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lesson plan

Duration:

2 hours

Objective(s):

Participants test their knowledge of the content of the workshop through a set of review questions.

Description:

This unit reviews and consolidates the knowledge of International Assistance gained by workshop participants during the preceding days. A questionnaire (Unit 54 Hand-out) poses a set of multiple-choice questions touching on different aspects of the workshop. Participants should first be asked to answer each of the questions on their own, then the facilitator guides them through a group discussion in which they are challenged to explain their answers (both right and wrong).

*Proposed sequence:*

1. The facilitator makes an introduction to the session, distributes the hand-out and leaves some time for individual reading.
2. The facilitator opens up a discussion on the nine questions and guides the group through them.

Supporting documents:

* Unit 54 Facilitator’s notes (including detailed responses for the nine questions)
* Unit 54 Hand-out
* Aide-mémoire for completing a request for International Assistance

Notes and suggestions

The facilitator introduces the session as one that offers participants the opportunity to test their knowledge of International Assistance. Each participant receives a hand-out and is asked to complete it (15 minutes).

The facilitator then proceeds to guide the group through a discussion of the nine questions. For each question, the facilitator should ask one participant (at random) to present and explain his or her answer. Before saying whether or not the answer is correct, the facilitator should ask all members if anyone else came to a different conclusion, and if so, they should explain their reasoning. The facilitator may then ask others to amplify the explanation(s) offered, and to explain why some of the other answers are incorrect (we can often learn as much from understanding why something is wrong as we can by understanding why something else is right).

Throughout the discussion, the facilitator should also encourage members to pose follow-up and related questions. The facilitator may also notice things that come up in the discussion that reveal lingering uncertainty among members. These additional questions can be noted on a white board or note pad, and when the nine questions in the hand-out have all been discussed, the facilitator can then return to the questions that have arisen along the way, once again posing them to the workshop members for their collective problem-solving.

Unit 54

facilitator’s notes for the review questions

#### WORKSHOP ON PREPARING INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

### Question 1

When States Parties submit requests for International Assistance, many stakeholders may be involved in the preparation of a request, but which of them can initiate it?

1. Any group or agency may initiate the process, as long as the relevant communities, groups and individuals participate as broadly as possible in preparing the request.
2. Communities, or their representatives, must initiate the process because they are the ones who need to give free, prior and informed consent.
3. Researchers or specialized institutions must start the process because they are the best informed about national needs for safeguarding ICH.

The correct answer is (a) – an International Assistance request can originate from anywhere, including both government offices, NGOs and communities themselves. Ultimately, it must be prepared and submitted by the State Party, which assumes responsibility for its content, but it may begin elsewhere. Moreover, the implementing agency need not be a government body, as long as the State takes responsibility to the Committee for its successful implementation.

Criterion A.1 requires that ‘the community, group and/or individuals concerned [with the ICH in question] participated in the preparation of the request […] as broadly as possible.’ Workshop members may point out that the selection criteria are not all obligatory, so perhaps answer (a) is not correct. You should emphasize that the Committee and Bureau have demonstrated that this criterion (not accidentally the first) is paramount, and projects that do not involve community participation are not granted funds.

Answer (b) introduces the distracting concept of ‘free, prior and informed consent’. Contrary to the two Lists and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, International Assistance is the one mechanism that does not require free, prior and informed consent; criterion A.1 instead requires their broadest possible participation.

Answer (c) unfortunately reflects the perspective of many States, but it finds no foundation in the Convention or the ODs.

### Question 2

According to the Convention, International Assistance may be used for the following purposes:

1. Safeguarding heritage inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
2. Preparation of ICH inventories, with the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs.
3. Safeguarding programmes, projects and activities carried out at the national, subregional and regional levels.
4. B and C above, but not A.
5. A, B and C above.

The correct answer is (e). Answer (a) aims to confuse workshop members, but there is nothing in the Convention that prohibits using International Assistance for safeguarding an element that happens to be inscribed on the Representative List.

The purposes of International Assistance are set out in Article 20, and prime among them is to safeguard the heritage inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List (Article 20(a)). Heritage inscribed on the Representative List is not mentioned as such in Article 20. But safeguarding heritage that is inscribed on the Representative List can easily fall within the scope of Article 20(c): ‘support for programmes, projects and activities carried out at national, subregional and regional levels aimed at the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’ (paraphrased here as answer (c)).

Operational Directive 9 goes somewhat further than the Convention in making explicit that priority will be given to safeguarding the heritage inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, but here too OD 9(c) is very inclusive and does not prohibit support to safeguarding elements inscribed on the Representative List. Since many of the 90 former Masterpieces were selected because they were in need of safeguarding, the fact that they are now on the Representative List does not block the door to funding safeguarding efforts. Nevertheless, to date no State Party has requested International Assistance for safeguarding heritage on the Representative List.

### Question 3

According to the Convention, International Assistance may take the following forms:

1. Financial assistance provided directly to a beneficiary State Party for various safeguarding purposes.
2. Technical assistance and capacity building provided to a State Party, including the services of experts.
3. Constructing buildings, purchasing automobiles and equipment, and creating and operating other infrastructure.
4. All of the above.
5. A and B above, but not C.

The correct answer is (d). Article 21 sets out the forms that International Assistance may take, which include all of those here (even if not described in exactly the same words). Financial assistance – answer (a) here – is the last of the forms mentioned in Article 21(g). Answer (c) (and thus, answer (e)) aims to confuse workshop members, because common sense might argue that scarce International Assistance funds should not be used for construction projects, expensive equipment and creating infrastructure.

Perhaps unfortunately, the language of Article 21 was modelled after that of the 1972 World Heritage Convention and aims to be more inclusive than it was. In short, there is nothing that prohibits the use of International Assistance under the 2003 Convention for any of the forms in answer (c) above. Until now, no State Party has requested such support.

### Question 4

The Committee’s or Bureau’s decision to grant International Assistance is based upon its examination of the request and its determination:

1. That each and every criterion in OD 7 and additional consideration in OD 10 is satisfied.
2. That each and every criterion in OD 7 is satisfied, but not the additional considerations in OD 10, which are optional.
3. That the request satisfies those criteria in OD 7 and additional considerations in OD 10 that it deems relevant to the particular circumstances of the request.
4. That the request fully satisfies those criteria in OD 7 that repeat requirements of the Convention as well as all other criteria in OD 7 and considerations in OD 10 that it deems relevant.

The correct answer is (d). In contrast to the Urgent Safeguarding List and Representative List, where each and every criterion must be satisfied in order for an element to be inscribed (as with answer (a) here), the Committee’s decisions for International Assistance are *based upon* the criteria and considerations, but not all are relevant in every case.

As the Aide-mémoire explains the decision of the Committee (or its Bureau) about granting assistance is based on an assessment of the overall strength of the request as compared to any possible shortcomings. Nevertheless, submitting States should not assume 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. In particular, since several of the criteria reiterate conditions set out in the Convention itself, the Committee may not simply waive one or another. Criterion A.5 restates Article 24.2, for example, and the Committee is barred from granting funds if this criterion is not satisfied. Similarly, criterion A.1 restates Article 15 about community participation.

The Committee may, nevertheless, deem that certain criteria or considerations are not relevant to a particular request. Answer (c) is incorrect because it fails to take note that certain criteria such as A.5 and A.1 cannot be ignored by the Committee, even if it were to decide they were not relevant.

### Question 5

The Convention’s Article 24.2 requires that the beneficiary State Party shall, within the limits of its resources, share the cost of safeguarding projects that receive International Assistance. The minimum percentage for such cost-sharing:

1. Is established at 15% in the Operational Directives, but the State may include its in-kind services to reach this figure.
2. Is established at 15% by a decision of the Committee, but the State may include its in-kind services to reach this figure.
3. Is not established in the Operational Directives but is accepted or rejected by the Committee or Bureau for each request it examines.

Answer (c) is correct. There is no minimum percentage for cost-sharing established in the ODs or as a general rule of the Committee. With each request that it receives, however, the Committee (or Bureau) makes a decision whether in its view the beneficiary State will share the costs of safeguarding. In a number of cases, the Committee has expressed its concern that the amount of cost-sharing set out in the request was very low, and this influenced its decision not to grant funds.

The Committee has emphasized that States should amply demonstrate their own in-kind contributions within the request, based in part on certain cases where the evaluation bodies and Committee assumed that the State Party was prepared to invest in the success of the project but had failed to demonstrate that adequately in the request form. The Committee’s pronouncements on this question have focussed on reminding States Parties to provide full details of their in-kind contributions (in cases where State’s contribution is less than 50%), rather than establishing any standard minimum rate for their cost-sharing.

### Question 6

The Operational Directives provide that in the case of International Assistance, the communities, groups and/or individuals concerned:

1. Will be involved as broadly as possible in the implementation of the activities to be funded by the International Assistance request.
2. Were informed of the preparation of the International Assistance request and will be involved as broadly as possible in the implementation of the activities proposed.
3. Participated as broadly as possible in the preparation of the request (except in the case of proposals for inventorying, where communities cannot yet be identified at the planning stage), and will be involved as broadly as possible in the implementation of the activities proposed.
4. Participated as broadly as possible in the preparation of the request and will be involved as broadly as possible in the implementation of the activities proposed.

Answer (d) is correct. The language of criterion A.1 provides that ‘The community, group and/or individuals concerned participated in the preparation of the request and will be involved in the implementation of the proposed activities, and in their evaluation and follow-up as broadly as possible.’ There is no exception for inventorying projects, even if certain States have argued that it is not possible to have communities participate at the early stage of planning an inventory (as wrongly suggested by answer (c) here). A State Party may not wish to create huge expectations among communities about their future involvement in an inventory project, for instance, when the funding for such a project is not yet in hand. However, this is obligatory and should not be deferred until funding has been assured. IA requests should describe in detail the basis on which beneficiary communities would be selected and mechanisms for ensuring their widest possible participation.

Answers (a) and (b) regrettably reflect the approach of too many States Parties. The evaluation bodies and Committee have nevertheless insisted that only (d) can be considered to conform to the ODs.

### Question 7

The question of compensating community members for their participation in safeguarding is complicated, particularly when it comes to inventorying their own ICH. The Committee has decided:

1. Community members participating as researchers should be compensated on the same basis as other researchers, but not those community members who cooperate by providing information.
2. Community members should be compensated for their time cooperating with an inventory project, but this should take the form of some kind of non-monetary compensation such as certificates.
3. Community members should not be compensated for their time and services, since it is their own ICH they are safeguarding and they should do so voluntarily, without the distorting effects of monetary payments.
4. Community members should be compensated for their time and services, whether it is in the role of researchers or those providing information.
5. None of the above.

Answer (e) is correct. Until now, the Committee has never taken a general decision on the question of whether and how communities should be compensated for their participation in safeguarding activities. It has however expressed its concern in the case of individual requests that did not show what it considered to be adequate compensation to community members. For instance, Decision 7.COM 10.1 ‘Recommends that, in addition to the wide range of national and regional stakeholders who will participate in drawing up inventories, the State Party fully involve the communities in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the activities and that their representatives, including the informants, be compensated just as are the other participants’; see also Decision 9.COM 9.c.1, where the Committee was troubled ‘that remuneration is foreseen only to experts and officials, but [the request] does not specify if and how the community representatives who will conduct the inventorying will be compensated’.

As participants will already have discussed in Unit 51, there is no simple answer to the question of how best to compensate community members who participate in the safeguarding of their own heritage. Few will take the extreme position of answer (c), which has been explicitly rejected by the Committee in two specific cases, but many are hesitant to accept answer (d). Answers (a) and (b) represent compromise positions: either compensate those who are working as researchers but not those who contribute as informants, or provide compensation in some non-monetary form. Until the Committee offers general advice on the matter, each State will have to make its own decision about the most equitable manner to compensate community members for their participation in safeguarding projects. What is essential, however, is that it explain clearly what it has decided in the International Assistance request. The Committee may or may not be convinced, but it is likely to consider silence on the question to be more damning.

### Question 8

Criterion A.4 provides that ‘the project may have lasting results’, signalling the importance of designing International Assistance projects so that they are sustainable. Among the methods that a State may use to increase the sustainability of a project are:

1. Committing itself to mainstreaming the project into its annual government budget.
2. Limiting costs during the International Assistance project so that it does not create dependency or false expectations.
3. Identifying a source of revenue within the project (e.g., selling tickets, selling publications, charging for services) and making provision for those revenues to support the project’s continuation.
4. All of the above.
5. A and B above, but not C.

Answer (d) is correct – all of these are legitimate means of increasing the sustainability of a project. Answer (c) aims to mislead workshop members by introducing the frightening idea of profiting from safeguarding activities. The evaluation bodies and Committee have encountered several requests that involved a revenue-generating component. They were troubled by these requests, but not because they would generate revenues. What was troubling was that the revenues disappeared without a trace. Answer (c) thus correctly requires ‘provision for those revenues to support the project’s continuation’. If International Assistance pays for publishing a book or CD, there is nothing to prohibit selling the book or CD – but the request has to explain clearly what will happen to the revenues that are generated.

### Question 9

When deciding whether to grant International Assistance, the Committee or Bureau considers whether ‘the proposed activities are well-conceived and feasible’ (criterion A.3). In reaching that decision, the Committee or Bureau may potentially focus its attention on several different sections of the ICH-04 request form such as:

* Section 13 (background and rationale)
* Section 14 (objectives and expected results)
* Section 15 (activities)
* Section 16 (timetable)
* Section 17 (budget)
* Section 19 (implementing organization and strategy)
* Section 21 (monitoring, reporting and evaluation)

Which sections of the request form are most important in determining whether criterion A.3 is satisfied?

1. Sections 14, 15, 16 and 17.
2. Sections 13, 15, 17 and 19.
3. Sections 13, 14, 15, 17 and 19.
4. All of these sections, but no others.
5. All of these sections, as well as others such as section 18 (community involvement) and section 20 (partners).

Answer (e) is correct – criterion A.3 involves virtually every section of the ICH-04 form. In deciding whether or not ‘the proposed activities are well-conceived and feasible’ the Committee cannot limit its purview to section 15 (activities) or even to that plus section 16 (timetable) and section 17 (budget). This criterion in fact refers to the request as a whole – even a chance remark in a seemingly minor section of the form may raise serious doubts in the minds of evaluators about whether the activities are well conceived and feasible. Among the criteria for granting International Assistance, criteria A.1 (community participation), A.2 (appropriate amount) and A.3 (activities) are in a sense super-criteria that involve the entire request.