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ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:

OPENING

1. **The Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for Culture**, Mr Francesco Bandarin, began byinforming the delegations that the working languages of the meeting were English and French with interpretation provided in both languages, as well as Chinese by courtesy of the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu, the host. Mr Bandarin spoke of his great pleasure and honour in opening the meeting of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group and to offer greetings on behalf of the Director-General. He extended a warm welcome to all the delegations, and he thanked the government of the People’s Republic of China and especially the Ministry of Culture and the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage for making the meeting possible, adding that he was certain that the meeting would have a very important role, if not a decisive role, for the future of the 2003 Convention. China had opened its arms to the 2003 Convention and very often it had occurred here in Chengdu. Mr Bandarin recalled that in 2007 the city had hosted the first Extraordinary session of the Committee where the criteria for the inscription of the Convention’s Lists were shaped prior to their adoption by the Second General Assembly of the States Parties. At that time, the Convention had 75 Member States; today there are 174 States Parties. In 2013, Chengdu was also the scene of the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Convention, which provided a strategic opportunity to discuss the intentions of the framers of the Convention, identifying its achievements, and defining priorities for the future. Both these meetings coincided with the Chengdu International Festival of Intangible Cultural Heritage, as did the present meeting. This meeting would play an important role in shaping the future of this powerful normative instrument. UNESCO’s commitment to results-based management principles had allowed UNESCO to define clear outcome-oriented results and targets to improve the quality of its programming and its capacity to provide the services required by its Member States. It thus seemed logical and commendable that a Convention that entrusts its Secretariat also sought to develop a results framework to improve its effectiveness.
2. **Mr Bandarin** was well aware that a results framework conjured up the notion of monitoring and reporting, a technically complex burden. However, this framework was not an end in itself, but rather a guide to help implement the Convention more effectively and so better safeguard intangible cultural heritage. This work was therefore a necessary and ambitious effort to define expectations in relation to the Convention, focusing on an internationally agreed set of results so as to gather evidence of the extent of intangible cultural heritage today and the extent to which it would continue to experience and transmit intangible cultural heritage tomorrow. Intangible cultural heritage is embodied and perceived in so many different ways that this Convention could only work with a myriad of actors with different aspirations and hopes. This is why a framework is necessary so as to layout a roadmap to help realize the full potential of the Convention. Mr Bandarin looked forward to the outcome of the discussions, both on the indicators to measure the impact of the Convention but also on how the envisaged results framework would improve the periodic reporting mechanism. He reminded the delegations that reporting continued to have less than satisfying compliance, as evidenced by the high proportion of States Parties that did not fulfil this obligation. Nevertheless, he was confident that the key to improving compliance was to ensure that the reporting processes were meaningful and useful to States. Reports themselves should constitute a safeguarding measure, as they should provide the opportunity to identify needs and priorities in terms of safeguarding. Furthermore, given the broader context of the Sustainable Development Goals, and the support that Member States expect from UNESCO in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, it was more necessary than ever to understand the impact of the Convention and the results framework would be one of the main tools used to construct this knowledge. Mr Bandarin concluded by wishing everyone the best deliberations over the coming days.
3. The **Secretary of the Convention,** **Mr Tim Curtis,** welcomed the participants to the meeting, informing them that the six working documents had been made available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/12com-wg) since the statutory deadline of 12 May 2017 in both working languages. Furthermore, for environmental reasons and to reduce costs, only the working document 4 (on defining effective indicators) and the 2016 edition of the Basic Texts of the Convention were available as paper copies.

ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:

ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIR AND RAPPORTEURS

1. **Mr Bandarin** turned to agenda item 2 and the Election of Chairperson, Vice-Chair and Rapporteurs, noting that there was no related working document. He recalled that this meeting was organized following Decision 9.COM/13.e, which decided in 2014 to convene an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group to examine an overall results framework for the Convention. He noted the support of China, and in particular, the Chinese National Commission for UNESCO, which made it possible for work to begin in 2016 in Beijing when the Director-General organized a preliminary meeting of experts to lay the groundwork for the work that would be presented over the next few days. Mr Bandarin then turned to the election, seeking a proposal for the Chairperson.
2. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** nominated H.E. Mr Xuexian Wang from China as the Chairperson, adding that he was well known as one of the founders of the Convention.
3. The **delegation of Belarus** supported the nomination of Mr Xuexian Wang, noting that he was the first Chinese Ambassador to South Africa and former Ambassador of the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations.
4. **Mr Bandarin** noted the support by Belarus and the consensus in the room. Mr Wang was thus proclaimed Chairperson by acclamation. Mr Bandarin congratulated Mr Wang and invited the Chairperson to take his place on the podium.
5. The **Chairperson** was grateful for the trust bestowedon him, adding that he appreciated the gender-neutral word ‘Chair’ and that he was ready to serve with the cooperation of all. He returned to the earlier remarks by Mr Bandarin who recalled the Chengdu meeting in 2007 and the tenth anniversary of the Convention, for which he also served as Chairperson on those occasions. The Chairperson then turned to the election of the Vice-Chairperson and the Rapporteurs, adding that usually there were one or two Rapporteurs, but this time he sought to elect six Rapporteurs, one from each Electoral Group. It was hoped that the end result of the deliberations would thus be geographically balanced and more representative. In addition, the Rapporteurs, together with the Secretariat, would follow the discussions carefully to compile and revise a final text for adoption.
6. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** wished to nominateZambia as a Vice-Chairperson from Africa.
7. The **Chairperson** took note, and sought further proposals for the Rapporteurs.
8. The **delegation of Belgium** seconded the proposal for Zambia as Vice-Chair.
9. The **Chairperson** announced the election of Zambia as Vice-Chair by proclamation. Noting that therewere no further proposals, the Chairperson proposed a short break to enable the States Parties to consult among themselves to elect the Rapporteurs.

*[Coffee break]*

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded with theelection,noting thatevery Electoral Group now had a candidate.
2. On behalf of Group I, the **delegation of Netherlands** proposedAustria as Rapporteur.
3. The **delegation of Belarus** supported the nomination of Austria.
4. On behalf of Group II, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** proposedBelarus as Rapporteur.
5. On behalf of Group III, the **delegation of Jamaica** proposed Colombia as Rapporteur.
6. On behalf of Group IV, the **delegation of Thailand** noted the overwhelming supportfor Republic of Korea to serve as Rapporteur.
7. On behalf of Group V(a), the **delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo** proposed Senegal as Rapporteur.
8. On behalf of Group V(b), the **delegation of Egypt** nominated Jordan as Rapporteur.
9. The **Chairperson** noted that all the Rapporteurs had been nominated, adding that they would serve in their personal capacity rather than on behalf of their States. They were duly elected by proclamation. The Chairperson congratulated the Vice-Chair and all the Rapporteurs, and he looked forward to working together. He invited the Secretary to present the agenda and the preliminary timetable.
10. The **Secretary** wished to first remind the delegationsof the role of the Rapporteurs, given that it was an unusual way of working with six Rapporteurs. He explained that, under agenda item 4, there would be no on-screen editing during the deliberations. All comments would be collected by the six Rapporteurs who would then work during the course of the evenings to consolidate all the points raised and ensure that they were correctly reflected in the document. During agenda item 7, and the adoption of the final report, all the comments would be projected onto the screen. The Secretary reminded the delegations that they would still be able to submit written amendments and proposals at that time. Following the election of the Chairperson, the Vice-Chair and the six Rapporteurs, the Secretary noted that there were six items on the agenda. Agenda item 3, ‘Towards an overall results framework for the Convention: progress to date and objectives of the present meeting’ presented an opportunity for the Secretary to present the background and context of this Working Group, and to clarify the objectives of the meeting, especially for those joining this specific work of developing a results framework for the first time. Agenda item 4, ‘Defining effective indicators’ represented the core and bulk of the work for this Working Group, for which considerable time would be devoted to this item. The Secretary proposed to examine the indicators in working [document 4](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-4_EN.doc) one-by-one. As explained, all the comments would be compiled by the Rapporteurs in order to create a revised and consolidated version of the document, which would then be presented for adoption [under agenda item 7]. Agenda item 5 ‘Linking the overall results framework to periodic reporting’ was the subject of working [document 5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-5-EN.doc), which proposed to explore how the adoption of a results framework for the Convention could affect the periodic reports that States Parties must submit in accordance with Article 29 of the Convention. Agenda item 6, ‘Mobilization of complementary information sources and utilization of collected information’ was the subject of working [document 6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-6_EN.doc), which would look at other possible sources of information more or less directly related to the Convention, but which may interact with this framework. The Secretary remarked on the busy schedule, and despite the tempting offer to visit the Centre of Giant Panda Breeding, Tuesday morning would be used to review the revised indicators that will be circulated beforehand by email. Nevertheless, the Chengdu authorities had proposed a visit to the Panda Centre on Wednesday morning following the completion of the work. Thus, delegations had the opportunity on Tuesday morning to check that all their concerns and remarks had been fully reflected by the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat so that any final comments could be prepared for the afternoon session when the report would be presented for a final review. The meeting would be officially closed by Tuesday afternoon. The Working Group would therefore meet over the next two days with no extended or night sessions foreseen. Finally, the Secretary suggested meeting briefly with the six Rapporteurs before lunch so he could reassure them about the nature of their task and how to proceed.
11. The **Chairperson** noted some flexibility with the timetable and counted on the cooperation of the delegations to be concise in their statements so as to save time and focus on the more substantive discussion. He then opened the floor for comment.
12. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** suggested adding an agenda item under ‘other issues’, which considered other matters that might arise during the discussions.
13. The **Chairperson** suggested the inclusion of‘other business’ to the provisional agenda, which was duly added. The Chairperson remarked on the Committee’s general practice of allowing a representative of the accredited NGOs to make a statement prior to the working session. He asked the Secretary to present the organization.
14. The **Secretary** invited Mr Antoine Gauthier, Director of the Conseil québéçois du patrimoine vivant to present his statement.
15. The **Director-General of the Conseil québéçois du patrimoine vivant**, Mr Antoine Gauthier, remarked that his organization had been reporting on the measurement of results and intangible cultural heritage indicators since 2014. Speaking on behalf of the ICH NGO Forum, he recalled its intervention during the 2016 ICH Committee session in Addis Ababa in which it stated its support for the crucial initiative of creating a global framework to measure and monitor the results of the 2003 UNESCO Convention both at the international and national level. It wished to congratulate the Secretariat for the work already done. The proposed document gave simple and comprehensive ways for States Parties to report on the goals that they all aim to achieve, namely the safeguarding of ICH and the diversity of its elements. The NGO Forum was glad to participate in the present meeting, and in the consensual elaboration of indicators that will permit to accurately measure products, effects and impacts, but also hopefully the favourable, fair and equitable conditions within which those products are being realized. The Forum would be pleased to contribute with insights on specific indicators and orientation notes of the framework during the following days, bringing to the table the experience that some NGOs already have in this field. He remarked that accredited NGOs were fully committed to participating in the evaluation process at the national level as allies of the States Parties and, in most cases, as representatives of communities and groups. As such, they have a specific role to play in all monitoring mechanisms. The ICH NGO Forum Steering Committee expressed its wish to be officially part of the following steps towards the adoption of the Global Framework. It also restated the idea, developed during an NGO meeting in the Republic of Korea, of establishing an international ICH observatory that could help States Parties, NGOs, institutions, communities, groups and other partners to monitor health and changes in local ICH around the globe in an independent, cooperative and transparent fashion. The Forum expressed its gratitude to China for its warm welcome.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Gauthier for the statement and also for his contribution. He remarked that it was standard practice within the Committee to limit the discussion and final adoption of the framework to the States Parties, but he hoped that the NGOs would actively participate in the discussion on the items related to the indicators. He therefore looked forward to their participation and contributions.
17. Before moving ahead, the **Secretary** wished to present afew housekeeping items. He asked delegations to register their participation to the Sixth edition of the Chengdu Festival, which was a separate registration process. He informed the delegations that the provisional [list of participants](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-Participants.doc) was now available online, asking them to kindly verify their personal information. He noted that 122 people had registered to attend this meeting, representing 68 States Parties, 12 accredited NGOs and 3 UNESCO category 2 centres in the field of intangible cultural heritage.
18. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and invited him to present agenda item 3.

ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:

TOWARDS AN OVERALL RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONVENTION:
PROGRESS TO DATE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT MEETING

1. The **Secretary** explained that thepurpose of this item was to provide some background on the processes that led to this Intergovernmental Working Group. He recalled that in 2013, the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO undertook an evaluation of the culture conventions in which it was quoted that capturing and reporting on results was only possible if the results to be achieved were clear, which was currently not the case with regard to the periodic reporting mechanisms. The IOS evaluation called for periodic reporting to be focused on results, and for the Committee to develop an overall results framework. In 2013, at its eighth session, the Committee welcomed this evaluation and endorsed its recommendations, calling for a results framework to be developed through consultation with States Parties. Consequently, at its ninth session in 2014, the Committee reiterated ‘the necessity for an inclusive process of consultation and discussion in the development of such a framework’, and called for the creation of an Intergovernmental Working Group on this specific item. Thus, in September 2016, thanks to the generous support of the Chinese authorities, UNESCO organized a category VI expert meeting in Beijing in which 21 experts from around the world, both governmental and non-governmental, as well as some Chinese observers, produced an agreement on the overall aims of the Convention. Together they plotted a results map as the first step towards the overall results framework, which would be presented under agenda item 4. This was later presented at the eleventh session of the Committee in Addis Ababa in 2016, which welcomed the results with satisfaction, calling it ‘a thinking tool for developing an overall results framework’. As a result, the Committee accepted China’s invitation to organize the present meeting.
2. The **Secretary** also wished to clarify the understanding behind the overall results framework, for example, which models were being used, as there are indeed various approaches in different areas. Thus, in order to anchor the framework currently presented, the Secretary explained that UNESCO had adopted a programming approach known as ‘results-based management’ (RBM). In presenting the overview of the RBM approach to those who may be new to this approach, the Secretary further explained that it was essential to understand the RBM cycle so as to situate the present phase within this cycle. Referring to the RBM cycle graphic projected onto the screen, the Secretary noted that the graphic indicated a continuous cycle: from planning to monitoring to evaluation, and then back to the next cycle of planning. Thus, the meeting in Beijing in 2016 and the eleventh Committee session, also in 2016, had set the vision for the RBM approach. Using the analogy of a clock, the Secretary considered the starting point at midday with the eleventh Committee meeting moving the cycle to about 1.30 p.m., or in other words, the first part of the cycle that produced the results map. The purpose of the present meeting was thus to move forward to about 5 p.m. so as to work through the planification stage, depending on the success of the group’s work. This would be followed by the twelfth Committee session in December 2017 in the Republic of Korea and the seventh General Assembly in 2018 where the results of the present meeting would be endorsed. This would move the clock hand towards 7 p.m. and into the other phases of the results cycle. The Secretary found it important to emphasize that a Convention posed a real challenge to the RBM approach in that it typically involved a clearly delineated set of a few key actors, who implemented the approach, with stakeholders benefitting the programme or project. However, like with most of the United Nations normative work, a Convention involves multiple and numerous actors, many potential causes, and just as many possible effects. The RBM framework must therefore attempt to take into account the complexities of all the different actors, effects and causes of a Convention, to the extent possible. In this way, the approach would not only be conducted by UNESCO and its Member States, but also by civil society, educational institutions, the media and, most importantly, the communities, groups and individuals concerned with safeguarding ICH.
3. The **Secretary** also sought to explain what was meant by results. The second graphic projected onto the screen showed how the results map produced in Beijing in 2016 began with inputs and activities, which then moved onto results of increasing importance. Thus, the simplest results were outputs defined as products, goods or services that result from a development intervention; the first effect of the intervention contributes to the attainment of results, which are often the most immediate results achieved in the shortest time. Outcomes then move on from outputs, and the results map from the Beijing expert meeting and the eleventh Committee session defined short-term, mid-term and long-term outcomes. Evidently, outcomes are more meaningful than simple outputs and they usually take longer to realize. They can be defined as changes in the institutional and behavioural capacities or development conditions taking place in States Parties. This is followed by the most ambitious kind of results, the third category: impacts. Impacts represent changes in peoples’ lives, which can take even longer to manifest than outcomes. These can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or other changes. Again, the results map of the Beijing expert meeting and the eleventh Committee session results map identified the impacts that were put forward with regard to the Convention. So, up until now – as was indicated in the IOS report in 2013 – monitoring and reporting on the Convention essentially dealt with inputs and activities. The hope was to move further along the process so that the focus in the future would be increasingly on the results of those activities and their outputs. The sought-after ideal would be that reporting increasingly moves from outputs to outcomes such that eventually they provide evidence leading to ever-greater impacts of the Convention.
4. The **Secretary** wished to point out that the focus on results was not intended as a means of self-congratulation but rather as a stage in the process to feed back into further planning so that better information can be fed into the next cycle of planning. As the RBM cycle continues its ongoing process of monitoring, which can be seen in phase 2, the information that is compiled and collected gets used for evaluation purposes. In turn, this process of evaluation leads to possible revisions of the results framework, which continually aims to achieve the Convention’s vision in a more effective or efficient way. The Secretary reiterated that the goal was not to set the results framework in stone, but rather that users could gain experience in applying the framework and implementing the Convention. Nevertheless, there was a strong likelihood of occasionally returning to take stock as to whether the framework continued to be an effective tool for planning and implementing the Convention’s safeguarding priorities and activities. Thus, as mentioned earlier, the objective of the present meeting was to move the clock hand from 2 p.m. to somewhere between 4.30 and 5 p.m., subject of course to the decisions of the Committee and the General Assembly in 2018.
5. The **Secretary** hoped that the working group would be able to produce an overall results framework and open a discussion on how best it could be used for monitoring and reporting purposes. Thus, the bulk of the present work was to take the results map (from the Beijing expert meeting and 11.COM) and turn it into a results framework by identifying a useful set of indicators and assessment factors that would provide a coherent, logical structure for measuring the extent at which the implementation of the Convention could be effective. In this regard, working document 4 presented the Secretariat’s proposal for a set of indicators and assessment factors based on the earlier work on the results map, as established in Beijing in 2016. It was anticipated that this work would take up the rest of day and much of the following day. The report of the Working Group, which would include a revised set of indicators and assessment factors, would then be presented at the twelfth session of the Committee in December 2017 and hopefully to the Seventh General Assembly in June 2018. Thus, the crucial test in terms of adequacy was whether an indicator could prove to be effective and can be effectively used. Are there sources of current information that will allow users to measure progress? To the extent possible, can the information collected be comparable, relevant, clear and accessible? The Secretary suggested that when examining each indicator, delegations should consider whether it met these practical requirements of feasibility. This was very important because the ultimate aim was to strike a balance between what was practical and feasible, and what was ideal, i.e. there was no point in having a perfect results framework that could not be implemented. When elaborating the tables proposed in working document 4, the Secretariat sought to achieve a balance between an ideal but very ambitious monitoring and evaluation system that would fully involve all the Convention’s diverse actors and stakeholders, while widening sources of information to include the huge diversity of players. At the same time, within the context of the IOS evaluation, the adoption of an inaugural results framework would serve as a tool for strengthening the monitoring and reporting obligations of States Parties.
6. The **Secretary** remarked that States Parties had stated on every occasion that for this approach to have any chance of success it would have to be very closely tied to the existing reporting obligations, specifically, periodic reporting. In this regard, the Secretariat had taken note of the burden of reporting cycles and therefore sought not to create an additional reporting cycle for States Parties. It was thus important to keep in mind such practicalities during the examination of each indicator, as proposed in document 4. For example, would it be possible to reasonably collect information from the periodic reports in order to measure the extent at which the indicator has or has not been achieved? The Secretary assured the Working Group that there was an opportunity to discuss possible improvements to the periodic reporting mechanism under agenda item 5. Finally, in agenda item 6, the Secretariat proposed to look at two other related questions: i) to what extent were there complementary sources of information already available beyond the periodic reports that could feed into one or more indicators? And ii) how does the overall results framework complement other result frameworks, i.e. the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda. The Secretary suggested that the Working Group keep these questions in mind when examining the indicators proposed in document 4. The Secretary was available to answer any general questions about this multi-year process or the next steps.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the very clear and detailed presentation, which laid down a solid base for the group’s work that had been built upon the results achieved so far by the Committee, States Parties, experts and the Secretariat. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.
8. The **delegation of Belgium** congratulated the Secretariat for the interesting work presented, adding that it was indeed a solid base on which to work over the next few days. It believed that the length of the periodic reporting was crucial in that it was the Achilles heel of the whole process. Thus, it supported a proposal to also think about the periodicity of reporting and, especially, to convince countries to submit their periodic reports. In order to effect this change, a starting point was required, and the delegation suggested that perhaps it would be interesting to look ahead, i.e. to have a global survey of how the Convention would be evolving in 2023 on its twentieth anniversary. The delegation imagined counting back to an interesting deadline – the 15 December 2021 – and perhaps to consider changing paragraph 152 of the Operational Directives that says the periodic report should be submitted every sixth year following ratification. The delegation explained that perhaps the whole system should be reset to start with a global survey, asking every country to submit their report by 15 December 2021, and then have the States Parties submit their reports every six years thereafter. Looking forward in time, the next deadline would be 2027, with the global report expected in 2029, which would be one year before Agenda 2030 is evaluated. This would be an interesting system that could perhaps convince countries to jump on board and follow up with their periodic reporting. In any event, the delegation believed that a basic starting point had to be set at some point in time in a reset of the entire system. With regard to the proposal by the Secretariat, it insisted on sticking as close to the vocabulary of the Convention and the Operational Directives as possible, adding that a slew of new words were emerging in the documents that could perhaps be the subject of debate. The delegation concluded by again congratulating the Secretary and the Secretariat for a very interesting working document.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for the points raised, adding that there would be a later discussion on the link between the results framework and reporting.
10. The **Secretary** thanked Belgium for its many pertinent comments, adding that some of the points would be addressed later in the meeting. Clearly the periodicity of the information and how it related to the periodic reporting was an issue. The Secretary remarked that the Working Group was not a decision-making forum on periodic reporting, but that the issue should certainly be forwarded, with any suggestions sent to the Committee and eventually the General Assembly. Concerning the issue of a baseline, the Secretary acknowledged that the process would start without baselines, as they would have to be developed. Nevertheless, many of the issues raised were indeed valid but were intended for discussion in later items of the agenda.
11. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** expressed thanks to the Chinese government for hosting this meeting and for their generosity and hospitality, and to the Secretariat for their work and the preparation of the agenda and documents. With regard to the objectives of the meeting, in particular, on monitoring and evaluation, the delegation noted that better approaches were sought, indicating that it was a matter of what States Parties should be doing to ensure the implementation of the Convention. It wondered whether there was any relevance between what the Working Group sought to achieve and the improvement of financial assistance, as this concerned education and training, and other issues such as the inventory. The delegation suggested discussing nominations and the nature of the Evaluation Body, which are parts of the process in the implementation of the Convention, as was the relation between sub-regional UNESCO offices and category 2 centres. It hoped that there would be opportunities to look at these issues in the present meeting, if within the scope of the agenda.
12. The **Secretary** noted the multiple issues mentioned, some of which were indeed intended to be addressed within the indicators, while some were beyond the remit of the meeting as they involved other mechanisms of the Convention and the Committee. For instance, the issue of nominations could be brought up at the proposed Open-ended Working Group on the transfer of an element. As for the other issues on financial obligations, category 2 centres, and so forth, rather than entering a general discussion, it might be worth proceeding on an indicator-by-indicator basis to see how the issue evolved moving forward. The Secretary felt that getting into a more general discussion on these issues and processes could be confusing. Nevertheless, the points were well noted; some would be addressed in the results framework, while others would perhaps be better addressed in other ongoing discussions within the Convention.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, adding that there will be more time to discuss other more difficult issues. He then adjourned the meeting for a short break.

*[15-minute pause]*

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the work with the intention of advancing on an indicator-by-indicator basis, adding that there would be no general debate or discussion on the indicators themselves, as the solid groundwork had already been laid down. In addition, the Working Group had only one day to finish all the work covering the eight thematic areas, 26 indicators and 76 assessement factors, and thus he hoped that all the interventions would go straight right to the substance of the issue at hand. Any proposals or revisions should be provided to the Secretariat in writing. The Chairperson then invited the Secretary to present agenda item 4 and to introduce the indicators.

ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA:

DEFINING EFFECTIVE INDICATORS

1. The **Secretary** turned to the main substantive issue of the meeting and agenda item 4 concerning the indicators. It was noted that this was the result of several processes and, in particular, the expert meeting held in Beijing in 2016 and the Committee discussions in Addis Ababa in 2016. The set of indicators was the focus of this work, but in order to complete an overall results framework, the Secretary acknowledged that a baseline and targets would eventually be required, as the framework was in its early stages. Thus, the expert meeting and the Committee had already made major advances with the results map (annexed to document 3), and the concrete, practical work of defining effective indicators was now required. The Secretary would begin with an overview of the task, with references to working document 4, which would help better understand the results based management indicators. He likened them to signposts on a highway; they indicate how far along the road we’ve come, which direction we need to take, and how much of the journey remains. The results based management guidelines of UNESCO state that the indicators, ‘enable us to verify the changes, the programme or project we are dealing with seeks to achieve’. Thus, indicators may be temporal measures showing where changes are partially or fully underway or have not started. They may measure progress, show to what extent they have been achieved, partially achieved, or not achieved at all. Nevertheless, if they are to be useful, they must be feasible and effective, and have undergone several tests, as explained in document 4. With each indicator, delegations must ask themselves:
* Is it reliable: Is it a consistent measure over time?
* Is it simple: Will it be easy and feasible to collect and analyse the information? Can we get the data?
* Is it affordable or cost-effective? It is pointless to have indicators that require unaffordable data collection mechanisms; indicators should be affordable and cost-effective. The method and technique used to collect the information was also important. Moreover, these techniques of information collection were not solely for UNESCO, but should also be applied within the capacities of States Parties.
* Is it valid: Is it relevant to what it intends to measure? Does the indicator have validity, relevance?
* Is it sensitive: Will it understand and be sensitive to situations as they change, or is it too rigid? This is very important to keep in mind when defining indicators.
* And how useful is it? Is the information useful for decision-making and learning?
1. The **Secretary** referred to the periodic report in that the results framework was not just a compliance mechanism. A good results framework should be a useful mechanism to States Parties in tracking their implementation of the Convention. It should be a useful tool to understand how to create policies and make decisions at the national level. The Secretary suggested keeping these tests in mind during the examination of the proposed set of indicators. It was noted that the working document consisted of three parts: i) an explanatory text; ii) Annex 1, and the draft overall results framework (two tables); and iii) Annex 2, and two sample guidance notes to illustrate the kind of support the Secretariat would provide to assist States Parties in implementing the results frameworks. The Secretary emphasized that the guidance notes were just samples with only 2 of the 26 indicators presented, though they would be developed further once the indicators and the factors were agreed upon and defined. He noted the similarity of Table 1 of Annex 1 that would be recognized by those having worked on the indicator framework proposed under the 2005 Convention for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in its 2015 Global Report. He remarked that it was intended to provide a general overview and summary of the results framework at a quick glance. The table took the results map created in Beijing, and welcomed by the Committee at its eleventh session, and combined it with the thematic areas and core indicators that – it was hoped – would be adopt in the present meeting. The four top rows appear as was previously agreed in the results map, and the bottom two rows were new.
2. The **Secretary** suggested that the working group begin its debates with Table 2 rather than Table 1, so as to revise the language of some of the indicators in more detail at the more specific level before returning to the brief, more general statements in Table 1. Table 2 presented a set of 26 core indicators and 76 assessment factors. These 26 core indicators were grouped together for convenience into eight thematic themes, which were not exclusive or strictly bound. The Secretary explained that the indicators had been grouped together such that three or four indicators appear to be related, but that certain indicators would be tied closely to more than one theme. This approach was used simply as a way of keeping a logical, structured framework, and clearly not every indicator was limited to just one theme. For each indicator, the framework presents one or several factors against which that indicator will be assessed. These generally refer to the results within a single State Party and variously include outputs or outcomes. The Secretariat had looked closely at a number of different UN organizations to see how they defined their indicators before adopting the approach proposed by UNESCO in its next programme document, the 39 C/5. The assessment factors were all concrete results that could be attained and reported on, and the results would then demonstrate the extent to which the indicator is attained. As most indicators have two or more assessment factors, one could possibly conclude that, within a given State Party, an indicator that is fully accomplished will provide – to a greater or lesser degree – some gradation to the indicator. The column on the far right of Table 2 cites the relevant provisions of the Convention or the Operational Directives. In most cases, States Parties would report on issues that they have already been encouraged or required to do by the Convention or by previous decisions of the General Assembly. In the few cases that do not have specific citations, they essentially refer to good practice or other measures that have been seen to work effectively in different countries.
3. By way of an example, the **Secretary** referred to the first indicator on ‘Education and transmission’. This indicator sought to measure the extent to which ICH is fully integrated into primary and secondary education, for which four assessment factors had been defined, each one dealing with a specific aspect of this same topic. These assessment factors were thus expressed as results. Some are simple outputs, but most – to the extent possible – were higher-level outcomes. As mentioned, the citations refer to the specific Articles of the Convention or paragraphs of the Operational Directives or the [Ethical Principles](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention-Ethical_principles-EN.docx), which served to help reference the assessment factors. The Secretary recalled the challenge of having a results framework that reflected the contributions of many diverse actors who each have a role in implementing the Convention. For instance, Indicator 1 covered interventions by State actors, as primary and secondary education is generally a public responsibility. However, in Indicator 2, the assessment factors also include results obtained by non-State actors. For instance, factor 2.3 referred to community-based and NGO-based programmes and initiatives. In the spirit of the Convention, the Secretariat had attempted throughout the framework to include results, wherever possible, that come from the bottom-up, i.e. from initiatives of communities, groups or individuals, and from civil society actors involved in implementing the Convention. All these were considered important results that were essential to capture in the results framework alongside State interventions. It was also noted that the indicators were not expressed in terms of the extent to which a State Party has achieved *x* or accomplished *y*. Although States are the primary reporters, there are many diverse actors contributing to the results. Each State Party may report results for one or more of the assessment factors, and by considering them together, at a given time, the extent to which the indicator is achieved at the country level can be measured. Having multiple assessment factors for each indicator would help assess whether the indicator is fully attained, partially attained and to what degree. In the longer term, as the Secretariat collects and compiles information submitted by the States, the extent to which an indicator has been achieved globally can be observed, i.e. how many States fully realized, partially realized or not realized a specific indicator at any given time. The Secretary recalled that the purpose of indicators and assessment factors was to allow for comparisons to be made over time across the varied experiences of the different States Parties. It was not intended as a marking exercise or scorecard, or a form of ranking. Instead, this should allow each State to assess its own achievements and mark its own results using a shared framework. At the same time, it would allow all States to get an idea of how the Convention is being implemented globally. The indicators therefore needed to function both at the national level and the global level. When core indicators refer to the extent of realization, this should be understood in two ways, depending on the context. For monitoring and evaluation at the global level, this should indicate the percentage of States Parties in a given situation vis-à-vis the indicator in question, or whether a change has been achieved, indicating the degree at which the indicator has been attained. However, when the same indicator is used by a State for its own monitoring and evaluation at the country level, this refers to a given situation and the extent of changes that have occurred within the territory of that State.
4. The **Secretary** wished to briefly mention a few other important considerations before entering into the debate on specific indicators and assessment factors. Firstly, a results framework is not complete until it has baselines and targets, which would be foreseen at a later stage. He considered it important to first agree on the indicators and the relevant results. Secondly, the baselines and targets were also tied to a specific monitoring and reporting period, and would always be adjusted from one period to the next. While the Secretariat hoped that the indicators and assessment factors would be more stable over time, this did not mean that they were not changeable, but it was not expected that they would all necessarily change every cycle. Thus, if the indicators were going to be applied consistently, it would be important to provide clear guidance to States Parties. Typically, within a results framework like this, each indicator would be accompanied by a guidance note or explanation; sometimes called the metadata for that indicator. Two examples of such guidance notes or explanations had been prepared so as to share a common understanding of the terms and methods for each indicator. The Secretariat welcomed comments and suggestions on how the Secretariat could best offer support to the States, so as to help develop a strategy in this regard. The Secretary was happy to answer any questions prior to the examination of the indicators and assessment factors.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the explanation of this stage, noting that the intention was not to revise the indicators and their associated factors directly on the screen. The Chairperson recalled Security Council meetings involving large numbers of participants that would drag on because of disagreements over a particular word or question. Thus, instead of carrying out the drafting directly on the screen, all comments, proposals and revisions would be carefully noted by the Secretariat and the Rapporteurs, who would then incorporate them into a revised version of the framework for distribution to each delegation before final adoption on Tuesday afternoon. The Chairperson advised the delegations to present their revisions in writing to the Secretariat, inviting the Secretary to continue with his presentation.
6. The **Secretary** began by introducing the thematic areas, explaining that several indicators were grouped together under the eight different and specific themes. It was noted that their related indicators were often addressed under different aspects of the same theme so as to better understand them side-by-side. An indicator should thus be understood in relation to the other indicators under which it is grouped within the same thematic area. [Instead of introducing each indicator individually], the Secretary proposed to introduce the set of two to four indicators making up the single theme. Thematic area 1 on ‘Education and transmission’ brought together three indicators: i) the first indictor deals with formal primary and secondary education curricula and programmes; ii) indicator 2 concerns the transmission of the skills and language to practice intangible cultural heritage whether in formal, informal or non-formal settings; and iii) indicator 3 covers post-secondary education. Indicator 1 looks at the extent to which intangible cultural heritage is integrated into primary and secondary education, both in its own right as a subject of study and as a complement to strengthen learning on core subjects, such as mathematics, science and literature. The Secretary recalled that the Convention emphasized self-respect and mutual respect, and the resolve to include the [teaching of] intangible cultural heritage in education systems to students within communities as a primary means of building such respect. The associated assessment factors therefore examine: i) whether ICH has been introduced within the relevant curricula and courses; ii) whether education programmes and curricula promote and respect both their own and other ICH; iii) whether the formal education system makes provisions for mother-tongue instruction and local content; and iv) whether it teaches about the protection of natural places and places of memory, as called for in Article 14 of the Convention. Indicator 2 moves away from teaching about ICH and focuses on formal and non-formal measures, in particular, to transmit the actual skills and knowledge of ICH and its practice. As explained earlier, there are many different actors that contribute to results (both public and private) and, compared to Indicator 1, where these measures are essentially under the responsibility of the State, under Indicator 2 the actors involved could include the NGOs and the community associations actively transmitting the skills related to ICH. The assessment factors in this case are based on: i) whether the bearers and practitioners of ICH are inclusively involved in designing and implementing the ICH education programmes (2.1); ii) whether the education programmes include the modes and methods of transmitting ICH that are recognized by community groups and individuals (2.2); iii) whether there exists a range of community-based or non-governmental programmes and activities strengthening ICH transmission (2.3); and iv) whether future teachers and educators are trained in how to strengthen ICH transmission (2.4). Indicator 3 concerns post-secondary education to support the study of ICH and strengthening its transmission. The two assessment factors relate to the offer of curricula and degrees in fields such as music, arts, crafts and TVET (Technical and Vocational Education and Training) to student teachers so as to develop skills and knowledge to practise ICH (3.1). This is directly related to practising ICH, while 3.2 concerns curricula and degrees in fields such as anthropology or cultural studies where ICH is the subject of study. The Secretary clarified that this did not refer to capacity-building or training in ICH management, which was proposed under another theme, but rather it focused on offering specific curricula to either practice intangible cultural heritage or to understand it more deeply. The Secretary thus concluded the first overview of the first three indicators and the first ten assessment factors on the theme of ‘education and transmission’.
7. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments, proposals or revisions.
8. The **delegation of Belgium** had a general question about the order of the thematic areas as presented, adding that it was not very convincing or particularly meaningful. It suggested that the thematic areas, ‘the role of intangible heritage in society’, or ‘the engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals’, or ‘international engagement’ would be better served as a first introduced theme. The delegation therefore called for a reshuffle in the order of the thematic areas.
9. The **Chairperson** understood the point made. However, for the sake of time, he suggested to first address the indicators as presented, and to return to the order of the thematic areas at the end of the discussion on all the indicators.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** agreed.
11. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comment on Indicator 1 and its four assessment factors.
12. With regard to assessment factor 1.4, the **delegation of Belarus** proposed to include ‘cultural’, i.e. ‘Educational programmes teach about the protection of natural and cultural spaces and places of memory […]’, as defined in Article 2 of the Convention. Moreover, cultural space was very important, for example, in wooden architecture and housing that comprised the whole cultural landscape.
13. The **Chairperson** took note of the point raised.
14. The **delegation of Germany** thanked the Secretariat for this comprehensive list, and noted that [assessment factor] 1.3 mentioned the diversity of learners and it wondered whether an additional factor (1.5) could be included to comprise the diversity of intangible cultural heritage traditions.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Germany for the proposal to add a fifth assessment factor, and suggested that it present its proposal to the Secretariat in writing so that it could be incorporated into the final version.
16. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** remarked on the mention of training of teachers with regard to the curricula. However, it also considered it useful to encourage a student or to involve a student with the practical learning of intangible cultural heritage through working with the community for the purpose of transmission of ICH from the older to the younger generation in a more practical approach.
17. The **Chairperson** took note of the point made.
18. The **delegation of Belgium** noted the emphasis placed on the word ‘respect’ in these indicators, and wondered, for instance, in assessment 1.2, ‘School students learn to respect the ICH […]’ whether they should not also ‘critically reflect on their ICH’. The delegation believed that the notion of critically reflecting on intangible cultural heritage should be included so as to avoid any form of propaganda in education. This would empower students to reflect on intangible cultural heritage, to allow it to evolve and not freeze ICH. It also noted an absence of safeguarding, which was not sufficiently emphasized in the proposals. With regard to assessment factor 1.3, and the use of ‘mother-tongue instruction’, the delegation cautioned its formulation, as it is a politically sensitive issue, as was the mention ‘the inclusion of local content’. The delegation also noted that States Parties work within a global context and that the notion of safeguarding ICH included working with the Convention. Thus, the idea of safeguarding within the context of the Convention in primary and secondary education was notably absent. The delegation added that for the Convention to be successful, not only in explaining intangible cultural heritage or enforcing respect for intangible cultural heritage, it should also encourage the notion of evolution and critical thinking so as to reflect together to engage in new programmes. Students should thus be empowered to work within this notion of safeguarding.
19. **The Chairperson** thanked Belgium for its valuable comments, asking that specific proposals should be provided in writing.
20. The **delegation of Senegal** praised the excellent job carried out by the experts on the indicators and the assessment factors. It supported this notion of ​​a practical and dynamic approach to learning at the school level, especially as it was often difficult to change curricula and introduce new disciplines such as intangible cultural heritage in some countries. Moreover, it takes time to introduce a law of such orientation. However, there were possibilities of creating parallel structures. For example, in Senegal, there are ‘club’ structures, i.e. UNESCO clubs or ‘family life clubs’ such that a student club on intangible cultural heritage could introduce students to directly discover and learn about living heritage at the ground level. This would be one dynamic and practical approach.
21. The **Chairperson** firmly believed that not every indicator or set of factors would be applicable to every country or every situation, as they differed from country to country, from community to community, from individual to individual. Nevertheless, there were some general commonalities.
22. Referring to the point raised by Belgium, the **delegation of Colombia** believed that an assessment factor to help analyse the critical ability of students’ approaches to ICH could be measured by the ideas and projects proposed by the students themselves after receiving such training programmes. It believed that States could measure the amount of projects being developed within formal educational programmes by the students themselves, which could be considered in the assessment for this indicator.
23. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** remarked on the pertinence of education and the younger generation at this stage of human evolution in bringing about the soul of the Convention, i.e. to enhance dialogue and the respect of other cultures. Thus, it was opportune for the younger generation to learn more about intangible cultural heritage and to respect the culture of others.
24. The **Chairperson** noted all the points raised concerning Indicator 1 and the four assessment factors, adding that there would be an opportunity to return to these points at the time of adoption of the final version. The Chairperson therefore opened the floor for comments on Indicator 2 and its four assessment factors.
25. The **delegation of Peru** congratulated the Secretariat, the experts and the Committee for the tremendous work carried out over the course of several meetings, and China for supporting this reflection. Moreover, the documents were extremely precise and clearly reflected all the discussions that had taken place at the different levels. The delegation then turned to the discussion on the core indicators and the assessment factors, specifically the use of ‘practitioners and bearers’ in 2.1, and the use of ‘communities, groups and individuals’ in 2.2. The delegation referred to the Operational Directives and its use of ‘practitioners and bearers’, but felt that this actually implied the ‘communities, groups and individuals’. It conceded that both were mentioned in the Convention and the Operational Directives, but that an added footnote would help clarify the precise understanding of the term employed, which in turn would help better understand the text as a whole, not least because they were employed interchangeably.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked Peru for its very pertinent and precise comment.
27. The **delegation of Niger** thanked China for hosting this meeting and for its hospitality. It also congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of the documents provided. With regard to indicator 2, ‘formal and non-formal education strengthen the transmission of ICH and promote respect for ICH’, the delegation was concerned about the use of ‘non-formal education’. The delegation explained that the idea of continuing education or extra-curricular education, whether formal, non-formal or continuing, all contributed to the expected outcomes. Thus, the use of ‘non-formal’ in the context of an indicator was problematic. Also with regard to 2.1, ‘practitioners and bearers are involved inclusively in the design and development of ICH education programmes and/or in actively presenting and transmitting their heritage’, it noted that ‘inheritors’ could also be included, as one could be a bearer without being an ‘heir’, and they were thus distinguishable.
28. The **Chairperson** agreed that, whether education was formal or non-formal, all forms of education were good.
29. The **delegation of Belgium** echoed the comments made by Peru regarding the use of ‘practitioners and bearers’, and proposed to use instead the more general terminology, ‘communities, groups and individuals’, which would send a message that communities, groups and individuals are included, as per paragraph 107(e) of the Operational Directives and Article 15 of the Convention. In this way, ‘practitioners and bearers’ would be covered by ‘communities, groups and individuals’, and thus offer more possibilities. Regarding point 2.3, a number of groups appeared to be absent, including ‘community and group based’ and ‘archive-based’, as per paragraph 109 of the Operational Directives. Thus, either the group terms are kept very general, for instance, referring to heritage institutions, or they should include ‘archives’ because they also play an important role. Regarding 2.4, the delegation believed that it was important not only to integrate ICH into education but also introduce the notion of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. This could be transmitted to teachers who could then translate the notion of safeguarding into education programmes. Thus, ‘safeguarding’ should be included in assessment factor 2.4.
30. The **Chairperson** agreed thatit was important to adhere to the language of the Convention and the Operational Directives as much as possible, though it may not be necessary to repeat every word, providing there was no contradiction in substance.
31. The **delegation of Finland** thanked the host country, and congratulated the Secretariat for its work on the indicators that had progressed well since the discussions in Beijing. It wished to voice its concern with respect to the communities, adding that they should be made more visible, especially with regard to normal transmission, which – in addition to education – should be viewed as valuable, worth seeing and supporting. In addition, the role of formal institutions should not be over-emphasized but better balanced with normal transmission and the wide-ranging work carried out by the communities. The delegation wondered whether there might be another indicator that supported normal transmission, adding that this would depend on what States view as important at the national level and what they consider worth supporting.
32. The **delegation of Comoros** wished to include ‘media’ in 2.3, as they also served as networks for the transmission and teaching of intangible cultural heritage.
33. The **delegation of Seychelles** wished to raise the issue of authenticity with regard to competent bodies and the transmission of ICH. It wondered whether some mechanism for quality control could be factored in (particularly under indicator 4), or indeed whether it applied to intangible cultural heritage, so that the right knowledge is transmitted.
34. The **delegation of Belgium** did not agree with the notion of authenticity, which was a hotly debated issue, nor its inclusion in the section on communities and groups. In addition, it was not in the language of the Convention. It was also unfavourable to the mention of ‘media’ in this particular instance.
35. The **Chairperson** sought the viewpoint of the Seychelles on this point.
36. The **delegation of Seychelles** felt that the indicators bore a responsibility to ensure that what was being transmitted within those communities is genuine and authentic, which was obviously a national and a community level decision. The indicators serve to guide those communities to ensure the original and authentic nature of the transmitted heritage, and were thus relevant.
37. The **Chairperson** sought the opinion of Comoros regarding Belgium’s comment on the inclusion of ‘media’.
38. The **delegation of Comoros** agreed to introduce this issue under another point.
39. The **Chairperson** thanked Comoros for its understanding.
40. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** supported Belgium’s comments on the issue of authenticity, as the spirit of this document was to acknowledge the diversity of intangible cultural heritage rather than quality control.
41. The **delegation of Belgium** understood the concern regarding authenticity and quality control, but admitted it was a very difficult topic. For instance, Ethical Principle 8, states, ‘Authenticity and exclusivity should not constitute concerns and obstacles in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’. This suggests that authenticity can have many meanings in a lot of countries. It can be interpreted in many ways and is a very difficult concept to use and be accepted all over the world, and should thus be avoided.
42. The **Chairperson** felt that Belgium held the majority view, and asked whether the Seychelles could go along.
43. The delegation of Seychelles agreed.
44. The **Chairperson** thanked Seychelles for its cooperation.
45. The **delegation of Jordan** returned to the difficult issues of authenticity and integrity, adding that it was unnecessary to get involved in this context because authenticity and integrity were related to the communities themselves and not the Convention. Intangible cultural heritage constitutes a part of the community’s culture so it would be difficult to control its quality or the quantity of material that should be taught within this context. It was thus up to the communities to decide what was being transmitted, as custodians and bearers of their ICH.
46. Thanking Jordan, the **Chairperson** sought the view of Senegal as to whether its point under 2.3 in indicator 2 was covered.
47. The delegation of Senegal was satisfied.
48. The **Chairperson** now invited the NGOs to speak.
49. **Mr Laurier Turgeon**, **NGO Canadian Ethnology Society**, an accredited NGO since 2016, thanked China for organizing this meeting, and the Secretariat for its fine job of laying out the groundwork for reflection. As a social anthropologist and historian, Mr Turgeon was concerned about the freezing of intangible cultural heritage within the Convention and he therefore suggested in the second point to add, ‘promote respect of ICH and study its creative, evolving nature’, because ICH, in the definition of the Convention and through the study of its practice, is a constantly creative and evolving process. Thus, it was important to allude to that fact under this assessment factor.
50. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Turgeon for his contribution.
51. **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck, Director of NGO Tapis Plein** aligned with the earlier remarks by Finland in that the indicator on education and transmission has a very institutional, educational approach. However, in addressing transmission, she felt that it was very important to first see where the needs of transmission lie within the communities, groups and individuals, and how these needs were detected, and how they could be supported. Of course, this was also true for educational systems. However, when transmission is a central point, as in this set of indicators, it should be viewed from the perspective of transmission and therefore from the perspective of the communities.
52. The **Chairperson** wished to close the discussion on Indicator 2, as there was still time to return to the issue later if necessary.
53. The **Secretary** remarked on the important point about transmission occurring outside of the formal or non-formal context, as termed by educators, which was the language employed in the document. The concerns raised were thus being addressed through dialogue with education specialists. The Secretariat was aware and cognizant that most ICH is transformed by what educators call informal settings, meaning within and outside families. Nevertheless, he wished to remind delegations that the document is a results indicator, which must be measurable, and it was thus very difficult to measure the kind of knowledge transmitted from a mother to a son or daughter, or to measure other forms of [informal] knowledge. It was noted that the results framework is at an early stage and that it is not intended to capture all the dimensions of ICH. It is limited to what is potentially measurable and where change can happen. The Secretary welcomed concrete proposals, but made clear that the framework was not dismissing this kind of transmission as unimportant. There were simply not the tools available to measure these dimensions, even though it is understood that it is happening in any case.
54. The **delegation of Belarus** had a concrete proposal [underlined] in factor 2.2, which would read, ‘Modes and methods of transmitting ICH that are recognized by communities, groups and individuals are learned and included as is possible in educational programmes, both formal and non-formal’. It explained that not all modes and methods could be included and transmitted in modern educational programmes.
55. The **Chairperson** thanked Belarus for the very pertinent comment.
56. Aligning with the remarks made by the NGO Tapis Plein, the **delegation of Belgium** did not think that the institutional focus looked at a number of important ways of transmitting that were also partly included in education systems, for instance, apprenticeships. Apprenticeship systems are important in many countries and can be monitored, especially apprenticeship systems that are combined with the notion of safeguarding ICH. The delegation believed that in many countries a dialogue could be instigated, for instance, among carpenters or builders, in training apprentices about the origins of the craft, its evolution, and future developments. It therefore found it important to include a reference in the framework to vocational training and apprenticeship systems.
57. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for the points raised.
58. Responding to the remarks by the Secretary, **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck** suggested in 2.2 to replace ‘included’ with ‘supported by’, which would thus read, ‘Modes and methods of transmitting ICH […] supported by educational programmes, both formal and non-formal’. Along the same lines, she suggested in 2.3 to replace ‘available’ with ‘supported’, which would read, ‘[…] strengthening its transmission are supported’. Ms Neyrinck explained that to really strengthen communities, they should not just be ‘available’ but ‘supported’, and the way in which it is supported could then be measured.
59. **Mr Iwamoto Wataru, Director-General, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI)**, noting the importance of training providers of non-formal education, suggested that teacher training programmes include ICTs in 2.4. With regard to measurability, Mr Iwamoto suggested under theme 1 that the national guidelines of a school curricula includes ICT as a subject of an interdisciplinary approach.
60. Thanking Mr Iwamoto, the **Chairperson** moved to close the morning session, inviting the Secretary to present some practical information.
61. The **Secretary** asked the six Rapporteurs to meet after the session so as to briefly explain how their work would be organized. He also made some practical announcements regarding registration to the International Festival.
62. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session for lunch.

*[Afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** wished to start the session with the discussion on Indicator 3.
2. The **delegation of Austria** congratulated the Secretariat for the excellent documents, and China for the wonderful hospitality. It wished to return to a point related to Indicator 2, but which also refered to the other indicators, i.e. intergenerational transmission. It appreciated the remarks made by Finland in that not all forms of intergenerational transmission were met, in what was referred to as ‘normal transmission’. A decision was occasionally made between, on the one hand, formal education, and on the other, non-formal education, but also informal education. The delegation was not sure that this three–branched distinction was explicit in the document. Nevertheless, intergenerational transmission was very important and should somehow be included. The delegation understood that the question was always how could this be quantified or measured, conceding that for some indicators it was probably very difficult. However, there may be some other methodology that would allow for measurement and reporting. Moreover, if it was completely omitted, then it might appear that such transmission does not exist or that transmission only occurs in a formal context. Thus, the very important informal transmission of ICH should be reflected in the framework.
3. The **delegation of Belgium** noted under Indicator 3 the mention of ‘social and cultural dimensions’, adding that this could also be expanded to include the study of social, economic, ecological and cultural dimensions to reflect the notion of sustainable development. Under 3.2, which mentioned the fields of anthropology and cultural studies, the delegation proposed to either delete these examples or to add a whole set of other disciplines, such as critical heritage studies, folklore studies, and so on, i.e. not restricted to a selection of two disciplines. It also noted that the issue not only concerned the study of intangible cultural heritage but should also include safeguarding, which was notably absent. The purpose of training people was to ensure better safeguarding. It therefore sought to include safeguarding, and either delete the reference to the scholarly disciplines or expand it with other disciplines.
4. The **delegation of Nigeria** congratulated the Chairperson, and noted that Austria wished to create three categories of education: formal, informal and non-formal. However, the delegation was of the understanding that there were only two categories: formal and non-formal/informal, as non-formal and informal were the same thing.
5. The **delegation of Netherlands** expressed concern about including intangible cultural heritage in the curriculum of primary, secondary and also post-secondary schools, as expressed by Senegal, as this would take a lot of time to change the formal curriculum, if indeed possible. The delegation explained that it was primarily schools and universities that decided on the cultural themes or topics addressed. However, educational ICH programmes offered by museums, and archive and cultural centres were important ways for non-formal or informal transmission to occur that could be offered to schools to involve them in intangible cultural heritage.
6. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond to the questions.
7. Responding to the question from Nigeria, the **Secretary** agreed that in common English, informal or non-formal appeared to mean the same thing, however, in educational parlance, and having spoken with education colleagues, they are not in fact synonymous. There have two distinct meanings. Informal transmission, for example, may take place in a village or in a family, whereas non-formal education involves institutions outside of the schooling system. Thus, in the language of educational theory, they are considered as two distinct forms. Concerning the issue of safeguarding, as mentioned by Belgium, the Secretary agreed that it was a very valid issue, notably under Indicator 4, which concerns capacity-building and training, and refers to tertiary institutions and the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the framework proposed two different indicators, and delegations should consider whether this is indeed satisfactory or not. With regard to the concern voiced by the Netherlands, the Secretary conceded that it was a complex issue, explaining that curriculum revision was not the sole process foreseen in terms of bringing ICH into schools. The Secretary reminded delegations that not all indicators were relevant to all countries. For example, some countries were working on integrating ICH into schools through teacher training or mainstreaming elements of ICH into classes, and very rarely involved actual curriculum revision. The indicator was thus trying to introduce that flexibility.
8. The **Chairperson** reminded delegations that efforts to be comprehensive could actually render any form of agreement more difficult and confusing, and that ‘simple’ can often be better. The Chairperson also reminded delegations to present proposals and revisions in writing; the Secretariat had forms for this purpose.
9. Responding to the remark by Belgium on 3.2, a Representative of NGO **China Folklore Society**, agreed to either delete ‘anthropology and cultural studies’ or compile a more comprehensive list that includes, for example, folklore studies, which is an important and active field with regard to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage history.
10. **Mr Laurier Turgeon** suggested adding ‘critical’ to Indicator 3, which would read, ‘[…] as well as critical study of its social and cultural dimensions’, adding that it was very important to undertake critical research so as to make it scientifically sound.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Turgeon and closed the discussion on Indicator 3 before moving to the Indicator 4 and a new thematic area.
12. The **Secretary** turned to the overview of the next set of [three] indicators clustered around the theme of ‘Institutional and human capacities’. He explained that Indicator 4 concerned the establishment of competent bodies for safeguarding. Indicator 5 focused on the existence of training and capacity-building programmes for safeguarding, and Indicator 6 concerned the audiences for such training. Indicator 4, referred to one of the concrete responsibilities of States Parties under Article 13(b) of the Convention, ‘to designate or establish one or more competent bodies for safeguarding of ICH in its territory’. There were five assessment factors under this indicator, which the Secretary advised reading together for the benefit of comparison and to ensure that any questions that may arise from one indicator is found under another indicator. Indicator 5 emphasizes human capacities for intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and whether there exists programmes to strengthen these capacities. The three associated assessment factors include: i) post-secondary institutions, which offer curricula and degrees; ii) governmental institutions, and whether government provides other opportunities for training in intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and management; and iii) community-based organizations or NGOs, and whether there are similar short-term training opportunities provided by these entities. Thus, capacity-building is seen across these different structures. The final Indicator 6, which complements Indicator 5 (on training opportunities), focuses on audiences and beneficiaries of such training. Thus, Indicator 5 looks at the existence of training, while Indicator 6 looks at the recipients and audience of such training, and whether it is addressed on an inclusive basis to community, groups and individuals, covered in 6.1, or is it more concerned with training culture and heritage professionals, including brokers and mediators, which is covered in 6.2. This was the summary of the three indicators and the twelve associated factors that fall within the second theme of ‘Institutional and human capacities’.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the helpful overview, inviting comments for Indicator 4 and its five associated assessment factors.
14. The **delegation of Belgium** noted [in 4.1] the introduction of a new term ‘provincial level’, adding that the language should adhere to the Convention, as this caused confusion. Not least because ‘province’ has a specific meaning to different countries, for instance, in Belgium, the province had just lost its competence on intangible cultural heritage as it was transferred to the national Flemish level. The delegation also noted in 4.3 and 4.5, the mention of ‘ICH management and safeguarding’, and wondered whether it might be clearer to simplify to ‘safeguarding’, even though it understood that ‘management’ was mentioned in Article 15 [of the Convention].
15. The **Chairperson** also preferred the use of ‘local’ in place of ‘provincial’, which had connotations in China with its many provinces.
16. The **delegation of Peru** had a question concerning 4.3, which mentioned ‘consultative committees, steering committees, ICH councils’, whereas the related citation, paragraph 80 of the Operational Directives, referred only to ‘consultative committees’. It believed that adding other kinds of organizational forms could create confusion and that the framework should adhere to the language of the Convention. Nevertheless, should another country employ another term, for instance, ‘council’, ‘committee’, etc., it is their prerogative to do so, but ultimately the framework should refer to the ‘consultative commission’, as stated in the Convention text. With regard to 4.4 and 4.5, the delegation wondered whether the two points could be merged, as it was unclear why the ‘institutions for ICH documentation’, ‘centres of expertise ‘ research institutes’, ‘museums’, and so on were split into two separate points.
17. The **delegation of Ghana** felt that Indicator 4 could address some very serious cross-border issues. For example, Ghana considers female genital mutilation a negative practice and has bylaws to halt its practice in the northern part of Ghana. However, a young woman reaching puberty may undergo pressure from her peers such that the procedure is undertaken surreptitiously in Burkina Faso despite the serious known health complications.
18. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** appreciated the huge and precious work undertaken, however, one must also consider the persons and the States who will report on these indicators and complete the reports. In this regard, the indicators should be as clear as possible. The delegation therefore suggested splitting the core indicators into more specific and logical ways, for example, by separating ‘institutional and human capacities’. This could then be applied to the other core indicators, such as ‘Inventorying and research’ and ‘Policies and legislation’.
19. The **delegation of Belgium** returned to the comment by Peru who proposed to change the wording, adding that paragraph 80 of the Operational Directives mentions two elements ‘consultative body’ and ‘coordination mechanism’. If change was called for, then the suggested was to add, ‘consultative bodies’ or ‘coordination mechanisms’ in the plural form. This would thus cover everything and still adhere to the language of paragraph 80 of the Operational Directives.
20. The **delegation of Armenia** supported Peru’s suggestion to merge points 4.4 and 4.5.
21. The **delegation of Eritrea** felt that 4.4 referred to documentation and archiving specifically whereas 4.5 sought expertise from other institutions, such as research institutions, archives, and so on, and therefore were best viewed as separate points.
22. The **delegation of Haiti** thanked the Chairperson and the host country. With regard to core indicator 4 and the different assessment factors 4.4 and 4.5, the delegation remarked that cultural institutions in Haiti were somewhat compartmentalized in terms of responsibilities, for example, the National Library and museums have specific roles. Thus, it would be helpful to specify precisely the kinds of support that would benefit these institutions, as they do not necessarily think of bringing intangible cultural heritage to the fore. For example, the museum might be better served by exhibiting or accepting cultural programmes or activities related to intangible cultural heritage. Thus, in terms of support it would be beneficial to specify how support could best be manifested.
23. The **delegation of Gambia** thanked the host country for the wonderful welcome and hospitality, and the Secretariat for its work and the well conceived document. It spoke of a recently concluded research project undertaken in Gambia, in consultation with a UNESCO expert, in which some of the findings and recommendations were very relevant to point 4.5, as had been highlighted during the consultative meeting. The delegation explained that 4.5 related to ‘Centres of expertise, research institutions, museums, archives, libraries, etc., contribute to ICH management and safeguarding’, but it did not provide any specifics in terms of means or intention. The delegation surmised that it encouraged the establishment of these learning centres at a sub-regional level. It seemed in fact to be advocating for an entity such as CRIHAP [International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region] or something similar in Africa and other regions in the world.
24. Referring to point 4.5, the **delegation of Finland** felt that it was important to mention these different institutions, as it provided more tools to work with on a national level. Another broader question worth considering concerned the mention of competent bodies. How and where was this defined? The fact that a body exists does not alone guarantee good safeguarding. The question is: What are they doing? And how can outcomes be measured? The delegation wondered whether there was sample guidance notes in this regard.
25. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** supported the remarks with regard to 4.5, and suggested to first mention ‘cultural centres’ followed by ‘museums, libraries […]’.
26. The **delegation of Comoros** wished to add ‘individuals’ *after* ‘communities and groups’, in point 4.3, as per standard practice.
27. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Secretariat was taking notes.
28. **Mr Antoine Gauthier, Conseil Québécois du patrimoine vivant,** made a suggestion under point 4.2, which currently read, ‘Competent bodies exist at the national level, and/or at local levels for safeguarding specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed’, to add, ‘and enjoys financial support and other forms of support’. Mr Gauthier explained that this would emphasize the supporting role played by States or other bodies, but it also avoids sending the message that financial support is only formally allocated to research, studies, archiving and documentation, as specified in point 9.1. Mr Gauthier had another suggestion, in point 4.5, which was to insert, ‘in compliance with the ethical principles for safeguarding ICH’ at the end of the sentence. This would recall the role of bearers in their relations with these centres or institutes.
29. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to clarify a point.
30. The **Secretary** concurred that the Secretariat would work with the Rapporteurs to ensure that all the comments were incorporated into the report. With regard to some of the comments that required more detail in explaining the indicators, the Secretary reminded the delegations that the level of assessment factors, and followed by guidance notes, were by nature limited in the amount of information they could communicate, particularly country-specific information, as this should be adaptable to different countries. However, some of the concerns raised would be easily addressed in the guidance notes, which would formulate the meaning and intent. Nevertheless, the Secretariat had taken note of the remarks on 4.4 and 4.5 and would incorporate the intent. The Secretary referred to the concern voiced by Mr Gauthier to separate one point, which looked at institutional and human capacity-building focused on continued practice and transmission, while the other point focused on intangible cultural heritage management and safeguarding, and those institutions that have that role. There was thus a differentiation, but of course should delegations feel that the points were best combined then there would be one less indicator.
31. The **Chairperson** opened the discussion on Indicator 5 and its 3 assessment factors.
32. The **delegation of Belgium** asked what ‘inclusive basis’ alluded to in the three points.
33. The **Chairperson** agreed that it was a good point that deserved an answer.
34. The **Secretary** brought the delegations’ attention to footnote 16, which first appears in point 2.1, that defines the understanding of ‘inclusive’ or ‘inclusively’ or ‘on an inclusive basis’. This is understood to mean ‘inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees, people of different ages and genders, persons with disabilities and members of vulnerable groups’ (c.f paragraphs 174 and 194 of the Operational Directives). When these actions and outcomes are reported, States Parties will be encouraged to provide disaggregated data or to explain how such inclusiveness is ensured’. The footnote thus avoided repetition of an otherwise cumbersome explanation.
35. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and sought further comments or proposals.
36. The **delegation of Belgium** returned to a previous remark concerning the use of ‘management’, adding that a programme of intangible cultural heritage management without safeguarding was not desirable. It thus preferred to only retain ‘safeguarding’.
37. The **Chairperson** would keep the point in mind, however, ‘management’ was used elsewhere.
38. Referring to Indicator 5, the **delegation of Gambia** noted the mention of tertiary education institutions, which implied formal and non-formal education, yet much of intangible cultural heritage was indigenous, and especially apprenticized indigenous transmission passed from generation to generation through the family. The delegation believed that those forms of transmission had to be encouraged, but how is this achieved in terms of training to ensure that these capacities – often inherited from childhood – were also being constructed in some form of concessionary training to improve the cultural manifestation in some way?
39. The **Chairperson** assured Gambia that the Secretariat would find a word that was more inclusive. He opened the floor for discussion on Indicator 6.
40. The **delegation of China** began by expressing its warmest welcome to all the participants attending the present meeting. China also hosted the meeting in September 2016 during which the overall results framework with the 26 indicators had been formulated. It highly appreciated the process that will play such an important role and lay a solid foundation in the future implementation of intangible cultural heritage in the local, national and international levels. The delegation also expressed gratitude to all the experts and the intergovernmental working groups for their contributions to this process. It expressed the need for all stakeholders to discuss and explore [the issues]. In this regard, the delegation expressed concern with the mention [in 6.2] of ‘cultural brokers and mediators’, which it considered problematic, not least because more attention should be given to practitioners and bearers, and their protection and [forms of] transmission.
41. The **delegation of Belgium** fully applauded the words ‘cultural brokers and mediators’, but voiced some concern about the use of ‘culture and heritage professionals’ [also in 6.2], adding that ‘culture and heritage workers’ was preferred because ‘professional’ had a very specific connotation. The implication was that this excluded ‘amateurs’ and those working as volunteers for example, because in practice they would – in many cases and regions – be the real brokers and thus the ones who required and deserved training.
42. The **Chairperson** found the point to be very pertinent.
43. The **delegation of Belarus** wondered whether the addition of ‘an inclusive basis’ in point 6.2, regarding the professionals, brokers and mediators, would be necessary.
44. The **delegation of Spain** congratulated China for organizing the meeting and the Secretary and his team for the documents provided. The delegation proposed to reformulate Indicator 6 because it believed that the communities themselves managed most of the training programmes, as the main actors of the elements. The current wording read, ‘Extent to which training is addressed to communities, groups and individuals, and to culture and heritage professionals’, with the delegation preferring, ‘Extent to which training is operated by communities, groups and individuals, and is addressed to culture and heritage professionals’.
45. Regarding Indicator 6, the **delegation of Gambia** wondered whether ‘groups’ was inclusive of religious groups, adding that this could potentially abate some of the threats related to extremism. It explained that many of the current threats around the world were linked to religion, but if intangible cultural heritage training were introduced at a moderate stage, it could forestall the rise of extremism that might exist within certain communities.
46. The **Chairperson** felt that religion was too sensitive an issue, but the point was noted.
47. The **delegation of Belgium** preferred any reference to ‘groups’ to be viewed in general terms without the use of nominative adjectives, which would complicate matters.
48. The **Chairperson** asked Gambia whether it was willing to go along with the use of ‘groups’ without indicating any special groups.
49. The delegation of **Gambia** agreed.
50. The **Chairperson** thanked Gambia for the progress made, inviting the Secretary to present Indicator 7 and the new thematic area.
51. The **Secretary** explained that the third set of indicators fell under the theme ‘Inventorying and research’, which covered ‘inventorying’, one of the core obligations of the Convention for States Parties addressed in Articles 11 and 12 and a prerequisite for participating in the Convention’s mechanisms, including the Lists. There were four linked indicators, 7 through to 10, and 12 assessment factors. Indicator 7 asks whether such inventories exist and whether they reflect the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and contribute to its safeguarding. The Convention is clear that inventory must be seen through the perspective of safeguarding, and there are four assessment factors that deal with specific aspects of safeguarding that relate to: i) whether one or more inventory systems have been established or revised since ratification of the Convention (7.1), ii) whether there are specialized inventories or multiple-level inventories that many States have found to be effective approaches to inventorying (7.2); iii) whether inventories have been updated; which is important as Article 12 reminds States of the necessity to deal with the evolving and dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage (7.3); and iv) how the inventories are used, whether they are accessible and respect the customary practice that might restrict access to certain aspects, and whether they are effective in strengthening safeguarding (7.4). Indicator 8 refers to the inventory process and whether it is inclusive and reflects diversity. The first assessment factor (8.1) asks whether community groups and relevant NGOs participate inclusively in the inventorying process, as required by Article 11 of the Convention, and whether their participation strengthens safeguarding. The second factor (8.2) concerns whether the inventorying process adequately reflects diversity, both of intangible cultural heritage and its practitioners, and is fully inclusive. Thus, presumably, if the inventorying process is truly inclusive, as addressed in 8.1, the expressions of diverse communities will all be included. However, this was not always the case, and hence the reason why the two proposed factors were separated.
52. The **Secretary** then presented Indicator 9 on forms of research and documentation, and the extent to which they contributed to safeguarding. Referring to the earlier concern voiced by the Canadian NGO, the Secretary responded that evidently the role of communities was important and research was not separate, but it was also important to consider all three indicators together as the indicators covered different aspects. The first assessment factor (9.1) addresses whether there are financial and other forms of support. Factor 9.2 looks at whether research is focusing not only on ICH itself but the approaches to and impacts of safeguarding specifically. Factor 9.3 considers whether practitioners and bearers participate in managing, implementing and disseminating research and whether it is carried out with free, prior and informed consent. The final Indicator 10 looks at the extent to which research outcomes are broadly accessible and are effectively utilized for safeguarding and policy-making. Assessment factor 10.1 focuses on accessibility, bearing in mind respect for customary access, as linked to factor 7.4 concerned with inventorying. Factor 10.2 considers whether research findings are used to actually lead to policy-making and not just research for its own sake. Finally, factor 10.3 similarly considers whether research findings are utilized for safeguarding. These factors thus linked research to safeguarding.
53. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comment and proposal on Indicator 7.
54. The **delegation of Belgium** proposed to delete 7.2, not only because of the use of ‘national, provincial, local’, but to take the part related to diversity and include it in 7.3 so that the updating [of the inventory] reflected diversity and the viability of elements, and so the updating process could be more dynamic and work towards diversity.
55. The **delegation of Senegal** sought to understand the rationale behind factor 7.2 as proposed by the experts, adding that ‘specialized inventories’ could in fact reflect thematic inventories. For example, an inventory could comprise initiation rites or traditional music. In which case, thematic inventories that covered a specific area of [intangible cultural heritage] should be maintained. In this regard, the delegation did not agree with the remarks made by Belgium.
56. The **delegation of The Republic of Korea** remarked that factor 7.2 concerns diversity, while factor 7.3 concerns keeping the inventory current and updated. Given that these were very important issues, the delegation sought to maintain factor 7.2.
57. The **delegation of Haiti** aligned with Belgium’s proposal because specialized inventories were important with regard to the very intention of each of these inventories, which was to have systematic references instead of intermittent and standardized inventories. So the diversity of inventories was an important point to bear in mind.
58. The **delegation of Germany** wished to maintain 7.2, as the importance of inventories is highlighted and provides an option with regard to reporting.
59. The **delegation of China** proposed maintaining factor 7.2.
60. The **delegation of Mali** began by thanking the host country and the organizers. The delegation preferred to maintain 7.2 and even broadening the specialized inventories at the different levels: national, provincial and local, and including regional and sub-regional levels. To explain the importance of 7.2, the delegation gave the example of the Tuareg Imzad found in Algeria, Mali and Niger that took into account the broad regional scope of the practices and know-how of this ICH inscribed [on the Representative List] in 2013. The delegation thus proposed to maintain 7.2 and to include ‘regional’ and ‘sub-regional’ levels.
61. The **Chairperson** noted that the delegations were divided on this issue and suggested that the Secretariat consult with some of the delegations in order to reach a compromise proposal if agreement could not be reached. The Chairperson noted Belgium wishing to take the floor with the possibly an offer of a compromise.
62. The **delegation of Belgium** explained that it was concerned with the notion of ‘specialization’ in that all inventories should reflect diversity. There should not therefore exist one mainstream inventory plus other specialized inventories when diversity should be reflected across all the inventories in general. Nevertheless, it was willing to go along with maintaining factor 7.2. However, the delegation preferred to delete ‘national, provincial, local’ but maintain ‘at multiple levels’.
63. The **Chairperson** assured Belgium that ‘provincial’ would be deleted.
64. The **delegation of Uganda** thanked China for organizing this event and for supporting the attendance of many delegations, and the Secretariat for its excellent work. Regarding 7.2 and 7.3, the delegation strongly believed that these were two different and distinct factors that should both be maintained.
65. The **delegation of Niger** believed that factor 7.2 contributed to the achievement of results and that, even with the deletion of ‘provincial’, the broadening of the scope to include ‘regional and subregional’ would also achieve more results.
66. The **delegation of Belarus** supported the proposal to keep factor 7.2 as it reflected the main idea behind this indicator. However, it agreed with the proposal by Belgium to delete ‘national, provincial, local’, which it deemed unnecessary.
67. The **delegation of Gambia** spoke of its existing inventory, but that it was also undertaking specialized socio-anthropological research to study the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, which were two distinct issues. Thus, despite the existing inventory it was still undertaking specialized research and therefore it suggested keeping 7.2. Nevertheless, it agreed with the recommendation to delete ‘national, provincial, local’ as ‘multiple levels’ encompassed all the possible setups.
68. The **Chairperson** noted the position to maintain 7.2 with some fine-tuning of the text.
69. The **delegation of Peru** agreed with the idea of retaining 7.2, as well as the deletion of ‘national, provincial, local’, which was to say that maintaining specialized inventories at different levels reflected diversity. However, it wondered whether the word ‘levels’ when ‘national, provincial and local’ is deleted would reflect these three levels. The delegation felt that perhaps the correct word was ‘scale’, which would help better understand the different scales within countries and territories.
70. The **Chairperson** agreed that a more pertinent word could always be found.
71. The **delegation of Italy** also supported maintaining factor 7.2, and suggested retaining ‘national, provincial, local’, or integrating it with another level that includes the transnational level. As way of an example, the delegation remarked that Italy shared a transnational inventory with Switzerland.
72. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that there were two options, to keep or delete 7.2, but also to converge 7.2 and 7.3, which it preferred in line with Belgium’s position. In addition, the delegation felt that factor 7.2 also increased additional duties of States Parties in preparing some more specialized inventories.
73. The **Chairperson** remarked that Belgium had been very cooperative to accommodate the opinion of others, but agreed that perhaps the language could be further refined.
74. The **delegation of Spain** wished to retain the cited levelsbecause, as a multilevel State, the mention of the different possible levels clarified the level to which the inventories pertained. Deleting ‘national, provincial, local’ would therefore not make clear what ‘multiple levels’ implied.
75. The **Chairperson** reiterated that there was general agreement on this point, with additional fine-tuning of the wording for which the Chairperson requested the Secretariat to consult and come back with a compromise solution. He then turned to Indicator 8 and the two assessment factors. With no forthcoming comments or proposals, the Chairperson turned to Indicator 9 and the three assessment factors.
76. The **delegation of Austria** wondered whether in addition to ‘scientific and technical studies’ [in 9.1 and 9.3] the factors could also include ‘artistic studies’, as cited in Article 13(c). The delegation explained that the engagement of artists and designers was also important for both the viability and visibility of intangible cultural heritage, which in fact concerned all the assessment factors: 9.1, 9.2 and 9.3.
77. The **delegation of Belgium** noted that factor 9.1 mentioned ‘ethical principles’ and it wondered whether this was a general reference or a more specific reference to the Basic Texts. It explained that there were many ethical principles, but no specific reference was made in this case. In factor 9.3, the delegation proposed to expand the notion of ‘practitioners and bearers’ to ‘communities, groups and individuals’. Finally, the delegation made reference to the last part of the ‘ethical principles’ in the Basic Texts in which ‘sustained consent’ is mentioned. It therefore proposed to change the wording to ‘free, prior, sustained and informed consent’ to include the notion of ‘sustained consent’.
78. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
79. The **Secretary** explained that that ‘ethical principles’ was not intended to refer exclusively to the ‘Ethical Principles’ as adopted by the General Assembly, but to also include the various codes of conduct and ethical principles that may exist within different scientific research domains and so on. He conceded that this would perhaps be better elaborated in the guidance notes, and it did indeed encompass a broader reference.
80. The **Chairperson** noted the agreement on Indicator 9, and then turned to Indicator 10.
81. For the sake of consistency, the **delegation of Austria** sought to add ‘artistic studies’.
82. The **delegation of Finland** remarked on an earlier discussion that spoke of ‘critical research’ and wondered whether it could be included in either Indicator 9 or 10? For example in the context of Finland, it would be very important to not only conduct ‘general research’ on intangible cultural heritage but that it is also supported by critical research on inventorying on both the national level and the international level. It could either be included in the assessment factor(s) or contained in a guidance note.
83. Thanking Finland, the **Chairperson** remarked that the discussion on Indicator 10 had concluded, and he adjourned the meeting for a short break.

*[15-minute pause]*

1. With regard to Indicator 11, **the delegation of Belarus** wished to state that the ICH safeguarding strategy should be based on a community-led platform.
2. The **Chairperson** took note of the point raised. He then invited the Secretary to present the overview of the new thematic area, which would help frame the discussion.
3. The **Secretary** turned to the next theme on ‘Policies and legislation’; a subject that is afforded a lot of attention in the Convention and the Operational Directives. Given the breadth of this topic and the number of specific measures that States are encouraged to take by the Convention or by the Operational Directives, the Secretariat proposed four indicators. Indicator 11 concerns policies and legislation in the field of culture. Indicator 12 concerns policies in the field of education. Indicator 13 concerns policies in fields other than culture or education, and finally Indicator 14 concerns respect for customary rights, practices and expressions. Addressing them one-by-one, the Secretary explained that Indicator 11 addresses the extent to which policies and legislation in the field of culture are concerned with intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding. Evidently, this is an area addressed most concretely in the Convention, specifically in several clauses of Articles 13 and 14. It has two assessment factors: i) 11.1 concerns whether the State has put in place cultural policies and legislation in integrating intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding; and ii) 11.2 does not concern policies and laws, but rather plans and strategies both for intangible cultural heritage in general as well as the safeguarding of specific elements, as required for nominations to the two lists. Indicator 12 concerns education policies and legislation. The Secretary recalled that Indicators 1 to 3 focused on educational programmes and activities, but here the indicator relates to policy. The two assessment factors ask whether policies and legislation in the education sector integrate intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding: i) 12.1 concerns policies that promote recognition, respect and enhancement of intangible heritage; 12.2 encourages transmission and practice; and iii) 12.3, looks at whether education policies or laws promote multilingualism, including mother-tongue instruction, as advocated in the Operational Directives.
4. The **Secretary** then turned to Indicator 13, which carries on this theme with respect to policies and laws in fields outside of culture and education. Factor 13.1 asks whether the recently adopted [Ethical Principles](https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866) [for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage] are reflected in development plans, policies and programmes. The Secretary recalled that the new chapter of the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development gave greater attention to policy in areas such as agriculture, health, gender, water, environment, disaster reduction and recovery, and so on. Factor 13.2 focuses on whether intangible cultural heritage is integrated, where relevant, into such policies and legislation. Factor 13.3 proposes to single out the areas of policies for inclusive economic development because they are a particular focus of concern, whether in tourism policy, employment policy or even, in some cases, industrial policy. Lastly, factor 13.4 echoes provisions of the Operational Directives encouraging States to think creatively about financial or fiscal measures or incentives that could promote the practice of intangible cultural heritage and increase the availability of much needed natural resources. Finally in this set, the last Indicator 14 brings together a number of concerns related to respect for customary rights, practices and expressions. The Secretary noted that this had already been alluded to in previous assessment factors with regard to customary restrictions on access to particular aspects of intangible cultural heritage, but in this case the focus was on whether these are taken into account more broadly, again echoing several provisions of the Operational Directives. Factor 14.1 asks whether policies and/or legislation are in place to protect intellectual property rights and privacy rights when intangible cultural heritage is exploited for commercial or other purposes. Factor 14.2 concerns customary rights of communities and groups to different ecosystems necessary for the practice of their intangible cultural heritage and its transmission, and factor 14.3 calls attention to the different forms of intangible cultural heritage that could contribute, for example, to dispute prevention and conflict resolution. This was the overview of the four indicators in the areas of ‘Policies and legislation’ together with their 12 assessment factors.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and moved to the discussion on Indicator 11.
6. With reference to the role of communities, the **delegation of Finland** remarked that it was not so much whether these policies exist but rather: What specifically were these policies doing? How were they fulfilling the goals of the Convention? And with what outcomes? Were they really helping communities to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage? And how is the success of a policy measured? The delegation suggested that perhaps this could be better communicated in the guidance notes, but nevertheless, the role of the communities should be emphasized.
7. With regard to the thematic area, the **delegation of Italy** felt that the wording needed to be revised so as to be more coherent with the Convention and suggested replacing ‘legislation’ with ‘legal and administrative measures’. This definition would thus be more comprehensive as it would comprise both ‘legislation’, as well as all the secondary legal instruments required in measuring the indicator, which would not otherwise be included.
8. The **delegation of Malawi** suggested in 11.2 the inclusion of the sub-regional dimension that would take into consideration the policies at sub-levels, including the elaboration of strategies or action plans at the sub-regional level that are transnational.
9. Referring to 11.2, the **delegation of Belgium** drew attention to a reference in paragraph 171(d) of the Operational Directives that mentions ‘appropriate integration’ and suggested inserting ‘appropriately’ into the sentence [as underlined], which would also take into account the remark by Italy. Thus, the revised 11.2 would read, ‘Cultural policies and/or legal and administrative measures are appropriately integrating ICH […]’, which could apply in many ways, but especially so in the safeguarding philosophy.
10. The **delegation of Austria** supported Italy’s remark on the wording, preferring ‘legal and administrative measures’ to ‘legislation’ because not all activities taken by the State were bound within a legal framework but could be based on another form.
11. The **delegation of Spain** also supported Italy’s proposal. With regard to Indicators 12 and 13, the delegation felt that it would very difficult for most countries to obtain this information and achieve these indicators. It explained that it was already very difficult to obtain information on intangible cultural heritage in cultural legislation and would be even more difficult to have it included in education legislation or any other legislation.
12. The **Chairperson** understood the point made, nevertheless, a State acceding to a UN Convention was already cognizant of its legal responsibility and the legally binding nature of the Convention, even though this Convention differed slightly to others.
13. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québéçois du patrimoine vivant**, wished to add a new factor 11.3 to reflect a continuously important issue in Canada, and probably in other countries as well, which would read, ‘The various components of ICH, whether inscribed or not, can access, openly and equitably, to the various public programmes in support of culture’.
14. **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck**, **NGO Tapis plein**, remarked that the notion of diversity was very much present in the core Indicator 11, but that this was absent in the assessment factors and there were no built in tools to measure this diversity.
15. The **Chairperson** did not see much difference in this indicator, but the remark was well noted, inviting the Secretary to respond.
16. The **Secretary** wished to address two points. He noted that many delegations had raised issues concerning sub-regional or international contexts, adding that this point would be dealt with later specifically under a different thematic area. However, Belgium raised a point that the Secretariat considered a results-based management issue. If qualitative factors were defined such as ‘appropriate’ or ‘effective’ in the assessment factors, it would invite another level of sub-indicators, the language of which it sought to avoid. The rationale being that the factors under consideration should come at the first indicator level.
17. The **Chairperson** thankedthe Secretary for the clarification, opening the floor for discussion and comment on Indicator 12.
18. The **delegation of Belgium** noted that ‘mother tongue instruction’ had been included [in 12.3], yet paragraph 107 of the Operational Directives made reference to vernacular languages and not the concept of ‘mother tongue’. The delegation wondered about its origin.
19. The **Secretary** understood that there were some notable discrepancies between the language of the Operational Directives and the language in the document. He explained that this was because the issue concerned the subject of education, and it was thus decided to follow the language used by educationalists and education programmes in the various education ministries, even though the intention was that it reflected the Operational Directives. [Disruption due to problems with the sound equipment]
20. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** thanked China for hosting this important Working Group meeting, and the Secretariat for its well-prepared document. Referring to 12.3, and the reference to ‘mother tongue’, the delegation felt that the order in which it appeared was incorrect vis-à-vis the mention of ‘multilingual education, in that one starts with mother tongue followed by learning other languages.
21. The **Chairperson** suspended the meeting to allow for the repair of the equipment.

*[15-minute suspension]*

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the meeting, apologising for the delay. He returned to the discussion on Indicator 12.
2. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** drew attention to the use of the term ‘enhancement’ in 12.1, which was understood to come from the Convention, though its use here was unclear. The delegation surmised that it implied ‘promotion’, in which case it would appear repetitive vis-à-vis assessment factor 12.2.
3. The **Secretary** found the question to be entirely pertinent, adding that the French version was written as ‘mise en valeur’, and the Secretariat had sought to respect the original language in the text. He agreed that in this case, ‘mise en valeur’ was closer to ‘awareness-raising” or ‘valorizing’ in English, and thereby proposed ‘valorizing’ in place of ‘enhancement’.
4. The **Chairperson** was sure that with so many bilinguists, the problem would soon be resolved.
5. The **delegation of Netherlands** wondered why education was apparent in this context given that it already appeared in Indicators 1, 2 and 3.
6. The **delegation of Uganda** viewed factors 12.1 and 12.2 as similar and could therefore be merged.
7. Responding to the question by the Netherlands, the **Secretary** explained that the first set of indicators deals with education as it is practised, whereas in this case it refers to legislation and whether there are specific policies in place. The Secretary conceded that this was indeed debatable, i.e. whether they should be separated given that education programmes will have policies, but as this method was applied in the case of safeguarding in other contexts, it was decided to include it twice in this education context. With regard to the question from Uganda, factors 12.1 and 12.2 were not intended to be exactly the same. Factor 12.1 concerns ‘awareness-raising’, ‘valorizing’ and recognizing the importance of intangible cultural heritage through education, whereas 12.2 is more directly linked to the actual transmission of intangible cultural heritage through formal, non-formal, informal education systems, for example, in specific schools of art that may train music practices. Thus, factor 12.2 concerned the transmission of knowledge, whereas 12.1 concerned the valorization of intangible cultural heritage in general in education systems.
8. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** returned to an earlier point regarding the word order of mother tongue versus multilingual education.
9. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the point was well noted.
10. **Mr Antoine Gauthier** suggested a re-wording of factors 12.1 and 12.2, which would read, ‘Policies and/or legislation for education are enacted, revised and implemented to ensure recognition’.
11. The **Secretary** clarified that the ‘implemented’ part was addressed at the level of the indicator, but not at the level of the assessment factors, which seeks to establish whether implementation is taking place.
12. Referring to factor 13, the **delegation of Belarus** did not think it was necessary to describe in detail the departments of the legislative system, such as health, agriculture, and so on, not least because they are mentioned in the subsequent factor 13.3. It suggested instead, ‘Policies and/or legislation systems are enacted or revised […]’.
13. The **Chairperson** took note and then turned to the discussion on Indicator 13.
14. The **delegation of Austria** noted that Chapter VI of the Operational Directives was referred to, and thus wondered whether it should also be included under 13.2 [underlined], which would read, ‘[…] consider ICH and its safeguarding as a driver and enabler of sustainable development’. With regard to factor 13.3, ‘economic development’ is mentioned, but the delegation wished to propose to either change it to ‘sustainable development’ or mention all three areas, i.e. ecological and social development as well.
15. The **delegation of Comoros** also wished to add tourism to the list, as intangible cultural heritage can be considered unique and a form of national wealth for many countries, especially for developing nations such as Comoros.
16. Referring to 13.2, the **delegation of Peru** noted that the text mentions various traditional knowledge and intangible cultural heritage know-how related to health, food, agriculture, and so on, as well as disaster reduction and recovery. It wondered how intangible cultural heritage and traditional knowledge could help prevent and mitigate disasters. Although necessarily a good thing, it was important to consider that, in the case of disasters or armed conflict, there are policies put in place by States to respond to the ongoing disaster or conflicts in disaster response policies, of which components of intangible cultural heritage should be taken into account. In the field of culture, responses to disasters often take into account the status of monuments for example, but not intangible cultural heritage, even though intangible cultural heritage is often hugely affected – along with the communities – by catastrophes. The delegation spoke of the huge floods that had recently affected a large part of the northern Peruvian coast where people lived from artisanal crafts. Not only did they lose their homes and possessions, they also lost their livelihoods because they lost their raw materials, tools, and so on. Thus, State disaster response policies should also review how elements of intangible cultural heritage could be sustained post-disaster. It thus proposed to draft a proposal in this regard because factor 13.2 had not taken this into account.
17. The **Chairperson** invited Peru to submit a written proposal.
18. The **delegation of Belgium** noted a problem with the wording in 13.2 and 13.3, and agreed with Austria on why economic development was singled out but not sustainable development. In 13.2, a number of items were mentioned in brief, for instance, ‘water’ is cited in general terms, whereas ‘clean and safe water’ appears in the Operational Directives. The same applied to ‘urban development’, but rural development was not included for instance. The delegation remarked on the imbalanced way of selecting a number of topics, and suggested to either, systematically reflect all the items specified under Chapter VI [of the Operational Directives] or to make a general reference to ‘sustainable development’. With regard to tourism, it cautioned the manner in which it was presented, suggesting to refer to paragraph 187 of the Operational Directives, particularly paragraph 187(b)(i) which calls for measures to ensure that the communities, groups and individuals concerned are the primary beneficiaries of any tourism associated with their ICH. Thus, tourism could be interpreted in many ways, and may need to be counterbalanced in this regard. In general, factors 13.2 and 13.3 still required a lot of work.
19. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** proposed to maintain the same level, whether specific or general, for these assessment factors. It explained that should delegations wish to highlight some areas that were closely related to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, then they should be pointed out, as in 13.2. However, in more general terms, the indicator could be defined as ‘Policies and legislation for inclusive social development’, in this way it would reference the Operational Directives. In the case of 13.3, if tourism or other areas were considered more important, then they should be mentioned in order to maintain the same degree of specificity.
20. The **delegation of Haiti** fully supported Peru's position, remarking on the specific case of Haiti during hurricane Matthew and the Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA), which did not take into account aspects of culture, including intangible cultural heritage. It was argued that it was not measurable, despite experts’ attempts to convince them otherwise. Thus, it was necessary to raise awareness on this issue and to publish clear communication in this regard.
21. Referring to 13.2, the **delegation of Eritrea** wished to focus on the issue of gender, specifically, female genital mutilation, which has components of intangible cultural heritage and is practised by some nations, yet the activity is not permitted globally. The delegation saw some parallels with the remarks by Gambia on the issue of religion. It wished to hear the Secretariat’s view on this issue.
22. The **Chairperson** noted that there was a general understanding on this theme, and that there were certainly some revision and fine-tuning required, which the Rapporteurs would work on. He highlighted a slight discrepancy in 13.2 between the French and English versions; ‘urban development’ would be added in the French version.
23. **Ms Ananya Bhattacharya**, **NGO Contact Base**, had two observations. Firstly, regarding 13.4, she wished to changed the wording ‘availability of natural resources’ to ‘natural and other resources’ or ‘natural and technical resources’, explaining that often communities lacked the basic things, such as lack of infrastructure and tools, which hampered practice and transmission. It could also refer to resources other than natural resources. Secondly, regarding 13.2 and the reference to ‘disaster reduction’, Ms Bhattacharya understood that there was another set of indicators on peace-building, but preferred ‘disaster and conflict reduction’ or ‘mitigation’ because policies related to conflict reduction should also take in natural and human-induced disasters.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Bhattacharya for her contribution. He then turned to Indicator 14.
25. Regarding 14.1, the **delegation of Belgium** referred to the phrase, ‘ICH bearers and their communities’, proposing to change it to the more general ‘communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals’, or at least ‘communities and groups and individuals’.
26. The **delegation of China** believed that the policy to protect the practitioner and bearer, and to protect the community was affected by the fact that there was no clear definition of intellectual property covering intangible cultural heritage. Thus, this issue required further discussion to advance on its development and resolution.
27. Apologising for the technical problems, the **Chairperson** congratulated the delegations for their hard work at this halfway juncture with the hope that the technical glitches would be soon resolved. He invited the Secretary to introduce the next thematic area.
28. The **Secretary** presented the fifth set of indicators under the theme ‘Role of intangible cultural heritage in society’, which continues from the theme of sustainable development referred to in Article 13 Convention as ‘promoting the function of ICH in society’. The focus however is less on policies, legislation or legal frameworks and more on programmes and activities. It includes two indicators and four assessment factors. Indicator 15 looks at the ‘extent to which the importance of ICH in society is recognized, both by the communities, groups and individuals concerned and by society at large’. Factor 15.1 asks whether these community, groups and individuals are able to utilize their own intangible cultural heritage to implement and achieve sustainable development programmes. Factor 15.2 concerns whether development interventions strengthen the role of intangible cultural heritage as a driver, guarantor and enabler of sustainable development, and recognizes its importance in society. The first factor thus concerns how communities use their intangible cultural heritage to achieve sustainable development goals or targets, while the second factor concerns how those sustainable development targets are effectively enhancing the role of intangible cultural heritage as a guarantee of sustainable development. Indicator 16 gives particular attention to the question of inclusivity, which had been previously examined under several other indicators and factors that refer to inclusive policies, programmes and activities. In this case, inclusiveness is spelled out specifically in factor 16.1, which echoes the language of the Operational Directives and Ethical Principles. Factor 16.2 focuses in particular on the questions of self-respect and mutual respect, which had been evoked earlier. The Secretary remarked that this was one of the shortest themes, but that it really spoke to some of the fundamental provisions and purposes of the Convention.
29. The **Chairperson** opened the discussion on Indicator 15.
30. The **delegation of Thailand** remarked on the importance of intangible cultural heritage in terms of inter-dialogue between communities and between societies. It thus found commendable the learning processes and activities from within and between the various peoples and communities, as well as aspects of inter-relation and inter-dialogue, all of which deserved to be highlighted. Thailand’s proposal emphasized the core value [of intangible cultural heritage], which is transmissible between communities, rather than the focus on the empirical aspect of the element. The delegation thus sought to propose another aspect as an indicator.
31. The **Chairperson** thanked Thailand for the intervention and its submitted proposal.
32. The **delegation of Haiti** wished to return to factor 14.1 and the question of intellectual property rights, adding that this work was important to prevent any exploitation of intangible cultural heritage, especially given the work already carried out thus far. It explained that there were many communities solicited by commercial agents who sought to take advantage of the growing interest in intangible cultural heritage. The delegation understood that the Convention did not necessarily have all the answers, but that nonetheless it was an issue that should be kept in mind for future discussion.
33. The **Chairperson** agreed that the issue of intellectual rights of intangible cultural heritage needed to be further defined.
34. The **Secretary** wished to clarify that the Working Group was not mandated to discuss directives or international law, but rather to establish a framework for implementation. Moreover, the Convention does not address intellectual property issues in the international context. This work was ongoing at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) where discussions were being held on intellectual property centred on traditional knowledge. However, countries may, within their own national frameworks, decide to attribute intellectual property as one of the means of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The proposal of an indicator in this regard would thus acknowledge part of a country’s safeguarding policy towards intellectual property, because some countries have such policies. However, this would have no implication on international intellectual property discussions at the level of the Convention, which explicitly concerns safeguarding. Nevertheless, the Convention recognizes that some countries, as part of safeguarding within their territory, may wish to use intellectual property instruments as a way of safeguarding intangible heritage.
35. The **Chairperson** believed this to be an important issue but one that was still ongoing, both at the national and international level, adding that the present meeting could not present anything defining on this issue.
36. The **delegation of Belgium** considered this thematic area on ‘Role of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society’ to be extremely important, which should in fact come in first place. It also noted that the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding was contained in the core indicator, with factor 15.1 stating ‘Communities, groups and individuals are able to use their Intangible Cultural Heritage for sustainable development programmes’, even though it was difficult to measure. Nevertheless, this factor frames the objective and purpose of the framework, and 15.1 should therefore be the first element that people acquire. In this regard, the delegation proposed a possible reshuffling of the themes, in line with its earlier suggestion, with factor 15.1 a good candidate to be in first place under ‘safeguarding in society’, while at the same time, broadening the scope of 15.1 to emphasize that communities, groups and individuals can use their intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development. It believed that this was a more active position, followed by outside interventions by States and brokers (in 15.2) to develop this approach. Factors 15.1 and 15.2 thus captured the whole philosophy of the Convention and hence a reason to place it first.
37. The **delegation of Germany** agreed on the importance of this thematic area, emphasizing the active role of intangible cultural heritage in contributing to society. It suggested strengthening this by adding a further assessment factor that referred to ‘visible and provable contributions of ICH for sustaining peace for intercultural cooperation, and for solutions to help resolve conflict’.
38. The **delegation of Jamaica** congratulated China for facilitating this meeting. Regarding factor 15.1, the delegation felt that it appeared mainly – or even exclusively – concern the use of intangible cultural heritage in the process of sustainable development. The delegation was of the experience that not all elements of intangible cultural heritage have that purpose. In Jamaica for example, there was important elements that spoke to anchoring the identity of a particular community, which was a separate issue from sustainable development. It therefore felt that although the two might be linked, they were also separate issues.
39. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed with Germany’s intervention in which it recommended a further assessment factor that linked the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to sustaining peace and conflict resolution. The delegation explained that factor 14.3 spoke of policies and legislation that recognized that ability of intangible cultural heritage to prevent disputes and provide peaceful solutions. In the case of 16.2, it presented an actual outcome, i.e. an actual change in a context or in an institution. Thus, greater emphasis should be placed on 16.2 and the concepts of sustaining peace and conflict resolution, which states ‘Self-respect and mutual respect are fostered among communities, groups and individuals through […]’. The delegation not only believed in ‘safeguarding plans and programmes’, but also in safeguarding itself, i.e. the actual practice of safeguarding that can contribute towards a real outcome, not just an output that is related to policy or legislation. Thus, in 16.2 there was an ability to actually speak about the contribution of intangible cultural heritage as an outcome towards sustaining peace.
40. The **Chairperson** noted that Colombia had already moved to the discussion on Indicator 16, inviting further comments on this discussion.
41. The **delegation of China** noted theinclusiveness of the communities in 16.1 and wished to recommend ethnic groups or peoples of different ethnicity.
42. The **Chairperson** noted the end to the work on Indicators 15 and 16, inviting the Secretary to make any final announcements.
43. The **Secretary** reminded the six Rapporteurs to meet later in the evening.
44. The **Chairperson** adjourned the day’s session.

*[Monday, 12 June 2017, Morning session]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated all the delegates for their hard work, inviting the Secretary to introduce the next thematic area and associated indicators.
2. The **Secretary** presented the sixth theme on ‘Awareness-raising’; one of the four purposes of the Convention set out in its Article 1. There are four proposed indicators and thirteen assessment factors; most of which are drawn from the provisions in Chapter IV of the Operational Directives. This theme would bring to the fore the role of communities, groups and individuals, as consistent with Article 15 of the Convention and the [Ethical Principles](https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866). The first Indicator 17 concerns the extent to which the communities, groups and individuals participate widely in awareness-raising activities. There are four associated assessment factors. Factor 17.1 specifically emphasizes the widest possible participation. Factor 17.2 puts the focus on the principle ‘free, prior and informed and sustained consent’ from those communities, groups and individuals before raising awareness on their own intangible cultural heritage. Factor 17.3 emphasizes the importance of protecting their rights and their moral and material interests when raising awareness. Lastly, factor 17.4 takes up the concern in the Operational Directives to actively engage the youth in particular, given not only the importance of awareness vis-à-vis intangible cultural heritage, but also for their potential contributions as skilled users of new media. Indicator 18 concerns the involvement of media in awareness-raising. The first factor 18.1 refers to media coverage, raising awareness and promoting mutual respect between cultural officers and media organizations, as occasionally there is a distant or even adversarial relation between them and experiences have shown that cooperation can be very effective for both (18.2). The third factor 18.3 takes up the question of whether media programming on intangible cultural heritage is inclusive, both in terms of audiences and in the languages used.
3. The **Secretary** then presented Indicator 19, which bundles together a number of other information measures that are mentioned in the Operational Directives. Assessment factor 19.1 refers to policies and programmes that provide public acknowledgement and honour to bearers and practitioners of intangible cultural heritage. Factor, 19.2, brings in a number of different informational activities and identifies a range of different audiences. Factor 19.3 takes stock of whether there are programmes to promote and disseminate good safeguarding practices in line with Article 16 and various provisions of the Operational Directives. Lastly, factor 19.4 asks whether the various information programmes promote mutual respect for intangible cultural heritage for and between diverse communities. The last Indicator 20 within this theme gives particular attention to the relevant ethical principles, an ongoing concern among States Parties whenever awareness-raising has been discussed. Factor 20.1 focuses on whether the 12 ethical principles adopted by the Committee in Namibia [in 2014] are being respected. Finally, factor 20.2 looks at whether other relevant professional codes of standards of the media and other information professions are being respected.
4. Before examining the indicators, the **Chairperson** alerted the delegations to the long hours spent by the Secretary and the Rapporteurs the previous eveving to compile the comments and proposals from the floor. He therefore recommended that proposals presented are concrete and precise, which would help in the formulation of the report and lessen the workload. He then turned to the examination of indicator 17.
5. The **delegation of Finland** thanked the Chairperson for the good work, and concurred that awareness-raising was a very important part of the Convention’s work. The delegation sought some clarification in factor 17.3 concerning the rights of communities, which evidently is very important, but it was unclear to what the indicator pertained, i.e. which rights, and what should none exist? It surmised that it might be further clarified in the accompanying guidance notes.
6. The **Secretary** explained that the idea was to ensure that communities, groups and individuals, in relation to their intangible cultural heritage, were not misrepresented, denigrated or presented in a way that infringed upon their rights, particularly if they had aspects of their intangible cultural heritage that should not to be shared with the public. The Secretary welcomed specific proposals to change the language if it was unclear.
7. The **Chairperson** was sure that Finland would provide a more specific proposal.
8. The **delegation of Ghana** did not have any particular issues with Indicator 17. However, it wished to bring to the fore the case in Ghana where most of the cottage-based industries are transmitted from father to son. For example, in most cocoa-growing areas children are gathering cocoa, drying the beans, etc. This is not considered child labour, although some gender activists might criticize this particular activity. It is essentially an awareness-raising exercise that the child enjoys, like a hunter might teach his son to shoot a gun.
9. Regarding awareness-raising, the **delegation of Peru** noted that modes of communication were taken into account, particularly mainstream media. However, a phenomenon was apparent within communities, especially among young people, in the use of new media and contemporary communication technologies. It believed that an assessment factor was required to promote the use of new media for safeguarding and for increasing visibility and awareness on the importance of intangible cultural heritage. Communities, especially young people, were already using this new media. For this reason, the delegation believed that a new factor 17.5 could be introduced, and would draft a proposal in this regard.
10. The **Chairperson** welcomed Peru’s proposal.
11. The **delegation of Belgium** agreed with Peru’s remarks, seeing an opportunity to mention social media in an official document relating to the 2003 Convention. The delegation had two small proposals in 17.2. Firstly, concerning the idea of *sustained* informed consent of communities, groups and individuals, and secondly, to change ‘before’ to ‘for’ to emphasize that consent is given during awareness-raising, which would thus read, ‘The free, prior, sustained and informed consent of communities, groups and individuals concerned is secured for awareness-raising activities […]’. It also wished to add ‘groups’ In 17.4 to complete the sentence ‘communities and groups’.
12. The **Chairperson** took note of the points raised and turned to Indicator 18.
13. The **delegation of Côte d’Ivoire** thanked the Chairperson and China for its hospitality, and congratulated the Secretariat for its methodical work. With regard to 18.1, it sought to delete the words shown in brackets ‘(including print and broadcast media as well as community-based media)’, as the first words expressed channels of communication whereas the second expressed an idea of scale. The delegation therefore proposed either to delete all the words in brackets, or to retain the wording and change ‘as well as community-based media’ to ‘including community media’.
14. The **Chairperson** remarked that ultimately the Rapporteurs would decide whether the words should be deleted.
15. The **delegation of Germany** wondered whether this indicator could provide a distinction between the 2003 Convention and the 1972 World Heritage Convention in another assessment factor, as these conventions were often confused in Germany.
16. Picking up on the point made by Germany, the **delegation of Belgium** concurred that when reporting on the Representative List, news articles often cited ‘World Heritage’. The delegation added that this indicator could be clearly measured because currently about 80 per cent of articles confuse the conventions. The target would be to reduce the percentage of errors, while sending a signal to the press to be precise in their reference to the 2003 Convention.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for its very pertinent comment.
18. A Representative of the **International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP)** thanked UNESCO and the Secretariat for their dedication and support to this very important meeting, adding that a category 2 centre would strongly wish to collaborate to help establish this framework in the near future. In relation to 18.2, the Representative noted the specific mention of cooperation between ‘cultural offices and media organizations’ and wondered whether it was limited to these two entities. If by cultural offices they comprise government offices then government-led initiatives were also implied. It was also important to promote awareness-raising by strengthening the role of and cooperation with media organizations, and by placing greater importance on multilateral cooperation with media organizations. In this regard, the Representative suggested replacing ‘cultural offices’ with ‘various ICH stakeholders and media organizations’.
19. With regard to 19.2, the **delegation of Seychelles** suggested including ethnographic film-making as part of awareness raising tools.
20. The **Chairperson** took note of the remark under Indicator 19, inviting further comments.
21. **Mr Laurier Turgeon**, **NGO Canadian Ethnology Society**, suggested adding ‘social media and Internet’ to the list in 18.1 so as to remain consistent with point 17. It also suggested in Indicator 18 to expand on ‘importance’, which was a very general term, by adding ‘the importance and the multiple uses of ICH’. This would give intangible cultural heritage agency to make it an agent of development, but also as a reminder that the indicators should reflect the importance of its use, as discussed in the previous session.
22. Regarding 18.3, the **delegation of Zimbabwe** suggested replacing the word ‘vernacular’ that had negative connotations in Southern Africa.
23. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** noted the focus on Indicator 18.1 and the role of media with respect to intangible cultural heritage, adding that it was equally important to also mention the role of intangible cultural heritage in expressing the identity of the communities and its role in sustainable development. It understood that this was mentioned in different indicators, but as this part referred to media it was an opportunity to enhance cultural dialogue and acknowledge other intangible cultural heritage from other countries, i.e. hinting to the media how best to explain intangible cultural heritage. The delegation also wised to add at the end of the sentence, ‘on the national level and international level’.
24. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivant,** had two comments on Indicator 18.1. Firstly, he wished to add ‘public media’ to ‘community-based media’, as a number of countries had nationwide public media that had an important role to play in this regard. Secondly, he wished to add a brief text, which would read, ‘media coverage disseminates cultural content related to ICH and awareness of the importance of ICH’. The addition of ‘disseminates cultural content related to ICH’ would allow for more measurable results compared to ‘awareness,’ which is more difficult to measure and understand with indicators.
25. The **delegation of Belgium** had some doubts on introducing ‘cultural content’ into the debate as this would introduce new concepts that were not covered by the Convention.
26. The **Chairperson** took note of the remark, and turned to Indicator 19.
27. The **delegation of Belarus** had a proposalin point 19.2 to delete ‘interested’ in ‘interested stakeholders’, as stakeholders were the interested group.
28. The **Chairperson** took note of the remark.
29. Referring to 19.4 on the question of ‘mutual respect, the **delegation of Thailand** remarked on how important it was to highlight the appreciation of intangible cultural heritage by other communities and other people, i.e. not just the bearers themselves, which was absent in this assessment factor, so that its value could be transmitted to other people.
30. The **Chairperson** understood the point made; that intangible cultural heritage be appreciated by others outside of the community.
31. Referring to 19.1, the **delegation of Republic of Korea** suggested changing the order of practitioners and bearers, in line with previous examples.
32. The **delegation of Belgium** also wondered [in 19.1] whether ‘bearers and practitioners’ should be replaced by ‘communities, groups, and if applicable, individuals’, particularly in 19.2 where only ‘bearers’ are mentioned.
33. The **Chairperson** remarked on the faithful adherence to the Convention by Belgium.
34. The **delegation of Gambia** concurred with the observations by Belgium. It also wondered what ‘goods’ referred to in 19.3, and wished to add ‘dissemination of cultural goods’ so as define the type of ‘goods’ implied.
35. Referring to the French version, the **delegation of Côte d’Ivoire** explained that it was unclear to what ‘it’ referred to in 19.4, adding that although it likely implied ‘intangible cultural heritage’, it should be made more explicit.
36. The **Secretary** concurred that there was an error in the French translation.
37. The **delegation of Germany** supported Thailand’s proposal on 19.4 to include the appreciation of others, as well as a formulation concerning the connectivity of intercultural content.
38. **Mr Wataru Iwamoto**, **Director-General, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region** **(IRCI)** suggested in 19.2 to include ‘researchers’ between ‘bearers and the general public’, so as to encourage researchers to release their scientific outcomes to the public, but also to inform researchers on the different fields of importance of intangible cultural heritage.
39. Referring to 19.2, the **delegation of Italy** suggested adding all the events cited in paragraph 105(b) of the Operational Directives to ‘workshops, festivals, public forums and seminars’, or replace the entire list with ‘public events’.
40. The **Chairperson** understood the point made but in practice there would be too many activities if all were cited. He then turned to the discussion on Indicator 20.
41. The **delegation of Ecuador** thanked China for the organization of this meeting and congratulated the Secretariat on its work. Referring to 21.1, it considered important to make clear that it is the bearers who must participate in an inclusive basis with regard to the elements, as referenced in Article 15 of the Convention.
42. The **Chairperson** took note of the remark on Indicator 21.
43. The **delegation of Côte d’Ivoire** noted in 20.1 in the French version that it was missing the definite article ‘the’, which should read, ‘for the safeguarding’.
44. The **Chairperson** agreed that the French language was very strict.
45. The **delegation of Ghana** wondered about the implication of ‘extent to which’ that was mentioned in the core indicators. The delegation explained that there was no indication of any qualitative or quantitative assessment, adding that States Parties should be able to implement actions adapted to its own situation, not least because ‘extent to which’ implied a very broad scope.
46. The **Secretary** thanked Ghana for this important question. The Secretary clarified that the work on the framework did not constitute the drafting of legal texts or Operational Directives and thus States Parties had freedom in this regard. These were signposts or guidelines for measuring progress. Moreover, the second column presented assessment factors that States may (or may not) wish to consider in order to establish the extent to which progress has been made. The set of assessment factors were there to help States establish the combination of quantitative and qualitative measurements that might be applicable, i.e. they were not indicators but factors for consideration.
47. Referring to 21.1, the **delegation of Belarus** wished to complement the text to read, ‘communities, groups and applicable individuals’, in line with the Convention.
48. **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck**, **NGO Tapis Plein**, suggested replacing ‘respect’ and ‘respected’ by ‘foster’ and ‘fostered’ in Indicator 20 and the two factors 20.1 and 20.2 respectively, as this considers awareness-raising.
49. The **delegation of Gambia** returned to the point made by Zimbabwe in 18.3 and the use of ‘vernacular’, which was very derogative in some ethnicities, and to change the text to read, ‘media programmes on ICH is inclusive, supported by programmes devoted to culture and cultural-related issues, preferably in local languages to address different target groups’.
50. The **delegation of Belgium** felt that the notion of local language was imprecise and not sufficiently clear; perhaps in some countries, but not in others. Moreover, ‘vernacular’ was cited in the Convention.
51. The **Chairperson** understood the point raised, closing the discussion on Indicator 20.
52. The **delegation of Senegal** understood Belgium's remark, but for some African countries ‘vernacular’ had a negative connotation related to history in which languages were imposed and defined by ‘native’ and ‘vernacular’. It appreciated that ‘vernacular’ exists in the French language, but when viewed in its historical context, it takes on a negative aspect. From this perspective, it preferred the use of ‘national languages’.
53. Referring to factors 20.1 and 20.2, the **delegation of Uganda** sought clarification on the difference between the two.
54. The **Secretary** explained that 20.1 concerned the Ethical Principles, as adopted by the Committee and endorsed by the General Assembly, while 20.2 looks at relevant professional codes or standards that might be applied to the media or others in television and the arts, and so on.
55. The **Chairperson** closed the discussion on this group of indicators.
56. With regard to the discussion on languages, the **delegation of Belgium** proposed ‘the languages of the groups and communities concerned’, as national languages was not an acceptable alternative.
57. The **Chairperson** suggested allowing the Rapporteurs to find a suitable formulation, inviting the Secretary to present the next set of indicators.
58. The **Secretary** remarked that the delegations had spoken several times on the importance of ensuring the widest possible participation of communities, groups and individuals, as well as other civil society organizations, such as NGOs. Thus, the seventh theme on ‘Engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals’ was intended to pull together those concerns into three indicators and eight assessment factors. Indicator 21 looks at the extent to which various stakeholders are engaged actively in safeguarding. Factor 21.1 focuses on the inclusive and widest possible participation of communities and groups in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in general, as well as for specific elements. Factor 21.2 focuses on the engagement of NGOs and other civil society organizations. Factor 21.3 looks at private sector entities that often have an important role to play in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in general, or specific elements. Indicator 22 considers the extent to which civil society is engaged in monitoring the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, emphasizing the importance of including civil society, not only in safeguarding but also in monitoring the process. Factor 22.1 asks whether an enabling environment exists that encourages the communities, groups and individuals concerned to monitor intangible cultural heritage safeguarding efforts. Factor 22.2 similarly asks whether scholars, experts and centres of expertise are enabled to participate in such monitoring. Lastly, factor 22.3 concerns whether NGOs, the media and other civil society organizations are able to monitor and studyintangible cultural heritage safeguarding programmes and measures. Indicator 23 in this set is different than previous indicators in that the reporting and monitoring for this indicator would be carried out by the Secretariat at the global level, rather than by States Parties at the country level, as has been the case up until now. This concerns the participation of NGOs acting in an advisory or consultative capacity to the Committee, as provided in Articles 8 and 9 of the Convention. Factor 23.1 looks at the overall number of NGOs accredited to provide advisory services and their geographic distribution. Factor 23.2 looks specifically at the participation of private persons in the Evaluation Body, as provided in paragraph 27 of the Operational Directives. This was the overview of the three indicators and 8 assessment factors addressing civil society engagement.
59. The **Chairperson** invited comments and proposals on indicator 21.
60. Referring to 21.3, the **delegation of China** remarked that paragraph 117 of the Operational Directives specifically focused on tourism-related activities and the respect of the community, groups and individuals’ rights in this regard. It did not know whether the private sector actively participated in the overall *safeguarding* of intangible cultural heritage, however from China’s perspective it recognized the value of private sector participation. In any case, it recommended deleting ‘in general’ in order to balance the sentence.
61. The **delegation of Germany** wished to add some text on the plurality of traditions and the diversity of heritage in today’s societies. It remarked on the many elements today that were related to more current social developments, such as migration or urbanization, and thus might be relevant.
62. Referring to 21.2, the **delegation of Niger** suggested replacing ‘NGOs and other civil society actors’ with ‘non-state actors’, as this encompassed the groups mentioned.
63. The **delegation of Netherlands** remarked that the core of the Convention centred on the engagement of communities, groups and individuals, as reflected in these core indicators. Having spoken about the important role of communities and groups in society under core indicators 15 and 16 during the previous day’s discussion, the delegation proposed to change the order of the indicators so that it did not begin with ‘education’, but with Indicators 15 and 16, followed by Indicator 21. This order would thereby highlight the importance of the role of communities in the Convention.
64. Regarding 21.3, the **delegation of Columbia** responded to the remarks by China in that developing countries found an important ally in the private sector. It understood the risk of exploitation of intangible cultural heritage, but in developing countries the private sector worked as an ally in the management and safeguarding of ICH and should thus be considered in this particular context.
65. The **delegation of Republic of Korea** had some concern over the wording of Indicator 21, notably the word ‘enhanced’, which means to change from one state to another, suggesting instead, ‘engagement is exercised’ or ‘guaranteed’ among stakeholders. However, if the intention was to measure the degree of change, it could go along with ‘enhanced’. It also shared concern about the over-commercialization of intangible cultural heritage with the engagement of the private sector, but that this was covered by the ethical principles in the previous core indicator that separated these issues.
66. Referring to the thematic area, ‘Engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals’, the **delegation of Thailand** found that the assessment factors 21.1, 21.2 and 21.3 did not clearly or logically correspond to the general heading of Indicator 21. The delegation suggested that the native speakers of French or English could clarify the use of the terms, i.e. ‘communities and groups, private sector entities, NGOs’ and so on. It also agreed with China in that it was very sceptical about the participation of the private sector in safeguarding and promoting intangible cultural heritage because of their vested interests.
67. The **Chairperson** noted the two different views with regard to the private sector, and suggested that the two sides work together to agree on a compromise text.
68. The **delegation of China** suggest that the terms used in 21.2 and 21.3 should be exactly the same, i.e. they contribute to the safeguarding of ICH.
69. The **Chairperson** appealed to the delegations concerned to meet together with the Secretariat to find the right terminology. He then turned to Indicator 22.
70. The **delegation of Ghana** sought clarification on the notation ‘OD’ in the table.
71. The **Secretary** explained that ‘OD’ referred to the Operational Directives that were adopted by the General Assembly. Any correlation between the assessment factors and commitments by States Parties to the Convention, as referenced in the Operational Directives, were given in the table as specific paragraphs of the Operational Directives.
72. The **delegation of Austria** sought clarification regarding the reference to ‘enabling environment’ [in 22.1], adding that previous discussions on the subject distinguished ‘enabling environment’ from the government perspective and from the stakeholder’s perspective, which was not necessarily the same.
73. The **Secretary** reminded the delegations that this referred to an assessment factor and not an indicator, and was thus not a measurable. The ‘enabling environment’ was considered one of the factors contributing to the extent at which civil society [contributes to monitoring of ICH and safeguarding]. The Secretary understood that there were very specific references to the ‘enabling environment’ in the 2005 Convention. Nevertheless, this factor could be better addressed in accompanying guidance notes, which could outline the meaning of ‘enabling environment’ (though not in a legal sense), and how to address this assessment factor operationally.
74. **Ms Ananya Bhattacharya**, **NGO Contact Base**, referring to 22.2, suggested having ‘research institutions’ together with the ‘centres of expertise’ in place of ‘scholars, experts’, in line with previous assessment factors.
75. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivant**, proposed to invert the order of 22.2 and 22.3 so as to adhere to the general rule within the Convention, which is to prioritize the communities, groups and individuals, followed by NGOs and civil society. In view of the fact that many individuals and groups were members or part of NGOs, many NGOs could even be considered as groups themselves.
76. Referring to 22.3, the **delegation of Peru** did not see the need to include the ‘media’ alongside ‘NGOs’ in that the role of the media in scientific studies was not clear and could create confusion for States. Moreover, the text ‘and other civil society bodies’ encompassed the media without flagging their role, alongside researchers and NGOs.
77. The **Secretary** concurred thatthe media obviously did not undertake scientific research, however, they do have a monitoring function. It was for this reason that it was included in the assessment factor. The Secretary suggested correcting the phrase to read, ‘to monitor and/or undertake scientific research’.
78. **Mr Laurier Turgeon**, **NGO Canadian Ethnology Society**, returned to the discussion on ‘enabling environment’ [in 22.1], adding that it seemed inadequate and lacked impact, suggesting instead, ‘opportunities for communities exist [...]’.
79. The **delegation of Peru** understood ‘enabling environment’ to mean a set of situations that were favourable to research and conducive to participation, and thus by being more specific it would in fact limit its scope. Thus, the delegation wished to retain the term.
80. The **delegation of Niger** also believed that ‘enabling environment’ was the correct term, which implied ‘favourable conditions’.
81. Returning to the point on ‘enabling environment’, the **delegation of Senegal** found the Secretary’s explanation clear on the difference between the indicator and the assessment factors, and what was measurable and not. Thus, ‘enabling environment’ should be viewed in the context of the assessment factor of the indicator, i.e. it takes account of the indicator but it is not the indicator. The delegation believed that understanding this distinction would help the Rapporteurs enormously in their work drafting the texts. Moreover, all these issues were explained in the guidance notes, the assessment factors and the citations.
82. The **Chairperson** thanked Senegal for the reminder. He then turned to Indicator 23.
83. The **delegation of Belgium** was not convinced of the need for 23.1 and 23.2, particularly 23.2 [on the participation of NGOs and private persons in the Evaluation Body], adding that although it was easy to measure, it provided no useful insights. For this reason, the delegation proposed to delete the two factors. It suggested that the work of NGOs could be better and more concretely evaluated with regard to their participation on the online platform on ethical codes following an invitation by the Committee to work with UNESCO in this regard.
84. The **Secretary** reiterated that the factors were not indicators and were thus not measurables, merely factors for consideration. The factors only served to assess the indicator, and additional factors could also be considered. Regarding 23.1, the Secretary explained that the issue of the geographic distribution of NGOs had repeatedly been raised within the Committee and thus it was felt to be a very important factor, and perhaps not the only one to understand the engagement of NGOs and public and private bodies in relation to the Committee and the Evaluation Bodies.
85. The **delegation of Peru** agreed with Belgium that these factors were more administrative in nature than qualitative aspects. It concurred that the role of NGOs had been largely discussed. However, while the delegation understood the Secretary’s remarks in relation to the Convention and the Operational Directives, it still had doubts as to whether these statements should be retained with regard to the number and the geographical distribution of NGOs.
86. The **delegation of Italy** sought clarification in factor 23.2, as – according to the actual mechanism of election to the Evaluation Body – this assessment would always be positive as equitable geographical distribution was guaranteed. Thus, the evaluation of 23.2 appeared redundant.
87. The **delegation of Gambia** referred to the importance of public/private partnership that was apparent when looking at the holistic manner in which a number of accredited NGOs work in their capacity to provide advisory services to public and governmental institutions. The factor should therefore reflect this public/private partnership.
88. The **delegation of Ghana** spoke of the private sector as the engine of growth in Ghana while the public sector almost always had limited funds. This indicator therefore helps States like Ghana by providing insights, as well as a measureable guide to measure the contributions of [the different parties], whether administrative or technical. The delegation therefore did not see an issue with this indicator, as it was simply a guide.
89. The **Secretary** remarked that it was difficult to establish a results framework for the Convention that took into consideration the multiple dimensions of this Convention, which exists at the intergovernmental, international and national levels, as well as the community level. This indicator specifically considers how NGOs and civil societies engage with the intergovernmental system of the Convention, and one indicator in which States Parties would not be expected to report on. The Secretariat would thus measure, through its observations and registration of the intergovernmental system, the engagement of NGOs in the intergovernmental decision-making process. Referring to the comment by Italy, the Secretary concurred that the Evaluation Body was indeed an elected and structured body that would not change. However, the Secretariat felt that based on the years of experience in the Committee and the experience with the NGO Forum and the advisory bodies that the first assessment factor was important in assessing the level of engagement of the NGOs with the intergovernmental process. The Secretary conceded that 23.2 might rightly be improved or deleted, and that Belgium was correct when it mentioned that there were other assessment factors that have yet to be considered.
90. The **Chairperson** noted that some delegations still wished to retain the factors while some others had different views.
91. The **delegation of Finland** remarked that if the assessment factor was to be retained as a signpost of the international level and the national level, then it would also be interesting to take note of the domains of intangible cultural heritage represented by the participating NGOs.
92. The **delegation of Haiti** felt that it was important to retain this factor because it provided an overview of the decision-making process and the actors involved, including NGOs, i.e. how they were accredited and distributed geographically. This information was thus important to understand how the process operates and how decisions are made.
93. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivante**, found interesting the comment by Finland and agreed that these indicators would benefit from clarification in order to glean more information on the participation of NGOs in the framework of the Convention. Moreover, the number of accredited NGOs was made public at every General Assembly and was thus known to all, but there were other ways to measure their participation, for example, the percentage of NGOs present at each meeting could be an indicator, but there could be others. There was thus an opportunity to measure participation more broadly to obtain more interesting information.
94. The **Chairperson** noted the lively debate and suggested keeping the factors for the time being, while delegations could provide specific proposals to further refine the texts.
95. **Mr Wataru Iwamoto, International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI)**, asked whether the principle of equitable geographical distribution was in relation to the number of existing NGOs in each region, or if there was another factor considered.
96. The **Secretary** confirmed that geographic distribution within the Evaluation Body implied the equitable distribution among the regions, though another level could assess the overall number of NGOs present within a region and whether that distribution was equitable. It was noted that the Committee had asked for better representation at the international level across the regions with some regions having a greater NGO presence than others. The Secretary suggested that these considerations could belong in the guidance note for the assessment factor.
97. The **Chairperson** closed the discussion on this set of indicators, inviting the Secretary to introduce the next set of indicators.
98. The **Secretary** remarked that one of the Convention’s four purposes is ‘to provide for international cooperation and assistance’, as the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is recognized as a common concern of humanity. The three final indicators are centred on ‘International engagement’. Indicator 24 focuses on the percentage of States Parties actively engaged in cooperation with other States for safeguarding. Factor 24.1 looks at whether States are reporting experiences of bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation for ICH safeguarding, whether general or specific elements shared across borders. Factor 24.2 refers specifically to the exchange of information about safeguarding ICH, as highlighted both in the Convention and the Operational Directives. Factor 24.3 looks at whether States are actively exchanging documentation on elements of ICH present in their respective territories. Indicator 25 turns the focus away from safeguarding itself and more towards networking and institutional cooperation for safeguarding. Factor 25.1 asks whether the State Party participates in the activities of category 2 centres for ICH, either as a host or beneficiary. Factor 25.2 looks at whether States Parties are fostering networks of different kinds, bringing together various actors, both within their borders and across borders. Factor 25.3 focuses on whether States Parties participate in relevant ICH activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO. The Secretary remarked that there were many such frameworks for cooperation in different parts of the world, and reference had been made earlier to subregional entities. Thus, factor 25.3 sought to identify this information on international cooperation that is happening outside UNESCO.
99. The **Secretary** then introduced the final Indicator 26, which the Secretariat intends to report and monitor at the global level, and not by individual State Parties. This concerns mechanisms of the Convention itself and whether the ICH Fund, established by the Convention, is being used effectively to support ICH safeguarding and international engagement. The first factor 26.1 looks at the demand side, i.e. whether States Parties were appealing to the ICH Fund when they need assistance (financial or technical), and whether they were implementing safeguarding once they receive such assistance. Factor 26.2 concerns the supply side, i.e. whether the ICH Fund is being replenished through voluntary and supplementary contributions, either for general or specific purposes. If donors express confidence in the capacities of the Convention to use contributions effectively this would thus be an important sign of the Convention’s impact at that international cooperation level. Lastly, factor 26.3 tracks the use of the ICH Fund, specifically to support international engagements in the mechanisms of the Convention, such as the participation of developing countries, experts and NGOs in the sessions of the Committee, extraordinary sessions to the General Assembly, and so on. This was the overview of the last three indicators and nine assessment factors of the final thematic area.
100. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for discussion on Indicator 24.
101. Referring to Indicator 24, the **delegation of Senegal** felt that it was perhaps necessary to single out initiatives to safeguard transboundary ICH, not least because certain countries, for example in Africa, share ICH. Through colonization many communities were separated, but their historical cultural identity continues to exist outside national boundaries. These States must be encouraged so that they can work to safeguard their common heritage, and to inscribe their heritage and define safeguarding plans together. The delegation gave the example of the shared ICH between Senegal and the Gambia in the Kankurang, Manding initiatory rite. Thus, there must be greater synergy and cooperation between States within the framework of the safeguarding plan so that States work together to safeguard shared heritage that is ultimately shared by three or four countries. It therefore welcomed an additional assessment factor in this regard.
102. The **delegation of Germany** concurred with the comments by Senegal, as it was easy to count the number of joint applications, and the additional factor could be taken into account.
103. The **delegation of** **Belgium** supported the proposal, adding that reference should not solely be made to Articles 16 and 17 but also include Article 18 on [programmes, projects and activities for the safeguarding of the intangible heritage] and good practices, which should be emphasized as well. The delegation added that this was an incentive for States to submit proposals with other States for good safeguarding practices, which was where progress could be made and change achieved.
104. The **delegation of Peru** supported Senegal's proposal to emphasize that it is desirable for States parties with shared transnational elements to work together to safeguard their common heritage, which could be reflected in 24.1.
105. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to the NGOs.
106. **Ms Ananya Bhattacharya**, **NGO Contact Base**, noted that the discussions on the other indicators had centred on ‘the extent of’ and ‘the nature of’, yet Indicators 24 and 25 had a quantitative definition that asked for a percentage of States Parties. She thus proposed to keep the qualitative dimension reflected in, ‘the extent of States Parties actively engaged […]’, with the percentages are sub-indicators. With regard to 24.3, Ms Bhattacharya proposed to talk of access to documents instead of document exchange, as exchange supposed an interchange, and thus ‘access’ was more appropriate. She recalled the discussion on restricted access in the last NGO Forum that had outlined the many challenges in this regard.
107. The **Chairperson** understood the point made regarding percentages.
108. The **Secretary** explained that these indicators concern the number of States Parties and the processes of the intergovernmental mechanisms of the Convention, and thus a more qualitative measure was introduced. The other indicators dealt with many multiple factors that occur within a country in which the use of ‘percentage’ would not be a realistic approach. However, if States felt that ‘the extent to which’ was more apt, the information could still be expressed as a percentage. The Secretary added that the intention was not to limit the factor to the kind of reporting, monitoring or information collection that would take place within a State Party where a total sum – and thus a percentage – could not be established, but rather to obtain information on attendees to the Committee that was readily available. Nevertheless, the Secretary was happy to change the text.
109. The **delegation of Eritrea** returned to the point raised by Senegal and Peru on shared ICH elements within different States, addig that this was the case in Eritrea and Ethiopia that share the same Afar language. It was thus a very important point that should be taken into account.
110. The **Chairperson** concurred that every State Party agreed on the importance of transboundary ICH elements.
111. The **delegation of Spain** supported the remarks by Eritrea, Senegal and Peru.
112. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivant**, had a minor linguistic correction in 24.1, suggesting in ‘including those in danger’, which placed the main subject of the sentence on the elements that were not threatened, with ‘notably’ or ‘particularly’, which would place the subject of the sentence on those elements which were threatened and which the Convention sought to safeguard.
113. The **Chairperson** then opened the discussion on Indicator 25.
114. **Mr Wataru Iwamoto**, **International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI)**, proposed a change in the wording in 25.1, suggesting to replace the word ‘participates’ by ‘being engaged […] in the activities of category 2 centres’. He explained that, according to the agreement between UNESCO and each category 2 centre, ‘participation’ is defined as all the processes, diplomatic channels, communication with National Commissions of UNESCO and so on, i.e. it involves very lengthy processes. The Representative remarked that the activities of ICHCAP covered all the countries of the Asia/Pacific region, and that all the other category 2 centres had similar challenges.
115. The **Chairperson** concurred that some NGOs had requested that category 2 centres announce the adhesion of Member States of UNESCO to these centres, though this was out of topic.
116. A Representative of the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP) supported the proposal by IRCI, adding that ICHCAP had also noted the lengthy procedures involved in the intention of ‘participation’ by Member States, and thus also sought to replace ‘participates’ with ‘engages’.
117. **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck**, **NGO Tapis Plein**, suggested in 25.2 to make the wording more active by replacing ‘networks’ with ‘networking’, or even ‘transnational networking of bearers, experts […]’.
118. The **delegation of Gambia** endorsed the proposal by the NGO Contact Base in 24.3 to replace ‘exchange’ with ‘access’, as exchange – to give away and then to receive – was not the correct term. With regard to 25.3, and the reference to ‘States Parties participates in […] activities of international and regional bodies other then UNESCO’, the delegation remarked that in most cases other NGOs or other international organizations support programmes that were cross-cutting within a particular region. Thus, the indicator should reflect this and encourage participation with other related international organizations as well.
119. The **Chairperson** believed that ‘international and regional bodies’ already covered that aspect, but the point was taken.
120. The **delegation of Austria** wished to add ‘transnational’ in Indicator 25, which would read, ‘engaged in international and transnational networking and institutional cooperation’, adding that there was a linguistic difference between ‘inter’ and ‘trans’. In addition, the delegation wished to include the wording ‘communities, groups and individuals’ in 25.2.
121. The **Chairperson** asked Austria to submit its proposal in writing.
122. The **delegation of Belgium** proposed to include a reference to a mechanism that does not yet exist. It explained that there was a need to share good safeguarding practices among States, and the idea of a light mechanism for sharing experiences in safeguarding had been discussed and could be fostered by UNESCO in its capacity as a clearing-house. The delegation therefore proposed to introduce the idea of a tool, such as an online platform, to share safeguarding mechanisms that did not necessarily have to go through the procedure of Article 18, but that can be actively sponsored. It did not wish to add to the Secretariat’s work but wished to know whether it could propose something along those lines.
123. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for its good intervention, remarking that the notion of ‘good’ safeguarding practices was better than ‘best’, as it was difficult to say that one practice was better than others.
124. The **Secretary** recalled that the Committee did indeed decide in Addis Ababa to refer to good safeguarding practices rather than best safeguarding practices. He thanked Belgium for the important intervention and the idea of lighter ways of sharing good safeguarding practices, which had been mentioned several times within the Committee. The Secretary spoke of the Secretariat trying to establish such a mechanism, adding that the idea could nonetheless be reflected under 24.2, which although a bit more generic could also then refer to the mechanism, even though it does not currently exist. Nevertheless, this could be an area under which it could be reported or monitored under the broader 24.2. Furthermore, the Secretariat had already considered this idea and indeed hoped to move forward with it.
125. The **delegation of Peru** understood the point made by Belgium, adding that there already existed an exchange of good safeguarding practices within the category 2 centres. Even though the platform did not exist within UNESCO, much was being done to exchange safeguarding experiences and the register of good practices at the level of category 2 centers, as this was the case with CRESPIAL.
126. **Mr Antoine Gauthier**, **Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivant**, remarked that in order to be consistent with the principle of moving from the closest [to the communities] to the furthest in terms of wording, proposed to add ‘NGOs’ after the mention of ‘networks of bearers’.
127. The **delegation of Senegal** fully supported Belgium’s proposal to think of a new mechanism in sharing good practices.
128. The **delegation of Ghana** spoke of the many examples of shared heritage in West Africa, especially between Ghana, Côte d’Ivoire, Burkina Faso and Togo, adding that these very salient cross-border intangible cultural heritage should be brought to the fore, which could be addressed in a new factor 25.4.
129. The **Chairperson** asked Ghana to submit its proposal in writing. He then opened the discussion on the last Indicator 26.
130. The **delegation of Netherlands** remarked that the global capacity-building programme was one of the priorities of the Convention and should thus be referenced in 26.2, which was very general.
131. The **Chairperson** noted the very pertinent suggestion.
132. **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck**, **NGO Tapis Plein**, wished to explicitly mention NGOs in 26.3.
133. The **Secretary** replied that civil society organizations were mentioned in 26.3.
134. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** congratulated everyone for completing the initial work on the 26 indicators; the final version of which would be adopted in the last session. The Chairperson noted the time constraints but suggested that delegations wishing to express any important issues could still provide their suggestions or proposals to the Secretariat. He also reminded the delegations that the purpose was not to draft a legal document or treaty and that close inspection of every word in the document was thus not required. The work involved the establishment of signposts to help States Parties better implement the Convention, which could be achieved by measuring the degree at which they have been successful. This was therefore something to keep that in mind in the concluding discussion in the final session.
135. The **Secretary** noted that the core of the work had been completed, with the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat now given the task of incorporating a number of very important proposals and revisions to prepare a revised framework that would be ready for adoption. As previously mentioned, Table 1 intended to summarize the results framework through rows 1 to 4, though the Rapporteurs would look at some of the structural issues brought up by some delegates. It was noted that rows 1 through to 4 were adopted at the Beijing meeting and welcomed by the Committee at its eleventh session in 2016, and thus were not re-opened for discussion. However, the bottom two rows were new [the ‘Thematic areas’ and the ‘Core indicators’]. The core indicators were presented in an abbreviated form, but with some of the changes proposed, the language would be reflected in the table. With regard to the row on the ‘thematic areas’, which the working group had yet to discuss, the Secretary noted that comments had been proposed to change the order. He reminded the delegations that the thematic areas were not intended to be rigid and mutually exclusive – indeed some issues cut across thematic areas – but they were intended to bring together a set of indicators under the given title. The Secretariat would be happy to present sample guidance notes under any titles proposed for the thematic areas.
136. The **Chairperson** remarked on the excellent work of the Secretariat, and opened the floor for comments or suggestions.
137. The **delegation of Belgium** remarked that some suggestions had already been provided on the thematic areas, adding that although the framework was not a legal document it would nonetheless be copied and used all over the world and was thus sending a specific message. The delegation further remarked on its surprise on finding that the framework had begun with education. It understood the reasons for this, but was not really convinced of this approach given that the core message should focus on the role of intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding in society. The advantage of moving forward in this way was to start by mentioning the communities, groups and individuals from the outset, which was an important way of communicating and sending the important message that communities, groups and individuals were at the centre and beginning of the Convention’s work. It thus proposed to reorder the indicators by placing ‘education and transmission’ later in the order of indicators.
138. The **Chairperson** supported Belgium’s comments.
139. The **delegation of Italy** supported Belgium’s proposal and wished to propose a new order of thematic areas, noting that the long-term outcomes were not presented in the order reflected in Article 1 of the Convention, under the ‘Purposes of the Convention’. The delegation thus proposed a new order that followed Article 1, and the purposes of the Convention, and linking it to the thematic areas. Hence, the order: i) recognizing the importance of ICH and its safeguarding, i.e. placing the thematic areas (mentioned by Belgium) on the role of intangible cultural heritage in society and awareness-raising, in first position; ii) respecting the diversity of ICH; iii) ensuring the continued practice and transmission of ICH; and lastly iv) engaging international cooperation for safeguarding.
140. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** fully supported Belgium’s proposal and Italy’s suggestion that the thematic areas should follow and correlate with the order of the Convention.
141. The **Secretary** wished to clarify that the thematic areas did in fact follow the four long-term outcomes, even though they were not worded in exactly the same way. For example, under Article 1(a) to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage, the long-term outcome was ‘continued practice and transmission’, and 1(b) to ensure respect for ICH [corresponded to ‘diversity of ICH respected], and so on. Thus they were precisely structured to follow the order as in Article 1 of the Convention. With regard to changing the order of thematic areas, the Secretary explained that no prioritization was intended, and the Secretariat had no preference on the order of thematic areas. However, there was a procedural issue in that these long-term outcomes had been established at the expert meeting in Beijing to precisely follow Article 1 of the Convention, and consequently these thematic areas follow from those long-term outcomes. Thus, if the thematic areas were to be moved then the long-term outcomes would also need to be adjusted. Although in practice this was possible, the Secretary reminded the delegations that the framework had already been welcomed by the Committee, and a revised format would have to be passed and welcomed by the Committee again. Nevertheless, it was possible to change the order or possibly the wording, but it was important to recall that the current order of the thematic areas had been positioned randomly, i.e. there was no order of priority.
142. The **delegation of Finland** supported Belgium’s comment, adding that at national level these thematic areas could be taken in order of priority.
143. The **delegation of Spain** congratulated the Secretariat for the excellent work accomplished thus far, adding that it supported Italy’s proposal as it was coherent with the order of the Convention.
144. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** understood the Secretary’s position.
145. The **Chairperson** noted that Belgium’s proposal enjoyed wide support, but there appeared to be some differences with Italy’s proposal. He remarked that the document had already been welcomed [by the Committee], but that it could be returned again.
146. The **delegation of Italy** clarified that the purpose of its proposal was reflected in the proposal by Belgium in that moving the thematic areas would also require that the long-term outcomes be moved.
147. The **delegation of Belgium** remarked that the Committee had welcomed the Annex, which had a different order, and that it made sense in relation to mid-term outcomes and long-term outcomes that were now in one sentence; they used to be in a separate column. The delegation added that there was a disconnect between the framework and the new thematic areas, which did not completely fit the logical order of the framework. Noting that the thematic areas have a different approach, the delegation believed that the order of the themes could be shuffled without necessarily having to change the order of the long-term outcomes.
148. The **Chairperson** believed that the order did not really affect the substance of the issue.
149. The **Secretary** felt that the core question was whether it was possible to move the thematic areas while respecting the long-term outcomes, as this would be easier from a procedural point of view, or whether to go back and try to reorder the long-term outcomes. The Secretary reiterated that the Secretariat had no preference in terms of the order of thematic area, but would nonetheless seek to establish coherence in the overall structure, while recognizing the work that had been done in the past. The Secretariat had a possible solution with regard to the re-order of the thematic areas that would still maintain the logic of the long-term outcomes, and suggested that Belgium propose a new architecture that could also be brought into consideration. The Secretary therefore welcomed any constructive solutions to address this issue.
150. The **delegation of China** remarked that the Secretariat had done an excellent job that respected the Convention, the Operational Directives and ethical principles. Concerning the thematic areas, the delegation felt that it did not adequately emphasize the communities, groups and individuals, as expressed in the Convention. It therefore suggested that theme 7 [on engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals] should focus more on the participation of communities, groups and individuals, as well as other stakeholders.
151. The **Chairperson** asked the delegations to entrust the Secretariat to make the necessary readjustments based on the comments from the floor. He then invited the Secretary to present the next item of discussion.
152. The **Secretary** turned to the issue of the guidance notes that had been widely discussed on several occasions, adding that for the overall results framework to be useful it was important that everyone involved had a shared understanding of the terms and methods by which the results would be reported and evaluated. The Secretary explained that a number of other results-based management frameworks had been looked at, for instance, the sustainable development global indicators, the UNAIDS indicators, United Nations Environmental Programme Indicators for Sustainable Development and, of course, UNESCO’s own cultural development indicators, and it was found that all of them had supplementary documents called guidance notes, implementation manuals or metadata. These supplementary documents typically include a formal statement of the indicator and a description of its assessment factors and defining key terms, if required, as well as background information explaining their context and relevance, the rationale behind the indicators, and how information would be gathered. The notes also describe the sources of information, the frequency of their collection, and the method by which the indicator was determined to be satisfied, and to what degree. As a result, the Secretariat had prepared two sample guidance notes, in Annex 2. Thus, based on feedback from the present Working Group, the Secretariat would proceed to elaborate similar notes for the other 24 indicators so that, once the Committee and the General Assembly adopted the overall results framework, a complete set of guidance notes would be made available to States Parties and others. The template used for these two samples includes a first section or ‘introduction’ where the exact language of the indicator and a description of the relevant assessment factors links to the relevant long-term outcomes and themes, as well as a discussion of the context and its relation to other indicators, either within the framework or in other results frameworks.
153. The **Secretary** further explained that a second section on the indicator’s purpose consists of a rationale and a summary of the benefits. The final section of the note spells out a methodology with sub-sections on interpretations, data sources and collection, and methods of calculation, as well as baselines and targets. Referring to the first sample on Indicator one, concerning primary and secondary education, it was noted that it began with a formal statement of the indicator and its assessment factors, though it would be revised to reflect any revisions adopted during the course of the present meeting. The statement explains that the indicator primarily supports ‘Long-Term Outcome 1’, and is part of the thematic area of ‘education and transmission’. The sub-section on context cites the relevant provisions of the Convention and Operational Directives, and explains the relation of this indicator to other indicators, as well as to SDG targets and indicators concerning education. The section on purpose includes a rationale explaining why education is such an important part of the Convention and why particular measures are highlighted in the assessment factors. It then explains how a State Party, or the Convention as a whole, can benefit from monitoring activities in this area. The third section on method begins by explaining how the indicator’s use of ‘extent to which’ should be understood differently, depending on whether it concerns, for example, country-level monitoring or global-level monitoring. The sub-section on data sources and collection suggests where the reporting State Party would seek data to respond to this indicator. Referring to the method of calculation, the Secretary explained that as each indicator had several assessment factors this introduced some nuance when measuring whether the indicator had been fully satisfied, partially satisfied – to greater or lesser degree – or not satisfied. In this instance, the four assessment factors were considered as equally important and the calculation was fairly simple. However, greater weight could be given to one or other assessment factor, and indeed some may not apply at all to a specific country or a given country. It was thus important to emphasize that this framework was not intended to produce a scorecard or set of marks or grades among States. However, the indicators are strongest and most effective when they are measurable and having this kind of scale for each indicator would greatly facilitate measurement.
154. The **Secretary** then explained that once the baselines and targets were established they would be discussed as part of the guidance notes. Referring to the second guidance note [on Indicator 11], it was noted that it had the same format but in a slightly different situation. The first assessment factor relates to one of the State’s obligations under Article 13 of the Convention, while the second factor, although proved to be a good practice in many countries, did not carry the same sense of obligation in terms of the Convention. However, if a State submits a nomination for the inclusion of an element on one of the Convention’s lists it would be obliged to have a safeguarding action plan. This is different from the first indicator [in the earlier example] where there were four assessments of equal weight. In addition, the method of calculation for this indicator works differently than in the previous example. If a State Party reports results addressing the first assessment factor, it should be considered as fully satisfying the indicator as, for many cases, the second assessment factor will not apply. If the State reports results that addressed the second assessment factor, but not the first, it could be considered as partially satisfying the indicator. If it reports no results for either assessment factor, it obviously is not meeting the indicator. Thus, these two samples illustrate the format proposed to demonstrate how each indicator might propose a calculation method that will allow for consistent measurement from one reporting State to another. The Secretary remarked that these were first drafts and the Secretariat very much welcomed suggestions about the format and any questions regarding content. It was not expected that the Working Group, or the Committee, would be asked to officially adopt the format of the contents, but any feedback would be greatly appreciated in developing these guidance notes.
155. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, reiterating that the Working Group was not requested either to approve or adopt the format, adding that this served only as guidance. He then invited comments or suggestions, but would not open the floor to discuss the samples line-by-line, as there was no intention to either approve or adopt.
156. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretary for the Annex on behalf of all those who will be preparing the reports, as the examples facilitated the task.
157. The **delegation of Belgium** appreciated the work done but was hesitant with regard to the guidance notes because they inferred a kind of assessment on the State. The delegation remarked that the whole idea of the exercise was to have feedback [from the States] to improve the working mechanism of the Convention and the Operational Directives, even though the Convention could not be changed, while the Operational Directives could be. From this exercise, a number of conclusions could be drawn that could improve the Operational Directives as well as a number of other instruments at the level of UNESCO. This was what the delegation had understood to be the rationale and purpose of the exercise, and not how a State could improve its own possibilities, even if this might be useful for the State. The delegation was therefore missing an explanation on how these guidance notes, together with this feedback, be fed into improving the mechanisms of the Convention, which was what it understood as the essence of the work, i.e. not evaluating States but to improve and change the enabling environment of the Convention.
158. The **Chairperson** concurred that the explanation provided was not fully satisfactory.
159. The **Secretary** thanked Belgium for the important point, explaining that there were indeed two levels. The first purpose of the framework is to help in the implementation of the Convention, which ultimately happens within States involving state policies and programmes, and where communities, groups and individuals live. The results framework was designed to be – first and foremost – useful to States for tracking their implementation of the Convention at the national level. However, it was hoped that through the collection of information from all the States through periodic reporting, an overall picture of the overall implementation of the Convention at the global level would emerge, which would be the aggregate of States’ implementation at the national level. The Secretary further explained that the purpose of the results-based framework is to make reporting by the States in the periodic report and other formats useful to States for their own monitoring purposes upon ratification of the Convention. States would thereby obtain an overview of the actions and activities happening nationally. This aggregate information would paint a picture of the Convention at the global level. Hence, the logic and rationale behind this exercise.
160. Thanking the Secretariat for the huge work, the **delegation of Belarus** asked whether Belarus should take into account these indicators when it prepares its first periodic report at the end of 2017. The delegation explained that it had already undergone monitoring of the state of its intangible cultural heritage and now had a huge amount of good data. Nevertheless, should these indicators now be considered as well?
161. The **Secretary** explained that States could indeed use the indicators – it would not be discouraged – but they were by no means obliged to or expected to. It was hoped that these indicators would provide a kind of common framework for these reporting mechanisms going forward. The Committee was also very attentive to the concern of States Parties of the increase in reporting modalities. The Secretary further explained that a later agenda item would look at how this results-based framework will be aligned to the periodic reporting in the future once this is adopted. He emphasized that this was not created as a parallel reporting system, and certainly States could use the framework now, but it was not intended as something that needed to be done at this stage.
162. The **delegation of Belarus** asked whether there were plans to use the online form for the periodic report in the future.
163. The **Secretary** remarked that this issue would be addressed under agenda item 5, which would specifically look at the relationship of the results-based framework to the periodic reporting mechanisms.
164. The **Chairperson** joked that Belarus would be very brave to take the lead on this.
165. The **delegation of Finland** congratulated the Secretariat on its good work, which was really needed on the national level both in terms of actions and measurables. The framework provided the tools for better cooperation nationally, as it clearly laid out the actions, and would help States develop their our own processes and monitoring, and not just for the sake of reporting.
166. The **delegation of Belgium** thanked the Secretary for the explanation, agreeing that the work was situated at two levels. However, the guidance notes should also be on two levels in that the focus should not solely be at the State level when there is the reality of communities and groups, and international cooperation, i.e. it should not be solely dependent on States’ reports. The delegation believed that the guidance notes required this kind of a broader picture that – in addition to the State reports – highlighted, for example, other kinds of developments by international NGOs and networks of communities that collaborate and also contribute towards realizing the goals of the Convention.
167. Thanking Belgium for its contribution and expertise, the **Chairperson** added that the Secretariat was extremely capable.
168. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates to register online with their correct email address so that the revised document could be sent, though printed copies would be distributed in the room.
169. The **delegation of Haiti** remarked that it was unable to access Gmail.
170. The **Chairperson** reiterated that hard copies would be made available. He then duly adjourned the session.

*[Afternoon session]*

ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA:

LINKING THE OVERALL RESULTS FRAMEWORK TO PERIODIC REPORTING

1. The **Vice-Chairperson**, Mr Moffat Moyo from Zambia, began by thanking China for its hospitality and for hosting this very important event. He also thanked everyone present for showing confidence in him as Vice-Chairperson. He then turned to agenda item 5, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that following the completed core work on the indicators it was opportune to reflect in more depth on the possible interconnection between the overall framework and the periodic reporting exercise. In this way, it was hoped that this framework could lead to the possible reform of the periodic reporting process so that it may gain both in quality and in usefulness to States Parties. [Document 5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-5-EN.doc) reviews the experience of reporting States up until now, and summarizes some of the challenges that have been encountered. The Secretary recalled the overall problem or challenge relating to the lack of reports received in Addis Ababa in 2016 at the eleventh session of the Committee. Only 16 per cent of reports were received, meaning 84 per cent of due periodic reports were not submitted. This year for the periodic reporting, the Secretariat had received 12 out of 47 periodic reports. Although statistically this was an improvement in 2016, it was still not an optimal number. The situation looked somewhat better for the reporting on the Urgent Safeguarding List for which 12 out of 15 due reports had been received. It was thus felt that the process of an overall results framework could feed into a review of the periodic reporting mechanisms. In addition, in most of the periodic reports it was noted that there was a tendency to concentrate on activities done rather than on the results or their impacts, i.e. it tends to be a list of activities rather than an analysis on the results of those activities. Information was often inconsistent or misplaced, making it difficult to make comparisons across reports. At the same time, many reports gave detailed information for less relevant subjects but a lack of detail on more relevant subjects. Other issues reported on in past Committees, including cross-cutting issues, were not adequately addressed, for example, on gender roles, and the absence of a separate section in the current form on such issues as policy legislation or sustainable development. The Secretary conceded that there was no doubt that some of these issues resulted from an overload in terms of reporting, but also because of the way the forms were structured that had perhaps not optimized the periodic reporting. Document 5 addresses these issues and identifies some possible ways forward, exploring ideas to improve the periodic reporting mechanism in light of this framework, but also to improve the submission rate. It was felt that a clearer structure of the periodic forms, aligned with the overall results framework structure, would thus be beneficial. In addition, through the guidance notes, the instructions and guidance could be improved so to enable States to report more on results and impacts rather than activities. The framework may also allow for benchmarks against which progress could be measured in future reports. Of course, the roll out of the overall results framework would require some time for States to familiarize with its use, but it could definitely be a driving force for reforming the periodic reporting mechanism, and perhaps roll out a new way of reporting [in the future].
3. The **Secretary** understood that questions would remain following this meeting, but that these could be addressed in a future proposal by the Secretariat to the Committee – if recommended to do so – to improve this reporting mechanism. The Secretariat had some ideas in relation to this, and it invited the delegations to discuss these, which include, for instance, the *process* of reporting and its periodicity. For example, it might be helpful to move towards regional deadlines for national reporting rather than the anniversary of ratification. The Secretary further explained that at the moment, a State Party is required to report every six years following its year of ratification. This means that many reports are due in some years, while in other years, less so. This is quite a haphazard way of grouping together these reports and it was felt that a regional cycle – because there are six Electoral Groups and six years per report – could effectively work through one Electoral Group per year, which would also allow for more collegiality and some capacity-building opportunities. In this way, the periodic reporting could result in roll out meetings on a regional basis that would allow for peer-to-peer support and assistance, which could ultimately improve both the quality and the submission of these reports. The Secretariat could for instance envisage a capacity-building programme or meetings in the context of regional reports every six years per region. In the longer term, the revision of reporting on the Lists of the Convention might also be considered. Moreover, there were parallel ongoing discussions in the Committee on the removal and transfer of an element from one list to another, and there was still an outstanding request by the Committee to have an open-ended working group on that specific topic, subject to extrabudgetary funding. Thus, the Working Group was not asked to consider the reporting on the Lists at this time, but on the general periodic reporting, which was more in line with the overall results framework issue.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, and opened the floor for comment.
5. The **delegation of Senegal** found interesting the proposal to take into account of the regions, adding that it was very beneficial for some countries, including those that had not submitted their periodic reports, as the periodic reporting was extremely important at the State level for the implementation of the Convention. The question was often posed as to why some countries did not submit reports: Was this a problem of capacity-building or resources? Why did those countries fail to submit their periodic reports? The solution proposed by the Secretariat – that this work be carried out at the regional level – would, in the case of Africa for example, enable all the African countries concerned to come together in capacity-building workshops. This would not only improve quality, but would also enable the countries to exchange their many experiences. The delegation thought this was an excellent idea and one that it fully supported at the level of the Committee and the General Assembly.
6. The **delegation of the United Arab Emirates** endorsed the remarks by Senegal, adding that this proposal was useful and served the objective in that the State Party would still have to submit a report. Moreover, States could work on a regular basis, which would also help the monitoring process because States were familiar with each other within the region, and they understand how to cooperate together, particular for some States that lacked capacity-building.
7. The **delegation of Comoros** supported the proposals, remarking however that in addition to the regional workshops, the workshops at the national level must also be strengthened because capacity-building must also engage the countries themselves.
8. The **delegation of Austria** also welcomed the proposal that supported a group exercise and regional reporting, adding that the collegiality of the team work would also foster international cooperation. However, it cautioned against creating any additional impediments for States when now integrating the framework, as some States, for example, might not have the cultural statistics available to them to the same extent.
9. The **delegation of Belgium** felt that the problem of periodic reporting was related to the larger issue of updating and was one of the challenges for the Convention. There were no mechanisms foreseen that truly followed up or managed the different Lists and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Also, most countries found the updating of ICH inventories present on their territory to be challenging. The idea that these inventories are updated regularly with the involvement of communities, groups and individuals was often not really foreseen. Nevertheless, the periodicity of the reports offered a good incentive and way to incorporate the deadline into national policy to ensure regular updates. This was currently the case in Belgium where the revision of inventories was adjusted to the periodicity of the periodic reporting, i.e. one year before the report’s submission the different stakeholders are consulted to see if things should be changed, and also to strategically plan. Thus, the message is that reporting is not only an obligation but also an occasion to carry out any necessary updates. The delegation felt that the notion of updating could be part of capacity-building or at least during policy-making workshops to focus on that element. The delegation also felt that it would be a good idea to move to a new system, such as the option of regional reports, if feasible. This would send a message to the Committee to make clear that work should be done in this regard and the Operational Directives should thus be revised, if possible. The delegation then mentioned the important IOS evaluation document in 2013 that had evaluated the Convention ten years after its inception, offering a whole set of interesting suggestions that were actually followed up and resulted in significant changes. With this in mind, States Parties should reflect on using the anniversary in 2023 to undertake a similar report, as the IOS experience in 2013 showed that this could really help the Convention, and perhaps it could link with the work carried out in this present session.
10. The **Chairperson** commented on the interesting perspective to consider a similar evaluation in 2023, which would highlight the direction of the Convention.
11. The **delegation of Finland** also welcomed the idea of regional reporting periods or initiatives that would present States with more opportunities to work together outside of joint nominations. This would concentrate cooperation on the core issues of the Convention and support States to learn more from one another.
12. The **delegation of Jordan** also supported the revision of the policy regarding periodic reports, and it appreciated the idea of holding workshops either at the regional or national level where community members as well as governmental members, who are involved in drafting the periodic reports, could also attend.
13. The **delegation of Jamaica** also supported that position.
14. The **delegation of Senegal** agreed along the lines of Belgium’s remarks in that this working group should formulate a recommendation for the next Committee. At the same time, the idea of the regional report could be linked to other exercises, such as the important updates that were mentioned, not only with regard to nominations but also for countries that allow them to take stock and to assess the level of implementation of the Convention at the national level. Moreover, compared with other conventions, for example, the quadrennial report for the 2005 Convention, it would provide an assessment of the national policy in this aspect. The delegation concurred with Belgium’s important comments that this report provided an opportunity to take stock and to update the inventories and all aspects related to reporting.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
16. The **Secretary** welcomed the broad support, but wished to clarify – in line with the concerns raised by the Comoros, and the issues raised by Belgium and supported by Senegal – that the Secretariat was not proposing a regional report. States would continue to submit their national report but the work would be organized on the basis of a regional cycle. The recommendation would thus be formulated in that sense unless advised otherwise.
17. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification.
18. The **delegation of Jamaica** was of the understanding that the national reports would still be maintained.
19. With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** remarked that the Rapporteurs would propose a recommendation on this specific item for the next session, and he called on the Secretary to introduce the next agenda item 6.

ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA:

MOBILIZATION OF COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION SOURCES AND UTILIZATION OF COLLECTED INFORMATION

*[The Chairperson reprised his role]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for presiding the discussion on this item, and invited the Secretary to introduce the next agenda item on the mobilization of complementary information sources and the utilization of collective information.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the Working Group was invited to reflect on how the results framework could make the reporting mechanisms that already exists under the Convention, in addition to the periodic reports, more useful to everyone. In addition, to reflect on how the information collected in this framework could be relevant and useful in other broader reporting frameworks and, in particular, with a view to the progress made towards the SDGs at country level and within UNESCO as a whole. Thus, the intention was to see how the work of this working group could feed into and help States Parties in the broader reporting mechanisms. As mentioned in the working documents, reporting under the obligations of the Convention, other than the periodic reports, fell on a number of different actors. States Parties benefiting from international assistance from the ICH Fund have an additional reporting obligation. Accredited NGOs acting in an advisory capacity to the Committee under Article 9 were also expected to report on their activities so that the Committee could undertake its quadrennial review of their accreditation. According to Article 30, the Committee also shall submit a report to the General Assembly at each of its sessions on the basis of States Parties’ activities and decisions and reports. Lastly, the Secretariat also reports to the two governing bodies on its activities at each of their sessions. It therefore seems logical that these reports be as closely aligned as possible with the overall results framework so that States Parties might integrate the information gathered in the context of these other specific requirements in the preparation of their periodic reports. The Secretariat thus invited the Working Group to reflect on how to best strengthen the synergy across these different reporting mechanisms. In addition, as the indicators discussed attempted to assess the impact of ICH safeguarding on fostering human well-being, dignity and creativity, it could be expected that the collected information would support other frameworks, particularly the 2030 Agenda.
3. The **Secretary** further explained that as the 2030 Agenda itself recommends that the follow-up and review of the implementation of the SDGs be built on existing reporting mechanisms, while acknowledging that Member States were already subjected to an overload of reporting obligations in many relevant areas, UNESCO began to work on implementing its programmatic framework (the C/5) within the SDGs. It was noted that the Draft Programme for the 2018–2021 cycle – to be examined in November [2017] by the General Conference of UNESCO – is based on an in-depth mapping of the proposed expected results of the Organization’s contribution to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, following extensive consultation with Member States. The Secretary remarked that working [document 6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-6_EN.doc) details the relevant SDGs and related targets that were identified as particularly relevant to the implementation of the Convention, as well as the work carried out in the ICH section [of UNESCO]; several of which received support in the debates on specific indicators. It was also noted that the guidance notes developed to assist States in their monitoring efforts will contain a sub-section on contexts that will cite the relevant provisions of the Convention and the Operational Directives, but also explain the relationship of a given indicator to a SDG target where relevant. It was hoped that at the national level such guidance could help link challenges, which might not necessarily be identified, and thereby enhance cooperation between the Ministry of Culture (often in charge of the periodic reporting, but not necessarily involved in SDG monitoring exercises) with other ministries and institutions. This could help identify gaps where support is needed, i.e. in safeguarding. At the global level, greater consideration of the results framework with other frameworks should also help UNESCO continue its advocacy with regard to the contribution of culture to sustainable development, as well as its support to Member States in implementing the 2030 Agenda through the provision of evidence-based policy recommendations and reporting. In this regard, the Secretariat welcomed suggestions about how best to leverage the results reporting for the Convention as both a resource and complement to other results frameworks at the international level, and also within countries.
4. The **Secretary** then spoke of another topic of discussion on how to take the fullest advantage of the knowledge and experience of civil society (including NGOs) during the Convention’s ongoing monitoring and planning. The issue had already been raised early in the day under Indicator 22 on civil society’s contribution to monitoring ICH safeguarding. Moreover, this echoes one of the recommendations of the IOS in 2013, which mentioned, ‘to complement the data gathered on the implementation of the Convention through periodic reports submitted by States Parties with information provided by NGOs’. It was noted that when the Committee took up this recommendation at its eighth session, it decided not to establish a parallel line of reporting but instead to encourage States Parties to complement their own data gathered on the implementation of the Convention through their periodic reports, including information provided by relevant NGOs (refer to [Decision 8.COM 5.c.1](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/5.c.1)). The Operational Directives on the periodic reports were revised in that spirit and adopted at the last General Assembly. The inclusion of information provided by civil society is of course conditional on their specific relationship with a particular State, and it might also be useful to discuss the extent to which State Parties have in fact been taking advantage of NGO inputs since that decision was adopted four years ago. The Secretary asked whether there were good practices in this regard, or perhaps other ideas for strengthening the contribution of civil society within this ongoing results-based monitoring process. Given that communities, NGOs and many other stakeholders play a key role in the implementation of this Convention, the actual implementation of the overall results framework might need to consider how non-state actors of the Convention could best be involved in future processes of reporting, monitoring and planning. The Secretary welcomed the Working Group’s reflections on this topic, particularly what might have worked and how that experience may be multiplied elsewhere.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his very comprehensive introduction, which brought up a number of discussion topics. He hoped that the ideas emerging from this discussion would be included in the report to the Committee.
6. The **delegation of Belgium** remarked on the series of interesting suggestions made. It agreed that more could be done with the reporting by accredited NGOs in which NGOs could be asked questions – on a voluntary basis – on a number of topics, for which they would be happy to oblige, as this would present the context of their involvement and how they gather information. An invitation could also be made to the ICH NGO Forum to reflect on a number of topics; perhaps they would be willing to take up the challenges. With regard to the strategic development of the 2030 Agenda, the delegation agreed that a lot needs to be done and should be approached in a creative way. For example, there was a lot of work under the six chapters of the Operational Directives, but there were also a lot of other possibilities to relate safeguarding ICH with the SDGs. In fact, the 2030 Agenda is a complex mix of a whole series of proposals and invitations to create a better world. Much of the creative thinking on how ICH fits in and can play a role in this regard still had to be done, and it was thus a challenge, not just to focus on one of the development goals but to engage in a creative thinking process as a whole. The delegation evoked the opportunity for one or more seminars to examine the relationship between the Convention and the 2030 Agenda. It also suggested to introduce a call for research projects, as university students worldwide were actively looking for topics to work on, adding that a list of proposals identified on the UNESCO website would have symbolic value and provide a huge potential to tap into universities or students who could propose projects that could fit into a larger worldwide call that would help advance work on specific, related topics. It could also inspire funding agencies to launch specific calls for projects. For example, in the case of Belgium, it could convince the National Board for Scientific Research to specifically call for PhD proposals on these topics. Thus, there was a potential to structure these themes and to combine them with information within a long-term optic, i.e. to foresee challenges into the new 15-year programme post-2030 on how culture and ICH, in particular, could be integrated. The delegation remarked on the current process of information-gathering, adding that there was still time to have a number of proposals actually incorporate ICH into one of the SDGs by 2026–2027, supported by research. It was thus time to not only try and influence this process but to take the opportunity to break into the Agenda to make a difference, which by then would represent almost 30 years of the Convention, and which could indeed make the difference.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that Belgium had touched upon a number of topics, adding that the connection between ICH and the SDGs was indeed a huge and important topic.
8. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** remarked that some States Parties consider reporting as similar to an exam in that it determined the quality of their work, and consequently they worry and panic when the time comes to draft their report. However, the discussions during the present meeting, which spoke of additional methods and approaches, revealed how reporting was a great opportunity at the national level to see where States stood with regard to their achievements. On the international side, it also presented an opportunity to promote the work of States Parties through their work on the Committee and the General Assembly. More importantly however, according to the Working Group’s recommendation, was that it presented an opportunity on the national level for all stakeholders and partners to get together to work collectively, once every six years, and see how much each partner had contributed and where they could improve their team work on each level. This was thus an opportunity to change some ways of thinking about reporting and monitoring, which was very important for the implementation of the Convention. The delegation concluded by going along with Belgium’s remarks about involving universities and student research, so as to collect more information, adding that this would indeed be a very useful approach.
9. The **delegation of Senegal** endorsed all the proposals suggested by Belgium, particularly on NGOs and research. With regard to the 2030 Agenda, the delegation remarked that intangible cultural heritage is a living, dynamic and evolving heritage that should not remain static, but rather the Convention should accept creativity and innovation, which is offered by research and many other paths. The 2030 Agenda is the culmination of a long process in which UNESCO played a fundamental role that should be recalled. It reminded the delegations that it was here in China that the Hangzhou Declaration already placed culture at the heart of development strategies. Moreover, it was the Hangzhou Declaration in May 2013 that enabled the United Nations to pass one of the most important resolutions on culture and development. It is this process that led to the 2030 Agenda in 2015, which presented an opportunity to put in place concrete measures to make culture and cultural heritage truly sustainable. This was an opportunity to create and innovate, and where – through this Convention – possible alternatives could be proposed. From this point of view, research was important, especially in Africa where there was a lot of work to be done. The delegation reiterated the importance of seizing this opportunity. It recalled that at the time of the adoption of the 2003 Convention, the 1972 Convention was said to have been imbalanced, and that the 2003 Convention was a convention for Africa and Asia because of their oral and intangible heritage. It would enable these continents to make a difference in terms of world governance. Was this opportunity seized? Unfortunately, the answer was not a resounding ‘yes’ given the number of elements inscribed [in these regions]. However, it was now time to seize this opportunity for innovation and creativity, and to work on tools and capacity-building to truly move forward to capture this possibility of making culture a breeding ground for development in the countries concerned. The delegation concluded by appealing to delegations to grasp these ideas, as it was moments like these that called for collective reflection.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Senegal for the very interesting points raised that were worth considering by the Working Group.
11. With regard to reporting and cooperation with NGOs, the **delegation of Finland** had the impression that reporting in many countries was carried out as desk work by the coordinating national organ, though Finland had yet to present its first report due only in 2019 and was not exactly familiar with the process. Nevertheless, from the excellent report by Norway that carried out extensive cooperation with its Norwegian NGOs, it supported the recommendation to involve NGOs and the communities in the reporting process. In addition, reporting should be seen as constant monitoring that is carried out along the process to really implement the results-based mechanism, from setting the vision, defining the results, implementing and managing, and then redirecting the vision accordingly, together with the communities and NGOs.
12. The **delegation of China** spoke of the supplementary or information-gathering exercise as a job for the Secretariat upon reading the periodic report, or from the States Parties when the information is gathered or provided. It did not believe in increasing the burden on the State Party, and that the State should maintain continuity in its reporting and information collection in a step-by-step manner with gradual improvements. The reform in the reporting framework should be simple, clear and doable, while the use of the template could reflect not only the goals of the Convention, but also the targets of the overall results framework, as this would benefit States Parties in measuring their implementation status and progress with regard to their ICH. At the same time, it would make it easier for the Secretariat to gather information without causing further burden to the States. The delegation spoke of the different perceptions of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the different countries and regions. The assessment indicators should therefore respect national and regional specificities in terms of their cultural development and thus make the system more flexible and resilient to allow every State Party in a bigger platform to contribute their wisdom in an inclusive manner, while recognizing their contribution.
13. The **Secretary** thanked China for its very important point, adding that this had been considered when working on the proposed overall results framework in consultation with experts and others. Moreover, many interesting ideas for indicators that came about were eventually dropped because it was not certain that the periodic reports could be relied upon to provide the required information; many of these would have relied upon specialists gathering information outside the context of periodic reporting. For this reason, they were not built into the framework precisely because it would place added burden on the States, without knowing the long-term reliability of creating such information. Nevertheless, this did not imply that there wasn’t an important role for independent experts and for other sources of information. At this stage, the overall results framework has been developed with a view to aligning it to support countries with periodic reporting to make the reports more useful and meaningful. However, an overall picture of the Convention may at one stage look at other systems of information without the periodic reporting. The Secretariat was thus exploring ideas in which the results-based framework would be developed over time and where the periodic reporting was just one of the elements coming into the overall picture. For the time being, the framework sought to be manageable, useful and meaningful, while acknowledging that the current system had its limitations, and because there were no reliable and consistent sources of information outside of the periodic reporting. The Secretary further remarked that when talking about other sources of information they were not necessarily included in the periodic reporting, although they may be [in the future]. This was still up for discussion. In fact, more and more researchers were reporting independently on the impact of the Convention. Indeed, there was a proposal from the NGO Forum to create an Observatory, which may or may not be linked to periodic reporting, but that might be useful for an overall results framework. The Secretary reiterated that this was part of the discussion, and that this exploratory process was very far from adopting any decisions on this issue. Thus, the answer was ‘no’, it was not necessarily expected that everything be incorporated into periodic reporting. Nevertheless, these were the first steps, starting with the periodic reports, before seeing how the process moves along.
14. The **Chairperson** commented that this was a concern for many States, not just China, when the workload was already very heavy.
15. The **delegation of Peru** wished to highlight that there were eight category 2 centers specialized in intangible cultural heritage that worked as allies in training and capacity-building at the national level, as well as allies in gathering information related to intangible cultural heritage across the regions. For example, in Latin America, there are 15 countries, members of the Regional Center for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Latin America (CRESPIAL), which comprises private and independent experts, and non-state actors who were brought together to gather information on the status of ICH and policy implementation in each of the 15 countries within the region. This was the third time that this had taken place in the last ten years, and this offered a complementary and important source of information in addition to the periodic reports. The delegation believed that they could be more involved around the world in this task of mobilizing information and strengthening the implementation of the Convention, and would thus serve as good allies, especially as they grouped together national experts. Moreover, the delegation was surprised that the category 2 centres were not mentioned in the working document.
16. The **Chairperson** agreed with Peru on the importance of these centres.
17. **Mr Laurier Turgeon**, **NGO Canadian Ethnology Society**, wished to follow up on some of the comments made by Belgium, notably regarding NGOs. He fully agreed that NGOs could contribute much more. For example, their reports can complete the information provided in the State Party reports, but they could also, in some cases, validate that information. Perhaps more importantly, the NGOs could also collaborate with States Parties in the preparation of their reports. The collaboration between countries was discussed earlier, but there could also be collaboration between the NGOs within the same country and the State Party. The NGOs could also contribute considerably to the thinking and reflection on the role of intangible cultural heritage in attaining the SDGs of the 2030 Agenda. This was indeed a very important issue that should not be overlooked and must be prepared ahead of time, which requires much research and argumentation and where NGOs could play a very important role.
18. On behalf of the ICH NGO Forum, **Ms Jorijn Neyrinck**, **NGO Tapis Plein**, wished to add that should States Parties be open to such reflection, the Forum would be happy to support them and contribute ideas in which complementary information could be gathered. Ms Neyrinck referred to the proposal by Belgium to have voluntary contributions or questionnaires, adding that this had already happened in which the IOS reported that an extensive questionnaire was sent to the NGOs and had delivered a wealth of information at that time. One of the follow-up actions of the Baku [Committee] session was the reflection on the evaluation of the new accredited NGOs from where a lot of complementary information had been gleaned, and this could provide a source of additional information in the coming years. With regard to the Observatory, just mentioned, Ms Neyrinck would be happy to serve in such instruments of evaluation and information, together with the NGOs and other partners.
19. Speaking from experience, the **delegation of United Arab Emirates** remarked that it had once asked at a Committee meeting about outcomes once the reports had been presented, to be told that the reports were available for consultation and that no further reflection could be made other than to acknowledge that the State Party had presented its report. The delegation believed that now was the time to better reflect on the future of these reports. Was it enough to know that they were available for consultation or could they be used to share experience among States on their actions in the implementation of the Convention through these periodic reports?
20. **Ms Ananya Bhattacharya**, **NGO Contact Base**, referred to the SDG goals identified, noting that in the discussion on indicators and assessment factors, the inclusion of socio-economic empowerment was repeatedly mentioned, but in the SDG goal list in document 6, neither SDG 8 on ‘work for all and sustainable and inclusive growth’ nor goal 16 on ‘peaceful and inclusive society’ were included. Ms Bhattacharya believed that there was need for more discussion, and that those goals needed to be included.
21. The **Secretary** fully appreciated the remarks, reminding the delegations that the table in document 6 was the proposal to the UNESCO General Conference for the adoption of the next programme of work, focusing on UNESCO’s Regular Programme resources. It was not subject to extensive consultation among Member States and did not imply that other goals were not relevant. It was presented as an example of other planning mechanisms that may feed into the goals. The Secretariat was certainly aware that ICH contributes broad and widely to the SDGs, but in the context of UNESCO’s planning for its overall cycle and budget there was a request from Member States to focus on where there would be greatest impact and possibilities of working.
22. The **delegation of Ghana** wished to congratulate UNESCO because two years ago Ghana ratified seven UNESCO Conventions, and having studied the conventions noted that in fact it re-affirmed what Ghana, and all the States Parties, have been practising all along, i.e. transmitting ICH in form or another for a very long time. The Convention however reminds the international community that safeguarding ICH was worth doing. The delegation reiterated that the private sector in Ghana is the engine of growth, while the contribution of NGOs, faith-based organizations and community based-organizations could not be overemphasized. It was noted that culture and the transmission of ICH was essentially a product of society. Moreover, the government alone could not carry out its obligations without the active involvement of the private sector. Nevertheless, to witness music, arts, crafts, traditional architecture and so on means going to the people at the grassroots level who have practised these skills over a long period of time, and therefore they should be recognized. Credible data cannot be obtained in offices. The delegation added that their culture led them on a holistic devolvement path, meeting their specific needs at the time. Telling stories, traditional food, practices and games are intangible forms of heritage that have been safeguarded and transmitted over the years whether the Convention exists or not. Thus, States Parties should reflect on how best to work with NGOs and the private sector to obtain the best reporting from the people to whom culture belongs.
23. The **delegation of Haiti** supported Ghana’s proposal,remarking that the notion of the private sector’s contribution had already been introduced during the meeting, together with the participation of civil societyand other organizations. However, the involvement of the private sector could occasionally be problematic, for which they had to be managed so that they could play a positive role, which would require clarity.
24. The **delegation of Austria** emphasized the remarks by Belgium about the importance of research and also for the updating of inventories at the national level, adding that sometimes it receives studies on particular elements that are very useful to have, especially when they contain new information and which somehow changes the situation. The arts should also be considered intangible cultural heritage and could be used as a source of creativity. For example, there are certain projects between practitioners and artists or designers in which the artists engage with their intangible cultural heritage and then translate it into their work, which provides a possible synergy between the 2003 and 2005 Conventions.
25. **Mr Antoine Gauthier** wished to mention other entitites that had not been mentioned so far, for example, national statistics organizations that exist within different States. He referred specifically to the Observatory of culture and communication of Quebec that sought to know how best to measure intangible cultural heritage, and how UNESCO’s Institute for Statisics, which produces framework statistics, could be used to go further in obtaining quantitative data to highlight new approaches. Mr Gauthier believed that the work undertaken during this present meeting would be very useful for shaping future work with these institutions.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegations for their ideas, which would be incorporated by the Secretariat into a report to be submitted to the Committee**.** He also reminded delegations that they were still able to present any proposals to the Secretariat in writing. He remarkd that there were two agenda items remaining, as well as a proposal by Austria. The Chairperson first adjourned the meeting for a short break.

*[15-minute pause]*

1. The **Chairperson** recalled that there was a discussion on changing the order of the thematic areas, which had already reached a consensus on their substance.
2. The **delegation of Austria** noted that there had been some concerns from a number of States Parties regarding the order of priortitzation of the thematic areas. In this regard, and as more time was needed, the delegation proposed that the Rapporteurs circulate the document later in the evening for consideration by the States Parties by morning.
3. The **Chairperson** remarked that the order was indeed important, but consensus had been achieved on the thematic areas and hence any changes in the order should be considered as more of a technical rather than a substantive issue. The Chairperson also hoped that the group working on these changes would be able to present their proposal to the Rapporteurs this evening, as the document had to be presented to the delegations before the start of the meeting the next day. The Chairperson explained that he did not wish to open discussion on this issue, as the session should be spent on adopting the indicators and assessment factors.

*[Tuesday, 13 June 2017, Afternoon session]*

ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA:

ADOPTION OF REPORT TO THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur, Mr Abdoul Aziz Guisse from Senegal, to join the podium. He then reminded the delegations that Observers were not allowed to speak during the adoption of the results framework and the recommendations.
2. The **Rapporteur** reported that the Rapporteur Group had tried its best to complete the work on schedule, which they would not have been able to do without the devoted efforts of the Secretariat. The Rapporteur asked the delegations and participants of the Working Group to join together to thank the Secretariat for its excellent work. He added that the work was not easy, although it became easier as they we were getting used to it step-by-step. In assessing the series of indicators and the assessment factors, the Group had endeavored to make more concrete contributions to the texts, and the Rapporteur took the opportunity to thank the delegates and experts for having greatly helped with their pertinent and often very concrete proposals. He apologized in advance if some of the proposals had not been integrated. Nevertheless, the Group were able to incorporate the vast majority of proposals received, and in many cases, the contributions were incorporated in their entirety, almost verbatim. In other cases, the Group tried to work in the spirit of the proposals with the texts slightly reformulated for consistency. Occasionally there were grammatical or termonolgy queries, in which case reference was made to the Operational Directives and the Convention to ensure the right text was used. In other cases, it was necessary to reconcile suggestions that were similar, while some delegates proposed text that needed to be harmonized. During the debates, occasionally a good idea was proposed by a delegation, but without a concrete solution, while another delegate had been able to make more concrete proposals along the same lines, so this was incorporated. Above all, consensus guided the resulting text.
3. The **Rapporteur** further explained that in very rare cases, when it was not possible to integrate the proposed revision, it was most often because the proposal took away from the essence of the theme and thus confused at times. In other cases, it was because the proposed terminology was problematic, or there was a translation problem in the different languages. In any case, for the whole exercise, the Group had tried to include all the proposals, in the spirit they were intended, along the lines of the Operational Directives and the Convention, and in the sense of consensus. It was believed that the current version captured the spirit of everything that was proposed. The six Rapporteurs remained at the disposal of the Working Group to answer any specific questions, but the delegations should avoid going back to open the debate.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur, adding that it was indeed a very solid, comprehensive summary of the hard work in cooperation with the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat, which accommodated – to the best extent possible – a great majority of the proposals. The Chairperson hoped to have a quick decision on all the indicators and factors, but would not reopen the discussion on an indicator-by-indicator basis. Instead, he would go through the document by thematic area, adopting the indicators by group. The Chairperson began with the first thematic area on ‘Transmission and education’, comprising three indicators with their associated assessment factors.
5. The **delegation of Belgium** suggested a minor detail in 4.3 to add ‘groups’, which would read, ‘undertaken by communities, groups and NGOs’. The delegation took the opportunity to congratulate the Rapporteurs and the Secretariat for having succeeded in accommodating all the comments and coming up with a wonderful text.
6. With no objections, and with no further comments, the **Chairperson** adopted the proposal by Belgium together with all three indicators. He then turned to the next thematic area on ‘Inventorying and research’ with the four indicators and associated assessment factors. With no forthcoming comments, the three indicators with their factors were adopted.
7. The **delegation of Thailand** informed the Chairperson that it had handed in some minor comments in writing. The most important was in 10.3 where it wished to take into account theoretical construction in cultural studies as a great contribution to academia and the enhancement of intangible cultural heritage.
8. The **Chairperson** asked Thailand to present the specific proposal.
9. The **delegation of Thailand** wished to add some text at the end of the sentence in 10.3, which would read, ‘contributed to the theoretical construction in cultural studies’.
10. Thanking Thailand, the **delegation of Belgium** felt that this was a very abstract notion and would not improve or add much to the sentence, and proposed its deletion.
11. The **delegation of Nigeria** had a minor amendment to replace ‘fruits of research’ with ‘results of research’ in 10.2.
12. The **Chairperson** took note of the remark, but wished to return to 10.3.
13. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** also had an amendment in 10.2, recalling that it was agreed to include ‘artistic studies’ in complementing ‘scientific and technical studies’. This would also apply in 10.3.
14. The **delegation of Germany** echoed the remarks.
15. The **delegation of Peru** supported the remarks by Belgium in thanking Thailand for its proposal, but that the amendment actually lessened the importance of safeguarding when the sentence should be emphasizing research for safeguarding. Thus, it supported the proposal to delete Thailnd’s contribution.
16. The **delegation of Ethiopia** supported the deletion of the amendment in 10.3.
17. The **delegation of Italy** supported the position by Belgium.
18. The **delegation of Eritrea** concurred with Nigeria on the use of ‘results’ in place of ‘fruits’, and with Belgium in 10.3.
19. The **delegation of Ecuador** joined in support of Belgium’s proposal.
20. The **delegation of Thailand** withdrew its proposal.
21. The **Chairperson** turned to the amendment in 10.3 to add ‘and artistic’.
22. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** agreed that it waslogical to replace ‘results’ with ‘fruits’.
23. The **Chairperson** concurred and pronounced factors 10.2and 10.3 adopted. He then turned to the adoption of all the indicators.
24. The **delegation of Netherlands** sought to replace ‘scope’, an abstract notion, with ‘various levels’ in 7.2, as this would make a reference to regional or local inventories, which could also possibly be mentioned in the guidance notes.
25. As one of the Rapporteurs, the **delegation of Republic of Korea** explained that ‘scope’ was chosen over ‘levels’ because it was considered important to avoid the implication of hierarchy among the different kinds of inventories.
26. The **delegation of Spain** supported the Netherlands proposal, though it understood the explanation made by the Republic of Korea.
27. The **delegation of Peru** preferred to retain ‘scope’, reminding the delegations that the list of ‘national, provincial, local levels’ had been replaced with ‘scope’ because it conveys the notion of geographical area without suggesting a hierarchy of levels.
28. The **delegation of Netherlands** now understood the rationale and could agree, but suggested to include a reference to ‘scope’ and its meaning of local, regional, provincial levels in the guidance notes.
29. The **Chairperson** thanked the Netherlands for its agreement, adding that its proposal would be taken into account. With no objections, the indicator was duly adopted. He then turned to the next thematic on ‘Policies and legal and administrative measures’ with four indicators with their associated assessment factors.
30. The **delegation of Comoros** had an amendment in 11.3, to delete the mention of ‘public’ with regard to ‘financial and/or technical support’.
31. The **delegation of Ghana** referred to Indicator 11 and suggested placing a comma after ‘policies’ and deleting the first ‘and’, which would read, ‘extent to which polices, legal and administrative measures’.
32. The **Chairperson** agreed that perhaps this could make it a bit clearer.
33. The **Secretary** explained that ‘legal and administrative measures’ were proposed to replace ‘legislation’, and were thus taken together. However, the Secretary proposed ‘as well as’, which would adhere to the original intention without the language repetition.
34. The **Chairperson** noted that Ghana agreed.
35. The **delegation of Peru** agreed with the proposal to delete ‘public’ as the indicator itself already referred to public policy. It also proposed to include a text after the word ‘equitable’, which would read ‘in relation to the overall support for culture and heritage at large’. The delegation explained that the sentence assumed that financial support for ICH must be equitable within intangible heritage as a whole, when it should encompass the overall financial and technical support that States grant to culture in general. It understood that this introduced a somewhat broader notion but that it was consistent with the idea of allocating the State budget in an equitable way that considered all aspects of culture.
36. The **Chairperson** noted the specific proposal.
37. The **delegation of Senegal** concurred with Peru, but had an issue in the French version with ‘*au sein de l’ensemble*, preferring to replace it with ‘*par rapport à l’ensemble du soutien à la culture et au patrimoine au sens large’*.
38. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no objection, and pronounced the indicatorsin this thematic area adopted. He then turned to the next thematic area on ‘Role of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society’ and its Indicators 15 and 16.
39. The **delegation of Austria** wished to return to the point made in Indicator 11 and extend it to Indicator 12, and the inclusion of ‘as well as’.
40. The **Chairperson** took note, and turned to the Indicators 15 and 16.
41. The **delegation of Netherlands** had an amendment in 15.3, to add ‘and as a source of knowledge and skill’ immediately following ‘as a source of identity and continuity’.
42. The **Chairperson** sought comments on these proposals.
43. The **delegation of Belgium** felt that ‘skill’ should be cited in the plural form, but nevertheless questioned whether this should be included because it moved away from the language of the Convention.
44. The **Secretary** clarified that the Convention does indeed refer to ‘a sense of identity and continuity’, but also under the definition under Article it does mention that intangible cultural heritage means practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills. Thus, knowledge and skills are part of the defined association with intangible cultural heritage in the Convention.
45. The **delegation of Belgium** thanked the Secretary for the clarification then suggested to have ‘skills’ in the plural form.
46. The **delegation of Germany** proposed to delete the reference to ‘strategic’ alongside ‘resource’, as this went beyond the strategic quality of culture.
47. The **Chairperson** took note of Germany’s proposal.
48. Referring to factor 16.1 in the French version, the **delegation of Comoros** preferred to use ‘*les personnes en situation de handicap’* rather than ‘*handicapé*’.
49. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to these proposals.
50. The **delegation of Colombia** wondered whether factor 15.2 was not more relevant to Indicator 16 that refers to self-respect and mutual respect.
51. The **Chairperson** sought comments on this proposal.
52. The **delegation of Mauritius** returned to the comment on 16.1 that refers to ‘persons with disabilities’, suggesting an alternative, ‘persons with other abilities’.
53. The **Chairperson** surmised that there was a specific term in the Convention.
54. The **Secretary** noted that the Operational Directives mentions people with handicaps, but noted that there was a Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and he therefore suggested accepting the term used by the United Nations.
55. The **delegation of Germany** suggested not deleting 15.2, as Indicator 16 referred to plans and programmes while Indicator 15 referred to safeguarding in society at the different levels, which was a broader, more general aspect.
56. The **Chairperson** agreed with the point made.
57. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** concurred with Germany’s point.
58. The **Chairperson** noted that Germany had a proposal to put forward.
59. The **delegation of Germany** suggested the following text [in 15.2], ‘communities, groups and individuals are considered through inclusive plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect in their diversity and their contribution to conflict resolution and peace-building’.
60. The **delegation of Belgium** thanked Germany for its proposal but felt that having double indicators was complicating matters, especially when filling in forms in response to this issue. It therefore preferred to keep one reference, which could be explained in reference to several of the goals. It thus proposed to keep the indicator as simple as possible and to retain the original proposal.
61. The **delegation of Italy** also sought to retain [the original] factor 15.2, and not to move it to Indicator 16, as 16.2 was already similar in its reference to mutual respect and [safeguarding] plans.
62. The **Chairperson** proposed to retain the original text, but have the Secretariat prepare guidance notes that would take the remarks into account.
63. Referring to factor 16.1, the **delegation of Peru** noted a discrepancy in the language versions between the cited ‘indigenous population’ in English and the French *‘population autochtones’* or ‘native population’, adding that it should be translated to ‘indigenous peoples’. It suggested that the reference could also be applied to the different ethnic groups, while not repeating the second enumerated reference to ‘groups of ethnic origin’.
64. The **Secretary** understood the point raised, explaining that the language employed followed the reference to ‘*peuples autochtones’*, asapproved by the UN Forum on Indigenous People, especially as ‘indigène’ had different connotations.
65. The **delegation of Peru** concurred that the reference was to ‘people’ and not ‘population’, which did not have the same meaning. Moreover, the word ‘indigenous’ was cited in the English version.
66. The **Secretary** explained that the English version did not have to use the definite article ‘the’, as in ‘*les indigènes*’ in French.
67. The **Chairperson** noted the subtleties of the two languages.
68. The **delegation of Ghana** wondered whether the second bullet point 2 in 16.1 was necessary, as by implication, indigenous peoples was one group, and ethnic groups of migrants, immigrants was another group.
69. The **delegation of Congo** spoke of its involvement in some of the work on this idea of indigenous peoples, for example, the use of pygmies or aboriginals in certain countries is considered reductive. Thus, the International Labour Organization (ILO) established a Convention No. 169 [Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention] that now prohibits the use of certain ‘indigenous’ words as a show of respect to these different populations. The term now employed is ‘indigenous peoples’ in English and ‘*peuples autochtones*’ in French so as to avoid the inequalities of ‘pygmy’, ‘aboriginals’ and ‘lap’ in the case of people from Lapland for example.
70. The **Chairperson** noted thatthere was recognized UN terminology on this issue, and suggested sticking to that rule, unless absolutely necessary to change it.
71. The **delegation of Belgium** recalled a lengthy debate in the Committee on this issue, and referred to paragraph 174 of the Operational Directives where ‘different ethnic groups’ was not mentioned. It thus proposed deleting ‘different ethnic groups’ in 16.1.
72. The **Chairperson** noted the proposal to delete ‘different ethnic groups’.
73. The **delegation of China** referred to the 12 ethical principles and the need to respect and recognize the identity of different ethnic groups. In this regard, it did not wish to delete this reference to ethnic groups, adding that in China, ‘indigenous people’ did not include the different ethnic groups.
74. The **delegation of Niger** suggested using ‘ethnolinguistic group’, because whether ‘indigenous’ or ‘*autochtones*’ [in French] was used, they were connected through language.
75. Noting the time, the **Chairperson** proposed to suspend the discussion on this issue and to return to it later when delegations had time to reflect on a proposal. He then pronounced the other indicators under this thematic area adopted. The Chairperson then moved to the next thematic area on ‘Awareness-raising’ from Indicators 17 to 20.
76. The **delegation of China** appreciated the efforts by the Secretariat, the Rapporteurs and the Chairperson to best accommodate the concerns of all the delegates in the revision of this draft document, and it congratulated the Secretariat for its work. Referring to factor 17.5, ‘communities, groups and individuals use information and technologies and new media so as to enhance the recognition of the importance of ICH and its safeguarding’, the delegation made reference to the paragraph 105(a) of the Operational Directives, which specifically cites ‘using all forms of media’. It thus proposed to revise the text to take into account ‘all forms of media, in particular new media’. In addition, the delegation recalled the discussion in 18.3 on the revision of ‘vernacular’ language, considering that the target groups of Indicator 18 are the relevant communities and groups. Thus, the indicator was unclear as to whom the target groups referred. It therefore suggested to change the text, which would read, ‘utilizes the languages of the communities and groups concerned to address the different target groups’.
77. The **Chairperson** sought comments on the proposal.
78. The **Secretary** wished to clarify the understanding in changing *‘and’* to *‘to’*, as assessment factor 18.3 referred to the media using all the different languages (it was recalled that there was much debate on the use issue of local, vernacular or indigenous language). Moreover, the indicator specifies that the media should use both local languages *and* it should address the different target groups. The Secretary understood China’s proposal as wishing to use the local language *to* address the different groups.
79. The **delegation of China** explained that using the language of relevant communities and groups to address the general public was not conducive to the understanding of ICH. It was however more reasonable to use the languages of the communities and groups for specific targeted groups.
80. The **Chairperson** supported China’s remarks, and with no further comments or objections, the indicators were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the next thematic area on ‘Engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals’ and Indicators 21 through 23.
81. Referring to the title of the thematic area, the **delegation of China** wished to revise it because ‘civil society’ already covered communities, groups and individuals, and therefore it suggested ‘engagement of communities, groups, individuals, as well as other non-governmental stakeholders’. In the same vein, and for the sake of consistency, it suggested changing factor 21.2 to ‘non-governmental organizations and institutions’.
82. The **delegation of Belgium** suggested inversing the proposal, explaining that in 21.1 the following text, ‘other civil society actors’ could be included in the title of the thematic area, ‘as well as other civil society actors’, which would read ‘engagement of communities, groups and individuals, as well as other civil society actors’, as this made more sense and was consistent with the language used elsewhere.
83. Referring to 22.2, the **delegation of Peru** insisted that ‘media’ was unnecessary and confusing, as ‘media’ is understood as an actor within ‘civil society’.
84. Referring to 22.1, the **delegation of Comoros** wished to delete ‘scientific’ because the communities do not undertake scientific research or studies, but rather academics.
85. The **delegation of Peru** did not agree, adding that communities do in fact carry out scientific research with more communities undertaking remarkable studies on their cultural expressions. Thus, it wished to retain ‘scientific’ in order to emphasize those capacities within communities.
86. The **Chairperson** asked the Comoros whether it could accommodate Peru’s view.
87. The **delegation of Comoros** accepted the point.
88. The **delegation** **of Niger** proposed ‘engagement of non-governmental stakeholders’, which gave greater consideration to the different groups and was more diplomatic.
89. Referring to 22.3, and for the sake of consistency, the **delegation of** **Zimbabwe** wished to complete the sentence [as underlined], which would read, ‘scientific, technical and artistic studies’.
90. The **delegation** **of Gambia** returned to the title of the thematic area, adding that it supported the idea of adding ‘non-governmental organizations’, because ‘civil society actors’ already encompassed the communities, groups and individuals, and was thus repetitive. In addition, it agreed with the remarks by Zimbabwe, to include ‘technical and artistic studies’.
91. The **delegation of Belgium** was concerned that the use of ‘non-governmental stakeholders’ would exclude a whole series of entities, such as public broadcasting companies that are often State institutions, and many research institutions that are part of the State structure. Thus, ‘civil society actors’ was vague enough to be inclusive and open.
92. The **delegation of China** believed that ‘civil society’ was not a term employed in the 2003 Convention, which focuses on the community, groups and individual. In addition, it wished to include NGOs and institutions for the role they play. For this reason, it insisted on completing the sentence with ‘non-governmental stakeholders’.
93. The **delegation of Peru** also supported Belgium to retain ‘civil society’, as it was clearer, inclusive, and had already been previously used in the same text.
94. The **delegation of Austria** supported Belgium, adding that ‘civil society actors’ was a more inclusive term than NGOs.
95. The **Chairperson** remarked that he encouraged creativity but that the delegations should adhere to the terminology used in the Convention and in the Operational Directives and not create new terms.
96. The **delegation of Senegal** strongly supported the Chairperson’s remarks, adding that ‘civil society actors’ opened up to associations, economic interest groups, and other entities that were not NGOs; these stakeholders would otherwise be disregarded.
97. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to clarify.
98. The **Secretary** was unable to offer clarity as neither ‘non-governmental stakeholders’ nor ‘civil society’ were terms used in the text of the Convention.
99. The **delegation of Colombia** suggested to simply state ‘stakeholders’, i.e. ‘communities, groups and individuals, as well as other stakeholders’.
100. The **Chairperson** supported the proposal, which was duly adopted. With no further comments on the other indicators, they were also duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the final thematic area on ‘International engagement’ and Indicators 24 through to 26. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson pronounced the indicators adopted. He then turned to the pending issue in assessment factor 16.1.
101. The **delegation of Ghana** explained that it wished to delete the reference to the ‘different ethnic groups’ as indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees in fact all belonged to different ethnic groups. So, by implication, all the bulleted points could belong to different ethnic groups, and thus, ‘different ethnic groups’ could be deleted.
102. The **delegation of Belgium** noted that in ethical principle 11 there was a reference to ‘respect for ethnic identities’, but not to ‘groups’, adding that it was important to be careful not to add adjectives to the very general wording of groups and communities. In addition, from a scholarly and scientific point of view, the adjective ‘ethnic’ was very problematic in several parts of the world. It therefore proposed to stay as close to the Convention and the Operational Directives as possible, on which 16.1 was based. The delegation understood that there were different viewpoints in the world but that consensus had already been reached in the Committee when adopting the Operational Directives in this regard.
103. The **delegation of Eritrea** thanked Ghana for its proposal, but in Eritrea the issue of different ethnic groups was very important, and thus it wished to retain the reference.
104. The **delegation of Jordan** supported Belgium’s suggestion to delete the adjective ‘ethnic’ so as to adhere to the common understanding of the Convention, and because all groups in the world have ethnic origins.
105. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** understood Belgium to be saying that ‘ethnic’, as an adjective, should not be used, i.e. it was not advocating to delete ‘ethnic’, but to refrain from using the combined term ‘ethnic groups’ and ‘ethnic communities’. In this regard, the delegation proposed to use ‘different ethnicities’ without the addition of ‘groups’. It then referred to the text ‘including but not limited to’, noting that some delegations were uncomfortable with that phrasing. The delegation referred to the point brought up by Ghana that had remarked on how indigenous peoples could also be found among the other groups outlined under the different bullet points, i.e. migrants, different age groups, different genders, people with disabilities, and so on. It therefore proposed to retain ‘different ethnicities’ as suggested by Eritrea.
106. The **delegation of Germany** suggested deleting the word ‘different’, which should not be combined with ‘ethnicity’, which could be avoided by using instead ‘groups with diversified ethnic backgrounds’ or ‘groups with diverse cultural backgrounds’. Moreover, the use of ‘ethnicity’ was contested in cultural theory and anthropological understanding, particularly with the addition of ‘different’.
107. The **delegation of China** insisted on the use of ‘ethnic groups’ as different countries have different contexts, adding that the first bullet point [on indigenous peoples] could not include the second bullet [different ethnic groups] because of the principle of inclusiveness. For descriptive purposes, it proposed ‘people of different ethnicities’.
108. The **delegation of Comoros** remarked that since the text mentioned ‘all strata of society’ then all the points could be deleted and the debate closed.
109. Noting that other delegations wished to take the floor, the **Chairperson** believed that there was still time to make a decision.
110. The **delegation of Uganda** recalled that reference had been made to paragraph 174 of the Operational Directives earlier in which all these groups were mentioned, but not ‘different ethnic groups’. It therefore proposed to delete ‘different ethnic groups’ and adopt the cited groups in paragraph 174 of the Operational Directives, especially as 16.1 states, ‘including but not limited to’.
111. The **delegation of Niger** asked that the floor be given to the Secretary to state whether the terms comply with the Convention, which would clarify how best to refer to the communities concerned, adding that if they were not in compliance, they could be deleted and the appropriate terms added.
112. The **Chairperson** thanked Niger, though unfortunately the Secretary was not a lawyer.
113. The **delegation of Nigeria** felt that the easiest solution was to delete the term.
114. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** drewattention to the guidance note 6 that already described the meaning of ‘inclusively’, and suggested that any changes to the text should also be reflected in the guidance note.
115. The **delegation of Finland** supported the proposal by Germany to use ‘groups with different ethnic identities’, adding that in Finland and other Nordic countries, the Roma people did not fall under any of the other headings mentioned.
116. The **delegation of Malawi** supported ‘ethnic identities’, as this was the term agreed in the ethical principles.
117. The **delegation of Senegal** believed that the text should be read in the spirit of an assessment factor, and when reading it as a whole, could appreciate that it should not be deleted as it attempted to identify the different layers of society. The factor concerns plans and programmes with respect to several layers of society, i.e. people with disabilities and immigrants, which was why they should be enumerated. Moreover, it had no issue in recognizing ethnicity, as this was not Operational Directives but an assessment factor about a programme that caters to the multiple layers of society.
118. The **Chairperson** remarked that he would soon close the discussion, adding that different countries use different terminology, but that the language of the Convention and the Operational Directives should be used in the first instance.
119. The **delegation of Egypt** supported the proposal of ‘ethnic identities’.
120. The **delegation of Haiti** noted the long debate and understood that concessions would have to be made. It felt that it was preferable to delete the term, adding that the factor assessed the plans and programmes for the safeguarding of ICH that needed to be inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, which was clearly specified. The delegation remarked that the repetition could be educational but it could also complicate matters. Thus, rather than come to an unsatisfactory compromise, it was best to delete the term.
121. The **delegation of China** agreed with Egypt and Germany on ‘people with ethnic identities’.
122. Noting that other delegations had also cited the term, the **Chairperson** proposed to use ‘ethnic identities’. With no further comments or objections, it was duly adopted. The Chairperson proposed a short break.

*[15-minute pause]*

1. The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the recommendations from the Working Group to the Committee, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** referred to [document 7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-7-EN.doc) that briefly summarized the work in Chengdu, adding that delegations would receive the more substantive record in the summary report of the debates when the Committee meets in December 2017. Document 7 also includes two sets of recommendations. First, the Working Group would address two brief and important recommendations that will be forwarded to the Committee. The first recommendation is to adopt the overall results framework proposed, and to consider how best to incorporate it into the ongoing work of monitoring and reporting on the Convention’s implementation. The Secretary remarked that it would be helpful to the Secretariat to receive recommendations on how to proceed over the coming months. The second set of recommendations put forward were the five tasks that required further work: i) to continue working on the guidance notes, as only two samples were presented; ii) to continue studying the linkages with periodic reporting; iii) to explore potential synergies with other reporting mechanisms, the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs were mentioned; iv) to continue looking for other sources of information that could help assess the impact of the Convention; and finally v) to prepare a proposal to the Committee that builds upon the work over the past two days and lays the groundwork for possible changes in the periodic reporting cycle, as discussed under item 5. This was a summary of the recommendations by the Working Group.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that there were two sets of recommendations, and wished to separate them to adopt them one-by-one. The first was the recommendation to the Committee to adopt the work carried out during the past two days. With no objections or comments, it was duly **adopted**. The second set of recommendations was addressed to the Secretariat [the five tasks as outlined by the Secretary]. With no objections or comments it was duly **adopted**. The Chairperson then spoke of the pending issue of the order or readjustment of the thematic areas, as discussed earlier. It was noted that some delegations had got together to formulate a proposal. He then invited Austria to present the discussions and results of the group to the Working Group.
4. The **delegation of Austria** recalled that during the discussions some delegations had sought to strengthen the role of safeguarding in the thematic areas presented by giving it a more prominent role, as this was very dear to their hearts and because it also reflected the Convention. Thus, the proposal was to start off with safeguarding and the role of communities rather than with education, which was considered a rather formal approach. The group came together and tried to find a way to accommodate these kinds of priorities. It also considered the thematic areas 5, 6 and 7[[1]](#footnote-1) to be important, and they were thus prioritized. The delegation informed the Working Group that the wording [of the titles] did not change**;** theywere simply moved up the table to the upper positions. The group was aware that it also had to consider the ‘long-term outcomes’, as they were linked with the thematic areas. Thus, the third column on ‘recognition and awareness’ also had to be re-positioned as the first column, in line with the thematic areas 5, 6 and 7. Another minor change was also made with core Indicator 23 [on NGOs and private/public bodies/entities serving in the Committee], which was thought more appropriate in the thematic area under ‘international engagement’. It was noted that the other 22 core indicators were required to be reported on by the States Parties, including their associated assessment factors. Conversely, indicators 23 to 26 were more related to the international level with reporting the responsibility of the Committee, the Secretariat of other organizations. Hence, they were grouped together under ‘international engagement’. This was the version that was distributed to all the delegations in the current version, as attached to Annex 1. The delegation also informed the Working Group that the Secretariat had rightly reminded the group that it is the long-term outcomes that will appear most prominently in the future publication of the document. The delegation referred to the 2005 Convention Global Report in which the goals featured prominently and boldly in colour. This would be the case with the long-term outcomes, and hence ‘recognition and awareness’ would now feature in first place, ahead of the other outcomes in the publication. It was thus up to debate whether this is the intention. In this vein, the delegation explained that an amendment was proposed, inviting the delegation of Belgium to further expand.
5. The **delegation of Belgium** explained that in dialogue with the Secretariat, a very simple solution was found. One of the key points was to avoid sending the message that formal education in primary and secondary schools was the central method to developing the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the group was very sensitive to the argument of keeping the order of the long-term outcomes and introducing minimal change. The delegation thus proposed to switch the position of the first two columns of thematic areas, i.e. ‘Institutional and human capacities’ in the first column, followed by ‘Transmission and education’, but which would maintain the sequence of the long-term outcomes. In addition, the order of the indicators under ‘Transmission and education’ was slightly changed in that education in formal and non-formal settings becomes more prominent. Thus, the final possible solution proposed to switch the two columns, as just explained, and to transfer Indicator 23 to the thematic area under ‘International engagement’.
6. The **Secretary** remarked that Austria and Belgium had clearly explained the situation. The Secretariat’s sole concern was the unintended effect of positioning ‘awareness raising’ ahead of ‘transmission and education’ in terms of the associated ‘long-term outcomes’. However, the proposal, as explained, appeared to reach a middle ground.
7. The **Chairperson** was of the understanding that the indicators and the factors had been agreed upon and that a discussion would not be reopened, nor would the total structure of the thematic areas be reshuffled, only readjusted. The major change involved moving indicators 5, 6 and 7 to the front.
8. The **delegation of Austria** clarified thatonly the indicators 5 and 6 had been moved forward in the final version. Indicator 7 remained unchanged.
9. The **Chairperson** noted the minor changes proposed, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, Austria’s proposal was **adopted**. The change to Indicator 23 was also **adopted**. With regard to the last proposal on the order of long-term outcomes, the Chairperson invited the Secretary to further explain.
10. The **Secretary** explained that the aim was to maintain the order of long-term outcomes as they had originally been elaborated by the expert meeting and then welcomed by the Committee. Thus, only minor adjustments were proposed. Firstly, the order of thematic areas 1 and 2 would be reversed, and secondly, the order of the first two indicators under ‘transmission and education’ would switch order so as to emphasize transmission over education. With regard to Indicator 23, on engagement of the NGOs, public and private bodies within the Committee, it would be moved [under ‘international engagement], as the Secretariat would report on it. This proposal would entail some minor renumbering of the indicators. It was noted that the original indicators had already been adopted, and that the final report would reflect the revised structure.
11. The **delegation of Jamaica** asked whether the final version would be circulated to the Working Group.
12. The **Secretary** proposed to continue working electronically with the group of Rapporteurs, as they represented all the geographic regions, so as to facilitate the communication rather than working with all the delegations individually. The Secretary explained that the process of incorporating the new sequence and numbering would take a couple of weeks. The report would first be circulated to the six Rapporteurs to confirm by email their endorsement of the report, but once endorsed, the official final report would be made available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-7-EN.doc).
13. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no change to the document except for the revision of indicators 5, 6 and 7, but the whole structure of the thematic areas remained unchanged. The Chairperson described the points proposed by Belgium and the Secretariat as logical in that the core of the report had already been adopted by the expert group and welcomed by the Committee itself. Nevertheless, the Working Group had been tasked to discuss the report and make some readjustments and/or recommendations. The Chairperson explained that the Working Group had tried to accommodate the views of Belgium and other delegations, and would now entrust the Secretariat to work out a final version to submit to the Rapporteurs. With no further comments or objections, the working group agreed to the procedure.

ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA:

CLOSING

1. The **Chairperson** was extremely happy to have chaired this meeting, and he warmly thanked all the delegations for their efforts. He also took the opportunity to thank the Vice-Chair and the Rapporteurs for their consistently hard work, without whom, the meeting would not have run so smoothly. The Chairperson also thanked the Observers, the representatives of the category 2 centres and other NGOs, all of whom had participated actively in the deliberations and had made contributions. He extended a very warm appreciation to the Secretary and his professional and efficient team. On behalf of the Working Group, he thanked the Chinese Government for its generosity in supporting this meeting, and it was hoped they would continue to do so in the future. He thanked the city of Chengdu, which means the capital of success. It was noted that three ICH meetings had been held in Chengdu: the first in 2007, the second in 2013, and this present meeting; all three meetings had been successful, and had been chaired by the Chairperson himself. He continued to thank the other workers, the technicians and the interpreters for their hard work. The Chairperson extended his best wishes to all, and hoped they would find time to stay in Sichuan province and enjoy the sightseeing aside from giant panda. He wished everyone a safe journey home.
2. The **delegation of Senegal** called for the opportunity – together with all the delegates of the various countries present, the NGOs and the Observers – to thank the Chairperson. The delegation spoke of the manner in which the Chairperson lead the meeting that combined experience, a sense of humour, diplomacy, and also rigour. This enabled the Working Group to conduct its proceedings in a pleasant climate that was conducive to reflection and the emergence of good ideas. The delegation congratulated the Chairperson and expressed its gratitude for his wisdom and for everything he had accomplished.
3. A **Representative of the ICH-NGO Forum** wished to congratulate the Secretariat and the Chairperson for the good work realized within the Open-ended Working Group. The Forum was sincerely happy about the meeting and its spirit of collegiality and collaboration, and for being open to the active participation of NGOs, which together achieved outstanding consensual results for an operative global framework. The ICH-NGO Forum reiterates its hope to be officially part of the next steps regarding the global framework. It would furthermore continue to work on the idea of an international ICH Observatory that had generated new interest during the present session. The Representative concluded by thanking China for its warm welcome, and he wished everyone a safe trip home.
4. The **Director of UNESCO Beijing office**, **Ms Marielza Oliveira**, thanked the Chairperson, the Vice-Chair, the Rapporteurs, delegates and colleagues. Noting the end of the rich and effective discussions over the past three days, Ms Oliveira spoke of her immense pleasure in sharing this important moment in the life of the Convention. She congratulated everyone for the impressive work accomplished, and for having reached consensus on a set of 26 indicators and 86 assessment factors capable of effectively measuring outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the results map of the Convention. Ms Oliveira called it ground-breaking work, especially as it was the first time measuring outputs and results related to ICH safeguarding, while the framework also specifies its contributions to sustainable development for human well being, dignity, creativity and peace. The reference to sustainable development was particularly significant as the international community is increasingly acknowledging the role of culture for sustainable development and has integrated it into the 2030 Agenda. As discussed during the meeting, the knowledge generated under the results framework would provide invaluable input to illustrating how safeguarding intangible cultural heritage can effectively contribute towards attaining the sustainable development goals. Work will continue in exploring linkages between this workstream and other reporting mechanisms, notably the SDGs, to ensure that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is well embedded in all relevant policy areas.
5. **Ms Oliveira** remarked that by agreeing on the set of 26 indicators and 86 assessment factors, the draft of the overall results framework for the Convention had now been completed and would be proposed to the Committee for endorsement at its 12th session in Jeju Island, Republic of Korea [in December 2017]. If the Committee so agrees, the results framework would then be submitted to the General Assembly at its 7th session in Paris in June 2018. In the meantime, the Secretariat would work further on the guidance notes for the indicators, as recommended. Ms Oliveira was convinced that the framework would become an incredibly useful tool for all stakeholders to implement the Convention more effectively and to support communities and groups to better safeguard their intangible cultural heritage. Furthermore, the meeting discussed the challenging question of how to generate the data required to fulfil the indicators under the results framework and to monitor progress in implementing the Convention. It was agreed that there was a need to harness the existing reporting mechanisms, and not create new reporting obligations, and to discuss ideas on how best to link the overall results framework to periodic reporting. There was strong support for the idea to move to a regional cycle for national reporting, which would provide new opportunities for international cooperation, knowledge-sharing and technical assistance, including capacity-building. The Secretariat would make sure to follow the recommendations in this regard and prepare new revisions of the Operational Directives for a regional cycle for national reporting for consideration by the next Committee session.
6. **Ms Oliveira** concluded by thanking everyone that had made the meeting possible. Firstly, the Ministry of Culture of the Peoples Republic of China and the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu for having generously hosted the Working Group. It was not the first time they had hosted a meeting for the Convention, and she was very grateful for their continued support and generosity. It was also timely to witness the Sixth International Festival of intangible cultural heritage, which was also a great way of celebrating and raising awareness for intangible cultural heritage. The discussions of the international forum, which this year focused on the important theme of ethics for safeguarding and the links that exists between ICH and sustainable development, was equally stimulating. Ms Oliveira thanked the Chairperson for the skilful, creative and humorous way he moderated the exchanges. She also thanked the Vice-Chair and the team of Rapporteurs who stayed up until late into the evenings to help reach consensus on the indicators. She then thanked Mr Tim Curtis, Secretary of the Convention, and his exceptional team for preparing and facilitating this meeting in a highly professional manner. Ms Oliveira reserved the biggest thanks to all the State Representatives, NGOs and experts for their constructive contributions and collaboration, and for their commitment to your Convention. She wished everyone a safe travel home.
7. The **Secretary** was very pleased to announce that the highly anticipated visit to the panda park had been arranged for the following day, adding that delegations should be aware of their flight schedules if they were leaving the same day.
8. The **Chairperson** concluded by thanking the hotel managers and especially the many young university students who volunteered their time. He duly closed the meeting.

*[Close of Open-ended Working Group meeting]*

1. . Thematic area 5: Role of intangible cultural heritage in society; Thematic area 6: Awareness raising; Thematic area 7: Engagement of civil society, including communities, groups and individuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)