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Lesson plan

Duration:

1 hour 30 min

Objective(s):

Understand what international cooperation and assistance mean in the context of the Convention,[[1]](#footnote-2) what their purposes are and how the related mechanisms function.

Description:

This unit provides an overview of two main topics: 1) international cooperation for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and 2) International Assistance (IA) to States Parties from the Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH Fund).

Proposed sequence:

* International cooperation
* Shared heritage and its safeguarding
* The ICH Fund
* International Assistance
* Timetable and procedures for assistance requests
* Evaluation criteria for assistance requests

The unit may be used as part of a workshop on implementing the Convention, on elaborating nominations or on safeguarding. It may also serve (in expanded form) as the introduction to a workshop dedicated to International Assistance.

Supporting documents:

* Unit 12 Facilitator’s narrative
* Unit 12 PowerPoint presentation
* Unit 12 Participant’s text
* Aide-mémoire for completing International Assistance requests and the Forms for requesting such assistance (available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/forms>)
* Unit 3 Participant’s text: ‘Evaluation Body’, ‘International, regional, subregional, local’, ‘International Assistance’, ‘International cooperation’ and ‘Shared or cross-border heritage’

Notes and suggestions

Facilitators should tailor the exercises in this unit to the needs of participants (or omit them if appropriate).

Facilitators should note that they are under contract with UNESCO to build knowledge and skills that will eventually help States to develop International Assistance requests that are in conformity with established criteria. The purpose of the training workshop is therefore *not* to actually prepare and complete a specific request. The preparation of specific requests is a separate step assumed by States.

It is important to keep in mind that, to prepare a specific request, States can benefit from the provisions of Article 21 (g) of the Convention and ask for technical assistance from UNESCO. They may do so by submitting a brief concept note describing the project for which they seek International Assistance and the Secretariat then arranges for the provision of expertise to assist the State to develop the ideas into a full-fledged request.

Unit 12

International cooperation and assistance

Facilitator’s narrative

###### Slide 1.

International cooperation and assistance

Participant’s text Unit 12 covers this topic.

###### Slide 2.

In this session …

The unit falls into two parts: first is the general topic of international cooperation (including shared heritage and multi-national nominations) and the second is International Assistance (including an introduction to the ICH Fund before turning to the specifics of International Assistance).

###### Slide 3.

International cooperation in the Convention

Participant’s text Unit 12.1 outlines what the Convention means by international cooperation and why it is fundamentally important.

Participants should be encouraged to find the passages quoted in slides 3 and 4 in their own copy of the Convention. When presenting slide 3, you might ask them to discuss the following, which is explained in the Participants’ text: What does the Convention mean by ‘universal will and common concern’ in the Preamble. Is this simply an empty platitude? Or does it express a larger international commitment to the safeguarding of all of the world’s intangible cultural heritage? Why should members of community X (perhaps the country hosting the workshop) be interested in the intangible cultural heritage of other communities or countries?

Among the purposes of the Convention (Article 1), why do we need a Convention to provide for international cooperation? Cannot countries simply cooperate among themselves when they wish, without a Convention? What are the advantages for cooperation that an international treaty such as a Convention creates?

###### Slide 4.

International cooperation in the Convention

When the Convention was being drafted, the initial discussion draft asked the experts whether to borrow language from the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (known as the World Heritage Convention) and refer to ‘the world heritage of mankind as a whole’, or whether to use an alternate formulation, the ‘common heritage of humanity’. Both choices were rejected by the drafters, in favour of the formulation in Article 19.2: ‘the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of general interest to humanity’. You might ask participants to consider what the differences are between saying that ICH is the ‘common heritage of humanity’ and saying that all of humanity has an interest (and an obligation) to safeguard the heritage of all of the world’s communities, groups or individuals. If something is the common property of all, it belongs to everyone and to no one and finally, nobody is responsible for its maintenance and safeguarding. The Convention instead insists that ICH always belongs to its communities (i.e., not to countries, or to humanity as a whole), but that everyone share the responsibility to safeguard it. This subtle but fundamental difference underlies the importance of international cooperation within the Convention.

###### Slide 5.

What is international cooperation?

For each of the three rubrics under Article 19.1, encourage participants to explain what they might imagine the text means. How could two or more countries exchange information and experience? Can they think of a joint safeguarding activity between countries, or an element or situation that invites joint safeguarding? What do they think a ‘mechanism of assistance’ could be? The Participant’s text offers examples of each of the three in section 12.1.

Exchange of information and experience

* Concerning the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices the facilitator may wish to mention one or two examples (see dedicated webpage <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/register>).
* The six-yearly reports to the Committee are mentioned in the Participant’s text as one way of sharing their experiences with others (strengths and challenges). The facilitator may add that in OD 156 States Parties are also requested to include information on the measures they take at the bilateral, subregional, regional and international levels for the implementation of the Convention.

With regard to documentation on an element of intangible cultural heritage present on the territory of another State Party OD 87 encourages the sharing of such documentation. In many countries, for examples, State borders have changed over time, sometimes resulting in a situation where a community previously living on the same State territory, finds itself in two or more different countries. Archived documentation can provide interesting information on the effects of such changes on the transmission of the intangible cultural heritage of the communities concerned. Similarly, situations of occupation and colonization have affected transmission of cultural heritage and archived documentation can provide relevant information for a better understanding of these effects.

 For different contextual reasons, neighbouring countries often share similar expressions, practices or forms of intangible cultural heritage. Research or documentation projects in one country might therefore also provide useful insights for the safeguarding of related heritage in another country. A State may possess practical experience or technical skills and could benefit a neighbouring State or a distant one. This sharing of experience may take different forms, such as conferences, training programmes or scholarships and fellowships.

Joint initiatives

* OD 86 mentions different forms of cooperation and some examples of how States applied these are contained in periodic reports submitted by States Parties and in the thematic analysis of the reports that the Secretariat prepares annually for the Committee. The documents are available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/committee-documents-and-in-depth-studies-00862>.
* OD 88 on regional cooperation refers to category 2 centres for intangible cultural heritage. Facilitators should be aware if the country where the workshop is being held, is served by one or more category 2 centres. The activities may provide illustrations of putting regional cooperation into practice (the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section maintains a website with information on all of the category 2 centres: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Category2/>). Recall, if necessary, that category 2 centres are established and funded by one Member State under the auspices of UNESCO and intended to serve as international or regional centres and poles of expertise or excellence to provide technical assistance and services to other Member States.

A mechanism of assistance

For the purposes of the Convention, international cooperation includes a mechanism of assistance to States Parties in their efforts to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage. This assistance is financially supported by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and can serve different purposes and take different forms, which are further explained below (see next slides).
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Why international cooperation?

The Preamble and Article 1 of the Convention take for granted that international cooperation is a good thing. If you’ve already discussed this topic, you might review this slide quickly, touching upon both the aspirational arguments (contribute to peace and understanding, foster solidarity) and the practical ones (this is a new field and all of us can learn from one another so that our work can be more efficient and effective). If you think these points need reinforcing, you could ask participants to suggest examples or situations from their own experience or their own imaginations.

###### Slide 7.

Shared intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding

Participant’s text Unit 12.2 discusses what is meant by shared heritage and why the Convention encourages international cooperation to safeguard it. It continues with a specific discussion of how shared heritage is treated in the case of nominations to the USL or RL. Depending where this unit falls in a workshop, you may wish to give greater emphasis to this topic. Be careful, however, not to reduce the topic of shared heritage to the problem of multi-national nominations – it is a vast topic that concerns every aspect of implementing the Convention, from inventorying to safeguarding.

Note on the different ways that ICH can become shared across international borders

* Migration provides the background for many cases of shared ICH.

There are thousands of examples of this. Large numbers of Kurds living in the Netherlands celebrate Novruz, the traditional New Year festivities of many peoples living between Turkey and India (inscribed on the RL in 2010, at the request of Azerbaijan, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Turkey and Uzbekistan). Large numbers of people from Pacific Island States have settled in New Zealand and actively continue practising their ICH there; the same is true of Sikh communities in the UK, Canada, the USA, Malaysia and elsewhere. Peking opera is also performed in New York by immigrants from China.

* Nomadic or transhumant groups often enact their ICH in different States; rituals may even start in one State and continue in another. Some pilgrimages also involve border crossing. One example are the Tuareg in Burkina Faso, Niger, Mali, Algeria and Libya.
* ICH can also spread from one community to another, through contact between people, and thus become internationally shared heritage.

The Tango, which was inscribed on the RL at the request of Argentina and Uruguay, is hugely popular in Japan and has long been incorporated into European ballroom dance. East Asian martial sports have spread over the globe.

* There are few State borders that do not split up communities.

Mongolians live on both sides of the Mongolian-Chinese border and their Urtiin Duu – Traditional Folk Long Song – is enacted on both sides; it was included in the RL in 2008 as shared heritage.

###### Slide 8.

Shared intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding (questions)

This slide poses a number of problems or questions that arise when we begin to think about shared heritage. Encourage participants to discuss them, topic by topic. The following points may help you frame the topic or guide the discussion. In the discussion, try to keep the focus on shared heritage and safeguarding in general, rather than leaping into the subject of nominations to the USL or RL – that will come with the next slide.

The questions could either be discussed by the workshop as a whole or in smaller groups, reporting back at the conclusion.

* Examples from your own experience?

Ask participants to identify heritage that they know of that is found in communities in their own country and a neighbouring (or far distant) country. Do they recall encountering ‘their’ heritage in unexpected places (for instance, when traveling) and how did that make them feel? Have they been surprised to see others practising ICH that they assumed to be their own? What sentiments of solidarity or shared humanity are provoked by such experiences?

* The same heritage, or similar?

What does it mean to say that the ‘same’ heritage is practised in different places? If people speaking a different language (or another dialect of the same language) call that heritage something different than ‘we’ do, is it the same? If each locality or group puts its own mark on a form of ICH, how can we decide it is one and the same? And who decides: the communities concerned or outside experts and officials? When would it be better to speak of ‘similar’ elements, rather than the ‘same’ element?

* A single community, or several?

If a community is defined by its ICH (‘we are the people who do X’ or ‘we are the people who enjoy Y’), does that mean that people far away who practise the same element are part of the same community? If people sharing a single cultural identity have been separated for years or even centuries by a political border, would we still consider them a single community? What if they no longer speak the same language, yet still practise much of the same ICH?

* How to cooperate in safeguarding?

How would participants imagine cooperation with a neighbouring country to safeguard a particular expression or practice? What obstacles might arise to such cooperation? What measures could help to surmount or avoid those obstacles?

* Why does competition arise?

As much as the Convention insists that shared ICH should stimulate cooperation, we know of many examples where it instead promotes competition. Encourage participants to consider why this seems to happen despite everyone’s best intentions. Could it be that a little competition is a good thing, but too much is bad? Can they suggest how to reduce competition or avoid misusing the Convention to gain advantage over others?

Some frequently asked questions about shared heritage (see also the next slide)

1. Can the ICH of immigrant communities (or that of nomadic or stateless people) be inventoried or nominated by the State Party where they have recently moved?

**Answer:** Yes, as long as the ICH is enacted on the territory of the State Party and it fulfils the definition of ICH in the Convention. Indeed, each State Party is obliged to safeguard the heritage present on its territory, regardless of who practises it, whether or not they are citizens, or how long they or their ancestors have resided in the country.

1. Can the ICH of geographically dispersed communities be inventoried by a State Party? What approaches can be used for identifying and inventorying ICH of communities that live non-contiguously within the borders of one and the same State?

**Answer:** If the community(ies) in question live(s) within the borders of one and the same State Party, the answer should be positive, on condition that they agree to be identified as one community and identify their ICH, considered for inventorying, as being very similar. Without their consent and involvement concrete steps towards the inclusion of their ICH in an inventory should not be taken. The situation is totally different when groups feel they belong to one community and have much of their ICH in common, while living in different States (contiguously or not). In that case, international cooperation should be recommended. If a State does not want such cooperation, then the inventory entries that will be produced should concentrate on the situation within that single state, and not make any claims about communities or their ICH present in other States.  States Parties are obliged to ensure that eventually the ICH of all communities and groups living permanently within their borders (including immigrant groups) be included in inventories of ICH, though not without the consent of the communities and groups concerned.

1. What options are available for communities or groups who live in States Parties to the Convention that refuse or do not intend to inventory their ICH?

**Answer:** States Parties are obliged to see to it that all ICH present in their territory eventually will be included in an inventory of ICH, which may take a long time, as, for instance, the exercise initially may have a limited scope, and a slow pace – or because the number of elements is huge. Inventories should, however, be inclusive and there should be no criteria or policies that exclude the ICH of specific communities and groups from inventorying for the purposes of the Convention.

If communities, groups or individuals, whether or not assisted by NGOs, repeatedly fail in their efforts to see one or several elements of their ICH included in an inventory at the national level,

(a) They should start collecting data and drafting inventory entries themselves;

(b) They should try to find support in Parliament or by other legal means;

(c) They may address themselves to the Intergovernmental Committee to ask for attention for their case, preferably in the year preceding the first-following examination by the Committee of a periodic report of the State Party concerned.

However, nominations are a different matter: no State Party is obliged to nominate any element for inscription on the USL or RL – it is the right of the States Parties to select elements to be nominated at the international level. OD 32 offers though a possibility for the cases of extreme urgency to be brought to the attention of the Bureau of the Committee by communities concerned, advisory organizations as well as any other State Party.

1. How can endangered ICH be safeguarded if the State Party concerned does not recognize it?

**Answer:** According to the Convention, it is communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit intangible cultural heritage. The communities concerned and those able to assist them (including NGOs) can undertake safeguarding, even if the State Party does not. Moreover, in cases of extreme urgency (see OD 32), parties other than the State Party may bring an element to the attention of the Bureau.

1. Can the same or very similar elements be inventoried or nominated by several States independently?

**Answer:** Yes, as long as the ICH is practised on the respective territories of the States Parties inventorying or nominating the element.
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Shared ICH and multi-national nominations

Please see Participant’s text 12.2 for key points to support the slide:

Facilitators may want to explain that a multi-national nomination requires that all of the communities concerned recognize a unified element and consider that it provides them all a *shared* sense of identity and continuity. The free, prior and informed consent submitted as part of a nomination should clearly indicate that all of those consenting were fully informed about the multi-national nature of the nomination and understand which other communities and States are included.

Expressions or practices that appear similar may have vastly different meanings from one group to another. Yes, people in different countries observe a particular calendrical holiday, but they may do so in ways that have nothing in common. Yes, people in different countries may practise similar expressions, but there may be nothing binding them together as a single element with which a single large community or group identifies. Almost every human society practises weaving, but would we want to see ‘weaving’ inscribed as a multi-national nomination with a hundred participating States? And the members of the different communities may not recognize one another as sharing a common element: ‘we do X and they do Y, and only someone who is ignorant would confuse the two’.

The Convention’s larger goal of raising awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage should not invite States Parties to invent artificial elements that may share a superficial resemblance but are not a single shared phenomenon, practised by and important to a single community.

Some frequently asked questions about multi-national nominations (see also the previous slide)

1. Does one State Party have the power of veto over a nomination by other States?

**Answer:** No, but it may express its concerns about how a nomination file is formulated or whether the element satisfies the relevant criteria for inscription. The Committee has instituted a formal procedure to guide the Secretariat’s treatment of concerns that are raised in correspondence. If they are raised in a timely manner before inscription they are brought to the attention of the evaluators and Committee, together with any response of the submitting State. If the concerns arrive later (or after inscription), they are brought to the attention of the submitting State.

1. When a single State Party submits a nomination for an element shared with its neighbours, how much information should the nomination include on the ICH practised outside the State nominating it?

**Answer:** Most information in the file should pertain to the ICH as it is practised within the State nominating it, but some context should be provided on related practices outside the State. In so doing, States Parties should take care not to characterize or judge the safeguarding practices of other States.

1. Are State Parties obliged to make multi-national nominations for shared heritage?

**Answer:** No, but in cases where the heritage is shared, they are encouraged to do so (OD 13). If a shared element has already been inscribed on one of the Lists of the Convention, the original State together with other States Parties may apply to extend the nomination (ODs 16-19) to include the ICH practised on their territories – if all the stakeholders agree.

1. Would communities in one State Party ever refuse to join a multi-national nomination with those in another State Party?

**Answer:** Communities may have many reasons to prefer not to be part of a multi-national nomination, whether it is because they wish to have an element inscribed in their own name, because they are unconvinced that the expressions practised by other communities are ‘the same’ as their own, or for other reasons. In any case, the free, prior and informed consent of ALL of the communities concerned is mandatory for all nominations, including multi-national nominations.

###### Slide 10.

ICH Fund

Participant’s text Unit 12.3 provides a brief description of the Fund and can be used to explain the bullet points on the slide. Funds began accumulating in 2006 when the Convention went into force, but requests for International Assistance have been slow in coming. In many instances, the low rate of submission of International Assistance requests was due to the lack of States’ capacities to prepare such requests, as well we to the fact that States wishing to use the Fund to supplement their national efforts for safeguarding often had to choose between submitting a request and a nomination to the Convention’s List or a proposal for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. As a result, the Fund has a large fund balance at the end of each biennium. A large fund balance is unfortunate because we know that great need exists. The global capacity-building programme aims to increase the use of the Fund by giving States Parties the skills to implement the Convention. Moreover, the General Assembly in 2016 decided to address the issue of low rate of submission of International Assistance requests by raising the ceiling for the ones that can be examined by the Bureau (see Participant’s text Unit 12.5) from US$25,000 to US$100,000, so that more requests could be processed at any time throughout the year (for more information, see Participant’s text Unit 11.11).

Note on planning for the use of the Fund

At every ordinary session of the General Assembly, the Committee presents a plan for the use of the ICH Fund for a two-year period. As provided in OD 66, the General Assembly has devoted more than half of every budget to International Assistance, but this allocation has never been fully used.
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Purposes of International Assistance

See Participant’s text Unit 12.4. The purposes of International Assistance shown on the slide are set out in the Convention (Article 20); they are echoed in the Operational Directives (OD 9). But note the small difference in the last purpose:

Article 20(d): ‘any other purpose the Committee may deem necessary’

OD 9(d): ‘preparatory assistance’

This means that the ODs adopted by the General Assembly are slightly more restrictive than the Convention. For now, the only ‘other purpose’ for which International Assistance may be used is to prepare nominations to the USL and proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (OD 21).

Slide 18 will cover preparatory assistance. Please note that it is not available for preparing nominations to the RL: the Committee and General Assembly agreed that it should be limited to the Register (as set out in Article 18.2 of the Convention) and to the USL, which they deemed more central than the RL to the Convention’s overall goal of safeguarding ICH.

###### Slide 12.

Forms of International Assistance

The forms of International Assistance shown on slide 12 are found in Article 21 of the Convention. According to the ODs, ‘The Committee may receive, examine and approve requests for any purpose and for any form of International Assistance mentioned in Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention respectively, depending on the available resources’ (OD 9). In most cases, a State Party requests financial assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund that it will then use to acquire goods and services in the forms set out in the Convention.

 Article 21: Forms of International Assistance

The different forms that assistance can take are specified in Article 21:

(a) Studies concerning various aspects of safeguarding.

Article 13 says that States Parties should try to ‘foster scientific, technical and artistic studies, as well as research methodologies, with a view to effective safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’.

(b) The provision of experts and practitioners.

ODs 86-88 encourage States Parties to promote international and regional cooperation involving ‘communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals as well as experts, centres of expertise and research institutes’: for example, to share safeguarding ideas and documentation. Experts and practitioners who are involved in the preparation of nomination files and safeguarding measures may also have to be paid for their services.

 (c) The training of all necessary staff.

Article 14 refers to the need for States Parties to undertake ‘capacity-building activities for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular management and scientific research’.

(d) The elaboration of standard-setting and other measures.

Article 13 asks States Parties to try to ‘adopt a general policy aimed at promoting the function of the intangible cultural heritage in society, and at integrating the safeguarding of such heritage into planning programmes’. The ODs encourage States Parties to ‘promote policies for the public recognition of bearers and practitioners of intangible cultural heritage’ and ‘support the development and implementation of local policies aiming at promoting awareness of intangible cultural heritage’ (OD 105). Some of the possible aims of policies developed by States Parties are detailed in OD 107.

(e) The creation and operation of infrastructures.

Article 13 refers to ‘institutions for training in the management of the intangible cultural heritage’ and to ‘documentation institutions for the intangible cultural heritage’. The ODs encourage States Parties to ‘create a consultative body or a coordination mechanism to facilitate the participation of communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals, as well as experts, centres of expertise and research institutes’ (OD 80), as well as networks of these stakeholders (OD 86­).

(f) The supply of equipment and know-how.

(g) Other forms of financial and technical assistance, including the granting of low-interest loans and donations.

Most assistance granted by the Committee to date constitutes financial assistance, in the sense of (g), although it is then used by the State to acquire the specific services or goods described in (a) through (f). But a State Party may also wish to receive direct assistance, in the forms described above, rather than receiving funds that it would itself manage and spend (see Participant’s text).
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Requesting International Assistance

Participant’s text Unit 12.5 provides a succinct overview of the different types or categories of International Assistance, the forms corresponding to each category, the procedures and timetable for submission and evaluation, and the question of appropriate expenses.

Form ICH-04 is the form most commonly used to request assistance and covers safeguarding projects regardless of their size, as well as emergency requests. The evaluation and examination procedures are different for different categories (see slide 14), but insofar as the requesting State Party is concerned, the type and amount of information required in the form are the same.

The ICH-01bis form permits a State Party to nominate an element for inscription on the USL and simultaneously to request International Assistance for the safeguarding plan included in the nomination. Previously, many USL nominations failed because the State Party could not demonstrate that the safeguarding plan proposed was feasible – usually because they could not identify funds to implement it. The combined form seeks to remove this obstacle.

Forms ICH-05 and ICH-06 are used to request preparatory assistance (these will be covered in slide 18).
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Requesting International Assistance

Participant’s text Unit 12.5 explains the timetables for the submission of assistance requests as well as the procedure for evaluation and examination.

ODs 47-51 explain the different deadlines and which bodies are responsible for evaluating and examining requests of different categories.

OD 49: Bureau of the Committee examines requests up to US$100,000 (including preparatory assistance).

OD 50: Bureau also examines emergency requests, regardless of the amount; this directive provides a definition of such emergencies.

OD 51: Requests greater than US$100,000 are first evaluated by the Evaluation Body, which offers its recommendations to the Committee, which then examines the requests and decides whether or not to grant assistance.

ODs 54-56 detail the timetable for International Assistance greater than US$100,000; relevant sections are summarized below, and annotated. The entire process for such requests takes 18-20 months; processing for requests up to US$100,000 and emergency requests may be completed in as few as six months, but may take longer if the original request requires substantial revision along the way.
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Criteria for granting International Assistance

See Participant’s text Unit 12.6. This slide makes two essential points: a) the decisions about granting International Assistance are based on seven criteria in OD 12 (A.1 through A.7) as well as several additional considerations (OD 10), and b) the Committee or Bureau may give greater weight to certain criteria and less to others, as circumstances demand.

These criteria and considerations for granting International Assistance function differently than those for inscription on the USL or RL. The inscription criteria are all mandatory: a nomination that fails to demonstrate that each and every criterion is satisfied cannot be inscribed. However, for International Assistance the Evaluation Body, Bureau and Committee may determine that a particular criterion does not apply directly, or that the overall strength of the request outweighs any small weaknesses. This does not mean that any criterion is purely optional – the Committee is obliged to take them all into account, even if it may weigh different criteria differently from one situation to another. Several of the criteria reiterate conditions set out in the Convention itself such as the requirement for cost-sharing, and the Committee may not simply waive it.

###### Slide 16.

Criteria for granting International Assistance (OD 12)

This slide summarizes the seven criteria set out in OD 12. Encourage participants to read the exact language of each criterion from the ODs, rather than the short summary on screen. The discussion there is organized by each section of the request form, rather than criterion-by-criterion.

The nomination forms for the USL (ICH-01) and RL (ICH-02) are organized so that each section of the form focusses on one of the inscription criteria. For the International Assistance request form (ICH-04), a single section may correspond to multiple criteria, and a single criterion may be demonstrated in one or several sections (for instance, criterion A.3 is treated in ten different sections). For more information, please see the exercise at slide 19.

Criterion A.1 is treated in a single section (18), but it figures as the first criterion and evaluators have emphasized that it is essential and obligatory for all requests. Criterion A.2 is also treated largely within a single section (17, budget), but the question of whether the amount requested is appropriate depends on the quality and feasibility of the activities. Criterion A.3 is obviously of the highest importance, and evidence to demonstrate whether it is satisfied is found within many sections of the form. Since criterion A.5 rephrases the language of the Convention (Article 24.2), it is also a mandatory criterion; criterion A.7 relates to UNESCO’s Financial Regulations that prohibit entering into a contract with a partner in default of a previous contract. The optional exercise at slide 19 asks participants to examine the ICH-04 request form and try to decide (for sections 9-24) which criterion or criteria are relevant to each section.

###### Slide 17.

Criteria for granting International Assistance (OD 10)

This slide presents the additional considerations in OD 10 that the Committee is also to take into account, beyond the seven criteria: 1) the principle of equitable geographic distribution and 2) the special needs of developing countries. In addition, the Committee *may* take into account whether the request involves international cooperation (OD 10(a)) or whether the assistance might unlock other funds, now or in the future (OD 10(b)). Neither of these is obligatory (a project to be implemented purely at the national or sub-national level is perfectly appropriate for International Assistance, for example) but if a request is particularly strong on one or both of these considerations, it might counterbalance a weakness with regard to one of the other criteria.

###### Slide 18.

Preparatory assistance

See Participant’s text Unit 12.7. The session concludes with a brief discussion of preparatory assistance to help a State Party to elaborate a nomination to the USL (ICH-05) or a proposal to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (ICH-06). Such preparatory assistance requests have their own forms, their own timetable and their own logic: the Bureau of the Committee necessarily applies the criteria for granting International Assistance flexibly because several of the criteria are not at all relevant. Participants should be informed that it can be a very important opportunity for a State Party to receive modest funds to support the preparation of a nomination or proposal.

The ODs do not make preparatory assistance available for nominations to the RL. Several arguments were offered in the Committee and General Assembly to focus such assistance on the USL: if an element is indeed in need of urgent safeguarding, a State Party should not be barred from nominating it because of a lack of financial resources for preparing the nomination. Given that the Convention’s primary purpose is safeguarding, experts agreed, priority should be given to the USL. Although an inscription on the RL may also have a positive impact on an element and its community, the experts agreed, there is no necessity that an element be inscribed, and if its funds are limited a State Party should perhaps prioritize things other than inscriptions when implementing the Convention.

###### Slide 19.

Criteria and the ICH-04 form

Exercise (30 mins): the ICH-04 request form

If time permits and participants are interested, they could now be given the opportunity to read and discuss the ICH-04 form for International Assistance. This is an appropriate exercise in cases where participants have specific questions about submitting a request. They should be encouraged to read the detailed instructions offered in each section, and to consider them in the light of the discussion that preceded. One way of approaching the topic would be to ask them to proceed, section-by-section, to identify which criterion or criteria are relevant to which section (you could refer to the table below to guide their responses). The Aide-mémoire also has discussions of each section that you could use as a reference if questions arise.

| **Section** | **Section topic** | **Relevant criteria or additional considerations** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 9 | Scope of the project | 10 (a) |
| 10 | Location of the project | 10 |
| 11 | Purpose of request | A.3 |
| 12 | Forms of assistance requested | A.3 |
| 13 | Background and rationale | A.3 |
| 14 | Objectives and expected results | A.3 |
| 15 | Activities | A.2, A.3, A.4, A.6 |
| 16 | Timetable of the project | A.3 |
| 17 | Budget | A.2, A.3, A.5 |
| 18 | Community involvement | A.1 |
| 19 | Implementing organization and strategy | A.3 |
| 20 | Partners | A.3, 10(a), 10(b) |
| 21 | Monitoring, reporting and evaluation | A.3 |
| 22 | Capacity-building | A.6 |
| 23 | Sustainability  | A.4 |
| 24 | Multiplier effects | 10(b) |

1. Frequently referred to as the Intangible Heritage Convention and, for the purpose of this Unit, simply the Convention. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)