United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织



**Distribution : limited**

**CE/11/5.IGC/213/3**
**Paris, 12 October 2011**
**Original : English**

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

**Fifth Ordinary Session**
**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters**
**5 - 9 December 2011**

**Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda:** Adoption of the detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Committee

This document contains in Annex the draft detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Committee (29 November - 3 December 2010) for adoption by the Committee.

Decision required: paragraph 4

1. In accordance with Article 43 of the Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee"), the Secretariat prepared a draft detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Committee (29 November - 3 December 2010) in the two working languages, English and French. The draft was published electronically on the Convention website (http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/diversity/convention/) simultaneously in the two working languages of the Committee on 21 April 2011.

2. Committee members were invited to submit their comments to the Secretariat of the Convention before 5 September 2011. At this date, no comments were received.

3. This document contains in Annex, for approval by the Committee, the draft detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Committee.

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

**DRAFT DECISION 5.IGC 3**

*The Committee,*

1. *Having examined document CE/11/5.IGC/213/3 and its Annex;*

2. *Adopts the detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions included in the above-mentioned document.*

**ANNEX**

**Draft detailed summary record of the fourth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions**

**OPENING OF THE SESSION**

1. The Fourth Ordinary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 29 November - 3 December 2010.

2. It was attended by 323 participants, including 92 participants from the 24 States Members of the Committee, 125 participants from 59 Parties non-members of the Committee (58 States Parties and the European Union (EU)), 64 participants from 28 States not Parties to the Convention, 2 participants from Permanent Observer Missions to UNESCO, 7 participants from 4 intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 33 participants from 15 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with Observer status.

3. In opening the session, **Ms Nina Obuljen**, Chairperson, welcomed all participants, reviewed logistical matters, including the timetable for the Committee's session in the coming days, introduced the members of the Bureau (Ms Nina Obuljen, Chairperson (Croatia), Mr Zaid Hamzeh (Jordan, Rapporteur) and China, France, Kenya and Mexico (Vice-Chairpersons)), and briefly reviewed the working documents and the order in which participants could intervene. The delegation of **France** made reference to the timetable of the agenda, suggesting that item 5, the feasibility study and cost analysis for the creation of an emblem, be dealt with at the end of the Committee's session, namely after item 13.

4. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported this proposal.

5. The **Secretary of the Convention** highlighted that the Committee would be examining 14 working documents and electing a new Bureau at the end of this fourth ordinary session. She proceeded to read through the working and information documents, also mentioning their numbers, which corresponded to the way in which they were to be referred to throughout the session. She subsequently reminded everyone that the working documents were sent to Committee members by post within the statutory deadline in conformity with Article 41 of the Committee's Rules of Procedure, and that they were also posted to the Convention website at the same time.

**ITEM 1 – ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/1**

6. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to adopt the agenda.

*Decision 4.IGC 1 was adopted.*

**ITEM 2 – APPROVAL OF THE LIST OF OBSERVERS**

7. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to read the list of observers: 52 Parties non-members of the Committee, 26 Member States not Parties to the Convention, 2 permanent observer missions to UNESCO, 4 IGOs, 5 NGOs.

8. The delegation of **Ethiopia** pointed out that it had registered as an observer that morning and that its country's name had not been called out.

*Decision 4.IGC 2 was adopted.*

**ITEM 3 – ADOPTION OF THE DETAILED SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRD ORDINARY SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/3**

9. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to proceed with the adoption of the detailed summary record of the third ordinary session of the Committee, held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 7-9 December 2009. She stated that Article 43 of the Rules of Procedure stipulated that the Secretariat should produce detailed draft summary record of the Committee's sessions in both working languages. She also remarked that Committee members had been invited to submit their comments to the Secretariat before 19 October 2010, and that no comments were received at that point; however a few typing errors were noted in both versions of the draft report, which the Secretariat corrected.

10. The delegation of **Germany** took the floor and requested the Secretariat to amend paragraphs 34 and 51.

*Decision 4.IGC 3 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 4 – PROGRESS OF RATIFICATIONS OF THE CONVENTION, STEPS TAKEN AND ACTIONS CARRIED OUT IN 2009-2010**

**Documents CE/10/4.IGC/205/4 and CE/10/4.IGC/205/INF.4**

11. The **Secretary of the Convention** reiterated that at its last session, the Committee adopted a ratification strategy that laid out a goal to achieve 35 to 40 additional ratifications between 2010 and 2013 with an emphasis on under-represented regions and subregions. She stated that 22 new ratifications were achieved in 2009 and 2010, with only 5 coming from regions targeted by the strategy, and as a result it was suggested that the Secretariat organize an information session before the Conference of Parties in June 2011 to facilitate an exchange of experiences on ratification between Parties and non-Parties.

12. The delegation of **Brazil** highlighted that it gives great importance to the ratification strategy, and that it promotes ratification through bilateral and multilateral cultural cooperation agreements, including all international agreements signed by the Minister of Culture, even with countries that have not yet ratified the Convention. The delegation also stressed that the theme of cultural diversity was discussed within the MERCOSUR cultural community of South American countries and that the Convention was placed on its agenda.

13. The delegation of **Germany** asserted that it fully supported the efforts undertaken to disseminate information on the ratification process and supported calls on States to ratify. In this context the delegation drew attention to a publication that had been prepared and just published by the Asia-Europe Foundation and the German National Commission for UNESCO called *Mapping cultural diversity: good practices from around the globe*.

14. The delegation of **France** stressed its commitment to advancing the Convention's ratification strategy. It highlighted the major role of UNESCO field offices in supporting these efforts due to their direct contacts in the field, and it also praised the Secretary General of the International

Organisation of La Francophonie for making ratification of the Convention a necessary precondition in any agreement negotiation.

15. The delegation of **Cuba** mentioned how it had undertaken several activities to implement the ratification strategy, particularly in the field of communication, including promoting awareness of the Convention and the call for ratification among specialists, senior managers and officials of the Ministry of Culture and its cultural institutions in the various international meetings they have attended.

**[Observers]**

16. The delegation of **Thailand** informed the Committee that Thailand had been approached by the representative of the EU in South-East Asia to ratify the Convention. The delegation stressed that the reason for which ratification had not already occurred did not reflect a lack of interest, rather it had to do with the lengthy internal procedures in ratifying any international Convention in Thailand. He stressed that the Ministry of Culture had consulted other national ministries and agencies concerned by the Convention, and that they were working with the UNESCO Bangkok office to promote capacity-building in the cultural industries in Thailand.

17. The delegation of **Mauritania** highlighted that its country had actively contributed to the promotion of cultural diversity, and that they had started a significant project funded by the Spanish Government through the Millennium Development Goals having to do with heritage and creativity to foster sustainable development.

18. The delegation of **Algeria** announced that Algeria had already ratified the Convention internally and that it just needed to take a few additional legal steps toward official ratification.

19. The delegation of **Japan** informed that the National Commission of Japan to UNESCO brought forward the proposal to ratify the Convention to the Japanese government and it was asking the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education and Culture to examine the Convention and to determine the benefits of ratification as soon as possible.

20. The **Chairperson** then invited representatives from IGOs and NGOs to intervene. When no IGO and NGO volunteered to take the floor, the Chairperson took the opportunity to thank the work done by these organizations in promoting the Convention and its ratification.

21. The **Representative of the Director-General** cleared up any confusion that may have arisen from the morning information session entitled “Cultural Expressions: Innovative Approachs and Data Collection Tools” to recall that in 2005, Member States who adopted the Convention, chose to focus on protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions transmitted through cultural goods, services and activities rather than on the broader concept of the 2001 Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity.

22. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Representative of the Director-General for her statement, reiterating that Committee members were still worried about lingering confusion between the Convention, the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity and the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. She suggested that at some point this item might have to appear on the agenda and perhaps a manual could be eventually produced to clarify the differences.

23. The delegation of **Brazil** suggested including a paragraph inviting Parties to promote the Convention whenever necessary, according to its regional interests, and within its geographical reality.

24. The delegation of **Germany** agreed with Brazil's remarks, drawing the Committee's attention to the matrix in the Annex of Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/4 that broke down ratifications by regional groups, pointing out that it might be a little bit short-sighted to reduce the efforts of Parties to their own regions only. The delegation suggested that "countries of the region" be taken out in paragraph 8 of the Decision and that the sentence stop at "to promote ratification among other countries".

25. The delegations of **Saint Lucia** and **Greece** supported the proposal made by Brazil and Germany, highlighting that the amendment leaves the issue open and that specifying regions limited the reach of Member States.

*Decision 4.IGC 4 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 5 – FEASIBILITY STUDY AND COST ANALYSIS FOR THE CREATION OF AN EMBLEM FOR THE CONVENTION**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/5**

26. The **Secretary of the Convention** began her introduction by pointing out that working document 5 presented a feasibility study on the creation of an emblem for the Convention, as well as preliminary draft operational guidelines on the use of the emblem. She continued by mentioning that some of the other conventions in the field of culture had emblems, some designed by one person and others selected through international competition, as was the case for the 2003 Convention emblem, which cost US $15,000 not including human resources that were required on the part of the 2003 Convention secretariat to manage and coordinate the competition. The Secretary of the Convention pointed out that document 5 provided an analysis of three different options for the Committee's consideration, including advantages, disadvantages, a cost estimate, and estimated human resources required on the part of the Secretariat to manage each of these options. These options included: 1) commissioning an artist to design an emblem for the Convention; 2) an international competition organized by the Secretariat; 3) an international competition to be managed through the Design 21 Social Design Network that had a partnership with UNESCO.

27. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened discussions with a few questions, including: whether the Committee wanted the Convention to have an emblem; whether what was presented by the Secretariat and in the document was acceptable; and which options should be considered.

28. The delegation of **France** acknowledged the usefulness of having an emblem for the Convention, since the other UNESCO conventions also had one. Believing that the particular priority should be on the projects, the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, the quadrennial reports and the use made thereof, the delegation indicated that of the three options proposed by the Secretariat, it was in favour of the most cost effective option. However, it wished to be provided with more information about that option: for instance, what expenses could be covered, and how it broke down. As for guidelines on the use of the emblem, it was premature to discuss the matter.

29. The delegation of **China**, supported by Cameroon and Brazil, stated that it believed in the necessity of an emblem, and that it wanted to discuss in greater detail its mode of creation. The delegation pointed out that the emblem could be used as a global awareness-raising tool, and that the expenses associated with its creation could be regarded as an investment in promoting the Convention. However, the delegation acknowledged that the costs were relatively high and given the limited resources available, they could stay flexible on this issue and join the Committee's consensus.

30. The delegation of **Tunisia** pointed out that in addition to promoting the Convention, an emblem could help to meet other future objectives, such as fundraising. The delegation of **Germany**, supported by Lithuania, also expressed its openness to joining the Committee's consensus, acknowledging the need for an emblem and the cost-saving potential in leveraging already-existing networks and partnerships.

31. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by Luxembourg, stated that it was not necessarily convinced of the need of an emblem at this stage, though it could serve as a measure to increase the visibility and promotion of the Convention. However, the delegation pointed out that a precise source of funding for the creation of an emblem had not been identified, so to ensure cost reduction and efficiency, it suggested that the visual signature that was being used to represent the Convention on the UNESCO website become its emblem. The delegation of **Croatia** supported comments made by Canada, highlighting that the Convention's present visual signature was attractive and that the circles associated with it already resonated immediately with Parties and stakeholders. In that respect, the delegation suggested involving the person who created these circles in adapting them for an emblem.

32. The delegation of **Greece**, also, highlighted the importance of an emblem in order to achieve the Convention's objectives, and suggested launching an appeal on the Convention's website for voluntary entries, and setting up a small group of selection. It stressed that the rules governing the use of the emblem could be discussed at the subsequent Committee meeting.

33. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Tunisia, confirmed the usefulness of an emblem, and remarked that the Convention already had an emblem that has been used for years. It suggested asking the artist to show the Committee a smaller version which could be used on documents. It added that costly options should not be entered into and expressed doubts about launching an international competition. It suggested following the example of UNICEF by engaging a specialized company to develop a strategy, raise funds and significantly raise the profile of the Convention. The delegation mentioned that it was not in a position to discuss or adopt operational guidelines for the emblem at the current session, especially since the guidelines were a carbon copy of those of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. It stressed that the two conventions were different. The delegation of **Albania** expressed support for the proposal to keep the emblem with the circles, which was already known and associated with the Convention. The delegation supported the previous statements about the operational guidelines and the fact that it was still too early to discuss them. The delegation of **China**, supported by Tunisia, emphasized that the creation of an emblem in itself was neither urgent nor as important as the process that would be used to create the emblem, stressing that broad international participation in its creation in the form of an international competition would allow people on the ground to participate in activities related to the Convention. The delegation of **Mauritius** affirmed the importance of the emblem, since it meant visibility and backing for the spirit of the Convention. However, the advantages and disadvantages of the options put forward should be weighed, and care should be taken to avoid committing already limited financial resources.

34. The **Chairperson** remarked that the consensus that was building among Committee members was not reflected in the draft decision and that the Committee was not ready to embark on a discussion of the operational guidelines for the emblem.

35. Following her proposal for a new draft decision, which could read as: "Having examined document CE/10/4.IGC/205/5 and its annexes, recognizes the importance of having an emblem symbolizing the Convention to ensure its visibility and promotion, and requests the Secretariat to forward this decision to the third ordinary session of the Conference of Parties, together with a summary of its debate of this subject and decision 3 IGC.6". The delegation of **Tunisia**, supported by Saint Lucia

and France, suggested eliminating the first point and going straight to “and requests that this point will be discussed at its next session”. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its preference to keep paragraph 3 because in its understanding the Conference of Parties had given the Committee the mandate to decide on this agenda item, leaving the Committee with the responsibility to inform it of its discussions. The delegation of **Cameroon** suggested replacing the term “resume” by “continue”. The **Chair** repeated the proposed amendment: “decides to add this item to the Agenda of its fifth ordinary session, and to continue its discussion about this issue”.

*Decision 4.IGC 5 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 6 – PERTINENCE AND FEASIBILITY OF APPOINTING PUBLIC PERSONS TO PROMOTE THE CONVENTION**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/6**

36. The **Secretary of the Convention** summarized the content of Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/6, highlighting the different options, including: the nomination of a single spokesperson on the international level; the nomination of six persons, one for each electoral group; engaging multiple persons on the national, regional, local levels to promote the Convention – those coming from a variety of backgrounds.

37. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that the decision to appoint a spokesman or several had never been taken, and that analyzing scenarios for such an appointment would be premature at this stage since Committee members had not had an opportunity to discuss this issue together yet. The delegation did not agree with the appointment of spokespersons because of the costs and complexities associated with it, and suggested that each country decide on its own mechanism to promote the Convention.

38. The delegation of **Luxembourg** agreed with Saint Lucia, stressing that it would be difficult to define the mandate of such a spokesperson(s), oversee his/her/their rhetoric and cover the associated costs, which were extremely high according to Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/6. In addition, she emphasized that such a move would not be relevant or advisable since one person does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of an electoral group. The delegation expressed its preference for each country to decide on its own mechanisms in this regard.

39. The delegation of **Canada** agreed with Luxembourg and Saint Lucia, highlighting that the associated costs and management demands would make the appointment of public figures at the international level unadvisable. The delegation also believed that it should be up to Parties to choose whether they wanted to appoint spokespeople, be it at national, regional and/or local levels, assuming themselves all related costs and responsibilities that accompany the decision.

40. The delegation of **France** agreed with the previous speakers and pointed out that limited resources would be better spent on funding projects through the International Fund for Cultural Diversity.

41. The delegations of **Cuba, Croatia, Greece, Kenya, Germany, China, India, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Tunisia** and **Lithuania** joined the growing consensus to not nominate spokesperson(s) at this time and to leave it up to each Party to decide how to handle this matter.

**[Observers]**

42. The delegation of **Ethiopia** observed some serious challenges to nominating a spokesperson(s). It underscored that Parties, whether individually or in cooperation with one another, could be

encouraged to promote the Convention without having a spokesperson or spokespersons. Additionally, the delegation stressed that already available resources, like the information kit developed by UNESCO, should be leveraged – and not just in electronic version, but also in hard-copy format, especially in developing countries that need more support.

43. The delegation of **Madagascar** echoed Committee members' growing consensus, expressing its wish to abstain from nominating either one or six spokesperson(s) because of its untimely nature and related costs, especially since fundraising efforts should be concentrated on the International Fund for Cultural Diversity.

44. The delegation of **Italy** joined the consensus, reiterating the important role that Associated Schools, among others, could play in increasing the visibility of the Convention. The delegation suggested that these issues should perhaps be revisited when discussing the creation of an emblem for the Convention.

45. The **Chairperson** asked that the amendments submitted on Decision 4.IGC6 be presented.

46. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Luxembourg, resumed the amendments, stating that they reflected the discussion on this matter, which was not to accept any of the proposals in the document at this stage, leaving each Party to choose the mechanism it finds suitable for the promotion of the Convention.

47. The delegation of **China** proposed to clarify in the amendment that each Party has the right to choose the mechanism it deems appropriate to promote the objectives of the Convention and that the Committee decides not to nominate any spokespeople for the time being.

48. The delegation of **Germany** expressed its support for the right of each Member State to decide.

49. The delegation of **India** proposed a small amendment that would reflect a recommendation to not appoint any spokespersons and also encourage Parties to promote, through appropriate measures and mechanisms, the Convention.

50. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that the crux of discussions focused on nominating a spokesperson, and that it would be important to have this clearly communicated so that Parties could have the option of deciding on the appropriate mechanism. In addition, it suggested that "decides each State Party" be amended to "invites each State Party" in the decision.

51. The delegation of **South Africa** stated that Saint Lucia had presented the Committee with the perfect solution to this matter, stressing that the Committee is charged to make a decision as to the pertinence and the feasibility of appointing a spokesperson(s). The delegation also encouraged Parties to use whatever mechanism they find relevant to promote the Convention, and a spokesperson is one of those mechanisms, an idea reflected in Saint Lucia's amendment since it mentions "including the appointment of a public spokesperson".

52. The delegation of **France** supported South Africa's statement, highlighting that the original proposal took into consideration all concerns expressed during the discussions and that in trying to improve the text of the decision, the Committee was creating more confusion. Echoing South Africa's intervention, the delegation stressed that the possibility to appoint a spokesperson for a State Party was one of the options, not an obligation – just one of the possibilities. The delegation further remarked that Germany's concern was also taken into consideration with the wording of the original proposal, leaving the Committee to decide that it is up to each Party to choose the most appropriate mechanism to promote the Convention.

53. The delegation of **Luxembourg** stressed that the proposal put forward by **Saint Lucia** allowed for quite a broad interpretation, and that it was deemed most acceptable by most delegations.

*Decision 4.ICG 6 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 7 – DRAFT OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES ON INFORMATION SHARING AND TRANSPARENCY (ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION)**

**Documents CE/10/4.IGC/205/7 and CE/10/4.IGC/205/INF.3**

54. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to explain Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/7 and information document 3.

55. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that Article 9 of the Convention invited Parties to provide information in their reports to UNESCO every four years on measures they had taken to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions within their territory and at the international level. She stressed that Parties were to designate a point of contact responsible for sharing information in relation to this Convention, and of course to share and exchange information relating to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. She resumed the outcomes of the last session of the Committee, remarking that the Committee proposed that a thematic approach be adopted rather than requesting Parties to report on the implementation of all the articles of the Convention one by one. She mentioned that among the themes that were identified by the Committee were international cooperation and the integration of culture into sustainable development policies. She also stressed that the Committee had insisted that these periodic reports be working tools and that they include both qualitative and quantitative information and be illustrated with cases of good practice. She went on to state that what most interested the Committee during its last session was for the periodic reports to help answer questions on how, why, when and with what impact such measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions were introduced in each country. She remarked that the Committee also acknowledged that the framework should evolve over time and recognized that not all Parties would be able to answer all the questions at the same level of detail; however all Parties were encouraged to appoint as soon as possible the national points of contact that would be responsible for sharing information in relation to the Convention. She pointed the Committee's attention to how and when these reports would be made available, keeping in mind that their purpose was to facilitate the sharing of information and the promotion of transparency, as well as to the importance of reinforcing the Secretariat to successfully manage the reception, processing and distribution of these reports.

56. The **Chairperson** opened the floor and invited discussion on the agenda item as a whole.

57. The delegation of **Luxembourg** indicated that it was happy to see that the document to a great extent reflected the wishes and demands of the Committee, reiterating that periodic reports should serve as practical and analytical working documents, presenting results, challenges and lessons-learned on the implementation of the Convention. She reiterated that the reports should not be too long or too short and they should include and reflect the contribution of civil society without defining strict rules on the ways and means of civil society participation.

58. The delegation of **Canada** highlighted the significance of the periodic reports as effective tools to assess the situation in the field and introduce effective policies. The delegation mentioned that the information contained in the reports would enable States to share expertise on the diversity of cultural expressions, and in light of that morning's information session, the Committee had gained greater familiarity with the challenges related to data collection. The delegation stressed that the report's framework should remain flexible and be adjusted to each country's capacities since not all Parties could collect and analyse the same quantity or quality of data. It also stressed that Parties

could list an array of measures implemented at the national level aiming to define the general context, and they should not be limited to new measures implemented since the ratification of the Convention. The delegation also asked whether it would be practical to present all reports to the Conference of Parties, especially since that would mean that they would have to be translated into six languages. It suggested instead that a short analytical summary be presented to the Conference of Parties. Lastly, the delegation asked whether the UNESCO Secretariat would have the necessary resources to analyse 94 quadrennial reports to be submitted in 2012.

59. The delegation of **France** reiterated the significance of the periodic reports, highlighting that they would provide an overall vision on measures taken in each State on the implementation of the Convention. The delegation stated that the quadrennial reports were working documents that signified that the Convention was actually in force. The delegation expressed its commitment to grant particular significance to the implementation of Article 16 of the Convention – Preferential Treatment – indicating that France would be ready to elaborate on measures to implement Article 16.

60. The delegation of **Luxembourg** expressed its readiness to present amendments to the operational guidelines, but before doing so it wanted to hear the Secretariat's comments on the questions raised by Canada because it could be helpful in debating the amendments it had planned to share.

61. The **Representative of the Director-General** remarked that one of the Secretariat's major concerns was how to translate such a large volume of information into six languages, and that the Secretariat would be in a position to present the Conference of Parties with an analytical summary instead. She highlighted that out of the three conventions for culture (1972, 2003 and 2005), the 2005 Convention's Secretariat is the smallest and the division in charge of the Convention was the most recent division to be set up in the Culture Sector. She stressed that the workload would of course increase in the years to come, starting with the large number of requests for international assistance from the International Fund for Cultural Diversity. She remarked that to provide quality services and to provide an analytical summary, the Secretariat would need more resources.

62. The delegation of **Bulgaria** suggested that the number of quadrennial reports be split to balance out the first two years since the first round would result in 94 submissions and the second round only 11 submissions. It mentioned that perhaps it would be useful to defer consideration of about 30 or 40 reports from the first cycle to the second cycle to allow the Secretariat more time and resources to focus on the substance and elaboration of the analytical summary.

63. The delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that focus needed to be placed on strengthening capacity within countries to collect required information and data, especially within developing countries. The delegation remarked that developing timely and comparable indicators is equally challenging. The delegation agrees that it is most effective to integrate indicators into quadrennial reports as they emerge.

64. The delegation of **India** stressed that it was important to address the issues that were raised by Canada and to an extent by France. It stated that the explanations provided by the Representative of the Director-General gave the Committee an idea of the scale of the problem. The delegation stressed that even though the reporting process is an important one, resources should be devoted in priority to the implementation of the Convention. He continued to emphasize that postponing reporting for some Parties in order to alleviate the workload of the Secretariat did not present a long-term solution, and in that respect it would be important to examine the reporting process and determine what is desirable, feasible, and should be responsibly recommended without

monopolizing the resources of the Secretariat to the detriment of actually implementing the Convention.

65. The delegation of **Germany** thanked the Secretariat for producing an effective first draft of the operational guidelines, but it also took the opportunity to warn against exaggerated expectations. The delegation stressed that Germany is a federal State and that the implementation of the Convention takes place on the level of its 16 Länder. The delegation stressed that restricting the reports to 20 pages would present a superficial vision of the situation in Germany, pointing out that it was important to invest energy into thinking about what and how information would be collected.

66. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the purpose of these reports was to facilitate the sharing of information and not to compare or create league tables. At the Committee's previous session it was recognized that not all countries would have the same level of data as others. She stressed that the indicators presented in the draft periodic framework are indeed those for which all countries have statistics. She mentioned that suggested sources for such statistics are quoted as a first step and that others may be used. She then addressed the approach of the framework, highlighting that it was divided into five sections with a limited number of pages to ensure that the reports could serve as working documents and tools to help in the implementation of the Convention, providing inspiration to other countries and facilitating the sharing of experiences. She pointed out that the framework addresses the different requests for information defined in the operational guidelines for other articles of the Convention. Finally she remarked that the last sections of the framework addressed questions raised by the Committee, on ways to collect and share information on main achievements, challenges to implementation, possible solutions, the engagement of public and private actors, main sources and links to important research and case studies.

67. The delegation of **Luxembourg** presented amendments proposed by nine French-speaking countries (Bulgaria, Canada, France, Greece, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Saint-Lucia, Tunisia), emphasizing that the amendments intented to clarify the text and to render the periodic reports more analytical and results-oriented. She then proceeded to explain the proposed amendments paragraph by paragraph:

i) the word quadrennial was added to the title to show that reports have to be presented every four years;

ii) in the first paragraph a reference to the Article of the Convention that calls for these reports was made;

iii) at the end of paragraph 2 "as well as on the impact and the results of these measures" was added to indicate that reports should not just be descriptive, but also attempt to analyse the measures taken and their impact;

iv) the language in the text for paragraph was changed to strengthen the message for the exchange of experiences and best practices;

v) a sentence in paragraph 4 was redrafted to clarify which document was being referred to;

vi) the language in paragraph 5 was changed to conform with the rest of the decision; and

vii) a paragraph 5(b) was introduced, explicitly referring to the obligation of developed countries to report on Article 16 on preferential treatment.

68. The delegation of **Germany** expressed concern with the formulation of the paragraph 5(b), pointing out that Germany is a federal State with 16 Länder, meaning that eventually all of them would have to report on what they have done in forms of preferential treatment – a task that would be impossible in the present system. As a way to remedy this obstacle, the delegation suggested that words "are invited" are inserted in the second line.

69. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Brazil and South Africa, questioned Germany's amendment, saying that Parties cannot "be invited" to do something when it's actually an obligation. The delegation of **Senegal** pointed out that the wording of this paragraph should not pose a problem to Germany since the sentence in question referred to "developed countries" not at a regional or local level. The delegation of **Germany** responded to Committee members' interventions by reiterating that its initial concern still remained. The delegation of **Brazil** asked Germany if it could suggest a new amendment with the verb "to illustrate", and Germany responded by proposing the text begin with "Developed countries will illustrate" and then continue unchanged. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** accepted Germany's proposal. The delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that Parties' obligations under the Convention cannot continue to be renegotiated. The delegation of **France**, supported by Brazil and Lao People's Democratic Republic, highlighted that a consensus was almost reached, and that "will describe" accurately captured the obligations of developed countries to implement Article 16.

70. The delegation of **Luxembourg** continued explaining the amendments, pointing out that a new paragraph 7 was introduced to replace the original versions of paragraphs 7 and 8. The delegation emphasized that, in compliance with Article 11 of the Convention, this paragraph recalled the obligations that served as the basis for civil society participation, leaving it up to each country to decide exactly how this participation would take place, but still requesting that each Party report on the way in which this is done as a means to keep all Parties informed on where things stand. The delegation continued enumerating the amendments, stating that: 1) the word "quadriennial" was added to periodic reports in paragraph 8; 2) under "Submission and dissemination of reports" a first step, namely the submission of the report to the Secretariat, was missing, which was added: the Secretariat invites the Parties to prepare their periodic quadrennial reports at the latest six months before the deadline is set for their submission, so that countries will be invited to do so, and will have to refer to the contact point appointed by the Parties while making sure to inform the permanent delegations to UNESCO and the National Commissions for UNESCO.

71. The **Chairperson** asked whether points of contact would be addressed directly in addition to permanent delegations and National Commissions as was usual practice. The delegation of **Luxembourg** responded by inferring that most Parties had already appointed a point of contact and that sending the information to delegations and National Commissions would ensure a broader information base. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat whether Luxembourg's assertion was correct, pointing out that oftentimes points of contact can leave or be replaced without the Secretariat being informed. The delegation of **France** emphasized the permanency of delegations, referring to this as their great advantage and making them the obvious channel through which points of contact could be addressed, leading the French delegation to suggest that perhaps the draft could be changed to read: "refers the contact points appointed by the Parties through permanent delegations to UNESCO." The delegation of **Germany** echoed France's concerns and supported France's amendment, highlighting that they are a Member-State-based organization and not a contact-point-based organization. The delegation of **Greece** expressed its support for Luxembourg's original amendment because it left a great deal of flexibility for the way in which information flowed. The **Legal Adviser** emphasized that this discussion would most productively be continued when the structure of contact points is discussed, outlining the means made available for them to perform their actual functions. The **Secretary of the Convention** pointed out that only 53% of Parties had thus far submitted information on their contact points to the Secretariat, and that the

Secretariat's normal practice was to send copies of all correspondence to all of the stakeholders, including Parties, contact points, National Commissions and permanent delegations. The delegation of **Luxembourg** emphasized that the original proposal was clear in making certain that information reached whoever needed it. The delegation of **Germany** expressed its overall support for the explanations offered so far by other Committee members and asked whether the word "through" could be replaced by "and", introducing a constructive ambiguity that might be helpful. The delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that Germany's amendment was probably misplaced since it did not read correctly in English. The **Chairperson** agreed with South Africa and made the following proposals: "To this end, the Secretariat refers to the contact points appointed by the Parties, while making sure to inform the permanent delegations to UNESCO and the National Commissions for UNESCO" or "while making sure to inform also the permanent delegations and the National Commissions for UNESCO" or just the original text as it was without "and". The delegation of **Greece** expressed its preference for the following wording: "The Secretariat refers to the contact points appointed by the Parties, as well as to the permanent delegations to UNESCO". The delegation of **Lao People's Democratic Republic** highlighted that Luxembourg's amendment reflected already-existing practices at UNESCO, which did not need to be reinvented. **South Africa** stressed that the discussion was purely semantic at this point, and that it would support the addition of "and" and the removal of "while making sure to inform". The **Chairperson** asked Luxembourg to continue explaining the amendments since consensus seemed to have been reached.

72. The delegation of **Luxembourg** explained a minor modification to paragraph 10, changing the past tense to the present tense and deleting the last sentence entirely to reflect that reports can either be submitted on paper or in electronic version, which reflects UNESCO rules. The delegation of **Germany** questioned whether this amendment would restrict Parties to submit reports only in one working language, perhaps making it necessary to state that they are indeed free to also submit the report in one of the other six UN languages. The **Chairperson** stated that according to her understanding the amendment clarified what needed to be done, especially given the fact that reports would have to be analyzed upon receipt. The delegation of **Luxembourg** pointed out that asking Parties to submit reports in more than one language would cause confusion, leaving the Secretariat to have to choose which version to take and what to do with the other.

73. The delegation of **Luxembourg** highlighted that paragraph 11 should be deleted altogether because the Secretariat could not judge whether reports are complete or not. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that it would be helpful for Parties to get advice/feedback on their reports and to know whether they are complete or not. However, the German delegation pointed out that between paragraphs 10 and 11, it was not clear according to which criteria the Secretariat would be judging the completeness of reports. The delegation of **Luxembourg** stressed that the Secretariat could not and nor would it have the resources to judge the completeness of reports, hence there would be no missing link between paragraphs 10 and 11. The delegation of **France** endorsed Luxembourg's statements, highlighting that strict frameworks should not be imposed, emphasizing that what is important is not whether reports are complete, rather what is to be done with the reports, which is where the analytical summary will play a large role. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported France's observations and asked how completeness could be defined, and the delegation of **South Africa** echoed Saint Lucia's comments. The delegation of **India** endorsed the plea for flexibility and stressed that the Secretariat should not be given a role that transcends its requirement and capability. The delegation of **China** stated that the Secretariat could acknowledge receipt of reports, proposing the following amendment: "Upon receipt of the report of the State Party the Secretariat will register reports and deliver a receipt". The delegation of **Mexico** supported China's amendment, but introduced the following small change: "Upon receipt of the reports of the Parties, the Secretariat will register them, acknowledge receipt and may advise the Parties on their content if necessary" or "may advise the Parties if necessary". The delegation of **Germany** supported Mexico's amendment, stressing that it addressed the missing link between paragraphs 10 and 11.

The delegation of **India** expressed no objections to Mexico's amendment, but questioned whether and how the Secretariat could do more in terms of offering suggestions as to the completeness of reports. The delegations of **Luxembourg** and **France** reiterated that the Secretariat is not in a position to do more than to register and acknowledge receipt of reports, supporting China's amendment. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its support for India's statement, stressing that Parties needed to accumulate experience in formulating these reports and that perhaps as a second stage they might decide that they need advice. The delegation of **Mexico** reiterated that dialogue between the Secretariat and Parties was necessary for the first report, not concerning the content, but on the method used to complete the reports. However, to reach consensus, Mexico withdrew its proposal, but asked Committee members to remember that Parties will most likely need advice in this first exercise. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported China's proposal, stressing that each Party will have to report on the themes and priorities that are important for each Party. Point 11 was adopted.

74. The delegation of **Luxembourg** pointed out that the first time reports would be received, there would be 94 of them. To facilitate the Committee's task in reviewing these reports, the delegation of Luxembourg suggested that the Secretariat prepare an analytical summary document, detailing the general trends, challenges, success benchmarks, barriers, etc. The delegation of **India** built on Luxembourg's comments and stressed that the Secretariat would be producing an analysis and not a summary of the reports received.

75. The delegation of **Germany** proposed to insert a first line to paragraph 12, after "to the Committee" the words "for its deliberation and decision". The delegation of **Albania** remarked that it did not understand Germany's amendment because it was not clear what the Committee would be taking a decision on upon the review of the analytic report. The delegation of **Germany** emphasized that with this amendment it wanted to make clear that it was the role of the Committee to deliberate and decide what to do with the reports, and not the Secretariat. The delegation of **Luxembourg** reemphasized that Germany's concern should have been addressed in the way in which paragraph 12 was worded, highlighting that the Committee forward reports to the Conference of Parties with its comments. The delegation of **Senegal**, supported by France, stated that Germany's concern would be more appropriately addressed in paragraph 13 rather than paragraph 12.

76. The **Chairperson** recognized the growing consensus among Committee members to address Germany's concern in the next point, moved on to paragraph 13 with the adoption of paragraph 12.

77. The delegation of **Luxembourg** described a linguistic amendment made to paragraph 13, removing "content summary" since the report's format already called for a one-page summary.

78. The delegation of **Canada** asked whether the reports had to be sent to the Conference of Parties or whether it was just the summaries. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that according to Article 23.6(c) the Committee shall transmit to the Conference of Parties reports from the Parties to the Convention together with its comments and the summary of their contents. The delegation of **Greece** noted that this would mean "content summary" could not be deleted from paragraph 13 of the guidelines.

79. The delegation of **Germany** referred back to its previous suggestion, proposing new text for the second line of paragraph 13 as follows: "Periodic reports will, after deliberation by the Committee, be forwarded to the Conference of Parties for review".

80. The **Representative of the Director-General** asked whether summary reports and the analytical summary should be transmitted to the Conference of Parties. The delegation of **France**, supported by Senegal, Saint Lucia and Tunisia, specified that reports should be forwarded to the Conference

of Parties as presented to the Secretariat but what should be translated and submitted are the summary documents that the Conference of Parties will have to review.

81. The delegation of **Luxembourg** continued with its explanation of proposed amendments concerning paragraph 14, adding the word "quadrennial" to periodic reports, and specifying that reports could be accessed by any interested Party, members of the Committee, etc. with the addition of "will be made available". Paragraph 14 was adopted as amended.

82. The delegation of **Luxembourg** said that the first sentence of the paragraph should be deleted because the Parties had an obligation to appoint a point of contact. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its support for the amendments, and made a general remark that points of contact were given a more important role than they should have. The delegation highlighted that it was up to Parties to determine the role of these focal points. The delegation of **Tunisia** stressed that points of contact must have the adequate means and resources to respond to such tasks. The delegation of **India**, supported by Saint Lucia, Germany, Albania, South Africa and Brazil, disagreed with Tunisia, highlighting that points of contact could not be expected to assume the functions of Member States. The delegation of **Tunisia** withdrew its proposal and Greece supported this action. Paragraph 16 was adopted as amended.

83. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that if paragraph 17 were to be kept, it would suggest the following amendment in its second line: "The points of contact may consider" and so on, with the word "Parties" deleted, suggesting to keep "Parties may consider" and not the points of contact, in line with recent discussions. The delegation of **Senegal** remarked that in the present text points of contact were assuming an institutional role that went beyond their original purpose. The **Chairperson** asked Committee members if they had any objections to deleting paragraph 17, and since this was not the case, she declared the deletion of paragraph 17. The delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that paragraph 11 already obliged Parties to create relationships with civil society and to make sure that there is collaboration on the report, leaving paragraph 18 to add very little added value in this regard. The delegation of **Tunisia** proposed to delete the last sentence of paragraph 18, and the **Chairperson** read the amended text as follows: "Parties may request points of contact to participate in gathering relevant information required as input to their quadrennial periodic reports", with the rest being deleted. The delegation of **India** expressed its preference for South Africa's proposal, pointing out that there was too much redundancy and overlap of functions, diminishing the role of Member States. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that paragraph 18 should not be deleted, highlighting that it was important to assign the task of collecting information to points of contact. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Senegal, China and Bulgaria, added that what was truly important was that the decision remain in Parties' hands, and by deleting the last sentence and keeping the rest of the paragraph intact, enough flexibility would be given to Parties to decide in this matter. The delegation of **India** proposed to follow the consensus among Committee members and keep paragraph 18, however it stressed that greater work needed to be done on paragraph 19. The delegation of **South Africa** noted that dealing with each paragraph separately has potentially caused a disjuncture, an over-simplification or over-management of the process. For the time being, the delegation conceded on paragraph 18 to advance proceedings. The delegation of **France** reiterated that Committee members did not want to institutionalize the role of contact points, suggesting that paragraph 18 be kept since it provided enough flexibility to Parties and points of contact; however, the delegation proposed to delete paragraph 19 all together since it did not bring any value to the table. The delegations of Tunisia, Albania, Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Senegal and Brazil supported the deletion of paragraph 19. The delegation of **Senegal** however pointed out that the idea of cooperation with other points of contact should be retained somewhere in previous paragraphs. Before moving forward, the **Chairperson** asked Committee members whether they had any objections to adopting paragraph 18 with its last sentence deleted, and since none were voiced, paragraph 18 was adopted. She then asked Committee members whether

paragraph 19 could be deleted, and noting the consensus in the room, she declared the deletion of paragraph 19.

84. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by India, remarked that paragraph 20 created a mechanism through which points of contact would be contacting the UNESCO Secretariat directly, which did not reflect UNESCO's usual practices. In that respect, the **Chairperson** asked whether there would be any objections to deleting paragraph 20 in its entirety, and seeing none, the decision to delete paragraph 20 was adopted.

85. The **Chairperson** then asked Committee members to turn to the document "Draft framework for periodic reports and measures to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions", which was an annex. She asked Luxembourg to take the floor and explain proposed amendments.

86. The delegation of **Luxembourg** highlighted that most of the amendments proposed were aiming to align the document with decisions taken for the operational guidelines.

87. The delegation of **India** stressed that guidelines were meant to guide and that they were not meant to serve as rules per se, suggesting that a phrase be added to convey that the following should be taken into consideration rather than to serve as an obligation. The delegation of **Bulgaria** expressed its understanding for India's concern, but pointed out that these operational guidelines are clarifications of the Articles of the Convention, which are obligatory for every Party, and once adopted by the Committee and confirmed by the Conference of Parties would become an obligation for Parties. The delegation of **India** clarified its proposal for amendment, suggesting to change the word "recommended" to "suggested". The delegation of **Senegal**, supported by India, suggested that in the English version "recommended" might be kept since it referred to a recommendation and not an instruction. The proposed amendments were adopted.

88. The delegation of **Luxembourg** continued to detail the amendments proposed in reference to guidelines for writing reports as follows: the number of pages excluding annexes, which was 20, was added; the word "evidence" was replaced by "facts" to clarify the French version; "or issues of current debate" in point number 3 was deleted because it did not add any substance to the information required; and numbers 5 and 6 were also deleted because they dealt with statistics, which are more relevant to the annexes. The delegation of **India** suggested that "Be as precise" and sub-section (i) also be deleted, and that "should be solidly supported" should read "should be supported" instead. The delegation of **Luxembourg** responded by expressing its preference for keeping the part in sub-section (i) that indicated that the maximum length of the report should be 20 pages. The **Chairperson** viewed that this suggestion would imply that the text for sub-section (i) read as: "The number of pages of the periodic reports should not exceed 20, excluding annexes". The delegation of **India** noted that it had no objections to this suggestion; however, it asked whether a decision was taken on whether the word "should" or "shall" be used.

89. The **Chairperson** stated that the original wording incorporated "should", however it was suggested that "shall" be used. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Luxembourg, responded by highlighting that it was up to Parties to decide whether guidelines are compulsory or indicative, but she suggested that it might be prudent to wait for the Legal Adviser to give his opinion as well. The delegation of **South Africa** reiterated India's concern, highlighting that it was never agreed that these guidelines would be prescriptive in nature, making it important to allow for a level of flexibility. The delegation of **France** expressed its support for India's and South Africa's concerns, however it pointed out that even though the form may be somewhat prescriptive, the substance of the guidelines is not prescriptive, providing for a great amount of leeway to Parties, leading the delegation to agree with Saint Lucia and Luxembourg. The delegation of **Brazil** stressed that there was a clear difference between "should" and "shall" in English, and that there was a need to clearly

distinguish between them. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** emphasized that the reports that would be submitted by Parties would be used to formulate an overall analysis, which would make it necessary that all Parties follow the same guidelines in order to ensure a minimum possibility of comparability between the reports. The **Legal Adviser** distinguished between "shall" and "should", highlighting that "should" makes something optional, while "shall" and "will" can be used interchangeably to imply an obligation. The **Chairperson** asked whether anyone else wanted to take the floor or had any objections, and when no one did, the amendments were adopted with the word "shall".

90. The delegation of **Luxembourg** presented amendments proposed for procedures for submission and follow-up of quadrennial reports. The delegation reminded Committee members that most of the amendments were proposed to align this document with the decisions taken, and they were as follows: in item (i) it was suggested to stick to the two working languages only; and under item (iv) it was recommended to transmit reports electronically, either through e-mail or CD-ROM, or in PDF or RTF formats. These amendments were adopted.

91. The delegation of **Luxembourg** explained amendments proposed for the "General Information" section. The delegation indicated that the major amendment to this section had to do with Parties sharing information about the way in which they involved civil society in the drafting of the quadrennial reports. This point was adopted.

92. The delegation of **Luxembourg** presented point 2.1, where it was proposed that the title of "Background" be deleted since "Cultural policies and measures" was already sufficient by itself. This too was adopted.

93. The delegation of **Luxembourg** explained amendments to section 2.2, where it was proposed to delete the word "background" again for the same reasons as before, and the concept of preferential treatment was added, referring to the request that developed countries mention their action in terms of preferential treatment. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by South Africa and Kenya, expressed support for the amendments and added that it was important to include a missing sentence whereby developing countries should identify their specific needs and priorities as specified in the operational guidelines on Article 14. This missing sentence could read as follows: "Parties from developing countries will identify separately their priorities, specific needs and interests with regard to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, and shall report on their operational plan to optimize international cooperation". The amendment was henceforth adopted.

94. The delegation of **Luxembourg** stated that the only changes proposed for sections 2.3 and 2.4 were the removal of the sub-heading "Background". This too was adopted.

95. The delegation of **Luxembourg** proceeded with the amendments proposed for section 3. The delegation went through the amendments as follows: the addition of "as well as the results that have been achieved" to reinforce the idea that reports should be results-oriented; the removal of the titles referring specifically to what Parties and civil society do to complete the reports because civil society cannot be forced to participate in the reporting process, rather it should choose how/if to get involved. Section 3 on "Outreach and engagement of civil society" was adopted as amended.

96. The delegation of **Luxembourg** continued to elaborate on proposed amendments to section 4 on "Achievements and challenges to the implementation of the Convention". The delegation of **Luxembourg** pointed out that section 4 should highlight the main results and achievements, the main challenges and any considered or adopted solutions. Section 4, as well as section 5, were adopted as amended.

97. The delegation of **Brazil** suggested that since one of the objectives of the Convention was to share information, an informal meeting be organized by the Secretariat among contact points during the next Conference of Parties to allow the exchange of ideas, experiences and viewpoints on reporting practices and the establishment of an informal network, among other things.

98. The delegation of **China** asked the Legal Adviser to clarify whether the Committee could submit the draft framework directly to the Conference of Parties without adopting it first. The **Legal Adviser** pointed out that in paragraph 3 of the draft decision the Committee adopted the draft operational guidelines for information sharing, meaning that the annex which was the framework for submitting reports was also included.

*Decision 4.IGC 7 was adopted as amended.*

**[Observers]**

99. The representative of the **International Organisation of la Francophonie** emphasized that the negotiation of operational guidelines on periodic reports was absolutely crucial in developing all the tools necessary in ensuring data collection, organization, assessment, dissemination and circulation of information. The representative stressed that it was indispensable for governments to help stakeholders collect the necessary data and information to implement the Convention in a concrete fashion, and the operational guidelines seemed promising in this respect.

100. A representative of the **Council of Europe's** stressed that the Convention was highly aligned with the work of the Council of Europe's own agenda on the democratic management of cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and social cohesion, and that on a practical level there were a number of tools and methodologies developed by the Council of Europe that could be useful in advancing the implementation of the Convention. She mentioned the Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe and the European Audiovisual Observatory as examples, and highlighted that it would be beneficial for all if these tools were used as widely as possible.

101. A representative of **United Cities and Local Governments** stated that it had signed a cooperation agreement with UNESCO in 2007 aiming to promote the diversity of cultural expressions through local communities and authorities. The representative emphasized that their local positioning allowed them to work closely with governments, civil society, citizens, artists and creators, and to understand difficulties related to local cultural policies. He emphasized the commitment of the organization in closing the gap between culture and development by highlighting the recent approval of culture as a fourth pillar of sustainable development made during the United Cities and Local Governments meeting in Mexico, and encouraged strengthening the recognition of local government in forthcoming operational guidelines.

102. A representative of the **International Network for Cultural Diversity** congratulated Committee members for approving a substantive framework for the quadrennial reports. He emphasized that it was particularly important that civil society reports on the actions it takes in protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions. He also expressed his hope that Parties encourage civil society engagement in this process early on. Finally, he pointed out that by deleting paragraph 19 of the annex, the role of points of contact as connectors to civil society would be diminished and that this was seen as a shortcoming.

103. The Secretary General of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** expressed his wish for Parties to begin dialogue with civil society as soon as possible if they haven't already done so, highlighting that quadrennial reports should not be done in two years, instead work on them should start right now. The representative made two suggestions: 1) for Parties that could

submit their reports before the deadline to do so for circulation to Parties that have questions about style and substance, and 2) to bring these reports into the media and public eye in international gatherings of stakeholders to raise the visibility of the Convention.

**ITEM 8 – DRAFT OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES ON EXCHANGE, ANALYSIS AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (ARTICLE 19 OF THE CONVENTION)**

**Documents CE/10/4.IGC/205/8 and CE/10/4.IGC/205/INF.5**

104. The **Secretary of the Convention** introduced the background leading up to the preliminary draft operational guidelines on exchange, analysis and dissemination of information. She highlighted that Committee members had underlined the need to define very clear roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders in this exercise, and that they also emphasized that any future activities in this regard avoid costly, complex or duplicative activities with priority given to capacity-building and the collection of information and data. She stressed the importance of collecting data and information on cultural expressions as defined in the Convention, and not to confuse cultural diversity and the diversity of cultural expressions. She also indicated that information document INF.5 pointed to some challenges in promoting public, private, civil society sector collaboration in data and information collection in response to the Committee's previous request to include a wide range of actors in this activity.

105. The delegation of **Canada** congratulated the Secretariat for the preparation of the document, highlighting the close links between Articles 9 and 19 of the Convention, pointing out that the information given in the quadrennial reports would feed into a very rich database and that it was up to Parties to share the data and experience concerning the diversity of cultural expressions as requested in Article 19. The delegation also stressed that a centralized data/information collection infrastructure should be avoided, and that a more cost-effective approach would entail a mapping of the players who have already collected the best practices in the fields related to the Convention.

106. The delegation of **Germany** echoed Canada's sentiments in commending the careful preparatory work for this point on the agenda, especially taking into account the fact that it built on the numerous exercises that are already in place in terms of knowledge tools and information structures. The delegation emphasized that while many decentralized regional efforts were under way, it was also important over time to leverage new online tools and digital platforms to build a framework to make best practice and collection of data comparable to ensure a certain amount of continuity that drives the Convention.

107. The delegation of **France** agreed with Canada and Germany, but added that major difficulties may arise if efforts are too ambitious, escalating costs being one of them, especially since one of the great priorities is to fund projects through the International Fund for Cultural Diversity. The delegation also pointed out that content would be another barrier in a centralized structure because data and information would somehow have to be translated and adapted across countries to be comprehensible on a whole to all Parties, a huge task for the Secretariat, especially in light of its already-existing task to draft an analytical summary on the basis of quadrennial reports. Finally, France stressed that attention should be focused on capturing the work and results of stakeholders and databases of information that are already in place.

108. The **Chairperson** suggested that interventions begin to focus on the examination of the draft operational guidelines on exchange, analysis and dissemination of information. She mentioned that two sets of amendments were received: one from a group of countries including Bulgaria, Canada, France, Greece, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Saint Lucia and Tunisia; and another from Germany.

109. The delegation of **Canada**, the representative of the first group of countries introduced the amendments. It began by highlighting the group's proposal to delete the first four paragraphs under "General considerations", and by replacing them with two paragraphs that were meant to simplify the document, strengthen the link to Article 9 and put greater focus on the objectives of the Article rather than the challenges. The amendments were adopted.

110. The delegation of **Canada** suggested in the section "Defining roles and responsibilities of Parties" changing the word "should" to "shall" in the new paragraph 3 (previous paragraph 5), and adding an idea about international cooperation. To the new paragraph 4, the delegation indicated an amendment that replaced "ensuring basic levels of" by "Parties are encouraged", emphasizing that it was difficult to focus on what is called a basic level and to demand guarantees. Finally, rounding off the amendments for "Roles and responsibilities" in paragraph 5, the delegation pointed out that the idea of cooperation be added again, and the word "can" be replaced by "should". The text was adopted.

111. The delegation of **Canada** continued on to the next section entitled "Roles and responsibilities of UNESCO Secretariat". It proposed new wording to better address the themes of the previous section: in paragraph 9 it suggested talking about correction of updates rather than maintaining information and in paragraph 10 third bullet point, it privileged the use of existing networks at both national and international levels rather than the centralization of data/information collection and dissemination. The delegation of **Germany** specified that over time the implementation of the Convention would profit greatly through bottom-up work towards comparability of the information collected, in that vein adding three more points to paragraph 10. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the Secretariat whether the tasks involved in the proposed amendments would be feasible to complete, especially since "Within its available resources" was deleted. The delegation of **Germany** clarified that its amendments were made under the shared understanding and awareness that human and financial resources in the Secretariat were scarce. The delegation emphasized that it was trying to optimize a decentralized reality of knowledge through networking opportunities, implying no direct expectation that the Secretariat perform the data collection itself, but rather that it provide Parties with targeted orientation through the implementation of the guidelines. The delegation of **France**, supported by Tunisia and Albania, pointed out that promoting networking to facilitate knowledge and best-practice sharing was already incorporated into the amendments proposed by the francophone group. The delegation also highlighted that the periodic reports would be a rich source of content for the database, and the experience of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics has already shown how long it takes to carry out the collection of statistics and how expensive it can get. Finally, the delegation mentioned that if Germany's amendments were approved, great additional financial costs would have to be assumed and that it would be a better idea to stick to the amendments proposed. The delegation of **Canada** emphasized that Germany's point about a shared framework for the collection of best practices at the international, national and regional levels was already covered in the operational guidelines for Article 9 of the Convention. The **Representative of the Director-General** pointed out that from a conceptual point of view, the Secretariat agreed with Germany's proposals, but that a shared framework to collect and disseminate data/information would require extra funding, without which the Secretariat could not make any commitments. The delegation of **Germany** suggested as a way to move toward consensus to start from the second line where it reads "Promote international exchanges of information and of best practices, inter alia through online discussion forums for experts and practitioners" and continue "with a view to fostering their comparability", keeping the amendment pragmatic and leaving the door open to examining the more conceptual issues later down the road. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the adoption of the text with the paragraph ending in capacity building, and expressed its hesitation to include a reference to fostering comparability at this stage as suggested by Germany. The delegation of **Albania**, supported by Canada, suggested that the

text in English be changed to read “with a view to facilitate comparison”. Amendments for this section were adopted.

112. The delegation of **Canada** explained also that it would propose adding “The contribution of civil society” to the title to simplify it and stressed that Parties cannot tell civil society what they can or cannot do. These amendments were adopted.

113. Concerning the draft decision, the delegation of **Canada** explained that the proposed amendment was to delete paragraph 4 and Annex II. The delegation of **Germany** asked that for the record their original amendment requesting the development of a shared framework be reflected on the record. Along the same lines, the delegation of **Brazil** asked that its proposal to organize, within available resources, a meeting of contact points, interested actors, organizations, etc. to share viewpoints on the exchange of information and best practices also be reflected on the record. The delegation of **France** pointed out that it was decided to organize an information session before the third ordinary session of the Conference of Parties to share experiences regarding ratification, and that perhaps Brazil’s suggestion to have an additional meeting would not be economical. The delegation of **China** reiterated France’s comments, and asked for Brazil’s amendment to be removed in an effort to advance discussions. The delegation of **Albania** also expressed its doubts as to whether the capability existed to fund such a meeting. The delegation of **Brazil** responded by highlighting that even though the content covered in the approved information session and the proposed meeting would be quite different that perhaps a way could be found to merge the ideas and resources for both. The delegation stressed that what was most important was for points of contact to have an opportunity to get to know each other, establish a network and to learn from one another. The delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that costs associated with parallel meetings had to be taken under consideration and that even though a meeting of the points of contact was a noble idea, operational guidelines on Article 19 still needed to be approved and adopted, also keeping in mind that Parties had the ultimate decision on the participation of points of contact. The **Representative of the Director-General** remarked that the appointment of points of contact was mandatory according to the Convention, and a meeting of points of contact could not be organized until the operational guidelines had been approved by the Conference of Parties. She suggested that perhaps a more pragmatic and cost-effective approach would be to have an open information session regarding the points of contact after the Conference of Parties not necessarily with the points of contact themselves, but with delegations who would already be present anyhow. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** pointed out that it was useful to remind everyone why points of contact were created, namely to facilitate the sharing of information among the different ministries (including trade, budget, culture, education) implicated by the negotiations of the Convention in each State. She emphasized, their networking efforts should not be impeded, but they should also not become costly to Parties. The delegation of **Mexico** proposed that it was not necessary at this point to include a paragraph on a separate meeting of the points of contact in the decision. The delegation of **Brazil** emphasized that it wouldn’t want to miss an opportunity to exchange at a broader level than the agenda during the next meeting of the supreme body of the Convention, but in favor of pursuing consensus, the delegation withdrew its proposal and suggested that this could be an idea to discuss further at the next Committee meeting.

*Decision 4.IGC 8 was adopted as amended.*

**[Observers]**

114. A representative of the **International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies** mentioned that it had been in discussions with the Council of Europe and the ERICarts Institute about creating an international version of their cultural policy database. She emphasized that such a database would serve as a tool for policy-makers, researchers, advocates, organizations of civil

society and the global community, and that it could also provide a useful mechanism to support the sharing of information on policies to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions and capacity-building to this end.

115. The Secretary General of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** added that perhaps one role of the Secretariat, in addition to ensuring cooperation and the circulation and comparability of data/information, would be to work toward having statistics that directly address the protection and promotion of cultural expressions, adding to what is being done by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics.

**ITEM 9 - DRAFT OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES ON EDUCATION AND PUBLIC AWARENESS (ARTICLE 10 OF THE CONVENTION)**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/9**

116. The **Secretary of the Convention** provided background for the preliminary draft operational guidelines of Article 10, emphasizing that among the responses to a questionnaire submitted by Parties were very specific suggestions for measures and actions that could be taken in particular to strengthen the ties between education and culture in policies and programmes and on the adaptation of educational activities and exchanges to meet the needs of various target groups, including students, professionals at primary, secondary and university levels and between formal and non-formal educational activities. She also mentioned that it was conveyed that each Party to the Convention would be responsible for identifying the resources that it wished to allocate for the organization of activities and for determining those that would have the biggest impact in their own countries. Finally, she remarked that as an illustration of how Article 10 could be implemented, the Secretariat had developed, together with partners of the University of Girona and the Interarts Foundation, an educational toolkit called Diversidades, the Creativity Game, with extrabudgetary resources from the Spanish Government.

117. The **Chairperson** invited Committee members to present their general opinions and assessments before examining the operational guidelines in detail. She also noted that only one amendment had been presented for these operational guidelines.

118. The delegation of **Canada** congratulated the Secretariat for the ideas expressed in the operational guidelines and the youth kit, Diversidades. The delegation also highlighted that these operational guidelines presented a good opportunity to express the purpose of the Convention and to go into the specificities of this particular Convention as compared to others at UNESCO.

119. The **Chairperson** then asked that the amendment submitted by a group of nine francophone countries be presented.

120. The delegation of **France** elaborated on the proposed amendments indicating that the most important amendments were made to paragraph 2 (or the new paragraph 3) to allow for a less traditional approach to public awareness and education, not only involving students and teachers, but also professionals in the culture sector. The delegation of **Kenya** emphasized that the new proposed paragraph 3 made an important contribution to the operational guidelines, but that the word “online” in paragraph 3(b) should be changed to “interactive” to suggest that various games can be developed, including online ones. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by Saint Lucia and China, suggested adding a paragraph 2 that would read: “Educational programmes and measures and involving heightened public awareness should, inter alia, bring out the specificities of this Convention and mention the differences between this Convention and the other normative instruments concerning culture in UNESCO”. The delegation of **Greece** supported the amendments

brought forth by the francophone group, but suggested that the term “differences” was somewhat negative, implying some type of fragmentation in UNESCO’s normative instruments, therefore recommending the following wording instead: “and mention the specificities of this Convention as compared to the other normative instruments of UNESCO in the field of culture”. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported Canada’s amendments, and suggested adding “institutes of higher learning and research for nurturing creativity and building capacities and the development of cultural policies” to paragraph 5. The delegation of **France** referred back to Kenya’s point concerning the term “online” in the new paragraph 4(b), highlighting that “online” should probably be mentioned after “developing educational and cultural materials in multiple formats.” The delegation expressed its support for amendments proposed by Canada and referred to Greece’s suggestions, recommending that the first time the word “specificities” is used in the new paragraph 2, be replaced by “characteristics” to avoid repetition. The delegation of **China** pointed out that in the last paragraph “designated focal points” should be changed to “designated points of contact” in conformity with the language of the Convention. The delegation of **Brazil** added the following to the new paragraph 5(h): “The Parties are encouraged to consider the promotion of intercultural dialogue and respect of different cultures as a strong tool to reduce conflicts and discrimination. In this sense, Parties are stimulated to use all this pertinent information in educational materials”. The delegation of **France**, supported by Greece, Saint Lucia, Albania and Tunisia, highlighted that this was not the arena to be promoting intercultural dialogue, and that this addition would only cause more confusion vis-a-vis the objectives of the Convention, stressing that Brazil’s amendment was out of context. Given Committee members’ reactions and in an effort to advance consensus, **Brazil** withdrew its proposal. The amended text was adopted.

*Decision 4.IGC 9 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 10 - IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD) AND FUNDRAISING STRATEGY**

**CE/10/4.IGC/205/10A**

121. The **Chairperson** moved on to the next item on the agenda, point 10, Implementation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity. She invited the Committee to engage in a general debate about the Fund first, and then gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention.

122. The **Secretary of the Convention** provided background information on the implementation of the pilot phase of the Fund, and noted that as of 30 June 2010 US $2.6 million was available in funds, 70% of which was determined by the Committee to be available for the pilot phase 2010-2012 amounts to US $1.8 million. She remarked that there was an overwhelming response to the call for applications to the Fund with the submission of 254 requests for funding from 57 beneficiary countries around the world with a total value of US $44 million, ranging from US $1,500 to US $3 million for one project. She noted that the Secretariat registered, assigned a dossier to and entered each application into a database. If the project application did not have a budget, a work plan or was not signed, it was considered incomplete. Overall 183 of the 254 applications received were deemed complete by the Secretariat and they were sent to the six expert evaluators that were nominated by the Committee at its third session. Each application was evaluated both qualitatively and quantitatively by 2 experts based on the criteria established in the guidelines on the use of resources for the Fund, paragraph 6. She ended her explanation by pointing out that Annex IV presented the 32 projects recommended by the panel of experts for a total value of US $2.2 million, while the draft budget that was approved by the Committee at its session in December 2009 foresaw a budget for 2010 of US $683,000.

123. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Secretariat on its work in launching the pilot phase of the Fund and managing the application process, and on behalf of the Committee, thanked the panel of

experts for their excellent work in completing a challenging task within the framework that was given to them. She then turned to the floor for general comments from Committee members. Committee thanked the Secretariat and the panel of experts for their professional work.

124. The delegation of **Canada** noted that there is a real need for the Fund. Given that the overall amount of projects recommended by experts far exceeds the budget allocated to the pilot phase, the delegation pointed out that either the pilot phase budget needed to be revised or that a number of projects needed to be selected for funding from the 32 recommended ones. In addition, he remarked that there might have to be a determination as to whether it would be necessary for the Conference of Parties to modify the criteria for the pilot phase. The delegation of **Lao People's Democratic Republic** called upon the Committee to assess and strengthen the funding criteria for the Fund at the end of the pilot phase. The delegation of **Luxembourg** pointed out that the large range of funding requests still signifies a misunderstanding in what the Fund is intended to accomplish, perhaps requiring greater clarification. She also noted that the elements presented in the documents at hand provided enough information to enable the Committee to draw some first conclusions and even define some criteria for the future. The delegation of **China** mentioned how important the choice of projects for funding was in showcasing the sustainable development impact of the Convention and encouraging future contributions to the Fund. In that respect, the delegation suggested finding ways to increase the funding that could be allocated to projects, for example by allocating funds available as of November or December 2010 rather than the end of June 2010. The delegation of **France** commented on the success of the Fund and how this is contributing to the operationalization of the Convention. The delegation emphasized that it was important to have launched the Fund, and that the reassessment of criteria to improve operations could always be carried out in the future as need be. Finally, the delegation remarked that the large number of applications from African countries was an excellent illustration of solidarity in the cultural industries. The delegation of **Brazil** joined France in applauding the operationalization of the Convention. The delegation also expressed its regret for the fact that the list of approved projects was not made available online before the Committee meeting, and called upon the Secretariat to publish the list beforehand for future sessions. Finally, Brazil supported statements made by Canada and China, concerning re-evaluation of criteria and that it would be optimal to fund the largest number of projects possible. The delegation of **Senegal** emphasized that the message the Committee communicate be twofold: 1) some applications received were more relevant to intangible heritage, meaning that an effort should be made to steer requests in the right direction going forward; and 2) for the time-being either reduce the number of projects or increase the resources available, and in the long-term ensure a robust fundraising mechanism for the Fund. The delegation of **Tunisia** raised the question as to whether the Fund should not be partially funding projects rather than entirely supporting them, thereby taking on a role as a catalyst for activities on the ground.

125. The delegation of **Mexico** asked the Secretariat to elaborate on the current status of the Fund to understand whether the allocation of more resources could be envisaged. The **Representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller** explained that the most recent official financial report, which was produced at the end of October 2010, showed that the Fund contained an amount of US $2,899,000. In addition, the Representative pointed out that more funds were received in the month of November; however, since the accounts for the month of November would close only later that week, these additional funds brought the grand total to an unofficial amount of US $2,984,000.

126. The delegation of **India** suggested that the Committee proceed in its discussions by focusing on two matters, namely choosing projects to fund from the list of recommended projects, and revising the criteria. The delegation of **Kenya** expressed its support for India's statement, and congratulated countries that had made voluntary contributions to the Fund. The delegation went on to emphasize that the large number of applications to the Fund indicated the success and the awareness of the Convention, especially in Kenya and its region, stressing the need for clearer criteria as to what the

Fund can and cannot do. The delegation of **Croatia** noted the need for further work to better define "preparatory assistance", the revision of criteria for the future and greater contributions from Parties to the Fund.

127. The delegation of **Germany** suggested that in developing a catalogue of criteria both procedural and substantial issues be taken into consideration. The delegation also asked the Secretary of the Convention whether the opinion of the coordinator of the panel of experts was reflected in the maximum of 40 points that a project could gain in the evaluation process. The **Secretary of the Convention** clarified the role of the coordinator, emphasizing that this person made sure that there were no discrepancies in the experts' evaluations and validated the points that were assigned to each project.

128. The delegation of **Greece** expressed its concern regarding the fact that the list of projects was not made public ahead of the Committee's session online and shared the general concern about the funding deficit for the projects in question. The delegation also suggested that since all of the recommended projects are essential to fund, that perhaps the European Union as a Party to the Convention could be mobilized to cover the deficit in addition to other Parties.

129. The delegation of **Chile** emphasized that the letter that would be sent to organizations whose projects were not approved for funding could be used as a learning tool to communicate what can be improved for future submissions, for both National Commissions and the authors of the projects.

130. The **Chairperson** remarked that she had been approached by a UNESCO Member State non-party to the Convention to make a contribution to the discussion, and noting no objections to this from Committee members.

**[Observers]**

131. The delegation of **Norway** stated that it considered the Convention to be an important frame of reference in establishing cultural policies at large, and that it pledged to contribute US $1.4 million to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity in 2011 as a way to ensure that the Convention would continue to be implemented and translated into national policy measures to promote and protect diversity of cultural expressions. The **Chairperson** thanked Norway for its pledge on behalf of the Committee and pointed out that such announcements were helpful in reinforcing the interest for contributions to the Fund in the future.

132. The delegation of the **European Union** expressed its intention to play its full role in implementing the Convention, highlighting its €1 million contribution to UNESCO to provide technical assistance to strengthen the governance of culture in developing countries. The delegation mentioned that the joint UNESCO-European Union Steering Committee had already met and that a call for requests for technical assistance would be launched in the beginning of 2011. Finally, the delegation reminded the floor that the European Commission would be celebrating the fifth anniversary of the Convention in Brussels on 8 December, and that the presence of Committee members would be greatly welcomed.

133. A representative of the **International Music Council** made a statement on behalf of its organization and the International Network for Cultural Diversity, the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity, the International Federation of Musicians, International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture, Traditions for Tomorrow and the International Federation of University Women, calling upon all Parties to make substantial and regular contributions to the Fund, emphasizing that the Fund needs to be sustainable with a process that is relatively predictable. The representative suggested that since it looked like all of the available funds would be allocated, that

perhaps this might signal the conclusion of the pilot phase, necessitating changes to the operational guidelines that should be submitted to the Conference of Parties in 2011. The representative stressed that the most important factor for civil society would be the review of funding criteria, especially since little guidance to potential applicants about the kind of projects that would receive priority consideration in the current funding round. The representative recommended that the Committee establish and publish clear rules and criteria, including a timeline and special regional, funding and other considerations to help the process become more predictable and to help stakeholders optimize potential synergies.

134. The **Chairperson** thanked the observers for their interventions, and proceeded to examining the budget, the list of projects recommended and any additional criteria that should be introduced to facilitate the work of the panel of experts. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested, as was recommended earlier by India, that the Committee start by discussing the list of recommended projects, then issues linked to the budget and finally move on to an examination of the criteria.

135. The delegation of **Canada**, in light of Norway's announcement, asked the Secretariat whether: 1) it would be possible to merge resources available in the Fund for 2010 and 2011 to fund the projects recommended by the panel of experts; and 2) Norway's pledged contribution could be made available before 31 December 2010 and added to the current US $680,000 dedicated to funding projects. The **Secretary of the Convention** remarked that the Committee had decided the previous year to revise at its fourth ordinary session, if necessary, the budget for the pilot phase in light of the contributions to the Fund and the number of requests for assistance, and in that respect, it would be up to the Committee to decide what to do about the proposed budget. The **Representative of the Director-General** stressed that as long as contributions to the Fund have not been accredited to the UNESCO account, they cannot be considered as part of the budget. In addition, she mentioned that in the month of November, voluntary contributions for the Fund were received from China and France.

136. The delegation of **Senegal** remarked that when the panel of experts examined the financial aspects of projects, they did not note whether a project could be scaled up or down, suggesting that perhaps some leeway to request the downsizing of certain projects to meet budgetary demands. The **Secretary of the Convention** highlighted that one of the criteria set out by the Committee addressed whether or not a budget seemed reasonable in relation to the proposed activities and impact, a point that was strongly taken into consideration by the panel of experts during the evaluation of the projects.

137. The delegation of **South Africa** stated that it did not see where the problem lied given that the Fund contained US $2.8 million in funds as of that day and that all of the recommended projects would need US $2.2 million, stressing that the Fund had enough in resources to cover all of the recommended projects. The **Secretary of the Convention** pointed out that the Committee had decided in its last session to dedicate 70% of the amount in the Fund as of 30 June 2010 to the pilot phase. Of this 70% to be allocated to the pilot phase, 82% would be allocated to projects (including project funding and preparatory assistance), 2% would be reserved for special situations and 18% would be dedicated to fixed costs (including the costs of the evaluators, costs associated with experts from least-developed countries (LDCs) who are members of the Committee to participate in the meetings of the Committee and the Conference of Parties and so forth). She then suggested that the Bureau of the Comptroller calculate 70% of the current amount in the budget to be able to determine how much would be available to fund projects if the current budget were used. The **representative of the Bureau of the Comptroller** announced that the amount of available funds on 30 November was US $2,984,000, of which 70% amounted to US $2.08 million.

138. The delegation of **Mexico** stressed the importance of sound management of the Fund, expressing its preference to approve projects with the resources available in the Fund at the current time. The delegation also suggested the Committee consider Canada's recommendation to merge budgets for 2010 and 2011, in which case a new appeal for projects in 2011 would probably not be necessary. As for the criteria, the delegation also emphasized that for future appeals it would be important to consider whether projects have a national or a regional impact.

139. The delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that a decision needed to be made as to whether projects would be funded in their entirety or partially, emphasizing that a minimum level of funding would have to be guaranteed for all of the projects recommended by the panel of experts.

140. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that it was clear from the discussions that the Fund could not allocate funds it did not have, questioning whether the Committee's previous decision could be revised to include funds dedicated for 2011, thereby avoiding the need to launch a new appeal for projects in 2011 and the associated costs of engaging a panel of experts, allowing a maximum number of projects to be approved in 2010. The delegation also emphasized that this would necessitate that comments be made on the recommended projects to avoid any future misunderstandings as to what kinds of projects should be funded and how much should be reasonably requested for them.

141. The delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support for disbursing funds to all of the recommended projects for the totality of the budgets requested since it was established that the funds would be available. The delegation noted that Norway's pledge for 2011-2012 should not enter current discussions and that the contribution should instead cater to projects chosen for the next round of funding. Finally, she mentioned that she agreed with Saint Lucia's suggestion to review the applications to ensure that they are aligned with the established guidelines; however, she pointed out, the review process should aim to help applicants better align their projects to the guidelines rather than to punish them for not doing so. The **Secretary of the Convention** remarked that the sum of all of the recommended projects amounted to US $2,228,206.53, while the Fund only had US $2,088,800 in funds available at that time.

142. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by Senegal, Saint Lucia and Brazil, noted that some countries had two projects on the list of recommended projects and that an infrastructure project was also included. The delegation suggested that if only one project per country were included and the infrastructure project were removed, the amount of funds needed would most likely arrive at the amount available in the budget.

143. The delegation of **China** asked whether the 2011 call for projects would be postponed or cancelled all together if the Committee were to allocate the entirety of the US $2.088 million available in the budget for the 32 recommended projects in 2010-2011. The **Chairperson** reiterated that this issue would be up to the Committee to decide.

144. The **Secretary of the Convention** presented a revised proposed budget for 2011 based on the unofficial figure of US $2,984,104 available in the Fund as of 30 November 2010, presenting a scenario were the Committee to decide to allocate 70% of funds available equalled to US $2,088,800, and under the assumption that no new call for applications would be issued in 2011, and no additional funds to pay experts to evaluate applications would be needed. She highlighted that some operating costs of the Secretariat would still be applicable, in addition to travel costs of the participation of experts from lesser developed countries in the meetings of the Committee, bringing the total of fixed costs to US $29,993. Finally, she remarked, the total value of all of the projects on the list of recommended projects added up to $2,228,206.53. The **Legal Adviser** pointed out that according to paragraphs 4 and 16 of the guidelines concerning Article 18 of the

Convention, the Committee must use the funds and make sure that the use of resources match the priority decided upon by the Committee, meaning that if among the 32 recommended projects the Committee were to identify priorities, decisions could be taken as to which projects would be funded without necessitating the modification of guidelines.

145. The delegation of **Brazil** asked how much total costs would be if a call for projects were to be issued in 2011. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded to Brazil by pointing out that in Annex III the amount of US $60,000 was budgeted for the evaluation work of the panel of experts for a new call in 2011 to which costs associated with an annual call for tender needed to be added depending on how many projects were submitted, what type of criteria were adopted, etc.

146. The delegation of **Canada** summarized a few conclusions that were drawn with some Committee members during lunchtime, namely that one project per country be funded from the list of recommended projects with the relevant amount available in the Fund's budget as of November 30th and that the infrastructure project not be funded at all. The delegation then elaborated on suggested amendments to the decision, noting that: first paragraph remained the same; second paragraph would read as "recalling its decision 3.IGC 5, and in particular paragraph 11 requesting the Committee to revise if necessary the budget of the pilot phase in the light of the contributions to the Fund and the number of requests for assistance"; third and fourth paragraphs remained the same; fourth bis paragraph would read as "having examined the list of 32 projects recommended by the panel of experts, takes note that: (i) the total budget of the recommended projects is larger than the budget available for 2010-2011"; (ii) that some Parties benefit from two projects on the list"; and (iii) that the individual amounts allocated to the different projects present important variations"; fifth paragraph would read as "adopts the budget for 2011 as set out in revised Annex III of the document"; sixth paragraph would read as "decides to dedicate 82% of the funds available for the pilot phase, that is 70% of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity on 30 November 2010 to finance projects presented in Annex IV-A amended as Annex to this decision"; seventh paragraph would read as "Decides that the projects presented in Annex IV-A amended will receive financial support from the International Fund for Cultural Diversity as annexed to this decision, within the limits of the funds available and according to the decreasing order of points attributed to each project"; seventh bis paragraph would read as "decides to accept the new request for assistance in June 2012"; eighth paragraph would read as "Requests the Director-General to launch every year a new appeal for contributions to all of the Convention's stakeholders"; and ninth paragraph would read as "recommends to the Conference of Parties to amend the guidelines for the use of the resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, operational guidelines in Article 18, taking into account the lessons learned during the first year of the pilot phase and the need to establish more precise eligibility and selection criteria". The delegation also suggested that: (a) a maximum amount of US $100,000 be attributed to each project or programme and US $10,000 be allocated for preparatory assistance; (b) the number of projects per beneficiary should be only one project per Party or non-governmental organization; (c) the maximum number of projects that a Party or non-governmental organization could present would be two; (d) a project be completed implemented before another could be presented; and (e) a clearer definition of the terms "preparatory assistance" and "institutional infrastructure" be communicated. Finally, the delegation mentioned that the tenth paragraph would read as "invite the Director-General to inform the Parties that this decision has to take into account the lessons learned during the first year of the pilot phase in the next call for projects".

147. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the Committee should not begin by analysing the budget before examining the list of recommended projects. The **Administrative Officer** detailed the budget and highlighted that 70% of the amount in the Fund's budget available as of 30 November would be $2,088,800. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Brazil and France, stressed that this budget did not take into consideration the possibility of issuing an appeal for

applications in 2011 because it did not include expenses associated with the evaluation of projects. The delegation then questioned whether the budget could be adhered to as it stood if the possibility of issuing a new appeal in 2011 were to remain open. The **Administrative Officer** pointed out that a US $60,000 provision for experts' assessment could be made.

148. The delegation of **Luxembourg**, supported by Mexico, presented two possibilities for moving forward: 1) US $60,000 could be removed from the budget as an allowance for experts' evaluation work in case an appeal were to be launched in 2011; or 2) it would be made explicit that a new appeal for projects would only be launched in 2011 if funds were available, including those to cover the evaluation work of experts. The **Representative of the Director-General** added that in order to complete its tasks effectively, the Secretariat needed more direction from the Committee as to how much money should be allocated to a second call for projects and when the deadline for this second call would be. The delegation of **Luxembourg** stressed that its proposal took into consideration the Representative of the Director-General's concerns by clarifying that a new appeal would only be launched in 2011 if enough funds were available. She highlighted that it did not make much sense to block US $60,000 for experts' evaluations in 2011 if not enough funds were available to launch a new appeal in 2011.

149. The delegation of **Germany** stressed that it was important to have a set of criteria related to the substance of projects proposed that could be consistently applied in the selection process. The delegation then proposed that both experts evaluating a project should generally agree on the usefulness, sustainability, content, etc. of a project and that once points were assigned, a threshold be introduced by the Committee to select the projects for funding. Such a threshold could, for example, be 75% of the maximum points received – which in this case would translate to a score of 30 out of 40 points. The delegation of **Luxembourg** asked the Secretariat to calculate the total amount that would be needed in funding if only one project per country were selected and if the infrastructure project were not funded at all. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that the proposal made by Germany would be helpful in the future if it were agreed that only one project would be funded per country, and she also stressed that it was important that both expert evaluations show positive feedback on all projects that were selected for funding. Finally, the delegation expressed that she had some doubts as to some projects on the list of recommended projects, and for this reason she requested that the Secretariat make available the project files to those Committee members who wish to have greater detail on certain projects. The **Secretary of the Convention** invited Committee members to examine each project's detailed dossier, including all correspondence with the Secretariat and evaluation sheets, any time they wished to do so. In addition, she explained which projects would be eliminated from the list of recommended projects if the Committee were to decide to fund one project per country according to a descending order of points and to not fund a proposed infrastructure project at all.

150. The delegation of **France** pointed out that there was one project submitted by the International Theatre Institute, Project No. 52, on the list of recommended projects that was not endorsed by the relevant Party. The **Secretary of the Convention** pointed out that the project was submitted by an international NGO, and that according to the guidelines international NGOs could submit projects to the Fund if they had a supporting letter from the State Party that was the beneficiary of the project. The delegation of **France** asked whether such a letter was submitted in this project's case. The **Secretary of the Convention** assured France that indeed such a letter was submitted in this case. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** stressed that it was important to communicate to the panel of experts that they express any and all reservations they may have regarding the conformity of a project with its budget. In addition, the delegation wanted to know who exactly are the beneficiaries of Project N°52. The delegation of **Greece** suggested that since a ceiling of US $100,000 in funding was proposed for other projects, perhaps the same could be applied to this project submitted by the International Theatre Institute. The delegation of **Canada** clarified that the proposal to apply a US

$100,000 ceiling was meant to apply to projects in the next round of funding, not the current one. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that the beneficiaries of Project N°52 were theatre professionals, and key partners of this project were THEMACULT, Theatre Maoundoh Culture in partnership with the Chad Centre of the International Theatre Institute and the Cultural and Artistic and Training Network Francophonie and Radio Harmonie.

151. The delegation of **South Africa** remarked that Canada's proposal was not the only one that was submitted to the Committee for its consideration, pointing out that it had submitted a proposal earlier to fund all projects that were on the list of recommended projects because the funds were available to do so. In addition, the delegation referred to paragraph 6 in the guidelines, highlighting that the types of projects that could be funded could entail "technical, financial or material support, or some form of expertise", and that paragraph 6.1.1 referred to "introducing cultural policies, where appropriate, and strengthening the corresponding institutional infrastructure", all of which would qualify the recommended infrastructure project for funding. Finally, the delegation questioned the efficacy of the proposal to limit the number of applications accepted per country to two, especially given the fact that NGOs could submit applications without Parties' knowledge. The **Secretary of the Convention** addressed South Africa's last concern by pointing out that the guidelines stated that NGOs' applications had to be submitted through their National Commissions, and that it was only for international NGOs where this was not the case.

152. The **Administrative Officer** recalculated the amount of money that would be needed if only one project were funded per country and the infrastructure project were not funded at all, stating that US $431,056 would be subtracted from US $2,228,206, resulting in US $1,797,150.

153. The delegation of **Luxembourg** reiterated that the maximum amount available to fund projects was US $1.8 million, and that by applying the one project per country rule and by not funding the infrastructure project, it would be feasible to advance with the funds at hand.

154. The delegation of **Tunisia** asked what would happen to the projects that were on the list of recommended projects and that would not be funded in this round. The delegation wanted to know if these projects would be included on a wait-list for the next round of funding or whether they would have to re-submit their applications. The delegation of **Kenya**, supported by Brazil, recommended that non-retained projects be placed on a wait-list and be funded in the subsequent round. The delegation of **Luxembourg**, supported by Germany, France and Mexico, remarked that if non-retained projects were to be placed on a wait-list for the next round of funding, then that round could only start when at least US $431,000 has been accumulated in the Fund, whenever that may be. In addition, the delegation asked if those projects would still be valid or whether they would need updating given changes that would have taken place on the ground in the meantime. Finally, the delegation pointed out that such earmarks would make it difficult for other countries to submit new projects in the future.

155. The delegation of **Jordan** expressed its support for South Africa's comments, remarking that the Committee's recommendations had been made in haste since the criteria could not be applied fairly for future projects. The delegation suggested that approximately 80% of all projects on the list of recommended projects be funded as a way to meet the gap in the supply and demand of funds.

156. The delegation of **Canada** addressed South Africa's concerns regarding the funding of infrastructure by pointing out that the guidelines on the use of resources of the Fund referred to funding institutional and not material infrastructure.

157. The delegation of **Brazil** highlighted that by limiting the projects funded to one per country, countries that submitted multiple eligible projects would be treated unfairly since they were not aware of the one project per country rule ahead of time.

158. The delegation of **Greece** pointed out that according to paragraph 12.5 of the guidelines, partial self-financing should be encouraged as far as possible, ensuring greater equality for all projects. To maintain equality of treatment, the delegation suggested that all projects be given an equal percentage of funding in a way to meet the budget for the projects as a whole.

159. The delegation of **Luxembourg** supported Canada's statement, and highlighted that a ceiling per project was not applied because given that it was a pilot phase, the Committee wanted to test how much applicants would demand. The delegation stressed that the objective was not to penalize any one country, and that in fact, many countries did not get any funding at all. Finally, she emphasized that the overarching objective was to allocate sufficient funding so that projects could be effectively implemented and that impact could be demonstrated.

160. The **Chairperson** summarized the proposals that were put forth by Committee members and asked to proceed toward adopting a decision.

161. The delegation of **South Africa**, supported by Tunisia and China, asked for a 10-minute recess so that Committee members could have a chance to discuss with one another and come up with a joint recommendation.

162. After a break, the **Chairperson** asked Committee members to share with the floor the results of their discussions.

163. The delegation of **South Africa** noted that the Committee's discussions had resulted in the following: 1) all projects would be funded except for the one that focused on material infrastructure development, namely the construction of a building; and (2) a funding ceiling would be placed on all projects.

164. The delegation of **Canada** asked whether the viability of projects could be guaranteed if they were to receive less funding than what was originally asked for, highlighting that this was why they preferred their original proposal. The delegation of **South Africa**, supported by France and Greece, mentioned that the ceiling would be US $100,000 per project.

165. After a discussion, the delegation of **Canada** stated that a number of Committee members had arrived at a consensus and that they had drafted a decision for discussion, proposing to: 1) cap funding for projects at US $100,000, which would involve reducing three projects down to US $100,000 and accordingly asking those project leaders to submit amended budgets to verify their viability; and 2) remove from the list of recommended projects the one project that was deemed to be for physical infrastructure development.

166. The delegation of **Germany** expressed a few concerns namely that it: 1) would mean that the Committee would accept more or less all recommended projects without discussing them and their potential impact in greater detail; 2) introduced a rather arbitrary cap of US $100,000 per project without proof of sustainability below or above this cap; 3) compromised the equal footing that all Parties eligible to the Fund would have by privileging funding for the first round.

167. The delegation of **France** supported the proposal of Canada concerning the maximum amount of $100,000 per project and its proposal to not retain projects that did not meet the criteria of the Fund's guidelines. The delegation highlighted the importance of better defining the criteria for the future.

168. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** added it was important to examine the projects fully and not just the evaluation sheets prepared by the Secretariat.

169. The delegation of **Albania** reminded the Committee of its previous decision "to appoint a panel of six experts to draw up recommendations, with a view for the Committee's examination of requests for the funding of programmes and projects", highlighting the Committee's responsibility to examine this request.

170. The delegation of **Mauritius** proposed funding one project per country, with a view to ensuring equity.

171. The **Chairperson** suggested that Committee members start examining Canada's proposed text for the decision, first adopting those paragraphs that are linked to the Fund's budget and the projects that will be funded, and then discussing other issues like whether a new appeal for projects would be issued in 2011.

172. The delegation of **Senegal** said that the current discussion on the modalities of the Committee's examination of projects was important.

173. The delegation of **France** supported the statement by the delegation of Senegal, and suggested requesting the Secretariat to share its conclusions and experience, and to make proposals for when that paragraph in the decision on the modalities of the Committee's examination of projects came to be discussed.

174. The delegation of **Canada** elaborated on the proposed decision, remarking that the first four paragraphs referred to previous decisions and the role of the Committee in revising the budget for the Fund's first phase, then detailing that paragraph: (4) bis addressed the list of 32 recommended projects that spanned a wide range of funding amounts, which together exceeded the overall budget available for 2010-2011; (5) stated that 70% of the funds available on 30 November 2010 was US $2,088,800, and that 82% of this amount would be available to fund projects and programmes recommended in Annex IV-A. Then, the delegation pointed out that the text of the decision led to the adoption of a budget for 2011 as set out in Annex III, after which the cap of US $100,000 per project is introduced. In paragraph 8 the Committee would decide to issue a new call for project applications in 2011. Finally, the delegation explained that it was proposed to dedicate 70% of the funds available in June 2011 for programmes and projects to be funded in 2012, keeping open the option to revise at its fifth ordinary session the budget for the pilot phase in light of the contributions to the Fund and the number of requests for funding.

175. The **Chairperson** stressed that the November 30th budget figures were still unofficial and that including such figures in the text of the decision could be problematic at this point. She asked the Administrative Officer to clarify whether it would suffice to use percentages in the decision rather than precise numbers to avoid such a potential problem.

176. The **Administrative Officer** said that since the budget figures were provisional, it would be wiser to refer to percentages.

177. The **Secretary of the Convention** read through the list of projects being considered for funding, noting that one project was eliminated from the original list of recommended projects and that three projects that originally exceeded US $100,000 were capped at US $100,000.

178. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that it was prepared to follow the consensus established by the Committee; however, it questioned whether applying a maximum cap of US $100,000 to a

project that originally requested US $308,000, as was the case with Project No. 242 for example, would not compromise the sustainability of that project.

179. The delegation of **Senegal** supported Germany's view concerning the amounts requested for assistance for projects. It proposed that for the examination of projects in future, the column in the table containing the country names should be removed in order to ensure greater objectivity and neutrality.

180. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the consensus on the $100,000 cap on project funding. While questions might be raised, notably concerning the execution of projects whose budget was in excess of that amount, it should be remembered that this was a pilot phase and a learning period.

181. The delegation of **Canada** explained that during the previous day's discussions it was recommended to solicit re-evaluated budgets from project groups whose original requests had been capped at US $100,000 to ensure that their proposals would still be viable. The delegation emphasized that funding would only be disbursed to these beneficiaries if the sustainability of their projects was proven within the limits of their new budget. The delegation of **Germany** suggested that the text of the decision reflect the fact that projects capped at US $100,000 would receive funding pending on beneficiaries' feedback as to their sustainability.

182. The delegation of **Greece** said that if the panel of experts was of the view that project budget estimates should be explained in greater detail, particularly in the case of large amounts, the Committee should reflect upon the procedure to be followed.

183. The delegation of **South Africa** remarked that the Committee had agreed not to place any conditions on funding, and that by demanding certain beneficiaries to adjust their budgets to meet the US $100,000 cap the Committee would in fact be placing such a condition after all. The delegation of **Kenya** supported South Africa's comments, emphasizing that it would be difficult for some beneficiaries to determine whether an adjusted budget would be adequate for a certain project. In addition, the delegation pointed out that the panel of experts not only expressed reservations about large amounts that were requested, but also about relatively small amounts, putting into question the scalability of very small projects as well.

184. The **Administrative Officer** said that contracts would be drawn up with the partners, and that the implementation and follow-up to the projects would be carried out. The beneficiaries whose budget amounts had been reduced would thus be able to revise their anticipated funding in order to ensure the feasibility of the project, and the project coordinator could then validate the project.

185. The **Chairperson** suggested that the decision be adopted point by point, and as such points 1 through 4 were adopted without any objections from Committee members.

186. After paragraph 4 bis was approved, the delegation of **Canada** proposed removing the exact budget figures in paragraph 5 and using only percentages, stressing that changes might be made to the budget.

187. The delegation of **Albania** proposed text for a new paragraph 4 bis, which stated "Recalls the Committee's obligation to examine the requests for the funding of programmes/projects by the IFCD as outlined in Decision 3.ICG 5." The delegation of **Canada** questioned whether Albania's proposal would not be better placed between paragraphs 1 and 2. The delegation of **Albania** agreed with Canada's suggestion. The delegation of **Kenya** questioned why this new paragraph 2 was being added, especially given that in the previous paragraph 2 Decision 3.IGC 5 was being recalled and in paragraph 4 bis "The Committee, having examined the list of 32 projects" was reiterated, adequately

catering to Albania's concerns. The delegation of **Albania** specified that it wanted its proposal to read "as outlined in Decision 3.IGC 5, paragraph 6", and emphasized the Committee's responsibility to examine the substance of the files and stressing that it was not up to the panel of experts to decide on the final list of recommended projects, but rather up to the Committee. The **Chairperson** noted no objections from Committee members and announced the adoption for this new paragraph 2, as well as paragraph 5.

188. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to examine paragraph 6 and requested the Administrative Officer to review the budget in question. The **Administrative Officer** said that the table included the following: a provision for the evaluation of projects by experts, since there would be a call for projects in 2011; operating costs of the Secretariat and related costs; the participation expenses of LDCs; the amount for the 31 projects funded; the 2% reserve for the financing, if necessary, of programmes/projects regarding special situations; the 10% of support costs; and the unallocated amount of the Fund. Noting no objections on the part of the Committee, the **Chairperson** declared that paragraph 6 was also adopted.

189. Concerning paragraph 7, the delegation of **Germany** suggested inserting "as requested" after the word "decision" in "as annex to this decision up to a maximum of US $100,000" to clarify that projects receive the amount of money they requested and that in addition the Committee introduced a US $100,000 ceiling. The delegation, supported by Albania, also proposed adding the phrase "Projects No. 242, 205, 52 will receive a funding of US $100,000 each, depending upon the feedback from the applicant on the viability of the project with that amount".

190. The delegation of **South Africa** emphasized that the amendments proposed digressed from normal UNESCO funding procedures because they imply that the Committee is asking beneficiaries to rework their projects to fit the capped budget and then encouraging them to look elsewhere to meet any funding gaps that would still exist. The delegation of **Cameroon** expressed its concern about the insertion suggested by Germany and proposed instead that the amount should be capped at $100,000, and that the future impact of that limit should be assessed. The delegation of **Albania** explained that it understood the amendments as resulting in two outcomes: either the feedback would confirm that the amount of money allocated to the project would be sufficient to guarantee sustainability, or it would explain that applicants would have other funding sources to guarantee sustainability. The delegation then turned to the Administrative Officer for further clarification on this point. The **Administrative Officer** said that it was essential that the beneficiaries whose budget amounts had been reduced should adjust their project, and that when contracts were drawn up, there should be agreement on the products to be delivered and the expected results. The delegation of **South Africa** echoed Kenya's observations, noting that the panel of experts had expressed reservations about projects that seemed to be too small, begging the question why smaller projects were not being scrutinized by the Committee and capped in the same manner as larger projects. The delegation of **Kenya** supported South Africa's comments and proposed adding "and that the Secretariat will work with the project applicants to ensure that the projects are viable with the amounts allocated". The delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its support for the proposal made by Kenya, suggesting to replace "work with the applicants" by just "follow up with the applicants to ensure that the projects are viable within the amount allocated". The delegation of **Germany** reiterated that with its proposal it took into consideration South Africa's concerns, ensuring that every applicant would get the money it had requested, and imposed caps would not be detrimental to the viability of projects. The **Legal Adviser** recalled two principles: (1) that the Committee's decision, on which there was already agreement, to limit the amount of funding to $100,000, and that the Secretariat could not grant a higher amount; (2) that if the funding were refused by the beneficiary on the grounds of insufficient funds, the amount must remain in the Fund. He therefore proposed the following wording: "and requests the Secretariat to notify the beneficiaries of the funding decision in order to ensure the feasibility of concluding agreements with

them". The delegation of **France** thanked the Legal Adviser for his wording, and proposed the following amendment: "and requests the Secretariat to notify the beneficiaries of the funding of this decision and to request confirmation from applicants of the feasibility of their project with a view to conclude agreements with them". The delegations of Kenya, Croatia, Cameroon, Canada, Germany and Albania expressed their support for the Legal Adviser's proposal. The delegation of **Albania** suggested that "tasks" be replaced by "and requests the Secretariat" in the English version and "demande au Secrétariat" in the French version. The delegation of **Tunisia** recommended changing the term "feasibility" with "implementation", signalling that if the US $100,000 is not accepted, then the project will not be implemented. The delegation of **France** said that Saint Lucia's request had not been reflected, and therefore proposed an addition to the second part of paragraph 7: "requests the Secretariat to notify the beneficiaries of the funding of this decision and to request confirmation from applicants who initially exceeded the cap of $100,000 of the feasibility of their projects with a view to conclude agreements with them". The delegation of **Germany** expressed its preference for the term "feasibility" rather than "implementation", suggesting that perhaps the same means could be achieved by adding "to notify the beneficiaries of the funds concerned" or "the relevant beneficiaries of the funds" to emphasize that this only refers to the three projects in question. The delegation of **Greece** suggested removing the term "concerned" from the amendment proposed by Germany as it could create confusion between the beneficiaries whose initial amount exceeded $100,000 and all beneficiaries, and proposed the following modification to the amendment by France: "to ask confirmation from applicants whose initial budget exceeded the cap of $100,000 of the feasibility of their projects". Canada, South Africa, Mexico and Germany expressed their support for the amendment as it stood. The **Chairperson** asked the Administrative Officer to explain what would happen with the projects, contracts and the entire procedure in dealing with this project from the day the meeting would be adjourned until a new meeting is convened. The **Administrative Officer** said that for the three projects whose funding had been reduced, three points should be considered: (1) the beneficiary must clearly accept the reduced amount; (2) the beneficiary must provide a revised budget and workplan; and (3) that they would be submitted to the coordinator of the panel of experts for validation. The delegation of **Senegal** proposed the following rewording of the amendment: "requests the Secretariat to notify the beneficiaries of this decision and to ask confirmation from applicants whose initial budget exceeded the cap of $100,000 of the feasibility of their projects with a view to conclude agreements with them", and proposed including the sentence concerning the final validation of the coordinator of the panel of experts in a subparagraph. The delegation of **Brazil**, supported by Canada and South Africa, proposed removing mention of the panel of experts. The delegation of **China** supported the imposition of funding limitations in order to ensure a balance of opportunities for all Parties eligible to apply to the Fund, emphasizing that no one project should be in a position to dominate the funding available. The **Representative of the Director-General** said that consultation with the panel of experts would ensure transparency and independent opinion, and that it would have no financial implications. The delegations of **India** and South Africa expressed their support for the text as it stood. The **Chairperson**, noting no further objections, declared the paragraph 7 adopted as amended.

191. The delegation of **Luxembourg** asked for clarification on paragraph 8, which read "Decides to issue a new appeal for project applications for the third year of the pilot phase 2012 and to accept the new requests for funding in 2011", remarking that a new appeal should be issued in 2011 as well. The delegation of **Canada** referred to the operational guidelines for Article 18, pointing out that the pilot phase was to last 36 months with Year 1 being June 2009 to June 2010, Year 2 being June 2010 to June 2011 and Year 3 being June 2011 to June 2012. To simplify paragraph 8, the delegation recommended to change the text to" "Decides to issue a new appeal for projects in 2011". The **Chairperson** noted no further comments from Committee on paragraph 8 and declared that it was adopted as amended.

192. The delegation of **Mexico** suggested that paragraphs 8 and 9 be merged to read "Decides to issue a new appeal for project applications in 2011 and dedicate 70% of funds available" and so on. The delegation of **Greece** suggested replacing Year 3 with "the third year" in paragraph 8. The **Chairperson** asked Committee members if they had any objections to either Mexico's or Greece's remarks, and when none were noted, the paragraph was adopted.

193. The **Chairperson** continued with what were originally paragraphs 10 and 11, and noting no objections she declared that they were adopted.

194. The **Chairperson** then introduced paragraph 12 to Committee members, pointing out that the pilot phase would be concluded with an evaluation so that this learning process could be appropriately transmitted to those who will be deciding on how to proceed. She also highlighted that whatever the Committee decided to do, the main objectives and priorities of the Convention needed to pave the way. Finally, she turned to the Secretary of the Convention and asked her to elaborate on what the Secretariat had been able to observe from the process so far. The **Secretary of the Convention** noted that the list presented in paragraph 12 reflected the discussions that the Secretariat had with the panel of experts. She mentioned that the Secretariat organized a capacity-building session via telephone with the panel of experts because it was evident that they did not have the same level of knowledge of the Convention and/or of the fields of activity covered by the Fund. She noted that the experts also asked about a minimum and a maximum amount of projects, finding it difficult to evaluate a project asking for US $1,500 and then comparing it to projects that were requesting US $50,000, US $200,000 or even US $1 million. In that respect, imposing a maximum amount of funding per project will be welcomed by the panel, the Secretary also relayed a message that the panel of experts would recommend imposing a minimum limit as well. Second, she pointed out that the panel of experts expressed their need for a better definition for terms like preparatory assistance and institutional infrastructure, stressing that programmes and projects outlined in paragraph 6.1 of the guidelines needed to be made more explicit. The Secretary highlighted that this last point was especially important because a significant number of the 254 applications that were submitted dealt with intangible heritage, intercultural dialogue and so forth, reflecting the fact that the criteria were not clear or precise enough. A third issue that was raised by the panel of experts had to do with the evaluation process when one country submitted 20 applications and another just one. The Secretary stressed that the projects were of course evaluated against each other one by one, but the panel remarked that if greater care were taken at the national level to screen projects at a first stage as indicated in the operational guidelines, the evaluation process would have been greatly facilitated. The Secretary pointed out that National Commissions received packages of explanatory information from the Secretariat throughout the Spring 2010, and several reminders were sent out to provide further information and coaching opportunities throughout the process. The Secretary went on to highlight that some countries organized public workshops and capacity-building exercises with their National Commissions to inform them about the Convention and the application process, while in other countries National Commissions did not assume a very proactive role. The Secretary noted that such efforts of course required resources, but that whatever could be done on the ground to facilitate building up a base of knowledge and experience in this area would be of tremendous help to the panel of experts and the quality of applications for coming years.

195. The delegation of **Tunisia** mentioned that it would have been useful to engage in an information session with the panel of experts to understand the challenges and opportunities of the evaluation process. Secondly, the delegation stressed that it would like to add criteria that directly linked the Convention with the Fund, namely cultural policies, strengthening institutional structure, capacity-building, cultural industries and cultural expressions at risk, with the idea to maximize the number of projects funded under each thematic category. The delegation of **Canada** thanked the Secretariat for providing a thorough overview of some of the lessons learned in the evaluation process, and addressed Tunisia's suggestion, pointing out that limiting requests to five fields may corner National

Commissions into choosing projects that do not necessarily reflect the activities they would have supported otherwise on their territory, adding greater complications to the application process. Other proposals, including capacity-building for the panel of experts, standardizing the evaluation process and linking it to the Convention's priorities, are also advancing and that is why relatively few additional suggestions have been put forward at this time.

196. The delegation of **China** pointed out that a clear distinction needed to be made between national and international NGOs in order to be able to set limits on the number of projects submitted by one Party. The delegation of **Lithuania** suggested that it might be useful to ask international organizations to clearly indicate the countries that would benefit from their projects.

197. The delegation of **Senegal** emphasized how important it is for the panel of experts to turn down project proposals that do not correspond directly to the Convention's principles and objectives. The delegation pointed out that this would be facilitated if files were anonymous, guaranteeing greater impartiality on the part of the panel. Secondly, the delegation asked for clarification on paragraph 12(b). Lastly, the delegation stressed that projects chosen for funding should contribute to building long-term structures where similar projects could be implemented without further support from the Fund.

198. The delegation of **Greece** suggested that paragraph 12 be clarified to include a clause that would require project teams that receive funding from the Fund to assume a portion of the costs related to the project themselves. The delegation of **South Africa** emphasized that it was already agreed not to ask applicants to partially fund their own projects. The delegation also suggested that, in order to use time efficiently, a working group of Committee members and NGOs be created to develop criteria, stressing that the role of the panel of experts was not to develop criteria, but rather to follow and implement criteria. The delegation of **Brazil** supported South Africa's comments, but emphasized that a working group could not directly submit its suggestions to the Conference of Parties without going through the Committee first, which might lead to amendments to the operational guidelines. The delegation of **France** thanked the panel of experts for their useful recommendations, and suggested that perhaps the best way to proceed would be to wait for the end of the pilot phase to create a working group that would review the operational guidelines in their entirety. The delegation pointed out that it was still too early in the process to be exhaustive and thorough, but the Committee could agree on a common compendium of items to advance the process without revising operational guidelines. The **Legal Adviser** suggested that it might be premature to send criteria recommendations to the Conference of Parties because they are still subject to discussion at the end of the pilot phase. The delegation of **Tunisia** expressed it support for the Legal Adviser's comments, and recommended that paragraph 12 be replaced by "Invites the Secretariat to take on board lessons drawn from the first phase of the evaluation, and recommends that a study be drawn up based on the first stage of the evaluation".

199. The delegation of **Germany** suggested that the Committee continue with the original text, acknowledging that it was the Committee's responsibility to give guidance to the panel of experts and if this were not done then it would be extremely difficult to launch the next round of projects on sound footing.

200. The delegation of **Senegal** expressed its understanding for the Legal Adviser's recommendation to be careful before hastening to modify the text of the decision, but it stressed that the Committee was facing an urgent matter in four respects: 1) a message needed to be delivered to the panel of experts to be bolder in their decision-making; 2) the Committee needed to assess its own decisions more effectively; 3) instructions needed to be given to the Secretariat as to how files should be presented; and lastly 4) the Committee needed report to the Conference of Parties.

201. The delegation of **Brazil** emphasized that it was important to address a number of issues and problems before the work of the Committee and the panel of experts could continue to evolve, even if it did not entail revising the operational guidelines. The delegation, supported by France and Mexico, suggested adding a new paragraph after 11, starting with "Invites the Secretariat and the expert group to take into account a number of elements in project evaluation for the next phase of the call for applications" and addressing: 1) clear limits as to the substance of requests, number of projects per country, minimum threshold, maximum threshold, etc; 2) experts' roles in re-evaluating project budgets; and 3) the working methodology, including how projects are presented and evaluated. The delegation of **Albania** introduced the following chapeau to paragraph 12: "Takes note of the following lessons learned from the experience of the pilot phase, with a view of integrating them in the findings of the global evaluation which is to take place six months before the end of the pilot phase, in conformity with paragraph 5 of the guidelines", followed by a list of the issues and concerns discussed. The delegation of **Mexico** suggested reformulating the chapeau with regard to the next call for applications. The delegation of **Greece** proposed amending the chapeau to "Recommends to the third Conference of Parties to consider amending the guidelines", indicating that a more proactive approach is needed to make headway with the work related to the Fund, and that this might entail revisions to the guidelines of Article 18 of the Convention. The delegation of **China** pointed out that according to Article 22 of the Convention, the function of the Conference of Parties is to approve operational guidelines prepared on its request by the Committee - then, whether to revise or amend the guidelines is up to the Committee to decide. The **Legal Adviser** noted that both Greece's and China's proposals were compatible, highlighting that it was the Committee's prerogative to invite the Conference of Parties to complete its guidelines or to modify them, but the Conference of Parties in 2011 could say that it authorizes the Committee to implement the criteria without modifying the guidelines. The Legal Adviser remarked that Greece's formulation would be valid if the Committee wished to notify the Conference of Parties of all of the issues and problems brought out in the discussions. The Conference of Parties may decide to modify paragraph 5 of the guidelines, but it can also decide to take on board lessons learned from the pilot phase without amending the guidelines. The Legal Adviser suggested that lessons learned be presented to the Conference of Parties in a draft resolution for either further modification or resolution. The delegation of **Albania** proposed adding "and decides to apply the lessons learned in the next call for projects" after "guidelines" in its original amendment, and asked the Legal Adviser for his opinion on these changes. The **Legal Adviser** emphasized that it was up to the Committee to decide how it wanted to proceed, but it needed to ensure that whatever actions fell outside of its prerogatives would be handed over to the Conference of Parties. The delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that there seems to be a consensus to have one project per country, and to set a maximum threshold per project of US $100,000. Then, the delegation suggested that a study be commissioned to define further criteria for the call for projects. The delegation of **Germany** stressed that it was important to give clear guidance to the panel of experts on how to deal with the next round of projects and noted that Albania's suggestion with the new amendment captured this idea. The delegation of **Greece** expressed some concerns with the wording of paragraph 12's chapeau as proposed and amended by Albania, pointing out that "lessons learned" more accurately reflected criteria. The delegation of **Albania,** supported by France and Brazil, proposed amending the text to "decides to apply the following criteria in the next call for projects". The delegation of **China**, supported by Tunisia, stressed that the proposed text was too long for a decision, urging the Committee to focus on priority issues and then, if need be, request the Secretariat to prepare a handbook of instructions for the panel of experts. The delegation of **Kenya** suggested tweaking a few words in paragraph 12's chapeau to "Takes note of the experience of the first call of projects, with a view to integrating its findings in the global evaluation" – the rest remains the same – "and decides to apply the following criteria" rather than the "following issues".

202. The delegation of **Albania** proposed US $20,000 as a minimum threshold per project. The delegation of **South Africa** questioned why a minimum threshold of US $20,000 would be

necessary, especially when a project proposal for US $5,000 was approved and no more money was needed. The delegation of **Tunisia** pointed out that assigning a minimum threshold of US $20,000 per project was somewhat arbitrary and that much more time would be needed to discuss this in greater detail. As a result, the delegation suggested that this minimum threshold be included in a separate annex or handbook for the Committee's consideration at its next session. The **Chairperson** asked Albania whether it insisted on introducing a minimum threshold at that point, and it did not. As such, the Chairperson recommended that the Committee move on in examining the rest of the text associated with paragraph 12.

203. The delegation of **Germany** asked whether in paragraph 12 (b) the panel of experts and the Committee were placed at the same level of decision-making power. The delegation of **France** pointed out that the panel of experts was mentioned first before the Committee in this paragraph to reflect the chronological sequence of events described in the paragraph, and not the decision-making power. In that respect, the delegation of **Germany**, supported by China, recommended that the text be changed to read "the possibility for the Committee, upon recommendation by the panel of experts". The delegation of **France**, supported by Senegal and Tunisia, expressed its preference for the original drafting of the text, highlighting that the Committee's full powers were recognized as a prerogative to act upon the recommendation of the panel of experts.

204. The delegation of **South Africa** appealed to members of the Committee to delete paragraphs (a) through (g), stressing that paragraphs 13 and 14 adequately captured the essence of what should be communicated regarding the lessons learned in the first year of the pilot phase. In addition, the delegation emphasized that it would not support limiting the number of project proposals per country.

205. The delegation of **Brazil** proposed including a reference to international non-governmental organizations in paragraph 12 (c) as follows: "The number of projects per beneficiary, only one project per Party, a non-governmental organization or an international non-governmental organization" and in paragraph 12 (d), hence the "maximum number of projects that a Party, an NGO or INGO may present".

206. The delegation of **Cameroon** noted that stipulating a time-frame in which a project group can raise remaining funds it needs beyond US $100,000 would be futile because it is not certain how long it would take to raise large amounts of money in different national contexts. In response, the **Representative of the Director-General** stated that revised projects will most likely be adapted to the amount of money approved by the Committee with limited durations since it was difficult to imagine that an approved project could take five years to be carried out because of lack of funds.

207. The delegation of **Kenya** suggested that paragraph (e) be deleted since it seemed to paraphrase paragraph 18 of the guidelines, which reads: "The applicants shall submit a mandatory descriptive, analytical and financial report on the execution of the programme/project and the realization of expected results. The report must be presented to the Secretariat six months after the conclusion of the project/programme as foreseen within the time frame. No financial contributions for new projects will be allocated to applicants who have not submitted this report". Noting no objections from the Committee regarding Kenya's proposal, paragraph (e) was delete.

208. The delegation of **Tunisia** added a criterion for the duration of the project of three years, suggesting the text "The duration of the project must not exceed three years".

209. The delegation of **China** noted that with the addition of the criteria, the decision is taking the shape of guidelines, which the Committee does not have the right to adopt since it needs to be approved by the Conference of Parties. If the Committee wishes to continue adopting the criteria

anyhow, the delegation asked the Secretariat to take note of its observation. The **Representative of the Director-General** remarked that in point (f) the Committee was introducing a criterion for itself, namely to accept the top 25% of projects, which it had a right to do.

210. The delegation of **South Africa** stressed that the Committee should not be imposing criteria and taking on the role of a funder in selecting projects to be supported by the Fund. The delegation emphasized that entitlement to receive funding should be based on whether projects are in line with implementing the Convention or not. The delegation of **Tunisia** highlighted that the Committee may be working toward an endless list of criteria, and it retracted its previous proposal to limit the duration of projects. The delegation of **Kenya** mentioned that it preferred to delete paragraph 12 all together; however, if the Committee wished to keep the paragraph, the delegation asked whether a clearer definition of the terms 'preparatory assistance' and 'institutional infrastructure' were actually criteria as indicated in point (e), and if so whose definition would be used. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the deletion of point (e), but suggested keeping paragraph 12, emphasizing that at a first stage where resources were limited a number of criteria to guide the Committee in selecting projects was necessary. The delegation appealed to those delegations that were against imposing any criteria whatsoever to reconsider their positions, highlighting that these criteria would probably not continue to be valid in the long-term, and that they might not even be kept beyond the pilot phase, but for the time being they helped to solve a number of concrete problems. The delegations of Saint Lucia, Mexico, France, Albania, Germany and Senegal supported Brazil's comments.The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested to re-draft point (e) to suit the Committee's expectations because otherwise the risk of the same problems regarding definitions of preparatory assistance and institutional infrastructure reappearing at the cost of Parties' time, energy and resources would be great. The delegation of **France** addressed a previous question about the distinction between point (c) and (d), pointing out that (c) referred to the number of projects that can be selected for funding while (d) focused on the number of projects that could be presented for funding consideration. As such, the delegation suggested clarifying the matter in point (c) by changing the text to "The number of projects kept" or "approved". The delegation of **Senegal** added two amendments to emphasize the importance of the position expressed by South Africa, namely: 1) highlighting that the proposed criteria were applicable to the next call for projects only; and 2) stressing that the criteria would be examined and/or revised at the end of the pilot phase. Paragraph 12 was adopted as amended.

211. The delegation of **France** remarked that the chapeau of paragraph 12 and the wording of paragraph 13 needed to be aligned, suggesting "Invites the Secretariat to draw the lessons from the first review of applications with a view to improving information provided to the Committee". The **Chairperson** noted no further objections to this proposal and declared the adoption of paragraph 13 as amended.

212. The **Representative of the Director-General** referred to point 12(f), and asked for clarification on whether the panel of experts would be asked to work within a certain budget when selecting the top 25% of the projects or whether they would be selecting the top 25% of the projects without regard to budgetary constraints, in which case it would be up to the Committee to decide on maximum amounts allocated to each project. The delegation of **Germany** explained that the threshold of 75% of the maximum of the total amount of points was introduced to give both experts evaluating a project a transparent indication of the extent to which they both need to support a project in order for it to be considered for funding.

213. The **Chairperson** turned the Committee's attention to paragraph 14, and declared its adoption after noting no further objections.

*Decision 4.IGC 10A was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 10 – IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD) AND FUNDRAISING STRATEGY**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/10B**

214. The **Chairperson** opened discussions on point 10 concerning the fundraising strategy for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, and called upon the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the document.

215. The **Secretary of the Convention** provided the background for this document, stating that at its last session, the Committee requested that a discussion on fundraising for the Fund be held at this session, a topic that is of great interest especially given the significant demand that was expressed for the Fund in its first call for applications. She reminded the Committee of the Director-General's letter to Parties in March of 2010, calling upon member States to contribute 1% of their contribution to UNESCO to the Fund. Since that appeal, the Secretary reported that 13 countries had made contributions to the Fund totalling approximately US $600,000. The Secretary of the Convention also emphasized that in comparison to the World Heritage Fund or the Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, contributions to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity are voluntary. In June 2009 the Conference of Parties gave the Committee a mandate to define a fundraising strategy, stressing that the success of a future fundraising strategy would be interlinked with the promotion and visibility of the Convention, the development of a communication strategy with identifiable messages and accompanying tools and potentially innovative mechanisms implemented on a national level to help generate contributions to the Fund. In this context, she encouraged the Committee to begin addressing some key questions that could contribute to shaping a future framework for a fundraising strategy, including: identifying potential contributors and stakeholders, and the type of visibility that can be provided to them; the objectives of the strategy; the financial targets to be achieved; and the resources that can be invested in pursuing this strategy.

216. The delegation of **Canada** said that developing a fundraising strategy for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity was a priority, and that the credibility and effectiveness of the Convention was at stake. In addition to calling for Member States to make contributions, innovative models should be explored in order to guarantee sufficient and regular funding. Since that matter had been put to the Parties, the delegation proposed a fundraising mechanism involving the award of a certificate or seal to cultural events showcasing a wide range of cultural expressions and artists or cultural productions from several countries, particularly from developing countries. Such a certificate or seal would boost the prestige, brand image and attendance of those events, which would, in return, ensure a financial contribution to the Fund. The idea was not to put in place a complex or cumbersome process; the certificate could, for example, confer the status of "expressions of international cultural diversity" on such events, which would enhance and promote the Convention's ideals while also generating publicity for it. Applications for such a certificate or seal would be made on a voluntary basis, and the financial contribution to be made in return by the events' organizers would be determined by clear indicators. The type of events eligible for such certification should be defined on the basis of general criteria and the objectives and principles of the Convention itself. The delegation indicated that it would be happy to provide its support for the preparatory phase.

217. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** emphasized that there were two aspects to examine in considering fundraising options for the Fund, namely voluntary contributions by Parties and external funding mechanisms as referred to by Canada. Insisting that every Party to the Convention, including developed and developing countries, should be regularly contributing to the Fund, the delegation stated that it would not vote for any candidate Parties to the Intergovernmental Committee if that Party had not contributed to the Fund, and it would lobby for others to do the same. The delegation

urged Parties to take up their responsibilities, even with symbolic sums, and to consider the implementation of simple yet innovative funding mechanisms as already mentioned by Canada.

218. The delegation of **Greece** said, citing Article 18.3(b) of the Convention, that the Committee should ask the Conference of the Parties at its forthcoming session, to allocate funds or a particular amount either to the Fund or in order to cover the requirements and expenditure arising from the implementation of the Convention. The delegation also mentioned the possibility of involving artists and the general public, the private sector and professionals in a global campaign on the basis of the experience of United Nations bodies such as UNICEF.

219. The delegation of **South Africa** supported other Committee members' statements regarding concerted fundraising efforts, highlighting that a branding mechanism suggested by Canada, in line with examples related to UNICEF's association with some international festivals, could be applied to the Convention to support both its fundraising and communication strategies. The delegation mentioned that it contributed to the Fund, but it stressed that it needed annual audited financial statements to present to its Auditor General in order to be able to continue its contributions.

220. The delegation of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** said that the proposal made by Canada was entirely legitimate, in keeping with Article 18, and should be studied by the Committee. It expressed its support for Saint Lucia and said that all donors, whether large or small, could contribute on a voluntary basis, in accordance with Article 18. To that end, although the Lao People's Democratic Republic was among the least developed countries (LDCs), it would make every effort to fulfil the obligations which it had endorsed by ratifying the Convention, in order to give the Fund the means to achieve its ambitions. It underlined the importance of solidarity between States, and of urging, at the next Conference of the Parties, that financial provision be made for the Convention in the programmes and budgets proposed in the C/5 document.

221. Stressing that fundraising for the Fund was essential to implementing the Convention, the delegation of **China** invited the Secretariat and Committee members to consider how to apply UNESCO's knowledge, experience and expertise in supporting the Fund's fundraising strategy.

222. The delegation of **Germany** pointed out that in Germany voluntary contributions were examined on a case-by-case basis by the parliament under the scrutiny of the Code of Auditors, making it impossible for the delegation to enforce obligatory voluntary contributions on a regular basis.

223. After noting that no further Committee members wished to take the floor, the **Chairperson** turned the Committee's attention to specific questions for its consideration: Who are the major stakeholders? Who can contribute to the Fund? What is the best way to reach out to them? What different needs and contribution capabilities do they have? What financial resources could be made available to create and implement a fundraising strategy? As well as given available resources, which stakeholders should be targeted in fundraising for the Fund? And how much money should be raised for the Fund? The Chairperson indicated that these questions are really important questions.

224. The delegation of **Greece** proposed an amendment to the decision: "the Committee requests the General Conference, at its next session in 2011, to allocate the resources required for the operation and implementation of the Convention".

225. The delegation of **Germany** questioned whether the Committee had the right to directly inform and report to the General Conference.

226. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the procedural problems could be resolved by changing the wording. It supported the substance of the amendment proposed by Greece, and stressed that

in UNESCO's regular budget, the Convention was the "poor cousin" when compared with that of the other conventions. The paragraph should be worded differently, by calling upon the Director-General to ensure that, in the next budget, the Convention had sufficient funding to operate properly, like the other conventions.

227. The delegation of **France**, with the support of Brazil, China, Germany and Tunisia, said that in the C/5 preparation work, it had emerged that the Convention was grouped together with other conventions, and that its specificity was not recognized either in terms of its substance or resources. The delegation therefore stressed that the key point was to refer to the C/5 document to ensure that there would be increased resources for the operation of the Convention. It made the following proposal: "requests the Director-General to allocate in the framework of the next C/5 increased resources for the operation and implementation of the Convention".

228. The delegation of **Germany** asked the Secretariat to explain what the 10% support costs going to the special account entailed, making referrence to document CE/10/4.IGC/205/10A, page 10, Annex II, and quoted the footnote "In compliance with UNESCO's financial regulations, 10% of support costs are applicable to the special account". The **Representative of the Director-General** said that all the UNESCO special accounts must, in accordance with the Financial Regulations, pay a 10% support-costs contribution. She added that these are not support costs for the team implementing the project. If any delegation wished to have further clarifications, she suggested organizing a meeting between the delegation and the UNESCO Administrative Officer. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that 10% of support costs were going to another reserve in the Organization, which not necessarily served the purposes of the Convention. The delegation highlighted this point because it wanted to include existing UNESCO regulations as one of the levers in implementing innovative funding strategies, stressing the importance of support costs flowing back into the activities that generated them.

229. The **Chairperson** read in paragraph 4, "Requests Parties to inform the Secretariat of innovative fundraising mechanisms implemented at the national level to raise resources for the Fund. This information is to be collected through a questionnaire that will be sent by the Secretariat to Parties". The delegation of **Tunisia** suggested deleting the word "innovative" because it served more as a buzzword rather than as a differentiator between innovative and non-innovative mechanisms. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that the word "innovative" signalled special mechanisms, whose removal would likely change the meaning of the paragraph as whole. The delegation also pointed out that the Committee should consider including the discussion of concrete measures for fundraising in the agenda for its next session. The delegation of **Tunisia** emphasized that the consideration of any financial mechanism to raise funds for the Convention should be welcome, whether innovative or not. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** said that the content of the paragraph might be broadened. The delegation of **Senegal** said that the Committee's concern was not merely to accept the current funding situation, because it was not sufficient, but to seek new funding. The purpose of the paragraph proposed was thus to call upon the Committee to explore new avenues, hence the importance of retaining the term. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked whether the Committee wanted to examine these mechanisms at its next session. The delegation of **China** agreed with Saint Lucia and suggested that the Committee examine the mechanisms before the Conference of Parties in June 2011. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Greece, pointed out that the Committee would not be meeting again before the Conference of Parties, and therefore suggested that the Committee examine the mechanisms at its next session in December 2011. In the French version, the term "innovant", meaning "innovative", to describe the fundraising mechanisms should be retained as it was the generally accepted term, rather than using the alternative "novateur". The delegation of **Greece** said that it was perhaps unnecessary to add a reference to the next session of the Committee since the Conference of the Parties would mandate the Committee to address the matter. The **Representative of the Director-General** said that the

questionnaire would be sent by the Secretariat before the next Conference of the Parties in June 2011 with the aim of providing a concise summary of the replies to the questionnaire to the Conference of the Parties.

*Decision 4.IGC 10B was adopted as amended.*

**[Observers]**

230. The delegation of **Norway** remarked on agenda item 10A, pointing out that lessons learned during the first call for applications would be highly relevant for the next call in 2011 and that the Committee would have lost an opportunity to give precious guidance if it had not included these lessons in its decision. The delegation emphasized that the evaluation of the fund at the end of its pilot phase would only add to its credibility, and that it would further examine the projects that had been granted funding to learn how the Fund was being perceived by Parties and other stakeholders as an instrument for the implementation of the Convention. The delegation also highlighted the confusion that was demonstrated by the applications received in the first call between the 2005 and 2003 UNESCO Conventions, signalling the need for more information distinguishing the two funds to potential applicants. The delegation stressed the importance of the Convention as a frame of reference for establishing cultural policies at large, and recognized that other Parties interpreted the main purpose of the Convention differently, many focusing on cultural industries and capacity-building. It expressed its hope that the next call for applications would produce a greater number of projects related to cultural policies because their experience had shown that a minimum of organizational and institutional infrastructure in the field of culture was necessary to create favourable conditions for the growth of cultural industries, especially in countries that represent relatively small language groups.

231. A representative of the **International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA)** stated that of the Federation's 75 member countries, many have run peer-assessed funding programmes to support artistic creativity, accumulating a wealth of knowledge on the complex challenges of designing, promoting, processing, analysing, deciding on, fundraising for and drawing policy conclusions from grant programmes. In addressing the key challenge of art advocacy shared by government agencies and arts communities around the world, the representative mentioned that IFACCA had published a major research report providing case studies and good practice in national arts advocacy campaigns. In closing, the representative offered, as appropriate, the Federation's assistance in contributing to the successful operation, promotion and fundraising for the Fund.

232. A representative of the **International Network for Cultural Diversity (INCD)** stressed that the organization had been a supporter of the Fund from its conception, and that it had argued for mandatory contributions to secure a sustainable future for the Fund. The representative stated that two structural issues needed to be addressed to make the Fund more attractive to Parties and the private sector, namely the introduction of amendments to the operational guidelines allowing donors to apply conditions on the use of their funds, and changing the decision-making process so that it would be more independent of the Committee, while retaining the Committee's overall authority and the participation of civil society. The representative then proceeded to urge the Committee to recommend the following to the Conference of Parties: (1) empower and direct the panel of experts to select and allocate budgets for projects according to established time frames, rules, criteria, priorities and funding available; (2) limit the decision-making authority of the Intergovernmental Committee to accepting or rejecting the recommendations of the panel of experts; and (3) evaluate projects after their completion to ensure having the information necessary to amend criteria and select appropriate experts for the assessment panel. The representative stressed that if the Committee were to retain authority to decide on individual applications, the process would risk losing

its credibility since politics would inevitably start playing a role, resulting in actors refraining from submitting meaningful projects altogether and a lack of outside donors.

233. The **General Secretary of the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)** stressed the importance of keeping up the momentum and bolstering the interest of civil society by launching a new call for projects for the coming year. He pointed out that many people were absent, referring both to those running projects and to those providing funding. The latter group would attend when there was more certainty, clarity and focus regarding the role to be played by the Fund as opposed to other funds. He gave the example of the project on technical assistance to strengthen the system of governance for culture in developing countries, which was funded by the European Union, emphasizing that it was important to identify their fields of competence and their complementarity. It was essential that the Committee should take a decision on the criteria. He concluded by stressing the importance of: (1) transparency (such as putting examples of best practices online); (2) identification of communication mechanisms in order to reach a wider audience; (3) promotion of international cooperation, in particular for North-South exchanges and ensuring the mobility of artists.

**ITEM 11 – DOCUMENTS TO BE APPROVED BY THE THIRD SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/11**

234. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that the Conference of Parties had requested that the Committee submit for approval at its third ordinary session draft operational guidelines for the implementation of the Convention and including draft operational guidelines on measures to ensure the visibility and promotion of the Convention. She explained that the Secretariat will add to document 11 draft operational guidelines adopted by the Committee at this session, on Articles 9, 10 and 19 of the Convention.

235. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that the Committee had not agreed on draft operational guidelines governing the use of the emblem, and that as a result this item should not be included.

*Decision 4.IGC 11 was adopted as amended.*

## ITEM 12 – REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND DECISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/12**

236. The **Secretary of the Convention** pointed the Committee's attention to the revisions made to the document, reflecting all of the decisions adopted by the Committee throughout the session.

237. The delegation of **Germany** asked for clarification on paragraph 6 in the Annex, "The main activities were the preparation of ...." and continuing on to "Other matters including", questioning why there was a differentiation made between main issues and other matters because the delegation saw them both at the same level. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained this matter by pointing out that the first group of bullet points necessitated draft operational guidelines, while the second group did not. The delegation of **Germany** stressed that the logic that was explained was not consistent with the chapeau of paragraph 6, which referred to main activities and decisions, with activities covering all of the matters. The delegation of **South Africa**, supported by Kenya, emphasized that the explanation given by the Secretary of the Convention was clear, and that there was no need to collapse all activities under one single heading. The delegation of **Greece** said that the heading in paragraph 6 was incorrect because the Committee had not adopted any

operational guidelines on the use of the Convention's emblem, and therefore suggested replacing the term "decisions" with "deliberations". The delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that even though the Committee had not adopted draft operational guidelines on the use of the emblem, it had prepared them as highlighted in the last part of the sentence "were the preparation of". The delegation of **Bulgaria** suggested adding "as well as such matters as strategy" at the end of "Draft operational guidelines for the implementation..." The **Secretary of the Convention** proposed deleting references made to draft operational guidelines on the use of the emblem since this was not requested by the Conference of Parties, and adding "Other activities" or "Additional activities" "requested by the Conference of Parties to the Committee were" followed by the bullet points as they were. The delegations of Brazil and Saint Lucia supported this proposal.

*Decision 4.IGC 12 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 13 – IMPLEMENTATION AND FOLLOW-UP OF THE CONVENTION BY THE COMMITTEE: CURRENT STATE**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/13**

238. The **Secretary of the Convention** introduced document 13, pointing out that the document was requested during the last Committee meeting. She remarked that it presented an overview of the articles of the Convention for which draft operational guidelines: 1) were approved by the Conference of Parties at its second session; 2) had been adopted by the Committee at this session; and 3) were deemed not necessarily required.

239. The delegation of **Canada** said that the format used to report on progress in the implementation of the Convention had been carefully chosen to permit an overall summary of the situation. Noting that the Conference of Parties had not taken a decision on the articles in the last column of the table annexed to the draft decision, with the exception of Article 12, it suggested that a clearer distinction be drawn in the assessment-information document, to be submitted to the Conference of Parties between articles identified by the Conference of Parties as requiring operational guidelines and those upon which no decision had been taken. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the table that would be presented to the Conference of Parties should take into consideration the proposal just made by Canada. The delegation of **Greece** supported the statements made by Canada and Saint Lucia, stressing that the third column should be made clearer or divided into two. It was puzzled by the expression "to be determined", inasmuch as it was not for the Committee to tell the Conference of Parties that it must determine whether one article or another required operational guidelines, given that it was the Committee's prerogative to take a decision or to leave the matter pending. It suggested that there be a third column showing Article 12 only, while the decision on the remaining articles would be left to the Conference of Parties. The delegation of **Canada** stressed that the draft decision contained in paragraph 4 should be amended by adding "to that end, taking into account the observations made by the Committee". After clarification had been requested by Saint Lucia and Greece, the delegation of **Canada** suggested that there be two main headings in the table, the first for articles on which the Conference of Parties had already decided, and the second for articles on which the Conference of Parties had not decided. Under those two general headings, there would be three columns: (1) articles on which operational guidelines had already been compiled; (2) articles for which guidelines had been requested and on which draft operational guidelines had been compiled; and (3) articles, for example Article 12, on which it had been decided that no operational guidelines would be required.

*Decision 4.IGC 13 was adopted as amended.*

**[Observers]**

240. The representative of the **Parliamentary Assembly of the Francophonie (APF)** said that parliamentarians had noted disparities among countries in the production and distribution of cultural goods and services, and that the implementation of the Convention must help to reduce such disparities. APF considered it vital to introduce preferential treatment for artists and cultural professionals and practitioners from developing countries and for their cultural goods and services. APF had recommended at the most recent Francophonie Summit in Montreux that States and governments contribute 1% of their UNESCO contribution to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and would follow up those recommendations actively. Parliamentarians were still concerned about the risks of interference between the Convention principles and world trade rules, and felt that particular regard should be had to Article 21 when assigning the drafting and adoption of operational guidelines to the Committee. APF had for the time being recommended that Member States from the French-speaking community refrain from making trade liberalization commitments that would affect the field of culture, whether during bilateral or multilateral trade negotiations, and he stressed the importance of referring to the Convention during such negotiations.

**ITEM 14 – DATE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/14**

241. The **Chairperson** turned the Committee's attention to agenda item 14 and invited comments from its members. There were no comments from Committee members on this agenda item.

*Decision 4.IGC 14 was adopted unamended.*

**[Observers]**

242. The delegation of the **United States of America** noted that it would be extremely helpful if the Secretariat could, by the first week of January 2011 post all the dates of forthcoming meetings on the Convention website.

243. Following the joint NGO statement made on Wednesday, 1 December, the representative of **Traditions for Tomorrow** proposed that the experience of the June 2008 exchange session between the Parties and civil society, be repeated. Such an event would strengthen dialogue between them and would be an opportunity for dynamic reflection, in which experts could participate, if necessary. A topic and format are to be determined. He suggested that the session be held in the morning of the first day of the Intergovernmental Committee's fifth ordinary session, and that the NGO-UNESCO Liaison Committee assist, as it had at the June 2008 exchange session.

244. The delegation of **Canada** brought up a point of order namely the fact that 4 December 2011 was a Sunday. The **Chairperson** thanked Canada for its precision and noted on the record that the date of the first day of the Committee's session be changed to 5 December 2011.

**ITEM 15 – ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

**Document CE/10/4.IGC/205/15**

245. The **Chairperson** reminded Committee members that according to the Rules of Procedure, Article 12.1, the mandate of the Bureau would expire at the end of the session and that new members of the Bureau would have to be elected.

246. The delegation of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** said that as China was an outgoing member of the Bureau, the Rules of Procedure should be suspended, in particular Rule 12.1, so that it could again be a member of the Bureau. The **Legal Adviser** said that the Committee might, under Rule 48 of its Rules of Procedure, decide to suspend any rule of procedure by a two-thirds majority. However, if Members did not object to the principle of rotation and agreed to suspend the passage in Rule 12.1, the Bureau could, without any problems, be established on the basis of that proposal. The delegation of **Canada** proposed Mr Zhi Yang from the Chinese delegation as the next Chair of the Committee.

247. The **Chairperson** noted no objections from Committee members to the proposed suspension of the Rules of Procedure. The delegation of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** supported Canada's proposal, stressing that Group IV had never before chaired a Convention body. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** wholeheartedly supported Canada's proposal, clarifying that the Committee was suspending the Rules of Procedure because China was the only candidate for this position. The delegations of **India, Germany, Brazil**, **Cuba and Cameroon** also expressed their support for the nomination of Mr Zhi Yang as the next Chair of the Committee, and Brazil mentioned that it looked forward to having an African country chair the sixth session of the Committee.

248. The delegation of **Cuba** nominated Brazil from Electoral Group III as one of the Vice-Chairpersons for the fifth session of the Committee. The delegation of **Luxembourg** nominated Canada as the Vice-Chairperson for Group I. The delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Chinese delegation for its nomination as the Chair of the next session, and proposed for Group V(a) Cameroon as one of the Vice-Chairs. The delegation of **Albania** also congratulated Mr Yang for his chairmanship, and proposed Bulgaria as Vice-Chair for Group II. The delegation of **Oman** congratulated China for the presidency as well, and nominated Tunisia as a Vice-Chair for Group V(b). The delegation of **South Africa** supported Cameroon's nomination as Vice-Chair.

249. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the Secretariat to recount which groups have already served in the role of Rapporteur so that it could be determined who from the Vice-Chairs should be nominated for this position. The **Representative of the Director-General** said that the office of Rapporteur had been held by Brazil at the Committee's first and second ordinary sessions and at its first extraordinary session, by Senegal at the Committee's second extraordinary and third ordinary sessions, and by Jordan at the fourth ordinary session. The **Chairperson** acknowledged Saint Lucia's nomination of Canada for Rapporteur, and turned to the Canadian delegation to name a person who would serve in that position. The **Chairperson** asked Committee members if they would adopt the decision as it was with the understanding that the final version of the document would include the name of the person Canada would choose to serve as Rapporteur. She noted no objections to this proposal.

250. The **Chairperson** reconvened the session and turned the Committee's attention to the revised decision on item 15 of the agenda, reflecting all of the proposals that had been made thus far including the name of the rapporteur Dominique Levasseur submitted by Canada.

*Decision 4.IGC 15 was adopted as amended.*

**ITEM 16 – OTHER BUSINESS**

251. The **Chairperson** turned the Committee's attention to item 16 of the agenda. The Chairperson then proceeded to introduce a draft decision on her own behalf for the Committee's consideration, asking the Director-General to take measures she deemed appropriate to strengthen the Secretariat staff and seek extrabudgetary funds to enable the Secretariat to meet all of the expectations that were presented at this session and the Conference of Parties.

252. The delegation of **South Africa** supported the draft decision proposed by the Chairperson, and requested that audited financial statements reflecting contributions to the Secretariat also be made available so that a holistic view of the Secretariat's capacity could be conveyed. The delegation also stressed the importance of keeping a certain amount of institutional memory alive in the Secretariat, especially in light of staff turnover. One way to retain this memory, the delegation emphasized, was to invite the Director-General to consider privileging the maintenance of a core staff rather than engaging interns on a short-term basis. The delegation, supported by Greece, further requested that audited financial statements reflect how many Secretariat staff members were supported with Parties' contributions and at what level. The delegation of **Germany** asked South Africa to clarify what it meant by audited financial statements, keeping in mind that UNESCO already had in place internal oversight (IOS) and an External Auditor. The delegation of **South Africa** stressed that the audit needed to reflect exactly how much money was being spent on staff, other fixed costs and supporting LDCs for example, regardless of whether it was prepared internally at UNESCO or externally. The **Legal Adviser** said that, pursuant to paragraph 19 of the Guidelines on the Use of Resources of the Fund, the UNESCO Comptroller was responsible for maintaining the Fund's accounting records and submitting the annual accounts to the UNESCO External Auditor for audit. The automatic audit would be reported to the Committee at the end of the Fund's pilot phase; it would be premature to use the term "financial audit". The delegation of **Brazil** mentioned that it understood South Africa's perspective, but that at this early stage in the life of the Convention this type of action would lead the Committee to micro-manage the work of the Secretariat even though no problems had been identified. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by Albania, stressed that South Africa was not asking for a specific financial audit, instead it wanted a detailed breakdown of how much was being spent on what, as is done procedurally with other UNESCO accounts. The delegation of **Germany** highlighted that the C/5 and the certified report referred to by the Legal Advisor would meet South Africa's request for data and certified reporting; however, "a detailed financial statement including use of personnel resources" could be added to provide a more holistic view on the use of resources on personnel. The delegation of **Albania** proposed editorial change to paragraph 3 as follows: "To enhance the dynamism of the Convention's credibility". The delegation of **Greece** proposed the following rewording: "to ensure the dynamism of the Convention." The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that reference should not be made to dynamism; in view of the work involved in receiving and analysing the quadrennial reports, the Secretariat would no doubt require assistance, as the current staff could not perform all of that work. The **Representative of the Director-General** provided information on the current staff of the Convention Secretariat. Ms Danielle Cliche, appointed in November 2009, was the Convention Secretary; she held a FITOCA post, in other words an extrabudgetary post; Mr Mauro Rosi (P-4) had been transferred within the Division, and had joined the Convention Secretariat in October 2010; Ms Anahit Mynasian, transferred from the Section of Intangible Cultural Heritage, where she had gained experience of another convention, was a language specialist; Ms Arian Hassani had been appointed one month previously on a P-3 FITOCA post that had been opened twice for recruitment and had been the subject of a recommendation in a Committee decision adopted in 2007; Ms Samira Zinini, assistant, whose performance was outstanding, had replaced two GS staff and, owing to her sense of organization and the experience of the 2003 Convention, was currently performing the relevant duties. She paid tribute to Ms Laurence Mayer-Robitaille, an expert on secondment from the French Government until August 2010, and currently paid under the regular programme to finalize preparations for the Committee's session; she had been assisting the secretariat since 2007 and had hoped to join the Convention Secretariat one day. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the representative of the Director-General for the information provided, and again proposed that paragraph 3 be amended to reflect the Secretariat's small staff rather than expatiating on the Convention's dynamism. The delegation of **Albania**, supported by Kenya, proposed the following re-wording and merging of paragraphs 3 and 4: "Bearing in mind that the analysis of quadrennial reports and projects financed by the IFCD will impose an additional workload on an already staff-limited Secretariat". The delegation of **South Africa** supported both

new amendments, but highlighted that as a result personnel costs would be neglected to be mentioned, diminishing the holistic picture related to the Convention. The **Chairperson** stressed that it understood what South Africa wanted to convey by detailing staff costs, however contributions to the Fund did not finance staff, and Committee members wanted an overall perspective of all of the costs associated with the Convention. The delegation of **Germany** remarked that in paragraph 3 the Secretariat was performing tasks that involved more than just "coordination". The delegation of **Canada** suggested that coordination be replaced with managing the process. The delegation of **Germany** proposed replacing "coordination" by "processing". The delegation of **Senegal** suggested that the word "processing" be translated by the French word "suivi".

253. The **Chairperson** remarked that the last paragraph required the Committee's consideration: "Further invites the Director-General to prepare a detailed financial statement, including the use of personnel resources, on the execution of the budget". No objections were raised.

*Decision 4.IGC 16 was adopted as amended.*

**[Observers]**

254. The delegation of the **United States of America** emphasized that in two instances that day proposals adopted by the Committee would imply requests to the General Conference for financing of the Convention, for which the delegation's silence should not be interpreted as assent.

255. A representative of the **International Network for Cultural Diversity and the International Music Council** expressed his wholehearted support for the decision that was just adopted, mentioning that he joined all of the other NGOs in believing that the Convention would achieve its vision if adequately resourced.

256. At the Chairperson's request, the **Rapporteur** summed up the discussions held by the Committee over the session and outlined the decisions that had been adopted.

257. The **Representative of the Director-General** thanked the Committee's Members for their patience, for their determination to have decisions adopted by consensus, and for adopting a decision noting the Secretariat's meagre resources. She paid tribute to the outgoing Members of the Committee, thanking the delegate of Saint Lucia in particular that chaired two Committee sessions.

258. The **Chairperson** thanked Committee members for their contributions, patience and understanding throughout the five-day session. She also thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Francesco Bandarin, Mrs Galia Saouma-Forero, Director of the Division of Cultural Expressions and Creative Industries and Mrs Danielle Cliche, Secretary of the Convention, for their excellent preparation of the meeting and documents and passionate work together with the Secretariat staff. Furthermore, she expressed her gratitude to the interpreters, technical support staff and other UNESCO colleagues who assisted in the organization and execution of the meeting. Finally, she congratulated the newly elected members of the Bureau, including the President and the Rapporteur.

259. The delegation of **Senegal** thanked the Chairperson for her calm, her equanimity and expertise in relation to the Convention. The delegation of **Canada** stressed that the future of the Convention rested, in particular, on the determination and skills of professionals, and congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their excellent work and the grace and democratic spirit with which the session was conducted.

260. The delegation of **China** expressed its honour to have been elected to serve as the next Chair of the Committee, thanking the Committee for its trust and support, and the Asia and Pacific group for

their spirit of consensus. The delegation also congratulated the Chairperson and previous Chairs for their excellent leadership, and noted that it would keep in close contact and communication with members of the Bureau and Committee with the assistance of the Secretariat to ensure the advancement of the implementation of the Convention.

261. The **Chairperson** declared the fourth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions adjourned.