**Overview and rationale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | 1. **Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of ICH**
 |
| **Assessment factors** | This indicator is assessed on the basis of five country-level factors monitored and reported by each State Party: |
| * 1. One or more competent bodies for ICH safeguarding have been designated or established.
 | Article 13(b)OD 154(a) |
| * 1. Competent bodies exist for safeguarding specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed.
 | Article 13(b)OD 158(a), OD 162(d) |
| * 1. Broad and inclusive involvement in ICH safeguarding and management, particularly by the communities, groups and individuals concerned, is fostered through consultative bodies or other coordination mechanisms.
 | OD 80 |
| * 1. Institutions, organizations and/or initiatives for ICH documentation are fostered, and their materials are utilized to support continued practice and transmission of ICH.
 | Article 13(d)(iii) |
| * 1. Cultural centres, centres of expertise, research institutions, museums, archives, libraries, etc., contribute to ICH safeguarding and management.
 | OD 79,OD 109 |
| **Relation with SDGs and other indicators** | **Sustainable Development Goals:** This indicator responds as a whole to SDG Target 11.4, ‘strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage.’ By encouraging formal bodies or mechanisms to coordinate broad public participation in safeguarding, Assessment Factor 1.3 also complements SDG Target 16.6, which aims to ‘Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels,’ as well as Target 16.7, which aims to ‘ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.’**Relation to other indicators:** This indicator focuses on institutional capacities, while Indicator 2 focuses on human capacities. The bodies and institutions covered here are typically governmental entities or established with government support, while the complementary activities of NGOs, community associations, and private sector entities are addressed in Indicator 21. Activities and findings of research and documentation are discussed under Indicators 9 and 10, while here the focus is on the institutions as such. The involvement of research institutions and centres of expertise in monitoring figures into Indicator 22, while international networking among such institutions and centres is addressed by Indicator 25.  |
| **Rationale for action** | Article 13(b) outlines the State Party’s responsibility to establish or designate one or more competent bodies that can safeguard ICH. In the Convention, such an institutional infrastructure is understood as a precondition for effective safeguarding, and in many countries such bodies are assigned specific responsibilities for implementing the Convention at the national level. Because the Convention puts communities, groups and individuals at the centre of safeguarding and foresees the participation of many other actors, States often find it useful to establish additional bodies or mechanisms to coordinate such involvement. Safeguarding bodies or institutions also include cultural centres, centres of expertise, museums, archives, libraries and other research institutions that may have a role in documenting ICH (Article 13(d) (iii)) as well as a wider role in safeguarding and managing ICH. |
| **Key terms** | * Competent bodies
* Elements of ICH
* Inscribed (whether or not inscribed)
* Inclusive/inclusively
* Participation or involvement
* Communities, groups or, in some cases, individuals
* Consultative body or coordination mechanism
* Centres of expertise
* Research institutions
 |

**Specific guidance on monitoring and periodic reporting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Benefits of monitoring** | Monitoring this indicator can provide a State Party with a map of the institutions active in the field of ICH and help identify and address institutional gaps or weaknesses. It can also help to assess whether existing competent bodies for ICH safeguarding are effectively mobilizing and synchronizing the safeguarding efforts of other actors. At the global level, monitoring can give an overview of the institutional infrastructure for ICH safeguarding and can offer examples of coordination mechanisms that have proven their effectiveness. |
| **Data sources and collection** | In many cases, the office responsible for monitoring and reporting is designated at the national level as the competent body for safeguarding ICH and coordinating implementation of the 2003 Convention and, as such, it is likely that it has access to existing information on the primary bodies, institutions and mechanisms referred to here. Other State bodies and national organizations will likely be among its frequent collaborators and partners, including those in sectors other than culture. It will also be important to take account of provincial and local bodies and institutions, and this may require ongoing networking. Particularly in the case of Assessment Factor 1.2 and competent bodies for safeguarding specific elements of ICH, the State Party may need to conduct regular surveys to monitor what is happening at local levels. If there is an effective consultative body or coordination mechanism, such multi-level monitoring will be more efficient.**Possible data sources*** Official gazettes/journals or compendia of laws and legal regulations
* Annual budgets, work plans, and reports of government cultural offices and heritage institutions
* Annual reports or minutes of national-level consultative bodies
* Periodic reporting to the State concerning elements inscribed on a national list or on either of the UNESCO lists
* Websites and directories of cultural offices and heritage institutions
 |