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**participants’ text**

## overview of GUIDANCE NOTES

Guidance notes have been prepared for each of the 26 Core Indicators of the overall results framework. Each guidance note is divided into two main sections: (1) an overview and rationale of the overall results framework and (2) specific guidance on monitoring and periodic reporting. Although section (2) is more directly related to periodic reporting, elements in section (1), such as the relationship to the SDGs and to other indicators, can also be useful. The various sections and headings in the guidance note are as follows:

***Section I: Overview and rationale:***

***Indicator*:** The indicator for which the guidance note has been prepared.

***Assessment factors*:** The assessment factors set out in the overall results framework for that indicator.

***Relation with SDGs and other indicators*:** This explains how the indicator is related to the SDGs and how it relates to other indicators, as two or more indicators may deal with the same general areas (e.g. indicators 7 and 8 for inventorying).

***Rationale for action*:** The rationale or basis on which interventions and other measures are implemented in relation to this indicator, citing Convention provisions, ODs and other sources where relevant.

***Key terms*:** This section sets out any key terms that need to be explained to fill out the relevant section of the form. The key concepts introduced in Unit 57 cover all of these.

***Section II: Specific guidance on monitoring and periodic reporting:***

***Benefits of monitoring*:** This explains what benefits can be found at both the national and the global levels from monitoring this indicator. This is not only an encouragement to States Parties to engage with the process, but also suggests how the process can feed into setting baselines and targets.

***Data sources and collection*:** This section addresses in general and with reference to specific sources where the data and information required to fill out the form related to the indicator may be found. This is intended as a guide and other useful sources may well also be available.

***Extent to which indicator is satisfied*:** This gives the weightings for each of the assessment factors related to the indicator.

## insights from Internal Oversight Office of UNESCO (IOS) 2013 Report

A report undertaken by the Internal Oversight Office of UNESCO (IOS) in 2013 identified several weaknesses in the periodic reporting framework that operated between 2011 and 2018. These are important to consider when understanding why the periodic reporting mechanism was reformed and what benefits the new system seeks to bring. The weaknesses identified in the 2013 IOS report include:

* A tendency to describe activities with little or no focus on their impact on the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage itself and/or the community, group or individuals concerned. The quality of the process often goes unaddressed and insufficient attention is paid to identifying the beneficiaries targeted (youth, women, minorities, disabled persons etc.) or the actors who provide specific programmes (States, NGOs, etc.).
* The type of questions used in the current form lead to information that is often extremely detailed but does not clarify the main approaches taken, emerging trends and the impacts or outcomes of the activities described. With regard to inventorying, for example, a high level of detail is often provided in the reports that is not always well organized and this obscures important information; in addition, the focus often tends to be placed on the inventory as a ‘product’ rather than on the inventorying process and its impact.
* Information is sometimes misplaced as it is not sufficiently clear what information is required in response to specific questions. For example, information on research by higher education institutions is often confused with the teaching and educational activities of these same institutions, which belong elsewhere. Conversely, the information provided elsewhere may focus on measures, but it is not clear who is responsible for them. In addition, information on safeguarding actions that may be related or overlapping (such as educational programmes and capacity building) is sometimes out of place or not sufficiently distinguished in the current form.
* It is often not sufficiently clear what information is relevant, leading to States Parties providing a large amount of information on one type of activity while not including other, equally relevant, information.
* Some important information is not solicited and therefore, if it is provided, tends to be placed rather randomly in the form; this impedes comparisons across periodic reports. For example, specific information on policy and legislative development is not requested in a clear manner and different States may therefore report it in various sections.

It is important to note that some aspects of the periodic reporting form used since 2011 were seen to have contributed towards these weaknesses identified. Further points made by IOS were:

* A topic that does not clearly enough emerge from the present reports relates to ways in which functional and complementary cooperation has been developed with and among communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals who create, maintain and transmit ICH, as well as experts, centres of expertise and research institutes.
* The diversity of gender roles and responsibilities within ICH expressions is increasingly understood to be an important transversal issue that cuts across most aspects of implementing the Convention.
* Another increasingly important cross-cutting theme is the degree to which safeguarding ICH is itself sustainable (for the heritage and the associated communities) and how far it can feed into achieving broader goals of sustainable development[[1]](#footnote-1) and the ways in which sustainable development can lead to better safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage.
1. Now addressed in Chapter VI to the Operational Directives. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)