment.

97. A unique aspect of the IFCD is the fact that it aims to provide a channel for joint collaborative work between artists, cultural industries, civil society and government officials. However, the evaluation team has documented throughout this exercise that this has not happened consistently. Sometimes National Commissions provided assistance to CSOs during the application process, but this did not occur across the board despite the recommendation of the 2012 evaluation. At this stage in the discussion, it is important to stress that in light of the limited capacity of the National Commissions, the tendency should be a) to limit their involvement rather than to expand their tasks and b) to strengthen their capacity in relation to their necessary participation in the IFCD.

UNESCO FIELD OFFICES

98. According to paragraph 21 of the Guidelines, *'all relevant UNESCO Field Offices shall designate a focal point to cooperate with the Secretariat in ensuring ongoing monitoring of IFCD projects, and their complementarity and synergies with UNESCO's other work at the country level. The involvement of UNESCO Field Offices should also facilitate the establishment of contacts and sharing of experiences between IFCD project partners and potential future donors'*.

99. This is in line with the implementation of IOS Recommendation no.12, which recommended the Secretariat to *'Work with UNESCO Field Offices to systematically ensure complementarity between the IFCD-funded projects and other UNESCO work at the country level'*. Despite ongoing efforts, their engagement with the IFCD to date has been uneven and organic. Nevertheless, the evaluation team has collected indications suggesting that communications with the Secretariat are improving substantially and Field Offices feel that the Secretariat is more proactive and reaching out more. For example, the Secretariat has produced and disseminated updated factsheets among the 22 Field Offices detailing the IFCD's current state of implementation and its impact on the various countries as well as how and why they should get involved in the Fund. There have been other concrete activities involving UNESCO Field Offices, such as the request from the Secretariat to follow up on the letter from the Director General to the Parties requesting contributions to the Fund.

100. Even with these promising signals, UNESCO Field Offices remain tangibly involved, mostly at the dissemination stage (in line with IOS Recommendation no.19), although 50% of the projects replying to our survey declared to have collaborated with the UNESCO Field Office during the implementation of the project (even if only on an ad hoc basis).

101. This is mainly because there is no contractual requirement to involve/inform UNESCO Field Offices but also because, even if all UNESCO Field Offices do have at least one programme specialist for culture, they do not necessarily manage portfolios of cultural projects (particularly in the realm of cultural industries) and therefore do not always have the expertise and/or the human resources required to effectively support IFCD projects funded in their countries.

102. Despite this, there are high expectations on the part of the projects for greater UNESCO Field Office involvement. By way of illustration, only one project of the 16 that replied to the survey declared to have had access to the national process in charge of preparing the Quadrennial Periodic Reports or other relevant cultural spaces linked to the Convention thanks to UNESCO support. None of the projects declared to have gained access to international spaces of cultural debate thanks to UNESCO's support and only two had received any technical support during project implementation.

2.2. PROCESSES

APPLICATION

103. The application process in the IFCD has significantly improved since the 2012 evaluation. Application formats and guidelines are annually revised and have gained simplicity and transparency. The most celebrated transformation during these years has been the development of an online platform, replacing the process used during the pilot phase in 2010/11, and projects can be submitted in electronic format. While the platform has increased the transparency of the process considerably, it still presents technical difficulties for applicants in countries with limited connectivity (as raised by stakeholders from countries like Haiti, Burkina and Bolivia). The Secretariat has introduced with flexible measures to overcome these difficulties, such as allowing certain documents to be completed offline and then uploaded, or submitting sections by e-mail.

104. The guidelines are clear for both potential applicants and for National Commissions. This is coherent with the testimonies collected by the evaluation team during field missions and through the survey.

105. However a major issue affecting the application process as a whole requires attention. During the evaluation, several voices pointed out the multiple disadvantages of requiring fully-fledged projects following a detailed log-frame approach at an early stage.


106. Firstly, the applications remain **too complex**. Potential applicants invest considerable time and effort in a process with very little chances of actually obtaining funding. According to several stakeholders (from both projects and from the expert panel), this factor may discourage potential qualified applicants from engaging in the process.

107. Secondly, while the IFCD requires for the description of very detailed activities, the **time elapsing between the application and when projects start implementation** is too long (minimum 13 months from the application to the establishment of the contract). The evaluation team documented that during this time there were invariably a number of contextual changes that often affected original project plans. In fact, all projects visited by the evaluation team had to introduce major changes into what they had originally planned in their application.

108. Thirdly, the IFCD pursues outcomes that according to the RBM would take at least 8 years to achieve, such as *addressing gender inequalities in cultural life*. The objectives of the Fund are therefore complex, long-term and of a structural nature. However, what the IFCD is asking for in the application process is for concrete short-term initiatives. The application places most of the emphasis on detailing project activities following a **logical framework approach** rather than focusing on explaining a) how projects are inserted into a wider **theory of change (ToC)** (see Figure 1)³¹, and b) how they are led by capable and legitimate partners who have framed the project into a broader organisational strategy.

³¹ <https://www.annmurraybrown.com/single-post/2016/03/20/Theory-of-Change-vsThe-Logic-Model-Never-Be-Confused-Again>

FIGURE 2: TOC VS LOGFRAME




109. Capable partners are organisations that are well-placed to introduce meaningful changes. Evidences suggest that the single main factor behind a successful project is the leadership of a capable partner. Contextual difficulties (even as serious as the coup d’État in Burkina Faso) can be navigated successfully by strong partners. However, in the application process as a whole, this element does not seem to be given the importance and weight it deserves.

110. The 2012 IOS evaluation already pointed in this direction ‘to not have the same organizational implementation experience, capacities, contacts and partnerships as more established organizations. Working with newly established organizations is therefore inherently more risky’. However, the 2012 IOS evaluation did not suggest that the IFCD should refrain from funding weaker organisations, provided that they gave more attention to sustainability issues and/or obtained greater support from UNESCO Field Offices in terms of monitoring and management. Nonetheless evidence suggests that the latter may not be a realistic option.

SELECTION PROCESS

FIGURE 3: THE SELECTION PROCESS



111. The IFCD selection process is divided into two key stages (see figure 3). The first part (April-May) is undertaken by UNESCO National Commissions who select up to four projects from each country submitted by potential applicants via the IFCD online platform. The second part occurs when selected projects are distributed among Expert Panel members for assessment (July-September). There is also an interim stage where the Secretariat checks that all projects filtered by the National Commissions are technically compliant (eligible) (June-July).

112. As was the case with the application process, this selection process has gone through important innovations in the last few years that have significantly improved its overall quality. Nonetheless, although these improvements have gained the Fund a well-deserved reputation of openness and transparency, there are still a few issues that require attention.

113. The thoroughness of the selection process differs greatly in the first phase (National Commissions) and the second phase (Expert Panel). As previously mentioned, the capacities of National Commissions vary greatly and so does the quality

of their assessments. However, their role is crucial: this is illustrated by the fact that for example in 2016, the majority of projects were turned down by National Commissions³².

114. During the second phase of the selection process (Expert Panel assessment) two controversial issues need to be addressed.

1. **30-point decision:** According to an existing IFCD decision³³, all projects that reach 30 points are recommended for funding. Hence the Expert Panel have to engage in what has been described as ‘uncomfortable gymnastics’ to avoid having too many projects above the mark. In 2015, 15 projects were graded at 28-29 clearly to avoid reaching the 30 points.
2. **Geopolitics:** Certain geographic areas clearly have people with better expertise and capacities and systematically produce better projects such as South Africa, various countries in Latin America or in Eastern Europe. In fact, 16 out of 36 projects have benefited countries with high human development/medium human development countries³⁴ (for cycles 3-6). These countries have different capacities that can constitute a disadvantage for others. As the evaluation team confirmed in the case of Serbia, high human development/ medium human development countries tend to have access to other resources and the IFCD is not as relevant.

MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING (MEL)

115. There are different monitoring and research processes in the IFCD, serving different purposes. Administratively, the Secretariat compares reports with initial proposals. This is already challenging since the activities that were initially planned at the application stage often have to be re-thought in light of contextual changes. The Secretariat is flexible and it allows projects to change plans providing they do not betray their initial spirit (or implicit ToC). However, this agreement is not communicated explicitly. There is an *administrative silence* when projects communicate change of plans in mid-term reports. This was the case in the three projects visited by the evaluation team. Consequently, the flexibility that projects have shown to successfully adapt to changing circumstances has not been properly celebrated and the IFCD has not seized the opportunity to learn from these circumstances. As a result of the limited human resources of the Secretariat, the purpose of this administrative monitoring is simply to ensure that projects have completed activities in order to release the funds as indicated in the contracts. The emphasis is not on validating the quality and impact but on whether activities have been completed.

116. Beyond administrative monitoring, the reports have also fed into the impact stories produced in recent years (a series of pieces of research conducted by an independent consultant expert on communications). The aim of this research has been to increase the visibility of the Fund for communication and fundraising purposes.

117. In conclusion, there is no systematic independent M&E (outside the global evaluations) conducted to build a body of evidence-based data and knowledge on what works better to inform the IFCD. As a consequence, the selection process (including Expert Panel assessments) is isolated from past experiences. In 2015, a guide for members of the Expert Panel was drafted to harmonise their work but there is still the feeling that more learning documents are needed.

118. When half of the Expert Panel members are renewed (every two years), the Secretariat organises a meeting at UNESCO HQ, where previous experiences are shared and an analysis of lessons learned is conducted. These meetings are positively valued by experts. However, no analytical learning documents have been produced as guidance for the Expert Panel on the types of IFCD projects that have performed best and worst and which factors have played a role in determining

³² Out of 451 projects received, 415 had to be examined by the National Commissions (19 projects were from non-eligible countries and 17 from INGOs). Out of 415 projects, 357 (86%) were evaluated by the National Commissions. Of the evaluated projects, 98 (27%) were pre-selected and 259 (73%) were turned down (Information provided by Convention Secretariat).

³³ Paragraph 17.1.2 of Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD: the Panel of Experts can recommend to the Committee “only projects that receive at least 75% of the maximum number of points attributable. Furthermore, paragraph 17.1.1 requires that Experts recommend to the IGC projects “within the limits of the funds available”.

³⁴ The evaluation uses here the UN human development ranking that, as mentioned previously, divides countries in “very high human development” “high human development”; “medium human development”; and “low human development”.

the outcome. Furthermore, in the absence of any performance evaluations at the project level, obtaining meaningful information about the quality of the projects is difficult.

119. Evidence suggests that despite efforts, more work is needed to analyse the results achieved so far, identify good practices and lessons learned and make them available to stakeholders in the most effective way possible. Hence, there is insufficient monitoring for learning purposes. This has occurred due to two main factors:

Lack of learning culture

120. This was already raised by the 2012 evaluation; *'In the context of the IFCD, learning needs to happen not only at the organizational level of UNESCO or that of individual beneficiary organizations but also across organizations, across different types of stakeholders (government, NGOs, private sector, Secretariat etc.) and across countries'*³⁵.

121. For example, a lot of effort is devoted to the elaboration of materials for the promotion of the Fund (communication material) which are not being capitalised for learning purposes. Naturally, in promotional products there will be a tendency not to tackle challenges which are often where organisations can learn the most from, but other spaces for potential learning (such as statutory meetings) are not maximised.

122. At the project level, there are very few links and synergies between project holders. Although the idea of creating a network exists, resources are limited and the 'learning approach' is largely missing, despite the fact that exchanges and experience sharing across projects was already suggested by the 2012 IOS Evaluation³⁶.

The monitoring system is not conducive to capturing learning

123. The present reporting system is not sufficient to trigger real learning. Reports are often full of self-declarations and there are very few tools available to validate the substantial information included in them. Significantly, given the scarcity of human and financial resources available, the Secretariat does not conduct follow-up missions or commission project evaluations. The team is well aware of this shortage and have often discussed how to improve monitoring without having being able to implement their ideas yet.

124. As a result, there are important achievements and strategies that are not being captured in progress reports and are not known by the Secretariat. For example, the project in Bolivia has undertaken an innovative valorisation of the process through which civil society developed the National Cultural Law. They gave an economic value to each partner's contribution, valuing the time and efforts and other in-kind assets. This type of analysis is intimately linked to how culture can contribute to economies, industries and development. Since there was no obvious place in the report to capture this, it went unnoticed by the Secretariat.

125. Similarly, other reports may provide misleading information. For example, the Serbian report listed tens of people under the section that described the project's team. While it is true that all these people were involved with the project, the majority of them were not part of the project team but associated to the project by helping out in concrete activities.

126. There is also a disconnect between the emphasis on structural and systemic changes of the selection process and what projects are asked to report on, which is basically on the completion of different activities. Similarly, financial reporting does not explain how resources were used but focus on bills and supporting documents. This is mainly due to UNESCO's administrative rules and procedures (i.e. the contractual nature of the relationship between UNESCO and the beneficiaries of the Fund). The Secretariat is well aware of this disconnect and makes efforts to counterbalance it.

127. It is also fair to acknowledge that the low quality of some progress reports is often not due to the quality of the format but due to the lack of capacity of the project holders. When the **partner has low capacity** or even has concrete limitations (such as not writing well in English/French), the project reports lack sufficient quality even if the project itself is generating quality results.

³⁵ DCE/12/6.IGC/7 – IOS Evaluation Annex.

³⁶ The IOS evaluation had pointed out that *'The information posted on the platform and its various websites should be complemented by initiatives that actively engage stakeholders in the exchange and analysis of information and practices. These might include webinars, discussion fora, and online courses. Facebook, Twitter, and other social media are also tools that can contribute to knowledge and experience sharing. Currently, these mechanisms are not being utilized by the Secretariat and excellent opportunities for spreading information and learning are not being exploited'*.

Box 3: Recommendations on governance and management

Strengthening processes

Recommendation 4: The Committee should consider introducing a call for concept notes that would complement the current call for proposals. Requesting fully-fledged project proposals requires investing substantial time and efforts by all actors involved in the process (from projects, National Commissions and Convention Secretariat to the Panel of Experts). Furthermore, the current timeframe and contextual factors make modifications to the originally submitted proposals inevitable. Since in light of these factors, the value of assessing detailed proposals is relative, the evaluation team recommends adopting a call requesting a short 2-3 page application with a simple budget based on two elements: a summary of the proposed action presented within a simple theory of change reflecting a wider contextual change process and elements proving the capacity of partners. Concept notes should be presented online and assessed by National Commissions. After the first screening process, a maximum of 15 to 20 applicants would be invited to develop full proposals following the same process currently in place.

Recommendation 5: The Convention Secretariat could consider working with the National Commissions to strengthen their role in line with the Guidelines in concrete areas such as the responsibility of forming and coordinating the pre-selection panel (as per articles 12.2 and 12.3 of the Guidelines).

Recommendation 6: The Committee could consider the allocation of extra criteria in the proposal scoring system to projects promoting certain strategic themes and/or geographic regions in order to fine-tune project selection and to reduce the challenges emerging from the 30-point decision as well as geographic imbalance.

Recommendation 7: The Convention Secretariat could consider incorporating a specific question about the IFCD in Quadrennial Periodic Reports (QPRs) to ensure that IFCD projects systematically feature in these reports, thereby ensuring that the links between the Fund and the implementation of the 2005 Convention are made explicit.

Improving stakeholder capacities

Recommendation 8: UNESCO Culture Sector should conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat (in line with IOS Recommendation 31). Strengthening the team's fundraising capacity is particularly key for the future of the Fund and in order to maximise efforts to date. Other additional profiles may be also needed (see recommendation 12).

Recommendation 9: The Convention Secretariat should strengthen the capacity of the National Commissions as key actors involved in the application process in order to improve the selection process and avoid the non-selection of good quality projects. A good step forward would be ensuring that each National Commission appoints a focal point in charge of coordinating IFCD issues for at least 2 years, and that in case of changes, the same person ensures the transfer of knowledge and files.

Recommendation 10: The Convention Secretariat should work with Field Offices to ensure that on the one hand, UNESCO maximises the opportunities of having an IFCD-funded project (such as increased visibility, enhanced contact with the local cultural sector and a better understanding of the context) and on the other hand, to ensure that projects know what they can (and should) expect from UNESCO Field Offices (especially in terms of support and involvement throughout the diffusion, communication and implementation processes). These measures are aligned with IOS Recommendation no. 22.

Recommendation 11: The Convention Secretariat could consider developing tailored capacity-building actions for countries with less funding opportunities in the cultural sector and for those countries that have never received IFCD funding.

Moving towards being a ‘learning-driven Fund’

Recommendation 12: The Parties to the Convention should make resources available so that the Secretariat can take bold steps for the IFCD to become a ‘learning-driven fund’ by introducing measures that aim to extract lessons and spaces for reflexion at the centre of the IFCD’s strategy, including the hiring of dedicated staff at the Secretariat responsible for project monitoring and evaluation. These measures would also support ongoing efforts under the implementation of IOS Recommendation no.16 on strengthening the knowledge-management platform and *‘soliciting stakeholders’ active participation in order to make them part of a larger learning community’*.

Recommendation 13: The Convention Secretariat should consider conducting random IFCD project evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences. To ensure that these opportunities for analysis and reflection are maximised, evaluation teams could be composed of external consultants and local UNESCO Field Office staff. Projects could be encouraged to incorporate a budget line to cover the cost.

Recommendation 14: The Convention Secretariat could consider taking steps to maximise the Convention’s potential as an advocacy tool among civil society actors. This could be done by providing more information, training and awareness raising on the importance of advocating on the contribution of the cultural sector to the economy, as well as on existing links between project-focused work conducted by cultural entities and their contribution to policy-related issues affecting the implementation of the Convention.

3. ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS

128. In this section the evaluation team analyses the extent to which projects have attained their objectives as intended, before going on to unpack what have been their contributions to different outcomes as described in the RBM framework of the IFCD³⁷.

3.1. PROGRESS

129. The difficulties that some of the IFCD's funded projects encountered during the pilot phase have been generally overcome. During this exercise, the evaluation team was able to consult via interviews or surveys 20 out of the 33 projects financed during cycles 3-6. The evaluation team also revised the final reports of the 13 remaining projects. 18 out of the 20 projects consulted reported that they had accomplished what they had planned initially. This is also coherent with the final reports.

130. However, a significant proportion of projects consulted (9 out of 20) declared that in hindsight, they would have planned their project activities differently to better achieve their objectives. This further reinforced the idea that activities planned during the application process are not always the most appropriate when projects actually start implementation.

131. On a related note, project holders and other stakeholders agreed that often IFCD initiatives designed too many activities in a tight timeline. This means that even if all the activities were dutifully implemented, this focus on activity completion contributes to a tendency of organizing activities that become ends in themselves.

132. In general, projects have been successful at reaching the audiences they intended to reach. The evaluation team could corroborate this through the field missions and from the responses in the surveys. However, a closer analysis suggests that often even if the audiences were the right ones, the scope of the people reached was insufficient to build the critical mass required to substantially contribute to the ambitious aims of the projects.

133. Nevertheless, the evaluation team has also witnessed exceptions to this. In Bolivia, the project funded by the IFCD (TELARTES) managed to involve a very significant critical mass of people and organizations nationally. The network that developed under the umbrella of the project has now become a legitimate actor in the country within the cultural sector.

134. They could only achieve this significant national outreach because the project has been built on previous work and was inserted in a wider programmatic logic. For example, before the IFCD funded project started, the project's holder had already organised (among many other activities) a big conference for the cultural sector in Sucre (Bolivia) that had convened more than 500 cultural entities.

135. This example illustrates once again, how for such small and concrete projects to significantly contribute to any structural or systemic change (often reflected in their motivational horizons) they have to be inserted in wider processes of change.

3.2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO MEDIUM AND LONG TERM TRANSFORMATIONS

136. This section analyses how IFCD-funded projects have contributed to different results and outcomes as stated in the IFCD RBM. The evaluation team has retroactively analysed all the project reports from the cycles 3-6 and has developed its own research through surveys and field missions as explained in the methodology section. However, it is important to point out that this analysis would have benefited from monitoring material more geared towards learning (such as project evaluations or a solid institutional reflection around indicators for each expected result, as suggested in CE/16/10.IGC/7).

³⁷ DCE/16/10.IGC/8

OUTCOME 1: A SUSTAINABLE SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE

137. The first outcome of the RBM is to have *'a sustainable system of governance for culture that promotes the diversity of cultural expressions is created through targeting structural change'*.

138. This is the outcome under which the evaluation team found clear examples of contributions from a number of projects. Most significantly, the evaluation team could document the paradigmatic example of the project TELARTES in Bolivia that has contributed to all three results described under this outcome.

- ❖ **Result 1:** Cross-sectoral cooperation in cultural policy-making and implementation is demonstrated (linked with SDGs 8 & 16)
- ❖ **Result 2:** Processes and mechanisms of public policy-making and implementation are strengthened (linked with SDGs 8 & 16)
- ❖ **Result 3:** The role of civil society in cultural policy-making and implementation is strengthened (linked to SDGs 8 & 17)

139. Many projects have successfully contributed to the development and adoption of legislations and other policies related to culture. Some examples of this have emerged at the national level; such as the development of the Law on Cultural Spaces and National Cultural Law in Bolivia or the adoption of the Cultural Policy of Malawi.

140. The case of Burkina Faso provides an interesting illustration of how an IFCD-funded project can contribute to ongoing political processes and build on existing policy elements. The project *'Décentralisation et politiques culturelles: un nouveau modèle pour le Burkina Faso'* (implemented between June 2014 and June 2017) has clearly built on a series of existing public policies, strategies and laws that have created an enabling legal environment for the promotion of culture in the country. Apart from the 2004 Decentralisation Law, Burkina Faso has adopted documents such as the *Stratégie nationale de développement des industries culturelles et créatives (2016-20)*, the *Stratégie de valorisation des arts et de la culture dans les système éducatif burkinabé, Plan d'actions de la stratégie nationale de la culture et du tourisme (2018-20)* and the *Plan National de Développement Économique et Social (PNDES 2016-20)*, which includes a specific reference to cultural industries under axis 3.

141. This IFCD project has also built on a previous IFCD project that completed a study assessing the impact of culture in the country (IFCD pilot phase), a second study applying cultural indicators to the culture sector and other elements of support provided by UNESCO (technical assistance and training), with a strong focus on cultural policies since 2010. Despite the challenges encountered, the commitment of the team and partners involved has allowed progress to be made in the completion of the sensitisation activities and the elaboration of a guide on how to develop local cultural development strategies. Following up on the use of this guide, monitoring its practical implementation and extracting lessons on the process are key next steps that unfortunately fall beyond the scope of the project (now completed).

142. Significantly, many examples were also identified at the regional or local level in several countries. For example, in Bolivia, in the department of Oruro, members of TELARTES, played a key role in the development of the Departmental Law for Cultural Emergency. In Zimbabwe, the project facilitated the development of cultural policies and strategies in four Rural District Councils, thus setting the framework for strengthening the local development of arts, culture and heritage.

143. At the local level, the evaluation team also documented instances where IFCD-funded projects had influenced policies and action plans/tools. In Pirot, Serbia, the project developed a comprehensive action plan on creative industries for the municipality. The Plan has not yet been adopted by the municipality but the process of putting it together was valuable and has sparked other cultural processes within Pirot's Civil Society.

144. At the policy practice level, evidence suggests that IFCD-funded projects could also connect and develop synergies with government initiatives. For example, in Burkina Faso, the Regional Directorates involved in the IFCD-funded project established interesting working links with a new initiative launched by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (*Fonds de Développement Culturel et Artistique*) that also pursues local development objectives for the cultural sector.

145. The IFCD is also contributing to strengthening networks of cross-sectoral cooperation that advocate for policy making. For example, in Cuba, the project incorporated an intersectoral approach involving health institutions to address HIV & AIDS through cultural activities targeting youth.

146. The IFCD has also financed projects that have significantly strengthened the role of civil society in policy making. For example, in Peru, the project had a number of advocacy objectives involving meetings between civil society and the Ministry of Culture and local governments, thereby facilitating the elaboration of joint programmes and the implementation of various activities.

147. TELARTES deserves special mention. The box below illustrates the project's main achievements, challenges and other key issues about involving civil society in cultural policy-making.

Box 4: Influencing policies from Civil Society. The case of TELARTES, Bolivia

TELARTES is an open multi-sectoral network that brings together thousands of cultural organisations and independent artists of the cultural sector in Bolivia. The secretariat of the network is hosted in the city of Cochabamba and has hubs (*nudos* in Spanish) in around 30 towns around the country. They have been active for around seven years.

A key testimony for understanding how TELARTES has involved Civil Society in policy-making processes in the country was shared by a former Minister of Culture `Bolivia is a country with little institutional capacity in the area of cultural management. In this context, TELARTES has come to fill in that gap and to structure the national cultural activity. For example, members of TELARTES have become key actors in Departmental Cultural Councils and from there they have become intermediaries between governmental institutions and civil society. They have had a key role in the development of several laws both at the national and regional level. The clearest example being the National Cultural Law for which they have been the main catalytic agents. Right now TELARTES is an absolutely legitimate agent, a main reference in the cultural structure of the country´.



The road to developing the National Cultural Law has been challenging. However, an interesting part of this process has been how TELARTES has turned certain **backlashes** into strengthening factors for the network. For example, after a long, participatory and complex process of national scope, TELARTES finally had a text for the National Cultural Law backed by the Ministry of Culture. However, the draft law was significantly altered before going to Parliament for approval. This brought the process to a halt. TELARTES turned this situation into an opportunity to further strengthen the movement `we could have given in for the sake of ticking a box and see a law passed for which we had worked so hard but we are now stronger as a movement. We stood up and developed our 10 non-disputable points to be included in the Law. We are now campaigning for them´.

It is interesting to note that networks like TELARTES **never used the 2005 Convention as an advocacy tool**, even if the network was so intimately linked to the IFCD. For example, one of its non-disputable points is the allocation of 1% of the National budget to the Cultural sector. They based this claim on the international commitment acquired by Latin American Ministries of Culture in the X Iberoamerican Conference of Culture that took place in Uruguay in 2007. It is remarkable that the network did not use the 2005 Convention ratified by Bolivia to hold the government to account.

148. Besides these types of examples led by Civil Society (also encountered in countries like Peru), there is a dearth of initiatives promoting collaboration between civil society and governmental organisations within the cultural sector.

OUTCOME 2: NETWORKS AROUND CULTURAL GOODS AND SERVICES

149. The IFCD's RBM sets as the second outcome aiming for *'a more balanced South-North and South-South flow of cultural goods and services, and increased international mobility of artists and cultural professionals from the global South, are demonstrate'*. The outcome identified two associated results:

- ❖ **Result 1:** Networks and initiatives, with a focus on North-South-South cooperation, that support and facilitate the mobility of artists and cultural professionals from the global South (linked with SDGs 9 & 10); and
- ❖ **Result 2:** Policy, advocacy and promotional mechanisms are in place to improve access to local, national or global markets for cultural goods and services (linked with SDGs 8, 9 & 10)

150. Many projects reported promoting networks encouraging the flow of services and goods of creative industries. However, most of the examples collected seem to have occurred within the boundaries of each country. For example:

- In South Africa, some theatre companies have received permanent support (e.g. Unmute) through other organisations and are now well-established.
- In Haiti, the mapping of the music industry conducted under the auspices of the IFCD contributed to the visibility of the sector and the mobility of artists.
- In Zimbabwe, the project on strengthening cultural opportunities improved skills in crafts-making, which enhanced product quality and led to the expansion of market linkages, ultimately improving income levels.

151. The focus on North-South-South cooperation did not emerge strongly, as the vast majority of projects have an acute national focus. This is coherent with the preliminary findings of the recent impact study undertaken by the Convention Secretariat, which states that *'improved access to international markets is a greater challenge'*³⁸.

152. In Bolivia, the evaluation team also documented that TELARTES successfully promoted the mobility of artists and cultural products among Latin American countries. The project brought artists from Brazil and Chile to Bolivia within the framework of the *Festival Grito Rock* (laterally linked to the IFCD finding).

153. With regards to policy, advocacy and promotional mechanisms to improve access to markets, the project in El Salvador reported opening a new distribution line of fair-trade products to Europe.

OUTCOME 3: ECONOMIC GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES

154. The third outcome of the IFCD's RBM reads as follows: *'the value and opportunities that cultural and creative industries contribute to sustainable development are clearly demonstrated to relevant authorities involved in national development planning'*.

155. There are numerous examples of projects that have focused on demonstrating the value of creatives industries and that have contributed to the three results under this outcome:

- ❖ **Result 1:** Innovation and new business models are applied to creation, production, distribution and access to diverse cultural goods and services (SDGs 8 & 9)
- ❖ **Result 2:** Critical capacity development needs relating to creation, production and distribution are assessed and addressed at appropriate levels (SDGs 4 & 9)
- ❖ **Result 3:** Participation in creation, production and distribution of cultural goods and services is widened to previously excluded regions and social groups (SDGs 4 & 8).

³⁸ Carpenter, J. Preliminary findings, Impact research (2017).



Internationally known Serbian filmmaker and musician Emir Kusturica modelling a shirt by Pirot designer [Silvana Tosic](#), using Pirot's traditional symbols. Silvana was a beneficiary of the IFCD project.

Box 5: Demonstrating the value of creative industries in Serbia

A good example of an initiative contributing to this outcome was found in the project '*Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies in Serbia*'. The project piloted a solid research methodology in the area of Pirot (South Serbia) mapping the cultural industries in the area. The mapping informed a Municipal Action Plan for the promotion of Cultural Industries. The Plan has not been officially adopted by the Municipal government but it has inspired interesting initiatives in Civil Society.

For example, several new ventures have been formed like the fashion workshop of Silvana Tosic who used Pirot's rich cultural resources, to design new fashion. The new skills she obtained through the IFCD project inspired her to set up the business and to try marketing techniques for product placement (such as using famous people to model her garments).

As a result of the Action Plan, another mapping was done targeting creative industries within the Roma community in Pirot. The results of the mapping attracted the attention of the press, which wrote an extensive article on the important involvement that Roma women have traditionally had in the production of Pirot rugs, the signature product of the town.

The methodology of the mapping was replicated in the town of Kikinda, with a mapping on cultural industries. This was done through an interesting partnership that the project established with the Standing Conference of Cities and Municipalities. The outcome of this research informed two projects that are now included in wider programmes financed by the EU in the area.

Outside Pirot, the project also organised the School for Entrepreneurs in Creative Industries. It was a very hands-on and intensive practical training that was very well rated among participants and produced outstanding results. For example, a Youth NGOs was set up by young Art and History graduates with the aim of promoting the local culture of a region around Belgrade. The organisation already has two innovative projects under implementation financed by an Austrian Bank and by the Ministry of Culture.

156. Outside Serbia, the evaluation could also document examples of projects developing innovative models applied to cultural goods and services. A remarkable example was found in Bolivia, where TELARTES has developed a sophisticated model of collaborative economy applied to the creative industries that has become one of the pillars of the project.

157. Other projects around the world have also expanded access to creative industries to previously excluded regions and social groups. This was the case in Brazil through the project on e-books targeting indigenous communities or in Cuba through the project *Quasicuba* that claims to have facilitated the interaction among different ethnic groups empowering traditionally vulnerable groups.

158. Finally, projects have often reported to have created employment or new career opportunities in the creative industries. This occurred in the audiovisual sector in Zimbabwe, in Congo in the music sector, or in Cambodia where artists acquired new skills, not only in the area of arts but also in terms of personal and career development.

OUTCOME 4: GENDER EQUALITY

159. The fourth outcome of the IFCD RBM calls for 'gender inequalities in cultural life to be addressed and more equitable access to and participation in cultural and creative expressions are demonstrated'.

160. The outcome is composed of two results:

- ❖ **Result 1:** Women's representation as creators and producers of cultural expressions is increased through strengthened professional networks and capacity development (linked with SDGs 4, 5 & 10)
- ❖ **Result 2:** Specific policy measures and /or funding mechanisms are introduced to encourage and improve equitable access to cultural events, goods and services (linked with SDGs 5, 10, 16 & 17)

161. Only a few projects seem to have taken explicit positive actions to increase women's representation as creators and producers of cultural expressions. There are cases of initiatives that have targeted women in particular, such as a handcraft project in Cameroon or a project actively supporting the improvement of basket weaving skills among rural women in Zimbabwe. Other projects have included specific lines of action aimed at women, such as Cambodia where empowering women was one of the aims of the project; or in El Salvador where the project allowed women to strengthen their ways of organising by networking with other entrepreneurs.

162. The evaluation team could also witness first-hand that in the case of Serbia even if the project did not have a specific focus on women, it involved a significantly higher number of women than men as beneficiaries. This happened because women constitute the vast majority of the people involved in creative industries in the province of Pirot where most of the project was implemented.

163. Furthermore, it is frequent that projects report using gender-disaggregated data (as was the case in IFCD-funded projects in Peru and Mexico, for example).

164. Despite these contributions towards gender equality and women's empowerment, what did not emerge strongly were projects that had significantly challenged the traditional roles of women or that explicitly tackled gender power relations within the sector of creative industries. In other words, the evaluation has seldom found any gender analysis in the IFCD-funded projects beyond counting women and men among beneficiaries or nominally including gender as a token word in project proposals and reports. This analysis is coherent with testimonies coming from the Expert Panel, which noted how projects proposal often mentioned gender in their narratives but did not reflect it in their budgets.

165. There are exceptions to this, such as for example in Bolivia, where the evaluation team found that the project had a gender-sensitive approach at different levels, which was not apparent in the proposal nor in the project reports.



* Source: web of TELARTES <http://www.telartes.org.bo/content/lente-subversiva-cortometrajes-desde-la-mirada-de-la-mujer>

Box 6: TELARTES: Promoting gender equality at different levels

'I feel that feminist reflections in TELARTES have been very important and that including feminist people and organisations in the network has been very healthy. This outlook has frequently challenged any Country Club logic (Men only club). For example, it was from those reflections that we understood that it was about time to have a woman coordinating after having had two men, and now Susana is in charge'. Member of TELARTES

As this testimony illustrates, gender analysis has been present in TELARTES at different levels. In terms of human resources, the project not only purposely appointed a female coordinator. While the project was under implementation, the male coordinator in charge became a father. The project set out concrete and practical work/life balance measures so that that the coordinator could meet his responsibilities as a father.

Furthermore, as the quote points out, the network has promoted several alliances with women and feminist organisations not only in Bolivia but regionally, such as *Movimenta*, a political women's forum of which TELARTES is a founding member. In addition, the evaluation found that often the network promotes events and contents that openly challenge traditional gender relations and roles within the creative industries, such as the event illustrating this box advertising a Bolivian festival of short films featuring *subversive* movies by women directors.

166. In this case, gender reflections had a strong presence in the project because the organisational culture where it was developed had a strong (even if not always explicit) gender approach. Conversely, strongly patriarchal contexts (such was the case of Burkina Faso) would also permeate IFCD-funded projects, limiting opportunities to advance gender issues.


167. Besides the case of TELARTES in Bolivia, there are other examples of projects making obvious efforts to integrate gender approaches, such as the case of Croatia, where the project made efforts to integrate women at the management level.

168. However, during this evaluation exercise, no contributions to the second result of this outcome emerged. The evaluation team did not document any examples of IFCD-funded initiatives contributing to policies or funding measures that directly address equitable gender access and participation.

FACTORS CONTRIBUTING OR HINDERING TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS

169. In the following infographic, the evaluation team has summarised the main factors that have helped or hindered the projects' contribution to expected results.

FIGURE 4: FACTORS THAT HELPED OR HINDERED RESULTS



Box 7: Recommendations on achievements

Gender in the Fund

Recommendation 15: The Committee could consider positively discriminating project proposals that include concrete actions aimed at increasing women's representation in key areas of cultural activity and/or aimed at challenging traditional women roles.

4. INCOME & BUDGET

4.1. INCOME

170. During the analysed period (2013-2016), the contributions of Parties to the Fund have followed an uneven trend (see table below). In 2013, 2014 and 2015, the Fund experienced a consistent annual decrease that almost halved contributions, with the contributions of 2015 representing approximately 54% of the funding received two years earlier. However, the following year witnessed a substantial increase of almost 90%, with contributions almost doubling between 2015 and 2016. The evaluation could not determine the reasons for this increase.

171. It is important to note that the IFCD's annual budget (which serves to determine the funds available for financing projects) is calculated from contributions received from 1st July of the year prior to the cycle, to the 30th June of the year of the cycle. For example, for the 7th IFCD cycle, the budget was calculated from contributions received from the 1st July 2015 to the 30th June 2016.

Table 1: Contributions to the IFCD

	IFCD Contribution from Parties (USD)	Other contributions (USD)	TOTAL (USD)
2013	810,999.27	1	811,000.27
2014	689,077.55	211	689,288.55
2015	436,000.37	13,239.73	449,243.10
2016	833,303.64	0	833,303.64

172. The causes for this uneven trend are difficult to discern. The fundraising activities undertaken in recent years (and detailed below under 4.2.1) may account for the rise in income witnessed between 2015 and 2016 but the links between these factors have not been systematically monitored and analysed by the Secretariat. These results are still far from the USD 1.9M tentative target that would be raised if all Parties to the Convention provided 1% of their annual UNESCO contribution to the Fund.

173. In terms of the composition of the donor base, the evidence shows that despite efforts to widen and diversify the IFCD's donors, it is the States that are Parties to the 2005 Convention that clearly remain the main source of funding of the IFCD, since the vast majority of the funding received to date is provided by these countries. In fact, despite the fundraising efforts described in section 4.2.1, no private sector partnerships have been agreed to date and no funds from the private sector have been received. The contributions of other donors (individuals and other institutions such as the sale of a photo book from an individual artist³⁹) remain very low at USD 14,687.55 for the period 2013-2016.

174. The fact that the IFCD remains a voluntary fund constitutes a real challenge for its stability and sustainability. Making this Fund voluntary as opposed to mandatory was part of the negotiations reached among States at the time of the adoption of the 2005 Convention.

175. Since 2007, 43% of the Parties to the Convention have made at least one contribution to the IFCD. At the time of the IOS Evaluation of 2012, only 39 of the 124 Parties to the Convention had contributed to the Fund. At the end of 2016, this figure had increased to 62 countries⁴⁰.

176. Achieving contributions from at least 50% of the Parties to the Convention is one of the stated targets for the IFCD fundraising strategy and it is considered an important indicator of success. Nonetheless, stakeholders (from UNESCO HQ

³⁹ DCE/16/10.IGC/8 par. 39

⁴⁰ DCE/16/10.IGC/8 par. 31

and from Delegations) agree that more than quantifying IFCD support in terms of number of countries, the ultimate aim should be to secure regular funding in line (as far as possible) with the 1% suggested contribution.

4.2. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FUNDRAISING STRATEGY

177. The fundraising and communication strategy currently under implementation was adopted at the 6th IGC meeting held in December 2012⁴¹, when the Committee decided *'to progressively implement the strategy with available funds and resources and have the budget assigned accordingly for future activities at each session'*⁴².

178. The strategy was developed by a team of consultants in line with Recommendation no. 8 of the 2012 IOS Evaluation, with the aim of identifying government partners and individual donors to be targeted; conducting a market analysis and setting out a fully-fledged communication strategy.

179. The aim of the 5-year fundraising and communications strategy adopted for 2013-2018 was to triple the annual funding of the IFCD by 2018. It was divided into three phases with three main goals: a) the first (January 2013 - June 2014) sought to expand the Fund's existing support base among governments; the second (July 2014 - June 2016) targeted external donors to secure partnerships with the private sector and selected individuals; c) the third and currently ongoing phase (July 2016 - December 2017) foresees the implementation of the private sector action plan.

180. However, from the adoption of the Fundraising Strategy there have been concerns voiced inside and outside UNESCO about the limited capacity of the Convention Secretariat to implement this strategy. In fact, from the initial stages in the definition of the strategy in 2010, the point was made at the 4th IGC Session that *'the creation and implementation of any fundraising strategy also requires financial resources and dedicated human resources specialised in this field'* (CE/10/4.IGC/205/10B).

181. The targets of the fundraising strategy depended on a set of conditions, such as contracting adequate human resources. Efforts have been made to strengthen the capacity of the Secretariat (under the implementation of IOS Recommendation no.31) but although Parties were encouraged to appoint an Associated Expert or a secondee in June 2015 (Resolution 5.CP 10, para.9) and discussed on various other occasions, this has not yet been achieved. Adopting the strategy with a budget for activities but without the necessary human resources has dampened the strategy's chances of success from the start.

182. Furthermore, since the adoption of the fundraising strategy, there has been a great investment in communication products. The evaluation team has not been able to fully understand exactly how the donors are using the materials nor of their concrete contribution to the IFCD's fundraising efforts. Communication projects have been exclusively geared towards attracting potential donors but no analysis has been conducted on how the implementation of the different phases has encouraged donors to provide contributions to the IFCD.

183. The Convention Secretariat tries to keep Permanent Delegations engaged through different channels- for example by providing thematic e-updates on issues of interest such as digital technology or gender. Parties should be using all the materials produced by the Convention Secretariat to influence their governments but this does not seem to be systematically happening.

184. National Commissions have also used the communication products produced by the Secretariat in different ways: TV and radio stations (St. Lucia), written press (Malawi), banners (El Salvador), social media (Mexico) or concrete TV contracts (Cameroon) as well as translating IFCD videos in their own languages (e.g. Portuguese, German).

⁴¹ DCE/12/6.IGC/7

⁴² DCE/14/8.IGC/9

PHASE I (JANUARY 2013-JUNE 2014)

185. During the implementation of this first phase, a number of activities were conducted, including IFCD rebranding through communication tools, electronic newsletters, brochures, videos and a new website (including Paypal access) with an estimated budget for phase 1 of USD 399,500 (including the staff costs) to raise USD 1,434,875.

186. The implementation of the first phase was deemed successful since 75% of this target was reached. The DCE/14/8.IGC/9 report states that *'the impact of the implementation of phase 1 is demonstrated by the fact that USD 1,060,893.86 were raised'*. However, it seems difficult to prove the causal link between the fundraising strategy and the results.

187. The DCE/14/8.IGC/9 report states that this percentage *'is clearly a direct result of the fundraising strategy'* but the suggested reasons do not logically support the claim: *'in consideration of the fact that the IFCD is based on voluntary contributions and the global economic crisis'*. While it may be possible to safely assume that the fundraising strategy contributed to these results, it is not possible to ascertain this, especially in the absence of an adequate analysis of both how donors used the different materials and tools and of their impact on donor contributions.

PHASE II (JULY 2014-JUNE 2016)

188. During the second phase, the Secretariat undertook a prospective research to seek alternative sources of funding and establish a list of potential private sector partners. The specific private sector fundraising strategy and action plan with specific targets sought to raise USD 4,391,367 with an estimated cost of USD 457,125 (staff costs included).

189. One of the main advantages of the IFCD from a private sector fundraising perspective is the fact that it operates through the entire value chain from public policies to strengthening small and medium enterprises in the creative economies in the country.

190. The main identified difficulty/challenge is the fact that the destination of funding cannot be determined in advance since it cannot be earmarked⁴³. Nonetheless, the strategy also tackled this challenge by arguing that the prestige of UNESCO branding would compensate this fact and provide greater returns. To offset the exclusion of earmarked programme funding, the Private Sector strategy recommended that international private sector companies providing in-kind resources should receive due legitimacy as *'global/local implementation partners'* with access to local programmes for purposes of mutually agreed upon publicity and recognition.

191. Despite these advances, the level of contributions decreased in 2015, when only USD 449,243.10 were raised.

PHASE III (JULY 2016-DECEMBER 2017)

192. The IFCD has completed the development of an action plan for implementing the private sector fundraising strategy with the overall goal of ensuring that by 2018, the IFCD receives regular financial support from at least 50% of the Parties and develops six key private sector partnerships that account for 30% of its resources.

193. During this ongoing third implementation phase, a wide range of communication materials have been disseminated. High profile media events have been held in Doha and Cannes in March and May 2016 and 50 articles were published between January and July 2016. In addition to these, three social media thematic videos, as well as 21 news items in three languages, an impact video (Burkina Faso project video-documentary), and a special brochure for the private sector (*'Creativity matters'*) promoting the IFCD have been produced (CE/16/10 IGC/8).

194. Stakeholders have unanimously praised the high quality of the communication materials produced. However, it is difficult to know to what extent their use has been maximised during these three implementation phases. It is also unclear whether UNESCO has learned from its experience developing and sharing these products. One positive example of the type of analysis that could be encouraged in this regard is the fact that the electronic update that was produced every 3-4 months and sent by e-mail was cancelled after discovering that it was only being opened by less than 10% of the recipients.

⁴³ The IFCD is managed as a Special Account pursuant to Article 1.1 of its Financial Regulations and, given its multi-donor nature, cannot receive tied or earmarked contributions.

This material was replaced by other communication products such as short videos and a communication package for social media.

195. In 2015, the IFCD worked with a specialist in fundraising and communications to establish the action plan and activities are being implemented for collaborating with the targeted companies. However, in terms of results, no private sector partnerships have been agreed to date, partly as a result of the limited fundraising resources available. Despite the Director-General's annual call for contributions, in April 2016 only 29 out of the 144 Parties contributed to the IFCD.

4.3. BUDGET

196. The analysis presented under this section is limited to the operational costs covered directly by the IFCD. This evaluation exercise has not analysed the full operational costs of the IFCD, since the staff costs covered by UNESCO for IFCD-associated tasks before the introduction of cost-recovery in 2015 have not been considered. The analysis does, however, consider the cost recovery introduced in 2015 (in line with IOS Recommendation no.33) and reflected in the financial statements analysed during this evaluation exercise.

197. The following conclusions based on the approved budget figures can be drawn: Firstly, the percentage of the Fund's approved budget that covers non-project costs⁴⁴ has decreased to 26% of the total IFCD costs in 2017, after the slight increase witnessed between 2013 and 2016 (from 28% to 36% of the Fund). Secondly, project funding decreased year-on-year from USD 1,136,641 in 2013 to USD 510,500 in 2017 as a result of the decrease in financial contributions to the Fund. This constitutes a 51% decrease over the four years, which illustrates the sustainability challenges of the Fund and the urgent need to strengthen fundraising efforts and secure the contribution of Parties.

Table 2. IFCD Annual approved budgets

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018 (Draft to be approved at 11IGC)
Fixed costs	IFCD Panel of Experts	65,000**	65,000	45,000	65,000	38,000	37,000
	Operating costs	20,000	10,000	7,000	7,000	1,000	500
	Participation in statutory meetings (government experts from LDCs)	15,000	20,000	15,000	15,000	8,000	6,500
SUBTOTAL		100,000	95,000	67,000	87,000	47,000	44,000
Funding of projects	Funding of projects (number of projects funded)	1,113,208 (10)	812,385 (7)	624,296 (6)	551,658 (6)	510,500	612,000
	Reserve*	23,433	18,518	0	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL (Projects)		1,136,641	830,903	624,296	551,658	510,500	612,000
Other	Cost recovery	0	0	Approved in 2016	76,668	70,248	70,942

⁴⁴ Non-project costs are defined as all costs that are outside direct project funding (i.e., fixed costs, cost recovery, support costs)

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018 (Draft to be approved at 11(GC))
					76,668** (2015)		
Unassigned funds	Fundraising strategy ⁴⁵	143,023	55,281	47,563	50,489	53,416	60,000 ⁴⁶
	IFCD Evaluation	0	0	0	0	40,000	
	Support costs	117,164	92,590	76,371.75	71,553	62,775	72,694
GRAND TOTAL		1,288,805	1,018,493	840,089.27	786,859	730,523	859,636

*This reserve line was mandatory until 2015.

**Funds allocated from unassigned funds.

198. In light of the number of projects financed by year, one of the main questions that arise is whether it is cost-effective to screen more than 400 fully-fledged proposals (involving National Commissions, the Convention Secretariat and Panel of Experts) when only 6 projects can be selected. Section 2 of this report suggests some recommendations on how this issue could be addressed with a view to minimising the resources devoted to this part of the process. Recommendations on other concerns related to income and budget discussed in this section are included in Box 8.

199. The Secretariat does not have the necessary capacity to adequately cover the wide range of tasks that the IFCD requires (project coordination, project monitoring and evaluation, project administration, communication/ visibility and fundraising). This is particularly evident in the case of project M&E as well as the implementation of the fundraising strategy, which is a full-time job that requires special skills. Adopting this type of strategy document without an efficient and cost-effective implementation plan is not an efficient use of the available resources, since the funding that goes to communication and fundraising cannot be maximised in this context. The resources of UNESCO's Section for Mobilizing Resources from Multilateral and Private Partners (BSP/MLP) and the Culture Sector's Convention Common Services Team (CLT/CCS) are also limited.

Box 8: Recommendations on income and budget

Recommendation 16: The Committee could consider reviewing its current fundraising strategy to ensure that it dedicates more attention to the contributions of Parties and their engagement in a more tailored manner, recognising that not all Parties have the same capacities and resources. This would require engaging with Parties to conduct an analysis that clearly determines their priority interests and preferences so that any fundraising efforts recognise this diversity.

Recommendation 17: Parties to the Convention must work towards meeting the suggested contribution of 1% (Art.18.3 and 18.7)⁴⁷ to strengthen the sustainability of the Fund and overturn the downward tendency of the last 5 years.

Recommendation 18: The Committee should consider strengthening the IFCD's fundraising strategy by incorporating an analytical dimension that ensures an explicit connection between the communications products and concrete fundraising targets (especially those related to Parties contributions). Connecting products and achievements would also allow the organisation to learn from experience and determine what works best.

⁴⁵ These amounts, without staff costs, were yearly approved for the implementation of the fundraising strategy.

⁴⁶ Fundraising and communication costs.

⁴⁷ According to article 18.3(a) and 18.7 of the 2005 Convention, Parties shall endeavour to provide voluntary contributions on a regular basis. The Committee encourages Parties to the Convention to provide annual contributions of the equivalent of at least 1% of their contribution to the UNESCO budget.

Recommendation 19: The Convention Secretariat could consider changing the current success target of 50% of contributing countries so that instead of focusing on ensuring that at least half of the Parties to the Convention give to the Fund, regular amounts are sought in line with the suggested 1%. In this regard, a thorough resource mobilisation strategy aiming at Parties should be developed and implemented. Special emphasis should be placed on ensuring that enough funds are raised to cover the human resources that are necessary to implement the strategy.

Recommendation 20: The Convention Secretariat should strengthen its use of communication materials on the IFCD. The first suggested step in order to achieve this is to conduct an analysis of the implementation of the different phases of the Communications Strategy to understand what has worked and what requires improvement.

5. SUSTAINABILITY

200. Several stakeholders (from projects and HQ alike) have highlighted the importance of the IFCD as an advocacy tool in their quest for greater sustainability of the culture sector. In fact, many actors argue that IFCD projects can help actors explain the existing links between culture and the economy by illustrating concrete aspects of the 2005 Convention and promoting related areas of work.

5.1. SUSTAINABILITY OF THE FUND

201. Under this section, one of the main findings of this evaluation exercise is that even if the funding trend of the analysed period suggests that voluntary contributions can be expected to continue to fund the IFCD, the overall sustainability of the Fund is far from guaranteed. One of the factors that may allow the Fund to promote greater Party engagement in strengthening this aspect is to give the contributions of Parties more adequate attention as opposed to the current 'one-size-fits-all' approach to Party needs and interests, since Parties remain the IFCD's main source of funding.

202. Ideally, providing funds to the IFCD should be mandatory as part of the commitment of Parties to the 2005 Convention. This would certainly guarantee sustainability, although stakeholders (from UNESCO HQ, Parties to the Convention and key consultants) agree that this is far from being a real possibility in the current institutional context.

5.2. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECTS

203. There is evidence to suggest that although the issue of sustainability was raised by the IOS Evaluation (see Recommendation no.13) and various efforts have been made (such as integrating sustainability criteria in the application, evaluation and reporting forms), it is not receiving the attention it deserves in the different components of the Fund's management, as the evaluation unpacks in this section. Nevertheless, this evaluation exercise has identified certain signs of sustainability at the project level.

204. There is a wide range of evidence to suggest that projects have developed certain approaches and strategies that are directly linked to sustainability, such as the collaborative economy initiative witnessed in Bolivia or the continuous use of products such as the handbook for creative industries development planning at the local level in Serbia or the guide (*Guide d'Élaboration de Stratégies Locales de Développement Culturel*) developed in Burkina Faso within the framework of IFCD funded projects. The individual changes identified (described under section 3) are more difficult to recognise and measure but they also tend to be of a more permanent nature.

205. The structural changes sought by the IFCD take time and require a number of elements that are not readily available in all contexts, such as political stability or the firm commitment of key stakeholders in governments. Furthermore, even when the right combination of factors and conditions are met in a particular setting, political and social contexts are never static and stability throughout project implementation can never be assured.

206. For example, in Serbia the project had the commitment of a proactive individual and then the person (local authority) changed. In Bolivia, the project had the commitment required for the project to be inserted in a wider national process and then the minister changed three times during project implementation. In Burkina Faso, a coup d'État transformed the political scene with the destitution of all trained and committed mayors. What followed was a long election process that had certain project activities on hold for almost a year. These political changes illustrate some of the inherent challenges of structural projects.

207. Partially because projects have a limited duration (typically one year), there is a tendency to finance outputs that could be a strategy, action plan, guide, mapping but the implementation is not foreseen and is not tied to available funding. For example, in Serbia, the IFCD funded the development of a Municipal Action Plan on Creative Industries in Pirot (which the project dutifully developed) but there was no provisions for any follow up. A similar situation was witnessed in Burkina Faso with the development of a guide for the elaboration of local cultural development strategies that is only beginning to

be implemented at the end of the project. In the three visited projects, the sustainability of the achievements is not guaranteed partly for this reason.

208. The role of the Parties is key for sustainability and the importance of their engagement is incontestable since engaging in a more complex long-term type of change process is necessarily more demanding than the implementation of projects that focus on the development of a cultural product.

209. This was already mentioned in the IOS Evaluation in 2012, which suggested ensuring that *'future projects chosen for IFCD funding include both short- and long-term targets at the output and outcome levels in their planning and that results are reported on at both these levels'*. This was one of the reason why RBM was introduced.

210. In conclusion, the evidence suggests that for IFCD projects to be sustainable, certain ingredients are essential: projects need a capable partner with a wider strategy that goes beyond immediate project activities implemented in a limited timeframe, who is passionate and able to involve other experienced partners. Political will and buy-in, coupled with a high level of institutional commitment are also fundamental.

5.3. CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE SECTOR

211. The key point to note under this section is the fact that there is an extensive evidence of projects contributing to the sustainability of the sector in a more subtle manner by helping to change mentalities and introducing ideas linked to economy and sustainable development with culture as its engine.

212. This has been a strong component of many projects, in line with the philosophy of the Fund although a lot of work is still needed on the advocacy front. For example, in Burkina Faso there was evidence from a wide range of stakeholders of how the sensitisation and communication campaign supported by the project had succeeded in informing local authorities about the economic and social possibilities of the cultural sector and had raised their awareness about its potential for development at the local level. Some collective values can be said to be very gradually changing in this regard but this is still to crystallise.

Box 9: Recommendations on sustainability

Many of the recommendations suggested under sections 2 and 4 (Governance & Management and Income & Budget) are closely linked to the sustainability of the Fund.

Recommendation 21: More attention should be devoted to the capacity of project partners and give this factor greater weight in the selection process. Hence the concept notes should include elements that prove the capacity of partners (such as experience, sector expertise, past performance and participation in networks).

6. CONCLUSIONS

213. The IFCD is unique for several reasons ranging from its formal statutory role in the Convention to its ability to serve as a catalyst for projects aiming at medium to long term structural changes. Nonetheless, certain critical voices question whether UNESCO is well-placed or well-resourced enough to be able to fully implement the IFCD to its full potential. The IFCD can also said to be complementary to other Funds operating under the cultural sector in UNESCO since it addresses a different dimension of UNESCO's mandate and serves a particular type of target group.

214. There is extensive exceptional coherence between the Convention, IFCD Guidelines and the activities implemented by the projects. There is also great sense of alignment across actors as well as a dominating long-term vision shared by projects (and in line with the dispositions of the 2005 Convention) that privileges systemic changes and medium-long term goals in a wide range of contexts. However, the implications of the IFCD's direct alignment with the Convention is not fully understood by many of the cultural actors involved.

215. For the revised RBM framework approved in 2016 to provide a real basis for effective monitoring, all key stakeholders would need to fully understand it and incorporate it into their practices. The level of knowledge and understanding of the RBM framework still ranges across actors.

216. The IFCD corresponds to the needs of the Parties, since it addresses their stated priorities in the field of culture and under the 2005 Convention. However, given the IFCD's scope and limited resources it is impossible for the Fund to fully meet the needs and demands of the Parties. However, the IFCD may not be as relevant to high human development countries, which have access to other Funds and/or their own sources of funding to cover this type of work. The IFCD is often described as 'a drop in the ocean', since very few projects are funded and the identified needs remain immense.

217. The Secretariat works diligently in an administratively complex context. Its proactive and systematic follow-up to ensure the full implementation of the IOS 2012 evaluation recommendations provides an excellent illustration of this. However, some question whether these actions have really translated into concrete improvements.

218. Most stakeholders positively rated the support of the Secretariat and praised the work of the team as 'some of the best in the Culture Sector'. Nonetheless, there are still concerns about the appropriate capacity of the Secretariat to fully comply with the requirement of the IFCD in terms of human resources, namely project coordination, project monitoring and evaluation, project administration, communication/ visibility and fundraising.

219. Several aspects related to the Expert Panel have improved significantly since the 2012 Evaluation (for example in terms of composition, feedback, working documents). They show a remarkable common understanding of the IFCD's vision.

220. The role of the National Commissions remains the weakest link in the IFCD's application and selection process. There are concerns that the quality of National Commission screenings is not always up to standard and that a number of high quality projects may have been lost in the process.

221. The engagement of UFOs has been uneven and ad hoc even if the IFCD guidelines describe their potential role. Despite expectations from different stakeholders for greater UFO involvement, the reality is that resources and expertise at the UFO level are limited.

222. The application and selection process of the IFCD has significantly improved since the 2012 evaluation (new online platform, revised formats and guides). However major issues remain: there are several disadvantages in requiring fully-fledged project proposals following a detailed log-framework approach at an early stage. It is not efficient to receive 400 fully fledged proposals to fund only 6.

223. Despite some improvements, four challenges remain: a) lack of financial resources; b) the role of the National Commissions; c) the issue of geographic priorities; d) and the criteria used in the scoring system to reach the 30-point decision that automatically recommends all projects above this threshold for funding.

224. No specific independent monitoring is conducted to build a body of evidence-based on what works better and to inform the IFCD strategy due to the lack of human resources.

225. The difficulties that some of the IFCD-funded projects encountered during the pilot phase have been overcome. Projects have been able to reach the audiences they intended but have generally not reached the critical mass required to contribute to structural changes.

226. For such concrete projects to contribute to any structural or systemic change they need to be inserted in a wider theory of change and they have to be led by capable and legitimate partners.

227. In terms of results, the outcome under which the evaluation team has found clearer examples of concrete project contributions has been 'sustainable system of governance', particularly contributing to the development and adoption of legislation and other policies related to culture (at the local, national and regional levels).

228. Many projects have reported promoting networks but they have been limited to the national level and only a few have extended their scope internationally. The evaluation team has only found anecdotal evidence of projects contributing to the 'development of policy, advocacy and promotional mechanisms to improve access to local, national or global market for cultural goods'.

229. Various projects have developed innovative models and mechanisms for the creation, production, distribution and access of goods and services. Significantly, projects have contributed to growth opportunities by tackling critical capacity and needs related to the creation, production, distribution of and access to goods at different levels.

230. In terms of women's representation in IFCD projects, the evaluation team has found that only a few projects introduced explicit positive actions but often projects used gender-disaggregated data, while a few have actively focused on supporting women creators and producers. Powerful gender approaches were witnessed in various projects that were not necessarily captured in the project reports.

231. There is an uneven trend in the contributions received during the analysed period. The fundraising activities undertaken in recent years may account for the rise in income witnessed between 2015 and 2016 but the links between these factors have not been systematically monitored and analysed by the Secretariat. These results are still far from the USD 1.9M tentative target that would be raised if all Parties to the Convention provided 1% of their annual contribution to the Fund.

232. Despite efforts to widen and diversify the IFCD's donors, it is the States that are Parties to the 2005 Convention that clearly remain the IFCD's main source of funding, since the vast majority of the resources received to date are provided by these countries. In fact, no private sector partnerships have been agreed until now and no funds from the private sector have been received.

233. The adoption of the fundraising strategy was a welcome move that has been unanimously praised by stakeholders as the first step in the quest for a sustainable solution for the IFCD. However, its effective implementation has faced a number of challenges (mainly due to the Secretariat's limited human resource capacity) that have marred the overall performance of the strategy and unmet targets.

234. Even if the funding trend of the analysed period suggests that voluntary contributions can be expected to continue to fund the IFCD, the overall sustainability of the Fund is far from guaranteed. One of the factors that may allow the Fund to promote greater Party commitment to strengthen this aspect is the extent to which the contribution of Parties receive more adequate attention as opposed to the current 'one-size-fits-all' approach to Party needs and interests.

235. Certain approaches and strategies developed by projects are directly linked to their sustainability (such as the use of a collaborative economy model). There are also cases where the projects have made continued use of products developed during the implementation phase beyond the life of the project. However, projects are too short and activity-focused to be fully sustainable, especially at the policy level. Structural changes sought by the IFCD take time and require a number of elements that are not readily available in all contexts.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

236. This evaluation report proposes a series of recommendations that aim to strengthen the IFCD by making it operationally more effective and maximising its potential to play a more vocal role in cultural development processes in countries that are Parties to the 2005 Convention. The proposed recommendations have been presented throughout this report under each of the five themes that structured the evaluation: a) relevance; b) governance; c) achievements of results d) income and budget; e) sustainability. These recommendations are now summarised in the table below:

Table 3: Summary of recommendations

Rec.	Details	Responsibility
1	To consider focusing IFCD support on low/middle income countries that have less funding opportunities in the realm of culture at their disposal by using other reference list such as the HDI or DAC.	The Committee
2	To consider actively promoting and/or prioritising regional initiatives through the IFCD in order to promote greater international cooperation (in line with article 12 of the Convention) and to also impact more countries, thereby meeting the needs and expectations of more Parties and potential project holders.	The Committee
3	To introduce an IFCD endorsement scheme for projects implemented in high human development countries where IFCD funding is not as relevant as in countries with low human development countries with fewer funding opportunities.	The Committee
4	To introduce a call for concept notes that would complement the current call for proposals. The evaluation team recommends adopting a call requesting a short 2-3 page application with a simple budget based on two elements: a summary of the proposed action presented within a simple theory of change reflecting a wider contextual change process and elements proving the capacity of partners. Concept notes should be presented online to be assessed by National Commissions. After the first screening process, a maximum of 15 to 20 applicants would be invited to develop full proposals following the same process currently in place.	The Committee
5	To work with the National Commissions to strengthen their role in line with the Guidelines in concrete areas such as the responsibility of forming and coordinating the pre-selection panel (as per articles 12.2 and 12.3 of the Guidelines).	Convention Secretariat
6	To allocate extra criteria in the proposal scoring system to projects promoting certain strategic themes and/or geographic regions in order to fine tune project selection and to reduce the challenges emerging from the 30-point decision as well as geographic imbalance.	The Committee
7	To incorporate a specific question about the IFCD in Quadrennial Periodic Reports (QPRs) to ensure that IFCD projects systematically feature in these reports, thereby ensuring that the links between the	Convention Secretariat

	Fund and the implementation of the 2005 Convention are made explicit.	
8	To conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat (in line with IOS Recommendation 31). Strengthening the team's fundraising capacity is particularly key for the future of the Fund and in order to maximise efforts to date.	UNESCO Culture Sector
9	To strengthen the capacity of the National Commissions as key actors involved in the application process in order to improve the selection process and avoid the non-selection of good quality projects. A good step forward would be ensuring that each National Commission appoints a focal point in charge of coordinating IFCD issues for at least 2 years, and that in case of changes, the same person ensures the transfer of knowledge and files.	Convention Secretariat and National Commissions
10	To work with Field Offices to ensure that on the one hand, UNESCO maximises the opportunities of having an IFCD-funded project (such as increased visibility, enhanced contact with the local cultural sector and a better understanding of the context) and on the other hand, to ensure that projects know what they can (and should) expect from UNESCO Field Offices (especially in terms of support and involvement throughout the diffusion, communication and implementation processes).	Convention Secretariat
11	To develop tailored capacity-building actions for countries with less funding opportunities in the cultural sector and for those countries that have never received IFCD funding.	Convention Secretariat
12	To make resources available so that the Secretariat can take bold steps for the IFCD to become a 'learning-driven fund' by introducing measures that aim to extract lessons and spaces for reflexion at the centre of the IFCD's strategy, including the hiring of dedicated staff at the Secretariat responsible for project monitoring and evaluation.	Parties to the Convention
13	To conduct random IFCD project independent evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences.	Convention Secretariat
14	To take steps to maximise the Convention's potential as an advocacy tool among civil society actors. This could be done by providing more information, training and awareness raising on the importance of advocating on the contribution of the cultural sector to the economy, as well as on existing links between project-focused work conducted by cultural entities and their contribution to policy-related issues affecting the implementation of the Convention.	Convention Secretariat
15	To positively discriminate project proposals that include concrete actions aimed at increasing women's representation in key areas of cultural activity and/or aimed at challenging traditional women roles.	The Committee

16	To review the current Committee's fundraising strategy to ensure that it dedicates more attention to the contributions of Parties and their engagement in a more tailored manner, recognising that not all Parties have the same capacities and resources.	The Committee
17	To work towards meeting the target contribution of 1% (Art.18.3 and 18.7) to strengthen the sustainability of the Fund and overturn the downward tendency of the last 5 years.	Parties to the Convention
18	To strengthen the IFCD's fundraising strategy by incorporating an analytical dimension that ensures an explicit connection between the communications products and concrete fundraising targets (especially those related to Parties contributions).	The Committee
19	To modify the current success target of 50% of contributing countries so that instead of focusing on ensuring that at least half of the Parties to the Convention give to the Fund, regular amounts are sought in line with the suggested 1% (Art.18.3 and 18.7).	Convention Secretariat
20	To strengthen the use of communication materials on the IFCD. The first suggested step in order to achieve this is to conduct an analysis of the implementation of the different phases of the Communication Strategy to understand what has worked and what requires improvement.	Convention Secretariat
21	To devote more attention to the capacity of project partners and give this factor greater weight in the selection process. Hence the concept notes should include elements that prove the capacity of partners (such as experience, sector expertise, past performance and participation in networks).	The National Commissions and the Panel of Experts

Annex 1 - Main documents consulted

Project documents

- Final report - Strengthening civil society participation in policy advocacy for Bolivia's culture sector, 2016
- Mid - term report - Towards the revision of the National Cultural Policy in Jamaica, 2016
- Mid - term report - Mapping the Haitian music industry, 2016
- Mid - term report - Sustainable development of cultural industries with women and youth in Ilobasco, 2016
- Mid-term report - Approaches to participatory governance of cultural institutions, 2016
- Mid-term report - Building a sustainable performing arts industry in Cambodia, 2015
- Mid-term report - Empowering African youth to harness the potential of the music sector, 2015
- Final report - Developing an efficient policy for the promotion of the cultural industries in Morocco, 2015
- Final report - Emerging Youth: strengthening sub-regional cooperation and promoting young talents in the African music sector, 2015
- Final report - Fostering an active participation of vulnerable groups in the creative sector in Uruguay, 2015
- Final report - Promoting young people's participation in the book and music industries in Mexico, 2015
- Final report - Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies in Serbia, 2015
- Project profile - Strengthening civil society participation in policy advocacy for Bolivia's culture sector, 2015
- Project Profile - Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies in Serbia, 2015
- Final report - Advocacy and information sharing: promoting the creative sector in South Africa, 2014
- Final report - Building a viable and sustainable film industry in Malawi, 2014
- Final report - Decentralisation and cultural policies; a new model of governance for culture in BF, 2014
- Final report - Developing a national strategy on copyright, 2014
- Final report - Funding culture in Peru: unveiling challenges and opportunities, 2014
- Final report - Indigenous E-books- Cultural Entrepreneurship, indigenous creators and digital culture in Brazil, 2014
- Final report - Measuring the social and economic contribution of the cultural industries in Saint Lucia, 2014
- Final report - Promoting the active participation of youth in cultural industries in Paraguay, 2014
- Final report - Strengthening minority language publishing industries in Haiti, Kenya, Nigeria and Serbia, 2014
- Final report - Theatre4youth- bringing theatre closer to the youth in South Africa, 2014

- Project Profile - Decentralization and cultural policies: a new model of governance for culture in Burkina Faso, 2014
- Final Report - A new paradigm for local development strategies in Cameroon, 2013
- Final report - ArtSANow: real-time information on creative industries, 2013
- Final report - Building the creative city: Zagreb's creative industries, 2013
- Final report - Cultural industries as drivers of development, 2013
- Final report - Cultural statistics in action: a clear picture of Mongolia, 2013
- Final Report - Decentralisation – The Diversity of Cultural Expressions and Local Policies, 2013
- Final report - INCREA LAB: opportunities for indigenous cultural entrepreneurs, 2013
- Final Report - Developing an audiovisual industry on Siberut, Indonesia, 2103
- Final report - Management and business training for culture professionals, 2013
- Final report - Measuring the economic contribution of the audiovisual industry, 2013
- Final report - Paralelo 9 MX: strengthening cultural industries for local development, 2013
- Final report - Promoting Afro-Cuban cultural expressions among youth, 2013
- Final Report -Creating a cultural industry around balafons in Côte d'Ivoire. 2013

ICG

- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Tenth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 12-15 December 2016, DCE/16/10.IGC/INF
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS, Tenth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 12 - 15 December 2016, DCE/16/10.IGC/Dec.
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Ninth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 14 - 16 December 2015, CE/15/9.IGC/6
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS, Ninth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 14 - 16 December 2015, CE/15/9.IGC/Dec
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Eighth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 9 - 11 December 2014, CE/14/8.IGC/8
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS, Eighth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 9 - 11 December 2014, CE/14/8.IGC/Dec.
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Seventh ordinary session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 10–13 December 2013, CE/13/7.IGC/8
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Seventh ordinary session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 10–13 December 2013; CE/13/7.IGC/8
- INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Sixth Ordinary Session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters 10 - 14 December 2012, CE/12/6.IGC/7

Conference of Parties

- Parties to the UNESCO 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions that are recognized by UNCTAD as developing economies, economies in transition and least developed countries, February 2017
- CONFERENCE OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Fifth ordinary session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II 10-12 June 2015, CE/15/5.CP/10
- CONFERENCE OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Fourth ordinary session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II 11-14 June 2013, CE/13/4.CP/8
- CONFERENCE OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS Fourth ordinary session Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, Room II 11–14 June 2013, CE/13/4.CP/INF.6

IFCD internal documents

- Application and Selection Procedure, 2017 call, UNESCO 2017
- Application Form for Programmes/Projects for Parties and NGOs 6th cycle, International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), 2016
- Application Form for Programmes/Projects for Parties and NGOs 5th cycle, International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), 2015
- Application Form for Programmes/Projects for Parties and NGOs 4th cycle, International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), 2013
- Application Form for Programmes/Projects for Parties and NGOs 3rd cycle, International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD), 2012
- IFCD Final Results Report Template
- IFCD Financial Report Template
- IFCD Midterm Report Template

- George, H. Feedback for the IFCD 2016
- George, H. Feedback for the IFCD 2015
- Brown, C. Phase II Project report for the implementation of the communications and fundraising strategy, September 2015, ToRs I, II, III
- Carpenter, J. IFCD Expected Results mapped to SDGs
- Carpenter, J. IFCD revised RBMF.

- IFCD, Contributions received 21/03/2017, Excel, 2017
- IFCD, Fundraising Campaign “Your 1% Counts for Creativity”, Exchange and Debate Session, Bios of project managers, 2013
- IFCD, Fundraising Campaign “Your 1% Counts for Creativity”, Exchange and Debate Session, List of participants, 2013
- IFCD, Fundraising Campaign “Your 1% Counts for Creativity”, Exchange and Debate
 - Session, Programme, 2013
- International Fund for Cultural Diversity Annotated Guide, UNESCO 2017
- IFCD, Pre-selection Guide, 2017
- IFCD, Pre-selection Guide, 2016
- Revised Guidelines on the use of the resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) (undated)
 - Diversity (IFCD) (undated)
- IFCD, Facilitator’s guide, Module 4-1 Capacity-Building Workshop on Applying to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (undated)
- IFCD, Facilitator’s guide, Module 4-2 Capacity-Building Workshop on the Pre-selection of applications to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (undated)
- IFCD, Creativity matters a new agenda for sustainable development (2016)
- Approved programme and budget 2016-2017 (38 C5)

- Approved programme and budget 2014-2017 (37 C5)

IFCD updates and brochures

- December 2016 E-update
- October 2016 E-update
- July 2016 E-update
- May 2016 E-update
- December 2015 E-update
- October 2015 E-update
- September 2015 E-update
- May 2015 E-update
- July 2015 E-update
- December 2014 E-update
- November 2014 E-update
- September 2014 E-update
- July 2014 E-update
- May 2014 E-update
- December 2013 E-update
- November 2013 E-update
- September 2013 E-update
- July 2013 E-update
- April 2013 E-update

- Brochure 2016
- Brochure 2015
- Brochure 2014

Other documents external to IFCD

- Ministère De La Culture, Des Arts Et Du Tourisme Burkina Faso Plan D'actions de La Strategie Nationale De La Culture Et Du Tourisme (Pa/Snct) 2018-2020
- 2e Rapport périodique quadriennal (RPQ) du Burkina Faso sur le mise en œuvre Convention de 2005 de l'UNESCO relative protection et à la promotion de la diversité des expressions culturelles. 2017
- Listado de reuniones locales de Telartes, 2017
- Sistematización final de proyecto Telartes, Telartes, 2017
- TELARTES: Fortalecimiento de la participación social para la incidencia política en el espacio cultural de Bolivia, Detalle del plan de procedimiento, 2016
- Scénario Panel de la société civile : La créativité à l'ère du numérique » UNESCO, Paris, décembre 2016
- Movimenta: Foro De Mujeres Políticas Por La Democracia, Autonomía Y Antipatriarcado Movimientos De Base Y Gobiernos- Latinoamérica, 2016
- Strategie De Valorisation Des Arts Et De La Culture Dans Le Systeme Educatif Burkinabe, 2015
- Gender Equality Heritage and Creativity, 2014
- Ministère de la Culture, Des Arts Et Du Tourisme Burkina Faso, Annuaire Statistique 2014
- UNESCO 2014–2021 Medium-Term Strategy
- Basic Texts of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2013
- Burkina Faso Quadrennial periodic report on measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions, 2013
- Serbia Quadrennial periodic report on measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions, 2013

- Felipe Buitrago Restrepo and Iván Duque Márquez, (2013). “La Economía Naranja, una oportunidad infinita Catalogación” Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (BID)
- Bolivia Quadrennial periodic report on Measures to protect and Promote the diversity of cultural expressions, 2012
- Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector: 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, UNESCO 2005
- Report on the “Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector Part IV – 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions”, ICG, 2004

Annex 2 - People consulted

UNESCO staff

- ALONSO CANO, Guiomar, UNESCO Field Office, Senegal
- BAAKRIM, Abdelghani, UNESCO Paris, France
- BAX, Denise, UNESCO Paris, France
- BOUMAIZA, Naima, UNESCO Paris, France
- CASAS, Juanita, UNESCO Paris, France
- CIDONELLI, Emanuele, UNESCO Paris, France
- CLICHE, Danielle, UNESCO Paris, France
- KRAUSE, Anthony, UNESCO Paris, France
- LEE, Doyun, UNESCO Paris, France
- MAYER-ROBITAILLE, Laurence, UNESCO Paris, France
- PATCHETT, Lynne, UNESCO Paris, France
- SANDOVAL RUIZ, Alcira, UNESCO Quito
- SEDIKINA, Katia, UNESCO Paris, France
- TORGLER, Barbara Former UNESCO staff

Parties to the Convention

- BAKYONO KANZIE, Sabine, Permanent Delegation, Burkina Faso
- KOVAC, Aleksandra, Permanent Delegation, Serbia
- LODÉN, Julia, Permanent Delegation of Sweden
- MENDIVIL, Rodrigo, UNESCO Permanent Delegation, Mexico
- TANASKOVIC, Darko, Permanent Delegation, Serbia

UNESCO National Commissions

- CLAUDE, Mballa Jean, UNESCO National Commission, Cameroon
- DA VEIGA GUIMARÃES, Gustavo, UNESCO National Commission, Brasil
- GUERRERO ARELLANO, César, UNESCO National Commission, Mexico
- MAGOMELO, Christopher Julio, UNESCO National Commission, Malawi
- MICHEL-BERTIN, Yolanda, UNESCO National Commission, Saint Lucia
- MOLEPO, Legohu, George UNESCO National Commission, South Africa
- MORÁN, Lidia Angélica, UNESCO National Commission, El Salvador
- NANA, Zabavy, UNESCO National Commission, Côte d'Ivoire
- TSETSENBILEG, Magsarjav, UNESCO National Commission, Mongolia

Expert panel and other key IFCD consultants

- BELGACEM, Ouafa, IFCD Expert Panel
- BROWN, Christopher, IFCD Communication Consultant
- GEORGE, Helen, IFCD Expert Panel
- INKEI, Peter, IFCD Expert Panel
- KAMARA, Yarri, IFCD Expert Panel
- LIANG, Eugene, IFCD Communication Expert
- RICHARD, Ferdinand, IFCD Expert Panel
- TJARVE, Baiba, IFCD Expert Panel

Stakeholders from projects

- ALEMÁN GUTIÉRREZ, Enrique, IFCD Project Manager, Cuba
- ALVA, Blanca, IFCD Project Manager, Peru
- ÁLVAREZ, Alejandro, Telartes Oruro, Bolivia
- ANTEZANA, Ariel, Cultural Manager, Bolivia
- ANTEZANA, René, Telartes, Bolivia
- ARANCIBIA, Larissa, German Cultural Centre, Bolivia
- ASKOVIC, Radovan, *Pralipe*, Serbia

- BANJONIN, Sandra, Municipality of Zrenjanin, Serbia
- BANROVIC, Nada, Municipality of Arandjelovac, Serbia
- BAWAR, Ousmane, Burkina Faso
- BAZEMO, Hermann Guy Local Authority, Burkina Faso
- BRAMIDO, Criss, Musician, Bolivia
- BRAMIDO, David, Musician, Bolivia
- CHACON, Mónica, Telartes Potosí, Bolivia
- CHEYNET, Grégoire, IFCD Project Manager, Uruguay
- COMPAORÉ, Pascal, Burkina Faso
- COTILLAS, Daniel, Telartes, Bolivia
- CRUZ, Jhade, *Martadero*, Bolivia
- DE MARCHI, Cecilia, Telartes, Bolivia
- ESPINOZA, Juan, Telartes, Bolivia
- ESTRADA, Sergio, *La Red*, Bolivia
- FREDES, Lil, Telartes, Bolivia
- GARCÍA, Fernando, IFCD Project Manager Telartes, Bolivia
- GERLIC, Sebastian, IFCD Project Manager, Brasil
- GOJIC, Dusanka, *Heritag*, Serbia
- GROUX, Pablo, Former Minister, Bolivia
- HARDIE, Yvette, IFCD Project Manager, South Africa
- ISSOUFU, Gansoré, Burkina Faso
- JOVANOVIĆ, Stela, City of Nis, Serbia
- KARAVIDA, Vesna, Municipality of Zrenjanin, Serbia
- KNEŽEVIĆ, Maja, Culture affairs, Standing conference of municipalities, Serbia
- KOALA, Vincent, Burkina Faso
- LANZA, Alejandra, Independent artist, Bolivia
- LEGA, Hamed Patric, IFCD Project Coordinator, Burkina Faso
- LOREDO, Gróber, Elwaky, Bolivia
- MAKORE, Samuel, IFCD Project Manager, Zimbabwe
- MAMBOUROU, Soma, Burkina Faso
- MANASSE, Nguinambaye Ndoua, IFCD Project Manager, Chad
- MARÍN, Marco, Telartes, Bolivia
- MARINKOV, Biljana, *Razboj*, Pirot, Serbia
- MEDA, Bermille Stanislas, Burkina Faso
- MIKIC, Hristina, IFCD Project Manager, Serbia
- MILANOVIĆ, Gordana, *Heritag*, Serbia
- MILJIC, Stefan, Youth Ambassador Network, Nis, Serbia
- MINCIC, Irena, Women of South, Serbia
- MUNTEAN, Asja Drača, Ministry of Culture, Serbia
- NEBIÉ, Denise, Burkina Faso
- NIKOLIĆ, Boban, Municipality of Pirot, Serbia
- NYATHI, Butholezwe Kgosi, IFCD Project Manager, Zimbabwe
- OBANDO, Susana, Telartes, Bolivia
- OIL, Mario, Band Manager, Bolivia
- OUATTARA, Sy Abdel Aziz, Burkina Faso
- OUEDRAOGO, Désiré, Former IFCD Project Manager, Burkina Faso
- OUEDRAOGO, Joseph, Burkina Faso
- OUEDRAOGO, Salfo, Burkina Faso
- PADILLA, Diego, IFCD Project Manager, Guatemala
- PENCIC, Marija, Women of South, Serbia
- PETROVIC, Nenad, Municipality of Pirot, Serbia
- PIMENTEL, Gabriela, Independent artist, Bolivia
- PRUVOST, Neige, French Alliance, Bolivia
- PUERTA, Nils, Cultural Centre Tarija, Bolivia
- PUYA, Thomas Dakin, Burkina Faso
- QUIROGA, Fabiola, Telartes, Bolivia
- RADONJIC, Estela, Institute for Heritage Protection, Serbia

- RAKCEVIC, Igor, IFCD Project Manager, Montenegro
- REGNAULT, Eric, IFCD Project Manager, Cambodia
- RIVADINEIRA, Neysa, Telartes, Bolivia
- ROJAS, Ivonne, Journalist, Bolivia
- ROMERO, Uvaldo, Regional Government, Bolivia
- SAAVEDRA, Viviana, Bolivia Lab, La Paz, Bolivia
- SALVADOR, José, IFCD Project Manager Hernández Munguía, El Salvador
- SANDLER, Milena, IFCD Project Manager, Haiti
- SEGDA, Adama, Burkina Faso
- SKOKO, Olivera, Municipality of Zrenjanin, Serbia
- SONDÉ, Adama, Burkina Faso
- SORÉ, Toussaint Moumouni, Burkina Faso
- STOJEV, Marija, Women of South, Serbia
- TEPIC, Miroslav, Municipality of Temerin, Serbia
- TOMIC, Vesna, City of Nis, Serbia
- TORRES, Elizabeth, Cultural Centre Simón I. Patiño, Bolivia
- TOSIC, Silvana, *Razboj*, Pirot, Serbia
- TRAJKOSKA, Zaneta, IFCD Project Manager, Macedonia
- UGARTE. Nelson, Telartes Amazonia, Bolivia
- VÁZQUEZ, Silvana, Gender activist, Bolivia
- VIDAURRE, Wiler, Art and Talent School, Bolivia
- VUYK, Cecilia, IFCD Project Manager, Paraguay
- ZAMELLI, Tamara, IFCD Project Manager, Croatia
- ZARATTI, Andrés, Culture, Municipal Government La Paz, Bolivia
- ZIVKOVIC, Snezena, Women of South, Serbia
- ZOROM, Idrissa, Burkina Faso
- ZOUNGRANA, Jérôme, Burkina Faso

ANNEX 3 - Relations with project

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation Questions	Interview questions	Admin Council	IFPC Sec	IFPC Finance	IFPC Senior	Evaluat or	Other UNESCO Funds	Board of project	Bellwether	Co-funder	Partner govt	Partner govt local	Project manager	Project staff	Audience	Support services	UFO	
Relevance: Understanding how appropriately the purpose and eligibility criteria formulated by the Fund and the interventions that were approved under the Fund responded to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries and other key stakeholders (implementing partners, UNESCO, etc.) throughout the life of the projects.	Extent to which the projects implemented are aligned with the aims and strategies of the Fund .	From your point of view, which are the main aims of the Fund? How do the projects relate to these aims?	x	x										x					
	Alignment with UNESCO's mandate , structure and strategic frameworks	How is the Fund aligned with UNESCO's mandate and structure? (think concrete alignment with specific strategies and structures)		x		x												x	
	Complementarity to other UNESCO Funds (i.e. what makes this Fund different and what is its added value vis à vis other UNESCO initiatives)	What would you say is unique about the IFPC? Do you feel that there is any duplication or overlap? What is its added value?		x		x		x											
	Extent to which the eligibility criteria are in line with implementing partners' mandate and congruent with their strategic framework	Which is your organisation's mandate and strategic framework?					x		x					x					
	How the approved projects are addressing in nature and scope the challenges and needs of women and men participants in a fair and equal manner. (According to men & women participants & according to official cultural plans)	What do you think the cultural priorities are and how are they being addressed (by the IFPC and by each project). How have the different cultural priorities and needs of men and women been taken into account? How have the cultural priorities of young people been taken into account?								x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Efficiency: Understanding the extent to which the resources made available through the Fund are being used wisely and timely used in relation with the results that the projects are contributing to.	Call for proposal and screening process: Eligibility criteria (clarity and scope); adequacy of screening tool, etc. IMP: son todos los que están y están todos los que son?	Please provide a description of the entire selection process (access to info on call announcement). Give us an assessment of the eligibility process (call + screening)? What has worked and what hasn't?																	
	Implementing model: Adequacy of funding cycle, information flows & decision making with implementing partners; administrative procedures; reporting mechanisms (including suitability of monitoring indicators requested by the Fund)	Give me a thorough description of what happens from the moment the decision is taken to provide the grant until the project is administratively closed (ask for financial reports, guidelines, welcome pack, which reports reach them, what the reports are/should be for) Red light for cancellation what makes you cancel a project? Communication and experience sharing among projects (synergies). What support do you provide-get? What worked/what didn't? Expectations?																	
	General finance mechanism: Adequacy of the financial flow, from donation mechanisms to disbursement.	Description and assessment of funding mechanism (IFPC Fin); donation system (IFPC Senior).	X	X	X									X	X			X	
	Quality of the products/experiences: Were the experiences/products facilitated by the project perceived of high quality according to participants?	Parameters: timeliness, scope and technical/artistic level. Please state some example of high quality products/outputs and why.																	
	Leverage of funds invested – were they used strategically? Were they able to attract more resources? Was there complementarity with other funds available in the field of culture?	Were they able to attract more resources? Was there complementarity with other funds available in the field of culture?																	
	Visibility of UNESCO's contribution to the project/s.	How was the brand used? Assessment.	X	X		X	X				X	X				X	X		X

Annex 4: Recommendations of the 2012 IOS Evaluation

The IOS 2012 IFCD Evaluation Report suggested a series of 35 recommendations aimed at strengthening the Fund. Since then, the IFCD has taken all the required steps to effectively implement the 30 recommendations accepted at the Sixth Ordinary Session of the IGC held in December 2012 (listed below)

Recommendation
1. Continue engaging in the Cultural Conventions Liaison Group to harmonize procedures of the various UNESCO Funds, to increase synergies, and to avoid overlaps in focus and funding. (Secretariat)
2. Consult with the Administrative Council of the IFPC to explore potential areas of competition and overlap and devise strategies to avoid these. (IGC)
3. Define “institutional infrastructures” and include the definition in the IFCD Guidelines. (IGC)
4. Remove “capacity-building” as a separate field of activity and link it to the other fields of activity related to cultural policy and cultural industries; and/or make capacity-building part of the over-arching purpose of the Fund. (IGC)
5. Widen the policy related field of activity from cultural policies to “cultural and other policies and measures that have a direct effect on the creation, production, dissemination, distribution of and access to cultural activities, goods and services”. (IGC)
6. Prioritise programmes/projects that, in addition to fulfilling the quality criteria outlined in the Guidelines, also respond to certain strategic considerations. Clearly identify these strategic considerations in line with the specific objectives of the Fund (yet to be developed) and review them on an ongoing basis as the Fund develops. This is an urgent priority if the IFCD is to continue beyond its pilot phase. (IGC)
7. Develop a vision for the future direction of the IFCD and a results framework with short and long-term objectives, time-frames and indicators. (IGC)
8. Establish clear resource mobilisation targets that are linked to the objectives specified in the results framework. (IGC)
10. Ensure that future projects chosen for IFCD funding include both short and long-term targets at the output and outcome levels in their planning and that results are reported on at both these levels. (IGC)
11. Ensure that the project duration of IFCD-funded projects is adapted to what they are trying to accomplish. This might require two-year periods for projects that aim to achieve sustained cultural change, including a shift in beliefs, values and behaviour, or policy impact. (IGC)
12. Work with UNESCO Field Offices to systematically ensure complementarity and synergies between the IFCD-funded projects and other UNESCO work at the country level. (Secretariat)
13. Pay particular attention to the sustainability of the projects. This needs to be done in the selection of the projects to be funded, in subsequent monitoring and when reviewing project reports. (Secretariat)
14. Include the promotion of gender equality as a criterion in the assessment forms used by the Panel of Experts and in the IFCD Guidelines. (IGC)
15. Make the key achievements/ results of projects funded by the IFCD, good practices and lessons learned, available to all stakeholders, so that learning can happen across organizations and countries involved. (Secretariat)
16. Complement, under the umbrella of the future knowledge management platform, all web-based knowledge management efforts related to the IFCD and to the Convention with initiatives that solicit stakeholders’ active participation in order to make them part of a larger learning community, and also use social media, such as Facebook, Twitter and others for this purpose. (Secretariat)
17. Establish clear criteria for the selection of a gender-balanced Panel of Experts with complementary expertise in the following areas: a) specialisation in cultural policy and/or cultural industries; b) experience in assessing projects; c) work experience in international technical cooperation; d) in-depth work experience in one of the regions; e) understanding of gender mainstreaming and gender-specific programming; f) fluency (oral and written) in English and/or French with a good understanding of the other language. Spanish is an asset.
18. The members of the Expert Panel should be proposed by the Secretariat and approved by the IGC. (IGC)
19. Disseminate information on future calls for applications through UNESCO Field Offices, National Commissions, 2005 Convention national focal points and civil society organisations that are observers to the IGC. Encourage all these entities to publish information on the Fund in their countries’ languages. (Secretariat)
20. Clarify in the communication to National Commissions and to potential applicants whether National Commissions are allowed to charge any fee for the mailing of applications to the IFCD or for any other services rendered in this context. (Secretariat)
21. Launch for the call for applications at least six months before the June 30 th deadline to ensure that organisations have enough time to prepare their applications. Request National Commissions to give applicants at least two months to prepare their application files. (Secretariat)
22. Designate national/regional focal points in UNESCO Field Offices who can provide information and assistance to applicants during the application process. (Secretariat)

23. Provide INGOs with more direction with regard to the support letters that they need to seek from governments. (Secretariat)
25. To avoid any conflict of interest, exclude National Commissions and any other organisations participating in the selection panel, from the list of stakeholders eligible to apply for IFCD funding. (IGC)
26. To avoid the disqualification of some applications for minor technicalities or for the absence of a corresponding assessment by the National Commission, request the missing elements from the National Commission rather than disqualify the project. (Secretariat)
27. Rotate members of the Panel of Experts (while ensuring continuity of the work of the Panel) by replacing at least one expert per year, and allowing each expert to serve a maximum of four years. Provide training to experts on the priorities of the IFCD and the Convention and allow them to ideally meet at least once face-to-face. (IGC)
28. Convene a joint telephone meeting for all experts once they have completed the assessment of project proposals to discuss their assessments and the reasoning behind them. (Secretariat)
30. Consider removing “preparatory assistance” from the fields of activity in the IFCD Guidelines for the reasons outlined above. (IGC)
31. Strengthen the capacities of the IFCD Secretariat so that it can undertake all actions required to improve the quality of the work of the IFCD and to ensure its future performance. (IGC)
32. Ensure the submission and review of all outstanding contract deliverables for the 2010 IFCD programme cycle, including descriptive reports on project implementation as well as detailed financial reports together with the original supporting documentation for expenditures. (Secretariat)
35. Plan for another evaluation exercise of the IFCD in 2017 or 2018. (IGC)

The IFCD has regularly reported to the IGC on the implementation of the recommendations and their implementation status has been an agenda item in all the IGC meetings held since the approval of the recommendations

The remaining recommendations (namely 9, 24, 29, 33 and 34) were not approved for the reasons summarised below:

Recommendation 9 proposed the development of an exit strategy. This option was discarded since the majority of the IGC members considered that it would ‘send the wrong message to donors especially when the Convention is in need of more projects and programmes to build its credibility and visibility and raise its profile in the field of creative industries and in the creative sector’ and also regarded the exit strategy ‘untimely (...) given the fact that the Convention was fairly young and there was room for further development in the implementation of the Convention’ (CE/13/4.CP/INF.6, para 10).

Recommendations 24 & 29 suggested strengthening the role of UNESCO field offices by increasing their engagement in both the project pre-selection process and activity monitoring during implementation. This recommendation was motivated by the fact that the evaluation had revealed the importance of Field Offices for both effective monitoring and for the sustainability of projects. However, the decision was taken not to pursue this recommendation given the lack of homogeneity that exists across Field Offices (different resources, technical capacities, expertise etc.) and the fact that they are not present in every country (CE/13/4.CP/INF.6, para 11).

Recommendation 33 proposed recovering the costs of the Secretariat from the IFCD and the IGC opposed, citing previous discussions on staff and coordination costs in the case of other UNESCO standard-setting instruments (CE/13/4.CP/INF.6, para 12). This recommendation was in fact implemented at a later stage and since 2015, cost-recovery policy has also been applied to the IFCD.

Recommendation 34 suggested not launching the 2013 call for projects (third year of the pilot phase of the IFCD) but was not approved due to the possible impact of this measure on the

visibility of the Fund if projects in developing countries were discontinued (CE/13/4.CP/INF.6, para 13).

ANNEX 5 - Project Recommended by the IFCD Panel of Experts

Score	Beneficiary Country	Project N°	Applicant
33.5	Bolivia	0308	Fundación Imagen (NGO)

Project title	Strengthening civil society participation in policy advocacy for Bolivia´s culture sector
Project duration	March 2016 – February 2017
Aim	The project aims to reinforce the network of creative actors in nine regions of Bolivia by building their capacities with improved skills in communication and cultural management and strengthening inclusion and participation in policy development.
Brief summary (§ 19.1)	Fundación Imagen, a non-governmental organisation committed to promoting socio-cultural and economic development in disadvantaged sectors of culture and the arts, proposes to: 1) strengthen the role of civil society in policy making and implementation; 2) widen the participation of excluded individuals and social groups in cultural and creative industries; 3) generate knowledge on the experiences in cultural innovation in Bolivia; and 4) strengthen the capacities of over 135 cultural industries stakeholders in the fields of communication and multimedia.
Potential impact and expected results (§ 19.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of civil society in policy making and implementation is strengthened in nine departments: Beni, Cochabamba, Chuquisaca, La Paz, Oruro, Pando, Potosí, Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Tarija – Fundación Imagen will organize meetings to promote sectorial discussions and legislative proposals as well as working groups between civil society organisations and the government to work together on drafting laws of culture. Four sessions on socialization of the Law of Cultures and workshops on the draft Law on Cultural Spaces and the proposal for the Artist Act, will also be conducted. Gender equality will be promoted in each activity, ensuring 50% participation of women. • Participation in cultural and creative industries is widened to previously excluded individuals and social groups - A digital database of resources related to cultural and creative industries will be elaborated and shared in nine departments. In addition, local meetings will be held to provide training on the use of the interactive tool “minka.me”, nurture local cultural projects and strengthen collaborative communities. Furthermore, a manual for the formulation of cultural projects and a data bank of cultural projects will be developed. • Knowledge from systematized experiences and cultural tools are produced - the best practices in cultural innovation in Bolivia and Fundación Imagen´s experience in civil society advocacy as well as its methodological tools will be digitally systematized into 13 audio-visual material. • The capacities of over 135 cultural industries stakeholders are strengthened in the fields of communication and multimedia – Fundación Imagen will organize workshops on network communication and the generation of multimedia content. In addition to maintaining a communication web platform that facilitates interaction between main actors, 3 inter-institutional communication management manuals on Culture Network, Open Communication, and Internal

	Communication will be created.
Recommended amount in US\$	99,340
Financial management and accountability (§ 19.3)	<p>Fundación Imagen has long standing administrative and financial management experience in at least 20 cultural projects at different scales.</p> <p>An accounting tool adapted to cultural management called SICOCEP will be used.</p>
Relevance to the objectives and the areas of intervention of the IFCD (§ 19.4 and 19.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforces local skills and professional capacities - This project will strengthen the capacities of cultural actors in Bolivia by providing training in policy development, cultural management, communication and multimedia, underlining the importance of cultural collaboration. • Widens and promotes the active participation of new actors in the cultural and creative industries – the project promotes an active participation of excluded groups in the culture sector.
Feasibility and modalities of execution (§ 19.5)	<p>The applicant is the largest cultural collaborative network in Bolivia promoting the development of cultural industries.</p> <p>The applicant's organizational capacity is demonstrated with the expected collaboration of a large group of non-paid contractors, individuals and NGOs.</p>
Sustainability (§ 19.6)	<p>The project will contribute to the development of policy actions and directly respond to local needs to foster inclusive national development of Bolivian cultural industries. Furthermore, it will increase the national capacity for greater inclusion in cultural industries and policy development across Bolivia and therefore enhance the potential long-term effects of the project.</p>
Comments from evaluators (§ 19.7)	<p>The evaluators recommend this project as it is a well-conceived and relevant proposal that directly aligns with the objectives of the IFCD, especially in creating structural change at the policy and institutional levels. It demonstrates what civil society can achieve through advocacy and networking to effectively influence public cultural policies.</p> <p>The evaluators, however, consider that the project will need to source other funds to meet the full project costs.</p>

ANNEX 6 - IFCD Project Recommended by Expert Panel

Score	Country	Request number	Applicant	Field of activity	Focus on capacity-building for cultural policies
35	Burkina Faso	2014/141	Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Burkina Faso (State Party)	Cultural policies	Yes

Project title	Decentralization and cultural policies: a new model of governance for culture in Burkina Faso
Project duration	June 2014-December 2016
Aim	The project aims to strengthen cultural development at the local authority level through elaborating and implementing cultural policies and programmes and building capacities at this level.
Brief summary (§ 16.1)	The Directorate of Studies and Planning of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Burkina Faso, the office in charge of elaborating cultural policies and monitoring their implementation, proposes to: 1) support the elaboration and implementation of cultural policies and programmes in the main communes of 13 regions; 2) strengthen the capacities of local authorities to facilitate the implementation of these cultural policies and programmes; and 3) establish forums for cooperation and dialogue among local authorities, local cultural players and national authorities.
Expected results and impact (§ 16.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main communes of 13 regions in Burkina Faso have a cultural policy and programme – an awareness campaign with local elected officials, local cultural players and civil society and development stakeholders in the main urban communes of the 13 regions will be organized to facilitate their support of the decentralization of cultural action. The policies and programmes will be developed and validated for the benefit of the 13 communes. • The capacities of the local elected officials and cultural players, as well as the representatives of civil society of the main communes of the 13 regions, are strengthened - Stakeholders will be trained in planning and monitoring cultural policies, searching for partnerships to find local cultural initiatives, developing cultural and artistic activities and structuring of cultural players. • Forums for local and national cooperation are created and are functional – 13 local consultation forums in the main communes of the regions for monitoring the local cultural policy and programme will be created. Furthermore, a national forum for cooperation between Ministry of Culture and local authority representatives, local cultural players and civil society will be established in Ouagadougou.
Recommended amount in US\$ (§ 16.3)	100,000
Relevance to the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to the implementation of public policies to promote cultural

<p>objectives of the Convention and the fields of activity of the IFCD (§ 16.4)</p>	<p>industries in Burkina Faso – both the capacity-building of policy-makers and the awareness-raising campaign are instrumental in ensuring effective policy interventions to develop competitive and dynamic local cultural industries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaffirms the importance of the link between culture and development – training local authorities, local cultural players and representatives of civil society provides them with the tools and resources to understand the value of culture and the opportunities that it brings to development processes. • Engages the active cooperation of public and civil society stakeholders – establishing forums for cooperation and dialogue among key local cultural players fosters better monitoring of the decentralization of cultural action.
<p>Feasibility and expected structural impact (§ 16.5)</p>	<p>The project's budget is realistic and its main activities are well coordinated and in line with the proposed objectives, which demonstrates the organizational capacity of the applicant.</p> <p>The project is consistent with the new development policies and strategies of the Government of Burkina Faso and addresses the main concerns of the local authorities which now manage cultural action together with the national authorities. Currently, the communes of Burkina Faso have municipal development plans that do not take cultural aspects into account. This project will eventually enable local authorities to have the tools to manage local cultural affairs.</p> <p>The project involves the participation of all stakeholders in the issue of local cultural development in Burkina Faso: local elected officials, civil society, the Association of Burkina Faso Municipalities (AMBF), the Association of Regions and cultural professional organizations, decentralized directorates of the Ministries of Culture, Territorial Administration and Economy, as well as the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.</p> <p>The structural impact of the project is provided through the development of local cultural policies and programmes to promote cultural industries and create national forums for cooperation and dialogue in charge of monitoring these policies and programmes.</p>
<p>Comments from the evaluators</p>	<p>Evaluators strongly support this project because of its feasibility and its impact on local cultural industries. In addition, the aims of the project are in line with the objectives of the 2005 Convention and the IFCD.</p> <p>The budget is split equally and the US\$100,000 requested is entirely devoted to the activities. None of the sum is allocated to wages.</p> <p>However, the evaluators have observed that the project team does not comprise a financial manager. It is recommended that this shortcoming is corrected and that when the contract is signed it includes the financial manager's name among the members of the project team.</p>

Background

The International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereinafter “the IFCD”) is a multi-donor voluntary Fund established under Article 18 of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Convention”) to facilitate international cooperation for sustainable development and poverty reduction, and to foster the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors in developing countries that are Parties to the Convention.

The overall goal of the IFCD is to support the implementation of the 2005 Convention and the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors in developing countries, through strengthening the means to create, produce, distribute and have access to diverse cultural goods and services.

The IFCD became operational in 2010. Since then, 90 projects in 51 developing and least developed countries have been funded up to US\$ 100,000 per project. The total funding provided to those projects amounted to more than US\$ 6 million at the end of 2016.

According to the [Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD](#) (para. 22) and Resolution 5.CP 14 (para. 4), an evaluation of the Fund shall be carried out every five years. A first evaluation was conducted in 2012 and made a number of recommendations whose implementation has closely been followed up on by the Intergovernmental Committee of the 2005 Convention. The 2017 evaluation shall assess progress made on the implementation of recommendations by the previous evaluation, identify lessons learned and make further recommendations that will inform the future governance and implementation of the IFCD.

1. Objectives

Within the framework of the IFCD, the evaluator(s) shall undertake the following activity under the supervision of the IFCD Secretariat:

The purpose of the overall evaluation is to generate findings and recommendations regarding the relevance and the effectiveness of the IFCD in the context of the 2005 Convention. The evaluation recommendations are expected to inform the future management and governance of the Fund, and the Secretariat’s efforts to monitor and support the implementation of the projects funded by it.

Points to be addressed in the exercise:

- The overall relevance of the IFCD, and its added value to the implementation of the 2005 Convention;
- The level of implementation of the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD, and of the Results Based-Management Framework (RBM) for the IFCD applied in 2015-2016;
- The level of implementation of the recommendations from the 2012 evaluation of the IFCD.

- The extent to which the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD and the decisions adopted by the Committee provide adequate guidance for the governance and management of the IFCD;
- The degree of implementation, efficiency and quality delivered on outputs and outcomes of projects funded by the IFCD;
- The effectiveness of the governance and management of the IFCD, including the responsibility of the Panel of Experts, resource mobilization, knowledge management, monitoring as well as administrative mechanisms;

The evaluation will cover the period from June 2012 up to the time of the evaluation in 2017 (funding cycles 3 to 6) given that the first evaluation of the IFCD covered projects from the first two cycles (2010 and 2011).

Part A. Evaluation of the IFCD governance and management

The following questions are to be addressed:

(i) To what extent did the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD and the additional criteria adopted by the Committee provide adequate guidance for the governance and management of the IFCD?

- How useful are they in terms of guiding the management of the Fund?
- To what extent have they been implemented?
- To determine this, special attention will be paid to:
 - eligibility criteria and clarity of the objectives of the programmes/projects.
 - role and capacity of IFCD Secretariat
 - role of the National Commissions and their capacity for reviewing projects;
 - role of civil society and its access to IFCD resources;
 - criteria and method for selecting experts to serve on the evaluation panel;
 - approval process for projects submitted for funding;
 - duration of the funding cycle.

(ii) To what extent were the management mechanisms put in place by the Secretariat successful in ensuring effective implementation of the IFCD, in particular the implementation of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD revised in 2013, the implementation of the recommendations on the first evaluation (2013-2016) and the implementation of the RBM framework (2013-2016), and supporting project output delivery?

Particularly:

1. How much have the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD improved the governance and management?
2. To what extent has the implementation of the recommendations of the previous evaluation improved the governance and management? Which lessons can be drawn?
3. To what extent has the RBM Framework of the Fund been implemented?

4. And how has this helped in terms of monitoring the implementation of the Fund and keeping track of progress made?

5. What lessons can be learned from this mechanism in terms of further improving and implementing the framework in the future?

6. To what extent is the RBM Framework of the Fund aligned with the overall framework of the Convention (as described in the Global Report), and what steps need to be taken in order to better align the two of them?

To address these questions, special attention will be paid to:

- use of human and technical resources, the organizational structure managing the Fund, working and information documents as well as decision-making by the governing bodies;
- procedures for submitting project applications and application forms;
- examination of the eligibility of the requests by the Secretariat;
- evaluation of the technical assessment by the Panel of Experts;
- coordination of the experts' work with the Secretariat and amongst the experts;
- working methods of experts and their tools for evaluation and communication;
- forms used to present the results of the experts' evaluation to the Committee;
- accessibility and evaluation on the online platform;
- contract management;
- visibility of the IFCD and a comprehension of the fields of activity by the relevant stakeholders and the public; and
- transparency of the process as a whole.

Part B. Evaluation of the relevance of the IFCD and of the results achieved so far

The following questions should be addressed:

I. How relevant is the Fund in terms of responding to Parties' needs and expectations?

II. What is its overall value added (in the context of the larger implementation of the 2005 Convention)?

III. To what extent do the projects reflect the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD, the additional criteria adopted by the Committee and the priorities of the Convention?

IV. How much are the projects aligned with the objectives of the Convention?

V. To what extent have the programmes/projects achieved their medium and long term outcomes and results?

To what extent have projects contributed to advancing Gender Equality?

VI. What are the reasons for the non-achievement of results?

VII. What were the main difficulties faced by beneficiary countries and stakeholders to implement the projects?

- VIII. What monitoring mechanisms have the programmes/projects put in place? To what extent have these been effective? What monitoring indicators can be recommended for incorporation into the application forms?
- IX. How did the activities of the projects address the objectives identified?
- X. Did the programmes/projects' objectives address the identified needs of the target group(s)?
- XI. Do beneficiaries have the financial and human capacity to ensure the sustainability of programmes/projects?
- XII. Has funding from multiple sources been a determining factor for the selection?
- XIII. What was the degree of visibility achieved by the projects? How visible is the 2005 Convention and UNESCO?
- XIV. In what ways have the Parties used and relayed information provided through the communication tools developed by the Secretariat?
- XV. To what extent is the IFCD complementary to other international funds covering similar fields (within and outside UNESCO)?

Part C. Assessment of the IFCD incomes and expenditures

The following points are to be addressed:

- (i) How much of the funding from the IFCD is going towards operational costs and how much towards projects?
- (ii) To what extent did the IFCD mobilize funding in accordance with the fundraising strategy that was developed? To what extent has the diversification of the donor base helped increase the funding mobilized?
- (iii) How efficient are the management and governance mechanisms of the IFCD?

2. Eligibility/qualifications/experience requirements:

The evaluation will be carried out by an external team of evaluators with the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years' experience in the field of monitoring and evaluation;
- Proven experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects in the field of culture;
- Advanced university degree in specialized fields of culture, social science, law, public policy, international relations or related fields.
- Understanding and knowledge of UNESCO's normative instruments in the field of culture and especially of the 2005 Convention would be an asset;
- Understanding and knowledge of the UN mandates in relation to Human Rights and Gender Equality issues;
- Excellent analytical and demonstrated drafting skills in English and working knowledge of French.
- Fluency in Spanish would be an asset.

3. Methodology

The evaluator(s) will be expected to

- Review all documentation related to the governance, management and implementation of the IFCD (3rd to 7th cycles)

- undertake telephone and/or Skype interviews with members of the UNESCO Secretariat, representatives of Parties to the 2005 Convention, and external partners and stakeholders (including the actual beneficiaries of the IFCD)
- undertake a minimum of 3 field visits to project holders (from various cycles and in different geographic regions), determined jointly with IFCD Secretariat.
- submit five deliverables according to the reporting schedule in Part 6 below.

4. Inputs

The IFCD Secretariat will provide the evaluator(s) with all documentation available, a list of key stakeholders to interview as well as a geographically representative list of IFCD financed projects illustrating the diversity of funded projects (activity type and scope, applicant status, ...).

5. Timing

Call for tender launch: 23 January 2017

Deadline for reception of quotes: 15 February 2017

Starting date: 1 March 2017

Delivery: 15 September 2017

6. Deliverables

The evaluator(s) shall submit the following reports:

- a. Inception Report: A detailed work plan of 10 pages proposing the methods, sources and procedures used for the evaluation and including all deliverables and deadlines to be submitted within the first two weeks of the contract (15 March 2017 the latest);
- b. Draft Report: A report containing the findings of the research and interviews undertaken in the field, as well as a series of initial observations and recommendations to be submitted 9 June 2017 the latest;
- c. Revised Draft Report: A report taking into account IFCD Secretariat's comments, to be submitted 24 July 2017;
- d. Final Draft Report to be submitted 4 September 2017;
- e. Final Evaluation Report: A report containing all findings, observations, conclusions and recommendations for the IFCD's monitoring and evaluation exercise to be submitted 15 September 2017 at the latest.

This report of 40 pages (annexes not included) should be structured as follows:

- executive summary (maximum four pages)
- programme description
- evaluation purpose
- evaluation methodology
- findings
- lessons learned
- recommendations

- annexes (including interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, balance sheets, terms of reference, etc.).

7. How to Apply:

Qualified candidates are requested to submit the following documents to IFCD Secretariat (ifcd.convention@unesco.org) by **15 February 2017 at noon, Paris, France time, at the latest:**

- a. an up-to-date curriculum-vitae;
- b. a statement indicating how your qualifications and experience make you suitable for the assignment;
- c. an indication of the approach you will adopt to carry out the assignment, including any inputs that may be required from UNESCO;
- d. the overall cost of the assignment, expressed in US dollars as an overall lump-sum in a separate file. Any travel and subsistence requirements should be indicated separately.

The statement should clearly illustrate how the evaluator(s) responds to the eligibility requirements indicated above and intends to achieve the objectives of this exercise.

Contact Information

UNESCO Culture Sector, Division for Creativity

Attn: International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)

Email: ifcd.convention2005@unesco.org

ANNEX 9: Comparative table of countries considered as eligible according to UNCTAD, the 2016 Human Development Index and the OECD's DAC List of ODA Recipients

*List of Parties to the UNESCO 2005 Convention that are recognized by UNCTAD as developing economies, economies in transition and least developed countries, and that according to paragraph 1 of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD, are eligible for funding (Status of 20 February 2017 - Reference list used for the IFCD 8th Call).

**According to the United Nations 2016 Human Development Index, List of Low and Medium Human Development Countries that would still be eligible for IFCD Funding.

***According to the OECD's DAC List of ODA Recipients, countries that would still be eligible for IFCD Funding.

****Antigua and Barbuda, Chile and Uruguay exceeded the high income country threshold in 2012 and 2013. In accordance with the DAC rules for revision of this List, all three will graduate from the List in 2017 if they remain high income countries until 2016.

Countries that would not be considered as eligible for IFCD funding if reference list is changed.



UNCTAD*	HDI**	DAC***
Afghanistan		
Albania	High HD	
Algeria	High HD	
Angola		
Antigua and Barbuda	High HD	****
Argentina	Very High HD	
Armenia	High HD	
Azerbaijan	High HD	
Bahamas	High HD	
Bangladesh		
Barbados	High HD	
Belarus	High HD	
Belize	High HD	
Benin		
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	High HD	
Brazil	High HD	
Burkina Faso		
Burundi		
Cambodia		
Cameroon		
Central African Republic		
Chad		
Chile	Very High HD	****
China	High HD	
Colombia	High HD	
Comoros		
Congo		
Costa Rica	High HD	
Côte d'Ivoire		
Cuba	High HD	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		
Djibouti		
Dominica	High HD	
Dominican Republic	High HD	
Ecuador	High HD	
Egypt		
El Salvador		
Equatorial Guinea		
Ethiopia		
Gabon		
Gambia		
Georgia	High HD	
Ghana		
Grenada	High HD	
Guatemala		
Guinea		
Guyana		
Haiti		
Honduras		
India		
Indonesia		
Iraq		
Jamaica	High HD	

UNCTAD*	HDI**	DAC***
Jordan	High HD	
Kenya		
Kuwait	Very High HD	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		
Lesotho		
Madagascar		
Malawi		
Mali		
Mauritania		
Mauritius	High HD	
Mexico	High HD	
Mongolia	High HD	
Montenegro	Very High HD	
Morocco		
Mozambique		
Namibia		
Nicaragua		
Niger		
Nigeria		
Oman	High HD	
Palestine		
Panama	High HD	
Paraguay		
Peru	High HD	
Qatar	Very High HD	
Republic of Korea	Very High HD	
Republic of Moldova		
Rwanda		
Saint Kitts and Nevis	High HD	
Saint Lucia	High HD	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	High HD	
Samoa	High HD	
Senegal		
Serbia	High HD	
Seychelles	High HD	
South Africa		
South Sudan		
Sudan		
Swaziland		
Syrian Arab Republic		
Tajikistan		
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	High HD	
Timor-Leste		
Togo		
Trinidad and Tobago	High HD	
Tunisia	High HD	
Uganda		
Ukraine	High HD	
United Arab Emirates	Very High HD	
United Republic of Tanzania		
Uruguay	High HD	****
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	High HD	
Viet Nam		
Zimbabwe		