**Overview and rationale**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **3. Extent to which training is operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage** | |
| **Assessment factors** | This indicator is assessed on the basis of two country-level factors monitored and reported by each State Party: | |
| * 1. Training programmes, including those operated by communities themselves, provide capacity building in ICH addressed on an inclusive basis to communities, groups and individuals. | Article 14(a)(ii)  OD 82,  OD 153(b),  OD 155(b) |
| * 1. Training programmes provide capacity building in ICH addressed on an inclusive basis to those working in the fields of culture and heritage. | Article 14(a)(iii)  OD 153(b) |
| **Relation with SDGs and other indicators** | **Sustainable Development Goals:** Like all indicators, the present indicator also responds to SDG Target 11.4, ‘strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.’ If a developing State benefits from international support for its capacity-building efforts, this indicator also responds to SDG Target 17.9, which focuses on international support for effective and targeted capacity-building to support national implementation of the SDGs. Like Indicator 2, this indicator also complements SDG Target 4.7, which refers to learners acquiring ‘the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development…[notably] appreciation of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.’  **Relation to other indicators:** Whereas Indicator 2 focuses on the institutions, bodies or other organizations offering capacity-building programmes in ICH safeguarding and management, this indicator focuses on the persons who are addressed by those programmes. The focus here on capacity building for ICH safeguarding and management distinguishes the present indicator from Indicators 4, 5 and 6, which are more directly concerned with the respect for, practice of and transmission of ICH. | |
| **Rationale for action** | The Convention highlights the importance of strengthening the capacities both of the communities and groups concerned (Article 14(a)(ii)) and of those professionally involved in ICH safeguarding and management (Article 14(a)(iii)). If communities, groups and individuals are to participate as widely as possible in safeguarding and to be involved actively in its management (Article 15), they may need to acquire specialized skills and methods they do not currently possess. Similarly, professionals working in the fields of culture and heritage may have broad knowledge and experience that support their work, but they may lack knowledge of the specialized approaches adapted to ICH safeguarding and management. It may be pertinent to target specific constituencies most centrally involved with ICH, while keeping in mind the general importance of inclusiveness for capacity building activities. | |
| **Key terms** | * Training * Capacity building * Communities, groups or, in some cases, individuals * Inclusive/inclusively | |

**Specific guidance on monitoring and periodic reporting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Benefits of monitoring** | Whereas Indicator 2 focuses on the availability of capacity-building programmes, the focus here is on whether they are effectively reaching several target audiences. Monitoring at the country level thus provides feedback both to those organizing such programmes and to State officials (who may in some cases be providing funding for them) concerning the degree to which they are actually providing training that reaches the intended audiences and whether adjustments need to be made to respond more fully to the needs of specific constituencies. Monitoring and reporting at the global level can help identify good models for effective delivery of capacity-building services and can help other States learn of approaches and methods that have demonstrated their effectiveness. |
| **Data sources and collection** | Disaggregated data on recipients and beneficiaries of training programmes and activities is an important source of information when available. This would normally be found in reports submitted after training programmes either to partners or for the general public. Ideally, such reports would identify whether trainees are members of communities and groups (Assessment Factor 3.1) or are professionally involved in culture and heritage (Assessment Factor 3.2). Inclusiveness can be monitored by data distinguishing participants by age, gender, language (if relevant), ethnicity, etc. Where available, medium- to long-term monitoring of trainees can track the extent to which they have utilized the skills and knowledge gained during training programmes.  **Possible data sources**   * Project reports and participant lists for training programmes and activities * Evaluations from training participants (at the conclusion of the training and, if possible, later) * Information gathered from NGOs and community-based organizations * Media coverage of workshops and training activities * Tracer studies with trainees to assess how they are utilizing the knowledge and skills they acquired in a specific training |