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Lesson Plan

DURATION

3 hours 40 minutes

Objectives:

Familiarize participants with the methodology that they need to involve the various stakeholders and other actors to consult with during the process of gathering data. Remind participants of the participatory approach embedded in the Convention and reinforced in the ODs and raise their awareness of the different degrees of participation that may exist in ‘participatory’ approaches and of the strengths and weaknesses of various methodologies that may be used.

Description:

This unit begins with a presentation of the various approaches taken for participation, drawing from experience in areas such as development and environmental protection, as well as from the implementation of the Convention. Some case studies of participatory approaches are used as the basis for discussion. A role-play helps to highlight good and less good practices with regard to multi-stakeholder consultations and a multi-sectoral approach. Exercises based on periodic report preparation undertaken individually or through group work allow for more direct consideration of the issues involved in organizing processes of drafting and validation with multiple stakeholders.

SEQUENCE OF SESSIONS:

**Session 1: Methodological approaches (60 minutes):** Different methodological approaches for conducting multi-stakeholder consultations and the use of diverse information sources are presented and considered. This involves a facilitator-driven presentation and a role-play.

**Session 2: Ensuring an inter-sectoral and inclusive approach (2 hours):** The challenges involved in ensuring real participation across different sectors of government and policy are considered, and ways of overcoming these identified. This requires a localized approach and will involve participants considering through an individual exercise which approaches could work in their country/regional context and share and evaluate these in plenary. The challenges of ensuring an inclusive approach will be raised and analysed through the use of a ‘moral dilemma’ inspired by Unit 38 on ethics.

**Session 3: How to organize the drafting and validation process (40 minutes):** This is a hands-on session in which the ideas, challenges and solutions identified in the previous two sessions are put into practice in the context of the ICH-10 form. Participants work in groups on different sections of the form, using other groups as their ‘stakeholders’ for consultation and validation purposes in a mini role-play scenario. The experience and its challenges as well as more effective strategies are shared in plenary and discussed.

Supporting documents:

* Facilitator’s notes Unit 60
* PowerPoint presentation Unit 60
* Participant’s text Unit 60
* Handout 1 Unit 60
* *Optional*: Case study 60 Cross-sectoral Cooperation and NGO Involvement (Brasil)
* *Optional:* Case study 61 Reporting under UNESCO’s 2005 Convention
* *Optional:* Case study 62 Culture for Development Indicator Suite
* Guidance notes per indicator for the overall results framework. Available from: https://ich.unesco.org/en/overall-results-framework-00984#guidance-notes-by-indicators
* Excerpts from the ICH-10 form.
* UNESCO. *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (referred to in this unit as Basic Texts). Paris, UNESCO. Available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00503>.

Facilitator’s Narrative

**Session 1: Methodological Approaches

***Estimated time: 60 minutes***

This session picks up from the final exercise in Unit 59 and looks at the role that focal points play in each country for the periodic reporting process and the relative roles of various other actors (non-governmental organizations, other civil society actors, community members and associations, governmental bodies, scientific experts and institutions, etc.).

An important issue is how the process can be as participatory as possible. Here, then, the different possible methodologies available for engaging with the multiple stakeholders that need to be involved in the data gathering and reporting process are considered.

The principle of community participation (allied with that of sustainable development) is given prominence in the Convention and the ODs. Article 15 of the Convention encourages each State Party to endeavour ‘to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit intangible cultural heritage, and to involve them actively in its management.’ Community participation is considered essential to ensure that safeguarding activities lead to the expected outcomes, most importantly to the future sustainability of the heritage and its communities.

The ODs require community involvement in the preparation of files for inscription on the Representative List, Urgent Safeguarding List and Register of Good Safeguarding Practices lists of the Convention. They also require States Parties, in their periodic reporting on RL inscribed elements, to demonstrate how communities (groups and individuals) have been involved in the safeguarding of these. In addition, the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage are even more explicit on the need for community participation and consent (as we see below at Slide 7).

Since 2015, an effort has been made to ensure that as wide a range as possible of the Convention’s stakeholders develop capacities for safeguarding actions, including the periodic reporting process.[[1]](#footnote-1) Indeed, States Parties are now encouraged ‘to engage in multi-stakeholder consultations in the preparation of their reports and to continue their efforts in including in their periodic reports information provided by relevant non-governmental organizations, research institutes and centres of expertise’ ([Decision 10.COM 6.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.a)). This is another means by which through a diversity of perspectives in the on-going monitoring and reporting of expected results can be promoted.

Non-governmental organizations can obviously play a significant role in advising States Parties (including at the international level) and can be very helpful in supporting the periodic reporting process. Currently, 176 non-governmental organizations have been accredited under the Convention to act in an advisory capacity to the Committee (Article 9 of the Convention). In requesting accreditation, non-governmental organizations have to provide information on ‘activities in the field of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’ and ‘experiences in cooperating with communities, groups and intangible cultural heritage practitioners’ (OD 97). Furthermore, every four years following accreditation of an NGO, the Committee reviews the contribution and the commitment of the advisory organization and its relations with it, taking into account the perspective of the NGO concerned (OD 94).

SLIDE 2

Different interests, roles and areas of expertise:

When presenting this slide, it is important for the facilitator to encourage discussion as to the different interests and roles of the various actors and stakeholders presented. Participants should be asked to suggest additional actors for the empty box, explaining what role they may play in the periodic reporting process or in ICH safeguarding more generally. An important point to stress is that the early engagement of as many such bodies and persons in the process of identifying and safeguarding ICH will allow for the building of formal and informal relationships that can be essential to successful periodic reporting. It is therefore important to consider how this can be done for periodic reporting under the Convention.

SLIDE 3

Community participation is encouraged in …

Community participation is encouraged by the Convention in the following implementing actions. The sources (Convention text, ODs, Ethical Principles, other) are shown in brackets.

* Identifying and defining ICH (Article 11(b))
* Inventorying (Articles 12 and 15)
* Awareness raising (Articles 14 and 15)
* Capacity building (Articles 14 and 15)
* Safeguarding, management (Article 15)
* Nominations (ODs 1, 2 and 7; forms)
* International assistance requests (OD 12)
* Periodic reporting (ODs 157 and 160)

SLIDE 4

Not just communities …

It is important to emphasize that a number of other non-state actors are increasingly seen as having potentially pivotal roles to play in implementing the Convention, and so on reporting on its implementation. Those mentioned in the ODs are presented in this slide. Of course, these are not the only people and/or institutions that can be useful to the reporting process and States Parties should attempt to be as inclusive as possible in this.

SLIDE 5

What the Ethical Principles say:

However, as neither the Convention nor the ODs provide specific guidance on *how* to identify communities or how to ensure their participation, we need to develop appropriate methods and approaches for engaging in multi-stakeholder consultation and collaboration in periodic reporting. It is important to stress that a ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach is not possible, but we can identify some fundamental principles to guide States Parties.

The Ethical Principles provide a useful basis for this. Although the Ethical Principles restrict their focus to the ‘communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals’ related to ICH, it is possible to extrapolate from these an injunction for participation by a broader range of non-governmental actors. In particular, these provide an important focus on the quality of the safeguarding process, which can also be applied in the periodic reporting process. For example, the notion of ‘transparent collaboration, dialogue, negotiation and consultation’ can be seen as applicable in periodic reporting. At the same time, if States Parties put these principles into practice, this will feed into their responses to the periodic reporting form, as in the case of Principle 4 and most directly in Principle 9.

When introducing this slide, the facilitator should explain that there are 12 Ethical Principles, and that they are included in the Basic Texts. They should be encouraged to read all of these as they are relevant to different aspects of periodic reporting.

SLIDE 6

Exercise (30 minutes):

***Learning objective***: To focus the participants on the importance of a participatory process for filling out the periodic reporting form and how they can manage this at the national level.

The facilitator should ask participants to consider in some detail how they think that this process can be managed at the national level, taking into account the specific context of their own country.

With the help of one of the participants, the facilitator can gather suggestions from participants on a white board or flipchart. If it is possible, they can try to order these under different headings. Once a number of such ideas have been written down, the participants can assess the merits of different approaches and try to identify a ‘model’ that might be applicable at the regional level. It may be the case that a very general model can be identified, but that national specificities also need to be taken into account.

The facilitator may wish to refer to the optional **Case Study 62** on the implementation of the Cultural Development Indicator Suite (CDIS) of UNESCO, emphasizing how it is built around a National Leading Partner (usually the Ministry of Culture) which is required to involve a range of other governmental and non-governmental partners. This is obviously a much better-resourced operation than the focal points can hope to have at their disposal, but it does illustrate a number of issues.

Following this, the facilitator can ask the participants to reflect on why it is necessary to have a participatory process for periodic reporting. To help the discussion, the facilitator may wish to note the following points:

* A participatory process is important as governmental bodies may not be aware of all the data available from non-governmental sectors.
* A participatory process is essential for checking the accuracy of data provided by governmental agencies.
* It allows for clarification relating to the data collected.
* It can help to ensure transparency of the process of data gathering.
* It allows for key priorities, problems, achievements and future challenges to be more easily identified.
* Structured dialogue with other stakeholders is reinforced and it avoids only consulting the most influential groups.
* A wider range of good practices can be identified and innovative approaches/examples identified through information sharing for the report.
* Better and longer-lasting cooperative frameworks can be developed that will feed into future safeguarding activities.

SLIDE 7

Why is a participatory process important?

It is important to stress here that the *quality of the process* is generally more important than the end product, although the value it brings to periodic reporting as a ‘product’ cannot be ignored either.

SLIDE 8

‘Participation’ takes many forms:

It is very important that we share a common understanding as to what we mean by ‘participation’ in this context. As one of the key words in areas such as development and environmental protection, as well as ICH safeguarding, ‘participation’ is used by many actors from very different political and socio-cultural backgrounds. A lack of conceptual clarity and common understanding of the term poses the risk that a ‘participatory’ process is anything but. For example, in local politics, ‘participation’ can be used to mask the legitimizing of interventions driven by more powerful actors in which citizens have no real control.

The ladder of citizen participation[[2]](#footnote-2) shown here has eight steps, each one representing a different level of participation. From bottom to top, the steps explain the extent of citizen participation and how much real power citizens have to determine the process and outcomes. Although this was developed to demonstrate different levels of participation (and non-participation) in the context of local politics, it can be read as an analogy for participation in the ICH field. For example, the lowest levels (1 and 2) represent forms of non-participation where powerful actors impose their agendas on the less powerful. Tokenism occurs when participants hear about interventions and may voice opinions about them; these are regarded by the power brokers as ‘input’ but do not have any actual effect on the intervention. This form of (non-)participation does not lead to change. A good example to use in this workshop relates to section C.7 of the original periodic reporting form in which States Parties were asked to “describe the measures taken to ensure the widest possible participation of the communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals concerned during the process of preparation of this report for each concerned element”. Unfortunately, many reporting States have submitted formulaic responses which refer to ‘consultation’ with communities that clearly suggest, in some cases, a form of tokenism. The important issue, then, for participation in ICH safeguarding in general as well as for the periodic reporting is how States Parties can move from tokenism – frequently couched as consultation or informing – to partnership or even delegating some of the power to non-state actors.

SLIDE 9

Potential pitfalls of ‘participatory’ processes:

When organizing a participatory process, it is important to consider not only its benefits but also barriers and challenges to participation. Some of these include:

* Participatory processes that are simply lip-service and not genuine participation (refer back to the ‘ladder’ in slide 10)
* Exclusion of key groups from the dialogue (including groups such as women, girls, children and young people, ethnic minorities, persons of different genders, etc.)
* Lack of planning and forethought
* Lack of clarity in setting objectives
* Poor facilitation and lack of necessary training
* Failure to programme for a reasonable timeframe for multi-stakeholder consultations, both before and during the consultation process.
* Lack of necessary flexibility to respond to groups who want to be consulted but were not initially included.

It should be noted that a key characteristic of participatory processes is that they needto beresult- and action-oriented. If this is managed well, the participants involved will find reasons to engage their time in the process of periodic reporting. Follow up activities on meetings and providing updates on the different stages of the preparation is also essential for success.

SLIDE 10

Some participatory methods:

This presents some participatory methods that may prove useful when seeking to engage multiple actors in periodic reporting and in other ICH safeguarding-related activities. Explanations of these are as follows:

**Attitude and behaviour change:** This addresses the fact that more powerful people involved in a participatory process –government officials, external facilitators, focal points or local leaders – need to change the way that they think and act to allow or create space for the less powerful to speak, ensure that they are respected and for their opinions to be taken seriously.

**Focus Group Discussion:** Focus group discussions are the most commonly used method in participatory methods. A group of different types of participants are given the opportunity to have a dialogue with each other in a safe setting. These are usually mediated and recorded by a team of at least two people, including a facilitator and a note-taker.

**Mapping and Modelling:** Many participatory methods involve local people analysing their situation through the media of pictures, diagrams and symbols. Mapping and modelling are common tools for this. The resultant maps and models can be large or small, simple or intricate, two or three dimensional, and can be created from a variety of materials (e.g. paper and pens, sand, earth, sticks, stones, etc.) They can provide semi- and non-literate people with a powerful form of expression for how they see the world around them.

**Most Significant Change:** This method is most often used in monitoring and evaluation and aims to identify cases where significant changes – positive or negative – relating to the key objectives of the intervention have occurred. It is particularly useful for tracking forms of change that are related to not easily quantifiable issues, such as ‘capacity strengthening’ or ‘gender equity’. Both of these are of direct relevance to periodic reporting under the Convention.

**Outcome Mapping:** This is a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating initiatives that aim to bring about some form of change or some other specific outcome(s). It helps to clarify a number of points for a project team or programme: who are the actors it targets; what changes it expects to see; and what strategies it employs. Results are measured in terms of changes in behaviour, actions or relationships. This may prove a useful tool when attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of particular actions and measures taken to fulfil the obligation to safeguard ICH.

**Semi-structured Interview:** This research method is widely used in the social sciences and which forms the basis of many kinds of participatory research. The interviewer starts out with a basic framework of themes to be explored, rather than a precise and fixed list of questions. This format allows for new ideas to be brought up during the interview as a result of what the interviewee says.

The explanations above have been adapted from information available on the website of the Institute of Development Studies: https://www.participatorymethods.org.

**Session 2: Ensuring an inter-sectoral and inclusive approach

***Estimated time: 2 hours***

It is important to recognize that involving a broad range of non-governmental actors in the process of gathering data and information for periodic reporting is not the only aspect of multi-stakeholder engagement. It is also crucial that governmental bodies other than the competent authority (Ministry of Culture or similar) be fully engaged. Unless good lines of communication (and appropriate institutional structures) for information-sharing and cooperation among the relevant governmental bodies already exist, this is likely to present the Focal Points with a number of challenges.

Here, it would be useful for the facilitator to ask participants to share any experiences – positive or negative – of such cross-sectoral cooperation. They can also try to suggest what structures may exist in their countries (possibly a scientific third party) that can be helpful in facilitating information-gathering across governmental bodies. They may wish to consider, for example, any structure(s) has/have been put in place to enable reporting on the SDGs. They may also wish to consider at what level(s) – Ministerial or similar, middle management, expert – this cooperation is likely to be most efficient and what formal requirements it may need.

SLIDE 11

Exercise (25 minutes):

***Learning objective***: Enable participants to identify more easily institutional and other actors/frameworks in their own countries important to data gathering, and how they might establish cross-sectoral cooperation for this.

The facilitator should divide the participants into groups and give each group one of the following case studies (depending on number):

* **Case Study 11** - Community involvement in a nomination: the traditions and practices of the Mijikenda Kayas in Kenya
* **Case Study 12** - Community involvement in the preparation of a nomination file in Mexico
* **Case Study 37** - Civil society engagement in the policy-making process: experience of the Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda
* **Case Study 53** - Colombia: a far-reaching policy with inter-sectoral implications
* **Case Study 54** - Flanders: a facilitation policy
* **Case Study 60** - Brazil: cross-sectoral cooperation and NGO involvement.

The groups should be asked to read their case study and consider what lessons can be learned and what messages may be taken from them for their own situation as Focal Points for the periodic reporting. Once they have done this, participants can then share their ideas with each other in plenary, during which the facilitator should try to identify a number of key findings. Although, of course, Focal Points are unlikely to be in a position to create and develop structures that do not exist, they may be able to point to some of these experiences to provide advice to managers in their own institution (ministry, government agency, etc.) as useful approaches.

At this point, it is important to stress that identifying ways to involve a variety of actors and stakeholders – governmental, non-governmental, community and from outside the community – has to be localized and sensitive to the realities on the ground. Participants therefore need to be encouraged to consider which approaches could work in their country/regional context and share and evaluate these in plenary.

SLIDE 12

Exercise and role play (85 minutes):

**Learning objective**: Raise awareness of potential conflicts and/or dilemmas that may be raised during a multi-stakeholder scenario related to periodic reporting, facilitate understanding of others’ viewpoints and help find ways to reconcile these.

***Exercise (25 minutes):***

Remaining in their groups, participants are now encouraged to have a discussion focused on resolving conflicts or dilemmas occurring in a multi-stakeholder situation related to reporting on or gathering information about ICH or safeguarding ICH. The facilitator should ask participants to think of examples from their own experience of such conflicts/dilemmas. After sharing these with each other, each group should choose one to analyze in some more detail and then share these with the other groups in plenary.

Facilitators should note, especially if there are community representatives in the workshop, that there may be some sensitivity in this exercise, depending on the country’s context. Possible tensions may include disrespect, exploitation or appropriation, misrepresentation, claims of ownership, copyright etc. that may be longstanding and unresolved. In addition, in a particular region there may be tensions between countries over cross-border or shared ICH elements.

***Role-play (60 minutes):***

Ask the participants to choose one of the examples identified in the previous exercise. The facilitator then conducts a role-play session based around the conflict or dilemma chosen in order to draw out issues related to the different views that people may have about certain matters. This exercise is designed to demonstrate how attitudes and perspectives can vary depending on one’s situation and relationship to the ICH in question. It can also highlight possible techniques that might maximize the beneficial outcomes from interaction between different stakeholders over information gathering for periodic reporting.

To conduct the role-play, the facilitator assigns each group (or part of the group, depending on the number) the role of a key actor/stakeholder in the issue. These should be different from their real life roles. Participants are then given 5-10 minutes to prepare to present their ‘case’ to a meeting convened by the national administration to discuss the issue relating to safeguarding the ICH element, and to utilize strategies and approaches to mediate and negotiate an amicable solution for all parties involved. Each participant, for their respective role, should develop a few reasons for supporting or objecting to (depending on their role) the events or actions that have unfolded.

Once all participants are ready, the meeting should begin and is chaired by the facilitator, who plays the role of the director of the administration department responsible for culture and heritage. The facilitator should ensure that representatives of each actor/stakeholder group are heard, and try to involve everyone in the discussion. Some rules which should be upheld by the facilitator are:

* Stay in character throughout the game, acting and speaking from that position
* Defend your convictions and choices vis-à-vis others
* Identify allies but also be willing to compromise and keep the general interest in mind
* Follow the guidance provided by the chair/facilitator (in or out of role).

After the role-play, participants (guided by the facilitators) should evaluate the meeting and discuss what they learned from the exercise, evaluating the positions of each role and the mediation and negotiation approaches employed to address the conflict.

**Session 3: How to organize the drafting and validation process

***Estimated time: 40 minutes***

This is primarily a hands-on session in which the ideas, challenges and solutions identified in the previous two sessions can be put into practice in the context of filling out the periodic reporting form. Before the group work exercise, it is useful to review the following (slides 13-16):

SLIDE 13

Who is needed to prepare the periodic report?

States Parties to the Convention are responsible for preparing the periodic report and national Focal Points must be responsible for gathering the relevant information as input to their six-yearly periodic reports. As the governance of culture involves a large number of governmental and non-governmental bodies (civil society organizations) and requires the active engagement of a large number of stakeholders, these different stakeholders will be engaged at different levels in the process.

The periodic report is a multi-stakeholder exercise that benefits from the involvement of different actors. It is also a valuable opportunity for national policy dialogue or consultations on the “state of play for the sector”.

For this reason, a *broad multi-stakeholder consultation process* held at the *municipal/regional and national/federal levels*, involving both *governmental entities (inter-ministerial consultation) and non-governmental actors (civil society organizations)* needs to be put into place. The challenge here, then, is how this is to be done.

SLIDE 14

Information sources - Governmental bodies:

This slide presents a number of the governmental bodies that may be consulted for reporting on policies and measures implemented at the national level. They include the following key ministries/governmental agencies:

* Ministries in charge of Culture and Education;
* Ministries in charge of Higher Education, Research and Innovation;
* Ministries in charge of Foreign Affairs;
* Ministries in charge of Employment, Labour and Social Cohesion;
* Ministries in charge of Youth and Sport;
* Ministries in charge of Economy, Trade and Industry, Tourism;
* Ministries in charge of Communication and Digital Economy;
* Ministries of Public Welfare.
* Ministry in charge of the Budget
* Ministry of the Interior (Internal Affairs)
* Other Ministries and National Agencies (e.g. Environmental Agency, Statistical Institute) serve as “resource” for complementary information

SLIDE 15

Information sources – Non-governmental bodies:

To ensure that the principles of the Convention are observed and implemented, States Parties should ensure a participatory approach to be operated through a multi-stakeholder process.

Useful data and information related to implementation of the Convention is often available only from civil society through:

* Non-governmental organizations with an expertise in the field of ICH;
* Civil society organizations, including cultural associations related to ICH elements;
* Other stakeholders such as research centres, centres of expertise and cultural centres;
* Umbrella organizations directly concerned by the implementation of these measures;
* Experts and academics active in private foundations or specialized research centres;
* The private sector (e.g. tourism, textiles, hospitality, etc.).

SLIDE 16

What method to choose?

States Parties may choose the methodology for collecting data that is most adapted to their national context. Possible methods include:

* Questionnaires
* Interviews (either individually or in a group, face-to-face or over the telephone)
* A working group
* Other …?

Of course, these are not mutually exclusive and may be combined. It is also possible that participants can suggest other useful methods based on their own experiences and context.

Beforehand, though, it is important to clearly identify:

* What information should be sought?
* From whom/where?
* How?

The facilitator can ask the participants if any of them already have experience of involvement in other participatory processes – in any context – and ask them to describe them briefly, focusing on the methodology that was used and what they learned from this.

It can be noted that States Parties may wish to use the periodic reporting exercise as an opportunity to set up a permanent system for collecting data on their policies and measures for safeguarding ICH that involves the various governmental and non-governmental actors and stakeholders.

SLIDE 17

Exercise (30 minutes):

***Learning objective:*** Identifying required information and data and likely sources for this, finding the best means of soliciting this and developing strategies to overcome any resistance.

Provide the participants with copies of **Handout 1** and divide them into an even number of groups. Each pair of groups should choose two of the assessment factors included in this handout and work in their groups to consider how they can solicit the information they need from the source(s) identified. If possible, encourage the group pairs to choose different sets of assessment factors for this exercise.

Once they have done this, the pairs can act this out in a mini role-play in which one of the groups acts as the periodic reporting team and the other group are their ‘stakeholders’ for consultation. The groups in each pair can then reverse their roles, using the other assessment factor. If they finish this quickly, they can repeat the exercise with another two assessment factors. The ‘stakeholders’ can be encouraged to raise problems and difficulties that the periodic reporting team has to find a way to resolve.

After the group work is completed, the participants can share in plenary their experiences, any challenges they identified and effective strategies they found to deal with these. The facilitator can then ask the participants to design together (using a flip chart or white board) a strategy for designing a participatory periodic reporting process. They should consider the following questions:

* Who should participate?
* At what stage of the process should they participate?
* Should all stakeholders be brought together or in separate groups?
* How is the diversity of stakeholders to be ensured?
* How is the legitimacy of the stakeholders to be ensured?
* What are the tasks and roles of different participants in the process?
* What is the role of the Focal Points and their team?
* What kinds of meetings or gatherings should be used for these processes, and where?
* How many meetings are needed?
* Should other methods than meetings be used?
* What are the data collection needs?
* What kinds of materials and time are required?
* What are the expected outputs (short and long terms)?

SLIDE 18

Optional exercise (15-20 minutes):

***Learning objective***: Reinforce understanding of possible strategies for managing a multi-stakeholder periodic reporting process.

This session can be included if there is time (it should take around 15-20 minutes) and it is based on the accompanying optional **Case study 61** on reporting under the 2005 Convention.

After reading through the optional case study, the facilitator can ask participants to share their understanding of their role as Focal Points for periodic reporting under the 2003 Convention. It is important to remind them that this system operates differently from those of the 1972 and 2005 Conventions, although they also bear similarities. The facilitator can then show slide 19.

SLIDE 19

Training Programme for the 2005 Convention:

During this discussion, it is useful to highlight their main responsibilities of Focal Points:

* Sharing information on the Convention at the national level with a wide variety of relevant actors and stakeholders
* Building a team (of potentially varied composition) for conducting the periodic reporting exercise
* Gathering relevant data and information through whatever appropriate means, as input to the six-yearly Periodic Reports
* Acting as a communication channel through which this information can be disseminated to/from relevant ministries and public agencies.

1. . For the documents of this meeting see the Convention’s website <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/events/developing-a-follow-up-and-evaluation-mechanism-for-capacity-building-activities-00475> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Sherry Arnstein (1969) ‘A ladder of citizen participation’, Journal of the American Institute of Planners 35.4: 216–224 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)