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| **Summary**  At its eighth session, the Committee decided to develop an overall results framework for the Convention. At its eleventh session, the Committee welcomed the results of a preliminary expert meeting on that subject, held in Beijing, China, from 7 to 9 September 2016, and reiterated its call for an open-ended intergovernmental working group to develop such a framework ([Decision 11.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/14)). The present document provides the report of the open-ended intergovernmental working group on developing an overall results framework for the Convention, convened in Chengdu, China, from 11 to 13 June 2017, including the draft framework recommended by the working group.  **Decision required:** paragraph 21 |

#### Introduction

1. In its 2013 evaluation of the standard-setting work of UNESCO’s Culture Sector[[1]](#footnote-1), UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) noted that the Committee’s task of monitoring the implementation of the Convention – one of its functions as set out in Article 7 of the Convention – was impeded by the lack of an overall results framework agreed by its States Parties. As IOS noted, ‘capturing and reporting on results (outputs and outcomes) is only possible if it is clear what results are to be achieved. This is not the case right now. […] Drawing conclusions about the progress made with regard to the implementation of the Convention is difficult in the absence of objectives, indicators and benchmarks’. After debate at its eighth session, the Committee therefore decided to ‘develop an overall results framework for the Convention including clear objectives, time-frames, indicators and benchmarks’ ([Decision 8.COM 5.c.1](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/5.c.1)).
2. Recognizing ‘the necessity for an inclusive process of consultation and discussion in the development of such a framework’, the Committee decided to convene an intergovernmental working group to that end, on the condition that adequate extrabudgetary resources were mobilized ([Decision 9.COM 13.e](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/13.e)). As a preliminary step, the National Commission of the People’s Republic of China for UNESCO offered to support a smaller meeting of experts that could elaborate a preliminary framework, for submission to a subsequent intergovernmental working group. From 7 to 9 September 2016 in Beijing, China, UNESCO organized a category VI meeting; that is, a meeting of a non-representative character of experts appointed by the Director-General who served in their private capacity. The meeting brought together 21 experts from different UNESCO Member States and Associate Members, working in governmental and non-governmental institutions, in communities or practitioner groups. The report of the expert meeting is found in document [ITH/16/11.COM/14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-14-EN.docx).
3. At its eleventh session, the Committee expressed its satisfaction with the outcomes of the expert meeting, taking particular note of the results map that the experts had produced ([Decision 11.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/14)). The Committee welcomed an expression of interest from China to host the open-ended intergovernmental working group, as it had called for during its ninth session. That meeting, made possible through the generous contribution of the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu, took place from 11 to 13 June 2017. The report of the working group figures as Annex 1 to the present document, and its summary records are available in document [ITH/17/12.COM/INF.9](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM-INF.9-EN.docx).
4. Fifty-three States Parties took part in the working group, as well as three category 2 centres and eight accredited non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The working group was chaired by H. E. Mr Xuexian Wang (China), and Mr Moffat Moyo (Zambia) acted as Vice-Chair. A group of six Rapporteurs, one for each UNESCO Electoral Group, included: Ms Gabriele Detschmann (Austria), Ms Alla Stashkevich (Belarus), Mr Andrés Forero (Colombia), Ms Sang Mee Bak (Republic of Korea), Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé (Senegal) and Mr Hani Hayajneh (Jordan).
5. The working group’s discussions built upon the high-level results map that had been put forward by the 2016 expert group and, as noted above, welcomed by the Committee. In addition, the Secretariat provided a draft set of 26 core indicators and an associated set of 78 assessment factors, intended to permit effective measurement of the outputs, outcomes and impacts already identified in the results map (see document [ITH/17/12.COM WG/4](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-4_EN.doc)). The working group subjected each draft indicator and assessment factor to careful consideration and debate. In numerous cases, working group members were able to improve the wording of specific indicators or factors; in other cases, they called for further-reaching revisions or a reordering of the components. Each evening, the group of rapporteurs reviewed the debates of the working group and, with the assistance of the Secretariat, prepared a revised text for the working group’s adoption during its final session. The number of core indicators remained steady at 26, although their order changed; the number of assessment factors increased slightly to 86.
6. The overall results framework which was adopted unanimously and enthusiastically by the working group, and recommended to the Committee for adoption, is found in Annex 2 of the present document. The graphic presentation of the framework is patterned after the indicator framework proposed for the 2005 Convention in its *2015 Global Report*.[[2]](#footnote-2) Table 1 provides – in its top four rows – the impacts and outcomes proposed by the expert group in Beijing and welcomed by the Committee at its eleventh session, reformatted here with Impacts at the top rather than the bottom, followed by Long-term, Mid-term and Short-term Outcomes. The next row identifies eight thematic areas that seek to group the core indicators in a logical way. Assignment of an indicator to a particular area is not intended to imply that it refers exclusively to that single thematic area. Certain indicators may well have a foot in two different areas, and other configurations might have been possible. Finally, Table 1 offers abbreviated statements of the 26 core indicators. It should be noted that the authoritative statements of the Core Indicators are to be found in Table 2. There, each indicator is accompanied by two to five assessment factors against which the indicator is to be assessed. The Committee will likely wish to examine these two tables in inverse order, as the working group did, first adopting the exact language of the core indicators in Table 2 before turning to the abbreviated statements in Table 1.

#### Core indicators and assessment factors

1. The working group was guided by the Results-Based Management (RBM) approach adopted by UNESCO and, more widely, utilized throughout the United Nations system (see document [ITH/16/11.COM/14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-14-EN.docx) and document [ITH/17/12.COM WG/3](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-3-EN.docx) for a general orientation to the RBM approach). In elaborating the draft framework examined by the working group, the Secretariat studied a number of RBM approaches and results frameworks utilized by other United Nations agencies, in addition to UNESCO’s own approach; examples from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) were found to be particularly useful. Typically, these frameworks not only defined a set of indicators but also identified for each indicator a set of reportable results, criteria or factors that would be used to assess whether, and to what degree, the indicator was attained. Different systems referred to these by different names, but for the present purpose ‘assessment factor’ has been chosen.
2. ***Indicators*** are defined as a qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment.[[3]](#footnote-3) Within a results framework, indicators represent an agreed consensus about what information can be considered to be a sign of the success or progress of a programme. Performance indicators make it possible to demonstrate results by providing a reference point for monitoring, decision-making, stakeholder consultations, taking corrective action, and evaluation.[[4]](#footnote-4) For indicators to function most effectively, they must be measurable, and all actors involved in monitoring, reporting and evaluation should share a consensus about what to measure and how.
3. For each core indicator, the draft framework thus presents two or more ***assessment factors*** against which that indicator will be assessed; these generally refer to the situation within a single State Party and variously include outcomes or outputs.[[5]](#footnote-5) Each State monitors and reports on the existence (or absence) of these factors within its territory. Because each indicator has two or more associated factors against which it will be assessed, it is possible to report that within a given State Party, an indicator is satisfied fully or partially. In most cases these factors and their terminology are drawn directly from the various provisions of the Convention and its Operational Directives, in which States Parties are obliged or encouraged to ensure that specific conditions are met, either through their own actions or by facilitating the actions of others.[[6]](#footnote-6)
4. One particular challenge in defining appropriate indicators for the Convention arises from the fact that, as for much of the United Nations’ normative work, the Convention ‘involves numerous actors, many potential causes and just as many possible effects.’[[7]](#footnote-7) Attaining expected results depends on the collaboration and engagement of a wide range of actors, particularly the ‘communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit [intangible cultural] heritage’ (Article 15). Complementing governmental entities of the State Party itself, there are a number of other key actors such as the media, universities, research institutes, museums, libraries, etc. (which may be public or private, according to the country) as well as civil society entities such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), voluntary associations, guilds or troupes, independent experts, and so on. Attaining a particular result may therefore not depend directly on a governmental office but instead on the common effort of several or many of those actors. It is essential that the assessment factors thus include both those ***initiatives*** that arise within the communities or groups themselves and those ***interventions*** that come from outside of communities or groups (including those that originate with the State). It should be noted in this regard that the core indicators are generally formulated in terms of ‘Extent to which [a given situation exists or change has been achieved]’. It is not accidental that they do not say ‘Extent to which the State(s) Party(ies) have [done X or implemented Y]’, since there are often a large number of actors contributing to the results.
5. Because the overall results framework is intended to be used both at the international level and at the national level, when the core indicators refer to ‘Extent to which…’, this needs to be understood in two ways, varying with the context. For monitoring and evaluation at the global level, ‘Extent to which…’ will usually be quantified as the proportion or percentage of States Parties in which the given situation exists or change has been achieved, and to what degree. When the same indicator is used by a State Party for its own monitoring and evaluation at the country level, ‘Extent to which…’ refers to the degree to which that given situation exists or change has been achieved within the territory of that State.
6. When debating the draft set of core indicators and assessment factors, working group members emphasized the necessity to focus them closely on the kinds of information that States Parties will regularly provide in their periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention at the national level, as required by the Convention in its Article 29 and Article 12 (see also Chapter V of the Operational Directives). The working group reiterated that the usefulness of the overall results framework depends directly on the periodic reporting process, while at the same time insisting that the results framework should not impose new reporting obligations on States Parties. This does not mean that there cannot be synergies with other reporting mechanisms such as those for the Sustainable Development Goals of Agenda 2030, or that other complementary sources of information cannot also be invaluable in assessing the impact of the Convention. However, it is assumed that the principal source of information for the overall results framework will be the periodic reports, and that those reports will provide sufficient information to determine whether each of the core indicators is achieved (with the exception of indicators 23 and 26, which are to be monitored at the global level, drawing upon information already being gathered by the Secretariat).

#### Guidance notes, baselines and targets

1. Among the documents examined by the open-ended working group were two sample guidance notes (see Annex 3). For the overall results framework to be implemented effectively, it is important that all those involved in monitoring, reporting and evaluation share a consensus about the scope of each indicator and a common understanding of how to measure the degree to which it has been attained. As recommended by the working group, the Secretariat will continue to elaborate similar guidance notes for all 26 core indicators, reflecting the perspectives and helpful suggestions raised during the working group’s debates.
2. Additional work will also remain to define baselines and targets for each core indicator. UNESCO’s *Guiding Principles* explains that the **baseline** provides the starting point or the status of the performance indicator at the beginning of a programme or project that acts as a reference point against which progress or achievements of results can be assessed.[[8]](#footnote-8) It continues: ‘the **target** is a measure associated to a performance indicator to be attained during a specific period with available resources’.[[9]](#footnote-9) In the case of the overall results framework for the Convention, baselines and targets will need to be established at both the global level and the country level. For instance, a target at the global level might call for a given indicator, within a predetermined time period, to be fully satisfied in X% of States Parties, partially satisfied in Y% of States Parties, and not satisfied in Z% of States Parties. In a subsequent period, for instance, the target would be revised to call for the percentage of fully satisfied to grow, and for the percentage of not satisfied to shrink. At the country level, based upon its own priorities, resources and capacities, a State Party itself might set a target to satisfy the indicator fully within a given time period, or its target might be to satisfy the indicator to a certain degree or not at all.
3. This will necessarily involve two parallel processes, inasmuch as the global targets would be established through an international consultative process, while the country-level targets would be established by each State Party according to its own situation, capacities and priorities. The same applies to baselines, which will have to be determined both for global-level and country-level results. To serve effectively, both targets and baselines need to be realistic, based upon actual experience, and in the case of targets, attainable. Targets should not be so easy that they will always be met, but neither should they be so ambitious that achievements will always fall short. In order to establish realistic targets, it is first necessary – to the greatest extent possible – to establish reliable baselines. In the case of certain indicators, a retrospective analysis of existing periodic reports may be sufficient to define a credible baseline, but in many cases the existing reports will not provide enough dependable comparative data to permit a baseline to be defined initially. At the country level, by contrast, it may be easier for a State Party to develop a baseline based upon its own knowledge of the circumstances within that country. Over time, the actual achievements in one period can serve as reliable baselines for the next period, but it should be expected that the process of determining baselines will be imperfect at first and improve over successive cycles.
4. The working group agreed with the Secretariat’s suggestion that it will therefore be prudent to approach the problem of baselines and targets at a later stage, once States Parties have reached general agreement on the draft framework as annexed to this document. This is all the more true since the baselines and targets will be revised regularly, with each monitoring cycle, while the results map and indicator will most likely change less over time. For country-level baselines and targets, each State Party would determine its own schedule for defining them, depending in part on the schedule of its periodic reporting.

#### Results-based reporting and rolling out the overall results framework

1. In its report, the working group recommends that the Committee ‘Consider how best to implement the results framework and integrate it into the ongoing processes of reporting, monitoring and evaluation of the Convention at the global level and within each of its States Parties, particularly as regards the Convention’s periodic reporting system’ (see Annex 1). Committee Members will recall that the 2013 IOS recommendation to ‘Develop an overall results framework for the Convention […] including clear objectives, time‐frames, indicators and benchmarks’ was one of several recommendations aimed at improving the reporting, monitoring and evaluation of the Convention. Another of its recommendations was to improve periodic reporting by having it focus on results – something that could not easily be done in the absence of an agreed results framework for the Convention. Working group members gave careful consideration to the advantages that the new results framework would offer in increasing the usefulness and effectiveness of periodic reporting. Members agreed that the adoption of an overall results framework called for reflection on how the periodic reporting process could become not simply an administrative reporting obligation but instead a learning opportunity for States Parties to take stock periodically of their own achievements and challenges and to define or redefine their national priorities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Increasing the usefulness of periodic reporting to States Parties themselves was also seen as an answer, at least in part, to the low submission rate for those reports. As the reports focus increasingly on results, the process of preparing them can progressively benefit the various actors involved in implementing the Convention by promoting dialogue and participation, and the submission rate can be expected to rise.
2. Some possible improvements to the periodic reporting system are addressed in document [ITH/17/12.COM/10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM-10-EN.docx). In particular, these concern the possibility to realign reporting deadlines so that States Parties would no longer report every six years on the anniversary of their ratification of the Convention, but instead would report concurrently with other States from the same region. Regardless of any possible change to the reporting schedule, the Secretariat has already begun considering possible revisions to the ICH-10 periodic reporting format to better align it with the overall results framework and ensure that the information solicited in the form contributes as directly and adequately as possible to the framework. This process of orienting the ICH-10 form towards results reporting will also aim to keep in the forefront how the reporting process itself can be made as useful as possible to States Parties and other actors.
3. A recurrent theme throughout the debates of the working group was the necessity to prepare properly for the implementation of the results framework and to accompany its introduction with informational and capacity-building activities so that States Parties and other concerned actors, in particular communities, groups and individuals, will be able to implement it effectively. The Convention’s global capacity-building programme was held up as the model for such activities, and working group members emphasized that a similar approach should be adopted for strengthening capacities to implement the overall results framework. In addition to the guidance notes mentioned above, other informational materials will need to be developed so that the Convention’s diverse actors can understand what the framework is and how they can be involved in monitoring, reporting and evaluation. A series of regional workshops to introduce the overall results framework and the revised results-oriented ICH-10 periodic reporting form could be complemented by more intensive working sessions – at a subregional or national level – to begin to define country-level baselines and targets. In that context, one of the main advantages of moving the reporting cycle to a regional rather than ratification-based calendar was the opportunities it could offer for more efficient capacity building, including peer-to-peer and neighbour-to-neighbour technical assistance.
4. If the Committee so agrees, the overall results framework annexed below (Annex 2) could be recommended to the General Assembly for adoption at its seventh session in June 2018. A revised version of the ICH-10 form for periodic reporting could be made available in early 2019, to be used by States Parties for those reports due in December 2019. Subsequent to the Assembly’s adoption of the results framework, the Secretariat could define provisional targets and – where possible – baselines for the Committee’s review at a future session. The Committee might also wish to request the Secretariat to identify possible informational and capacity-building activities to support States Parties in their use of the overall results framework and revised periodic reporting forms.
5. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 12.COM 9

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/17/12.COM/9 and its annexes,
2. Recalling Article 7 and Decisions [8.COM 5.c.1](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/5.c.1), [9.COM 13.e](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/13.e), [10.COM 9](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/10.COM/9), [11.COM 2.BUR 1](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM_2.BUR-Decisions-EN.docx) and [11.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/14),
3. Thanking the Ministry of Culture of the People’s Republic of China and the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu for having generously hosted and co-funded the open-ended intergovernmental working group on developing an overall results framework that was held in Chengdu, China, from 11 to 13 June 2017,
4. Expresses its satisfaction with the outcomes of the working group and thanks its members for their efforts and contributions;
5. Recommends to the General Assembly to approve the overall results framework, as annexed to this decision;
6. Requests the Secretariat to continue elaborating guidance notes and other informational materials to support States Parties and other actors in their implementation of the overall results framework, including their establishment of targets and baselines at the country level;
7. Further requests the Secretariat to elaborate provisional targets and, where possible, baselines for implementation of the overall results framework at the global level, for its examination at a future session;
8. Takes note that the overall results framework will necessitate revision of the ICH-10 Periodic Reporting form, and also requests the Secretariat to revise the form accordingly;
9. Invites the Secretariat to develop capacity-building materials for periodic reporting which will be aligned to the overall results framework and, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary funds, to plan and implement capacity-building activities to support States Parties and other actors, in the context of the existing global capacity-building programme, in their implementation of the overall results framework as well as in their periodic reporting exercise;
10. Further invites States Parties to provide voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to support the implementation of such capacity-building activities.

**ANNEX 1**

**Report by the open-ended intergovernmental working group to the Committee**

1. The open-ended intergovernmental working group on developing an overall results framework for the Convention met in Chengdu, China, from 11 to 13 June 2017.
2. The working group wishes to express its gratitude to the Ministry of Culture of the People’s Republic of China and the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu for having generously hosted its meeting, as well as to the National Commission of the People’s Republic of China for UNESCO for having supported the preliminary expert meeting held in Beijing, China, from 7 to 9 September 2016. It commends the expert group, which established a solid foundation for the work achieved, as well as the Secretariat for preparing a comprehensive set of indicators and assessment factors to serve as the basis for its deliberations.
3. The working group was chaired by H. E. Mr Xuexian Wang (China), and Mr Moffat Moyo (Zambia) acted as Vice-Chair. A group of six Rapporteurs, one for each Electoral Group, was elected as follows: Ms Gabriele Detschmann (Austria), Ms Alla Stashkevich (Belarus), Mr Andrés Forero (Colombia), Ms Sang Mee Bak (Republic of Korea), Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé (Senegal) and Mr Hani Hayajneh (Jordan). The revised overall results framework annexed to this report benefitted from the careful attention of the group of Rapporteurs, who met at the end of every daily session to integrate the comments and observations of States Parties concerning the draft proposed by the Secretariat.
4. The working group discussed linking the overall results framework to periodic reporting and deliberated on the potential of mobilizing complementary sources of information and how they might also be used for assessing the impact of the Convention.
5. The working group agreed upon the importance of establishing an overall results framework to permit all those involved in implementing the Convention to have a shared vision of its outputs, outcomes and impacts and a set of common criteria for evaluating its effectiveness and accomplishments. When discussing its linkages with periodic reporting, it highlighted the benefits that could be attained through moving to a regional cycle for national reporting, as this would provide opportunities for international cooperation, knowledge-sharing and technical assistance, including capacity building.
6. The working group therefore **recommends**:
   * + 1. That the Committee:
     1. Adopt the draft overall results framework annexed herein;
     2. Consider how best to implement the results framework and integrate it into the ongoing processes of reporting, monitoring and evaluation of the Convention at the global level and within each of its States Parties, particularly as regards the Convention’s periodic reporting system.
        1. That the Secretariat:
     3. Elaborate guidance notes for the proposed indicators, reflecting the perspectives raised during its debates;
     4. Continue to identify the linkages with periodic reporting, with a particular view to restructuring the periodic reporting formats;
     5. Explore potential synergies with reporting mechanisms outside of the Convention, in particular the Sustainable Development Goals of Agenda 2030;
     6. Continue to explore the possibility of using other sources of information for assessing the impact of the Convention beyond periodic reporting;
     7. Propose to the Committee, for its consideration, possible changes to the periodic reporting mechanism to move towards a regional cycle of national reporting, as discussed during the present meeting, and prepare draft revisions of the Operational Directives necessary to that end.
7. The working group will present the results of its deliberations, including the summary records, to the Committee for its 12th session in Jeju Island (Republic of Korea) from 4 to 8[[10]](#footnote-10) December 2017.

**ANNEX 2**

**Draft Overall Results Framework**

**Table 1: High level framework with brief indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impacts** | Intangible cultural heritage is safeguarded by communities, groups and individuals who exercise active and ongoing stewardship over it, thereby contributing to sustainable development for human well-being, dignity and creativity in peaceful and inclusive societies. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Long-term Outcomes** | Continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage ensured. | | Diversity of intangible cultural heritage respected. | | | Recognition and awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding ensured. | | | Engagement and international cooperation for safeguarding enhanced among all stakeholders at all levels. | | |
| **Mid-term Outcomes** | Effective relationships built among a diversity of communities, groups and individuals and other stakeholders for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.  Dynamic development and implementation of safeguarding measures or plans for specific elements of intangible cultural heritage led by a diversity of communities, groups and individuals. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Short-term Outcomes** | Improved capacities to support the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in general.  Improved capacities to implement safeguarding measures or plans for specific elements of intangible cultural heritage. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Thematic Areas** | Institutional and human capacities | Transmission and education | | Inventorying and research | Policies as well as legal and administrative measures | | Role of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society | Awareness raising | | Engagement of communities, groups and individuals as well as other stakeholders | International engagement |
| **Core Indicators (brief)** | 1. Competent bodies support practice and transmission 2. Programmes support strengthening human capacities for safeguarding 3. Training is operated by or addressed to communities and those working in the fields of culture and heritage | 1. Education, both formal and non-formal, strengthens transmission and promotes respect 2. ICH integrated into primary and secondary education 3. Post-secondary education supports safeguarding and study of ICH | | 1. Inventories reflect the diversity of ICH and contribute to its safeguarding 2. Inventorying process is inclusive, respects diversity, and supports safeguarding by communities and groups 3. Research and documentation contribute to safeguarding 4. Research findings are accessible and utilized | 1. Cultural policies and legal and administrative measures reflect diversity of ICH and are implemented 2. Education policies and legal and administrative measures reflect diversity of ICH and are implemented 3. Policies and legal and administrative measures in fields other than culture and education reflect diversity of ICH and are implemented 4. Policies and legal and administrative measures respect customary rights, practices and expressions | | 1. Importance of ICH in society widely recognized 2. Inclusive plans and programmes recognize the importance of safeguarding ICH and foster self-respect and mutual respect | 1. Communities, groups and individuals participate widely in awareness raising 2. Media are involved in awareness raising 3. Public information measures raise awareness 4. Ethical principles respected when raising awareness | | 1. Engagement for safeguarding ICH enhanced among stakeholders 2. Civil society contributes to monitoring safeguarding | 1. Committee involves NGOs, public and private bodies, private persons[[11]](#footnote-11) 2. States Parties cooperate for safeguarding 3. States Parties engage in international networking and institutional cooperation 4. ICH Fund supports safeguarding and international engagement[[12]](#footnote-12) |

**Table 2: Core indicators and assessment factors, arranged by thematic areas**

| **Thematic Areas** | **Core Indicators** | **Assessment According to the Following** |  | **Citations[[13]](#footnote-13)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institutional and human capacities** | 1. Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of ICH | * 1. One or more competent bodies for ICH safeguarding have been designated or established. |  | Article 13(b)  OD 154(a) |
| * 1. Competent bodies exist for safeguarding specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed.[[14]](#footnote-14) |  | Article 13(b)  OD 158(a),  OD 162(d) |
| * 1. Broad and inclusive[[15]](#footnote-15) involvement in ICH safeguarding and management, particularly by the communities, groups and individuals concerned, is fostered through consultative bodies or other coordination mechanisms |  | OD 80 |
| * 1. Institutions, organizations and/or initiatives for ICH documentation are fostered, and their materials are utilized to support continued practice and transmission of ICH. |  | Article 13(d)(iii) |
| * 1. Cultural centres, centres of expertise, research institutions, museums, archives, libraries, etc., contribute to ICH safeguarding and management. |  | OD 79, OD 109 |
| 1. Extent to which programmes support the strengthening of human capacities to promote safeguarding and management of ICH | * 1. Tertiary education institutions offer curricula and degrees in ICH safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |  | Article 14(a)(iii)  OD 107(k) |
| * 1. Governmental institutions, centres and other bodies provide training in ICH safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |  |  |
| * 1. Community-based or NGO-based initiatives provide training in ICH safeguarding and management, on an inclusive basis. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which training is operated by or addressed to communities, groups and individuals, as well as to those working in the fields of culture and heritage | * 1. Training programmes, including those operated by communities themselves, provide capacity building in ICH addressed on an inclusive basis to communities, groups and individuals. |  | Article 14(a)(ii)  OD 82,  OD 153(b),  OD 155(b) |
| * 1. Training programmes provide capacity building in ICH addressed on an inclusive basis to those working in the fields of culture and heritage. |  | Article 14(a)(iii)  OD 153(b) |
| **Transmission and education** | 1. Extent to which both formal and non-formal education strengthen the transmission of ICH and promote respect for ICH | * 1. Practitioners and bearers[[16]](#footnote-16) are involved inclusively in the design and development of ICH education programmes and/or in actively presenting and transmitting their heritage. |  | OD 107(e) |
| * 1. Modes and methods of transmitting ICH that are recognized by communities, groups and individuals are learned and/or strengthened, and included in educational programmes, both formal and non-formal. |  | Article 14(a)(i); Article 14(a)(ii)  OD 180(a)(iii) |
| * 1. Educational programmes and/or extra-curricular activities concerning ICH and strengthening its transmission, undertaken by communities, groups, NGOs or heritage institutions, are available and supported. |  | OD 109 |
| * 1. Teacher training programmes and programmes for training providers of non-formal education include approaches to integrating ICH and its safeguarding into education. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which ICH and its safeguarding are integrated into primary and secondary education, included in the content of relevant disciplines, and used to strengthen teaching and learning about and with ICH and respect for one’s own and others’ ICH | * 1. ICH, in its diversity, is included in the content of relevant disciplines, as a contribution in its own right and/or as a means of explaining or demonstrating other subjects. |  | Article 14(a)(i)  OD 107,  OD 180(a)(ii) |
| * 1. School students learn to respect and reflect on the ICH of their own community or group as well as the ICH of others through educational programmes and curricula. |  | Article 14(a)(i)  OD 105,  OD 180(a)(i)  EP 11 |
| * 1. The diversity of learners’ ICH is reflected through mother tongue or multilingual education and/or the inclusion of ‘local content’ within the educational curriculum. |  | OD 107 |
| * 1. Educational programmes teach about the protection of natural and cultural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing ICH. |  | Article 14(c)  OD 155(e),  OD 180(d)  EP 5 |
| 1. Extent to which post-secondary education supports the practice and transmission of ICH as well as study of its social, cultural and other dimensions | * 1. Post-secondary education institutions offer curricula and degrees (in fields such as music, arts, crafts, technical and vocational education and training, etc.) that strengthen the practice and transmission of ICH. |  |  |
| * 1. Post-secondary education institutions offer curricula and degrees for the study of ICH and its social, cultural and other dimensions. |  |  |
| **Inventorying and research** | 1. Extent to which inventories reflect the diversity of ICH and contribute to safeguarding | * 1. One or more inventorying systems oriented towards safeguarding and reflecting the diversity of ICH have been established or revised since ratification. |  | Articles 11 and 12  OD 1, OD 2 |
| * 1. Specialized inventories and/or inventories of various scopes reflect diversity and contribute to safeguarding. |  |  |
| * 1. Existing inventory or inventories have been updated during the reporting period, in particular to reflect the current viability of elements included. |  | Article 12  OD 1, OD 2 |
| * 1. Access to ICH inventories is facilitated, while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of ICH, and they are utilized to strengthen safeguarding. |  | Article 13(d)(ii)  OD 85 |
| 1. Extent to which the inventorying process is inclusive, respects the diversity of ICH and its practitioners, and supports safeguarding by communities, groups and individuals concerned | * 1. Communities, groups and relevant NGOs participate inclusively in inventorying which informs and strengthens their safeguarding efforts. |  | Article 11  OD 1, OD 2  EP 1, EP 6,  EP 8, EP 10 |
| * 1. Inventorying process respects the diversity of ICH and its practitioners, including the practices and expressions of all sectors of society, all genders and all regions. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which research and documentation, including scientific, technical and artistic studies, contribute to safeguarding | * 1. Financial and other forms of support foster research, scientific, technical and artistic studies, documentation and archiving, oriented towards safeguarding and carried out in conformity with relevant ethical principles. |  | OD 173, OD 175 |
| * 1. Research is fostered concerning approaches towards, and impacts of, safeguarding ICH in general and specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed. |  | OD 162 |
| * 1. Practitioners and bearers of ICH participate in the management, implementation and dissemination of research findings and scientific, technical and artistic studies, all done with their free, prior, sustained and informed consent. |  | OD 109(a),  OD 109(e),  OD 153(b)(ii),  OD 175  EP 1, EP 7 |
| 1. Extent to which research findings and documentation are accessible and are utilized to strengthen policy-making and improve safeguarding | * 1. Documentation and research findings are accessible to communities, groups and individuals, while respecting customary practices governing access to specific aspects of ICH. |  | Article 13(d)(ii)  OD 85,  OD 101(c),  OD 153(b)(iii)  EP 5 |
| * 1. The results of research, documentation, and scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH are utilized to strengthen policy-making across sectors. |  | OD 153(b)(ii) |
| * 1. The results of research, documentation, and scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH are utilized to improve safeguarding. |  |  |
| **Policies as well as legal and administrative measures** | 1. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of culture reflect the diversity of ICH and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. Cultural policies and/or legal and administrative measures integrating ICH and its safeguarding, and reflecting its diversity, have been established or revised and are being implemented. |  | Article 13(a)  OD 153(b)(i),  OD 171(d) |
| * 1. National or sub-national strategies and/or action plans for ICH safeguarding are established or revised and are being implemented, including safeguarding plans for specific elements, whether or not inscribed. |  | OD 1, OD 2 |
| * 1. Public financial and/or technical support for the safeguarding of ICH elements, whether or not inscribed, is provided on an equitable basis, in relation to the overall support for culture and heritage at large, while bearing in mind the priority for those identified as in need of urgent safeguarding. |  |  |
| * 1. Cultural policies and/or legal and administrative measures integrating ICH and its safeguarding are informed by the active participation of communities, groups and individuals. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in the field of education reflect the diversity of ICH and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for education are established or revised and implemented to ensure recognition of, respect for and enhancement of intangible cultural heritage. |  | Article 14(a)(ii) |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for education are established or revised and implemented to strengthen transmission and practice of ICH. |  | Article 14(a)(ii) |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures promote mother tongue instruction and multilingual education. |  | Article 14(a)(ii)  OD 107 |
| 1. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures in fields other than culture and education reflect the diversity of ICH and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented | * 1. The Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage are respected in development plans, policies and programmes. |  | OD 171(c)  EP |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for inclusive social development[[17]](#footnote-17) and environmental sustainability are established or revised to consider ICH and its safeguarding. |  | OD 171(d),  OD 178,  OD 179,  OD 181,  OD 182,  OD 188-190,  OD 191 |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures to respond to situations of natural disaster or armed conflict are established or revised to include the ICH affected and to recognize its importance for the resilience of the affected populations. |  |  |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures for inclusive economic development are established or revised to consider ICH and its safeguarding.[[18]](#footnote-18) |  | OD 171(d),  OD 183-186 |
| * 1. Favourable financial or fiscal measures or incentives are established or revised to facilitate and/or encourage practice and transmission of ICH and increase availability of natural and other resources required for its practice. |  | OD 78,  OD 186(b) |
| 1. Extent to which policies as well as legal and administrative measures respect customary rights, practices and expressions, particularly as regards the practice and transmission of ICH | * 1. Forms of legal protection, such as intellectual property rights and privacy rights, are provided to ICH practitioners, bearers and their communities when their ICH is exploited by others for commercial or other purposes. |  | OD 104,  OD 173 |
| * 1. The importance of customary rights of communities and groups to land, sea and forest ecosystems necessary for the practice and transmission of ICH is recognized in policies and/or legal and administrative measures. |  | OD 178(c) |
| * 1. Policies and/or legal and administrative measures recognize expressions, practices and representations of intangible cultural heritage that contribute to dispute prevention and peaceful conflict resolution. |  | OD 194, OD 195 |
| **Role of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in society** | 1. Extent to which the importance of ICH and its safeguarding in society is recognized, both by the communities, groups and individuals concerned and by society at large | * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use their ICH for their well-being, including in the context of sustainable development programmes. |  |  |
| * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use their ICH for dialogue promoting mutual respect, conflict resolution and peace-building. |  |  |
| * 1. Development interventions recognize the importance of ICH in society as a source of identity and continuity, and as a source of knowledge and skills, and strengthen its role as a resource to enable sustainable development. |  | OD 170,  OD 173 |
| 1. Extent to which the importance of safeguarding ICH is recognized through inclusive plans and programmes that foster self-respect and mutual respect | * 1. ICH safeguarding plans and programmes are inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including but not limited to: * indigenous peoples; * groups with different ethnic identities; * migrants, immigrants and refugees; * people of different ages; * people of different genders; * persons with disabilities; * members of vulnerable groups. |  | OD 100,  OD 102,  OD 174,  OD 194  EP 1, EP 2,  EP 4, EP 9,  EP 10 |
| * 1. Self-respect and mutual respect are fostered among communities, groups and individuals through safeguarding plans and programmes for ICH in general and/or for specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed. |  | Article 1,  Article 2,  Article 14(a)  OD 100,  OD 107, OD 155 |
| **Awareness raising** | 1. Extent to which communities, groups and individuals participate widely in raising awareness about the importance of ICH and its safeguarding | * 1. Awareness-raising actions reflect the inclusive and widest possible participation of communities, groups and individuals concerned. |  | OD 101 |
| * 1. The free, prior, sustained and informed consent of communities, groups and individuals concerned is secured for conducting awareness-raising activities concerning specific elements of their intangible cultural heritage. |  | OD 101 |
| * 1. The rights of communities, groups and individuals and their moral and material interests are duly protected when raising awareness about their ICH. |  | OD 101(b),  OD 101(d),  OD 104,  OD 171  EP 7 |
| * 1. Youth are actively engaged in awareness-raising activities, including collecting and disseminating information about the intangible cultural heritage of their communities or groups. |  | Article 14(a)(i)  OD 107(f) |
| * 1. Communities, groups and individuals use information and communication technologies and all forms of media, in particular new media, for raising awareness of the importance of ICH and its safeguarding. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which media are involved in raising awareness about the importance of ICH and its safeguarding and in promoting understanding and mutual respect | * 1. Media coverage raises awareness of the importance of ICH and its safeguarding and promotes mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals. |  | OD 111,  OD 112,  OD 113 |
| * 1. Specific cooperation activities or programmes concerning ICH are established and implemented between various ICH stakeholders and media organizations, including capacity-building activities. |  |  |
| * 1. Media programming on ICH is inclusive, utilizes the languages of the communities and groups concerned, and/or addresses different target groups. |  | OD 112, OD 113 |
| * 1. Media coverage of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding is in line with the concepts and terminology of the Convention. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which public information measures raise awareness about the importance of ICH and its safeguarding and promote understanding and mutual respect | * 1. Practitioners and bearers of ICH are acknowledged publicly, on an inclusive basis, through policies and programmes. |  | OD 105(d) |
| * 1. Public events concerning ICH, its importance and safeguarding, and the Convention, are organized for communities, groups and individuals, the general public, researchers, the media and other stakeholders. |  | OD 105(b) |
| * 1. Programmes for promotion and dissemination of good safeguarding practices are fostered and supported. |  | OD 106 |
| * 1. Public information on ICH promotes mutual respect and appreciation within and between communities and groups. |  |  |
| 1. Extent to which programmes raising awareness of ICH respect the relevant ethical principles | * 1. The Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage are respected in awareness-raising activities. |  | EP |
| * 1. Ethical principles, particularly as embodied in relevant professional codes or standards, are respected in awareness-raising activities. |  | OD 103 |
| **Engagement of communities, groups and individuals as well as other stakeholders** | 1. Extent to which engagement for safeguarding ICH is enhanced among stakeholders | * 1. Communities, groups and individuals participate, on an inclusive basis and to the widest possible extent, in the safeguarding of ICH in general and of specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed. |  | Article 15  OD 1, OD 2,  OD 7, OD 79, OD 101(b),  OD 171(a)  EP 1, EP 2, EP 9 |
| * 1. NGOs and other civil society actors participate in the safeguarding of ICH in general, and of specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed. |  | OD 90, OD 108, OD 157(e),  OD 158(b),  OD 162(d),  OD 163(b) |
| * 1. Private sector entities participate in the safeguarding of ICH, and of specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed, respecting the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding ICH. |  | OD 187 |
| 1. Extent to which civil society contributes to monitoring of ICH safeguarding | * 1. An enabling environment exists for communities, groups and individuals concerned to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. |  |  |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for NGOs, and other civil society bodies to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. |  | OD 83,  OD 151,  OD 153(b)(ii) |
| * 1. An enabling environment exists for scholars, experts, research institutions and centres of expertise to monitor and undertake scientific, technical and artistic studies on ICH safeguarding programmes and measures. |  |  |
| **International engagement** | 1. Number and geographic distribution of NGOs, public and private bodies, and private persons involved by the Committee in an advisory or consultative capacity[[19]](#footnote-19) | * 1. Number of NGOs accredited to provide advisory services, their geographic distribution and their representation of different domains. |  | Article 9  OD 93 |
| * 1. Percentage of accredited NGOs that participate in the sessions and working groups of the Convention’s governing bodies, and their geographic distribution. |  |  |
| * 1. Number of occasions and activities in which accredited NGOs are involved by the Committee for consultative purposes, beyond the evaluation mechanisms. |  | Article 8 |
| 1. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged with other States Parties in cooperation for safeguarding | * 1. Bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation is undertaken to implement safeguarding measures for ICH in general | . | Article 19  OD 86 |
| * 1. Bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation is undertaken to implement safeguarding measures for specific elements of ICH, in particular those in danger, those present in the territories of more than one State, and cross-border elements. |  |  |
| * 1. Information and experience about ICH and its safeguarding, including good safeguarding practices, is exchanged with other States Parties. |  | Article 19  OD 156,  OD 193 |
| * 1. Documentation concerning an element of ICH present on the territory of another State Party is shared with it. |  | Article 19  OD 87 |
| 1. Percentage of States Parties actively engaged in international networking and institutional cooperation | * 1. State Party engages, as host or beneficiary, in the activities of category 2 centres for ICH. |  | OD 88 |
| * 1. International networking is fostered among communities, groups and individuals, NGOs, experts, centres of expertise and research institutes, active in the field of ICH. |  | OD 86 |
| * 1. State Party participates in the ICH-related activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO. |  |  |
| 1. ICH Fund effectively supports safeguarding and international engagement[[20]](#footnote-20) | * 1. States Parties seek financial or technical assistance from the ICH Fund and implement safeguarding programmes resulting from such assistance. |  | Article 19,  Article 21 |
| * 1. States Parties or other entities provide voluntary supplementary contributions to the ICH Fund, for general or specific purposes, in particular the global capacity-building programme. |  | Article 25.5, Article 27  ODs 68-71 |
| * 1. The ICH Fund is utilized to support costs of participation in the meetings of the governing bodies of the Convention by a wide range of stakeholders, including ICH experts and accredited NGOs from developing countries, public and private bodies, as well as members of communities and groups, invited to those meetings to act in an advisory capacity. |  | Article 8,  Article 9  OD 67 |

**ANNEX 3**

**Sample guidance notes[[21]](#footnote-21)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | **Indicator 1: Extent to which ICH is mainstreamed into primary and secondary education, included in the content of relevant disciplines, and used to strengthen teaching and learning about and with ICH and respect for one’s own and others’ ICH**  **Description:** This indicator is assessed on the basis of four country-level factors reported by each State Party:   * 1. ICH is included in the content of relevant disciplines, as a contribution in its own right and/or as a means of explaining or demonstrating other subjects.   2. School students learn to respect the ICH of their own community or group as well as the ICH of others through educational programmes and curricula.   3. The diversity of learners’ ICH is reflected through the use of mother tongue instruction and/or the inclusion of ‘local content’ within the educational curriculum.   4. Educational programmes teach about the protection of natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the ICH.   States Parties may report that they fully satisfy, largely satisfy, partially satisfy, minimally satisfy or do not satisfy this indicator (see Method below).  **Links:** This indicator primarily supports Long Term Outcome 1: ‘Continued practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage ensured’; it falls within the thematic area of ‘Education and transmission’.  **Context:** The present indicator aims to measure the extent to which States Parties are responding to those provisions of Article 14 that concern education *about* ICH, focussing here on primary and secondary education. Indicator 2, by comparison, concerns how formal and non-formal education can be used to strengthen *transmission* of ICH and thereby ensure its safeguarding, while indicator 3 focusses on post-secondary education. Other provisions of Article 14 that concern capacity building are addressed by indicators 5 and 6, while those provisions of Article 14 concerning awareness raising are addressed by indicators 17-20. Legislation and policies about ICH and education are addressed in indicator 12.  This indicator complements SDG Target 4.7 and SDG Indicator 4.7.1, particularly insofar as it concerns ‘appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development’. It also supports SDG Target 12.8 and SDG Indicator 12.8.1 as it concerns education for ‘sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature’. |
| **Purpose** | **Rationale:** Among its core safeguarding obligations under the Convention, a State Party shall endeavour to educate its population, in particular young people, about what ICH is and why it is important. Primary and secondary education is the primary context for such efforts in many countries. The present indicator encompasses a number of actions that have demonstrated effectiveness in this area and have been encouraged in the Operational Directives (see paragraphs 107, 155, 180). These possible actions focus on teaching and learning about and with ICH – both that of students and that of others – and thereby fostering respect for ICH and mutual respect. By using the content of ICH to teach and learn other subjects such as math, science or literature, schools can emphasize the importance of ICH in everyday life, stimulate students’ curiosity and promote safeguarding.  **Benefits:** Monitoring at the country level can help a State to identify how fully it is taking advantage of educational approaches and methodologies that have demonstrated their effectiveness around the world in ensuring the practice and transmission of ICH. Monitoring at the global level can help to identify opportunities for strengthening such approaches and methodologies and for fostering international cooperation to diffuse them more widely. |
| **Method** | **Interpretation:** At the country level, ‘extent to which…’ is understood to mean ‘the degree to which the indicator has been satisfied, within the territory of the reporting State Party’. At the global level, ‘extent to which…’ is understood to mean ‘the percentage of States Parties in which the indicator has been satisfied, to different degrees’.  **Data sources and collection:** For its Periodic Reporting, a State Party will need to draw upon cooperation between ICH authorities and its Ministry of Education. Complementing information at the national level concerning programmes and curricula, the State Party is encouraged to identify examples of successful actions taken at lower levels to put them into practice. Certain programmes may remain stable from one reporting cycle to another, while others may be introduced during a reporting cycle. The concrete examples of successful actions should be those occurring during the reporting cycle.  **Method of calculation:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Indicator is:** | **If:** | | Fully satisfied | State Party reports results addressing all four assessment factors | | Largely satisfied | State Party reports results addressing three assessment factors | | Partially satisfied | State Party reports results addressing two assessment factors | | Minimally satisfied | State Party reports results addressing one assessment factor | | Not satisfied | State Party reports no results addressing the assessment factors |   **Baselines and targets:** At the country level, if a State Party is not fully satisfying the indicator at the time of reporting, it can establish a target to do so within a certain time period, or to show progress in that direction. At the global level, targets can be established and results monitored for the proportion of States Parties satisfying the indicator to which degree. |
| **Introduction** | **Indicator 11: Extent to which policies and legislation in the field of culture reflect the diversity of ICH and the importance of its safeguarding and are implemented**  **Description:** This indicator is assessed on the basis of two country-level factors reported by each State Party:   * 1. Cultural policies and/or legislation integrating ICH and its safeguarding have been elaborated and/or revised and are being implemented.   2. National or sub-national strategies and/or action plans for ICH safeguarding are established or revised, including safeguarding plans for specific elements, whether or not inscribed.   States Parties may report that they fully satisfy, partially satisfy, or do not satisfy this indicator (see Method below).  **Links:** This indicator primarily supports Long Term Outcome 2: ‘Diversity of intangible cultural heritage respected’; it falls within the thematic area of ‘Policies and legislation’.  **Context:** This indicator aims to measure the degree to which States Parties are responding to Article 13 of the Convention. The focus of the present indicator is on policies and legislation within the field of culture; by comparison, indicators 12and 13 refer to policies and legislation in fields other than culture.  The indicator complements SDG Target 11.4 and indicator 11.4.1, which refer to strengthening ‘efforts to protect and safeguard the world’s cultural and natural heritage’. |
| **Purpose** | **Rationale:** In conformity with Article 13(a), each State Party shall endeavour 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’. Policies and legislation concerning culture are often the primary context in which such a general policy is expressed. These may be laws or policies on culture in general, or on heritage in general, or they may be devoted specifically to ICH. Article 13(d) further calls upon the State Party to ‘adopt appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures’ to ‘ensure the safeguarding, development and promotion of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory’ in several specific areas within the culture sector. Paragraph 171 of the Operational Directives further specifies the characteristics that should mark such laws or policies.  Assessment factor 11.1 refers to the laws or policies mentioned in Article 13 and in the Operational Directives. Assessment factor 11.2 refers to a number of measures that have proven to be effective complements and good practices in many countries, but are not required by the Convention. However, for States Parties that have nominated elements to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Operational Directives require that there be a safeguarding plan for the nominated element. In some cases, national law or policy requires elaboration of a safeguarding plan for specific elements included within an inventory or inscribed on a national list. Similarly, action plans for safeguarding ICH in general may also be required by some national laws or policies.  **Benefits:** Monitoring at the country level can help a State to assess how fully it is meeting its fundamental responsibility in the domain of cultural legislation and policy. Monitoring at the global level can help to assess the degree to which ICH is integrated into cultural laws and policies worldwide, and where priority attention should be given to legal and policy reform. In the case of safeguarding plans for specific elements, whether or not inscribed, monitoring can contribute to the relevant mid-term and short-term outcomes. |
| **Method** | **Interpretation:** At the country level, ‘extent to which…’ is understood to mean ‘the degree to which the indicator has been satisfied, within the territory of the reporting State Party’. At the global level, ‘extent to which…’ is understood to mean ‘the percentage of States Parties in which the indicator has been fully satisfied, partially satisfied or not satisfied, respectively’.  **Data sources and collection:** The ICH authorities responsible for preparing a State Party’s periodic report should have the information needed for this indicator readily at hand, particularly as far as assessment factor 11.1 is concerned. Laws and regulations are typically published in an official journal or record, and a citation to an available source is expected; in some cases these will also have been integrated into the UNESCO Database of National Cultural Heritage Laws. For assessment factor 11.2, strategies or action plans may not have been published officially and ICH authorities may need to solicit these from local officials or from communities and groups so they can be accurately reported. In the cases where specific elements have been nominated for inscription on either of the Convention’s Lists, safeguarding plans for specific elements should be found as part of nomination files. The dates on which laws, regulations, policies or plans were adopted and/or revised are essential information to indicate whether this occurred prior to or after ratification of the Convention and during or prior to the present reporting cycle.  **Method of calculation:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Indicator is:** | **If:** | | Fully satisfied | State Party reports results addressing assessment factor 11.1; assessment factor 11.2 is optional | | Partially satisfied | State Party reports results addressing assessment factor 11.2, but not 11.1 | | Not satisfied | State Party reports no results addressing either assessment factor 11.1 or 11.2 |   **Baselines and targets:** At the country level, if a State Party is not fully satisfying the indicator it can establish a target to do so within a certain time period, or to show progress in that direction. At the global level, targets can be established and results monitored for the proportion of States Parties fully satisfying, partially satisfying, or not satisfying the indicator. |

1. . ‘Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard‐setting Work of the Culture Sector: Part I – 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage’ available in [English](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095e.pdf)|[French](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095f.pdf)|[Spanish](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095s.pdf)|[Arabic](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002230/223095a.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . *Re|Shaping Cultural Policies: A Decade Promoting the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. 2005 Convention 2015 Global Report.* <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002428/242866e.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. . *Results-Based Programming, Management, Monitoring and Reporting (RBM) approach as applied at UNESCO:* *Guiding Principles* (Document BSP/RBM/2008/1.REV.6), p. 58. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001775/177568E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. . Ibid., p. 27. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. . For the most part, the assessment factors seek to define outcomes, that is, ‘changes in the institutional and behavioural capacities or development conditions’ existing among the States Parties. Outputs are generally understood as ‘products, goods and services which result from a development intervention’, ‘the first effect of the intervention which contributes to the attainment of result(s)’. Over time, as diverse actors gain experience in implementing the Convention, the expectation is that monitoring and evaluation increasingly focus on outcomes, and the simpler and shorter-term outputs recede in importance. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. . In Annex 2, Table 2, a column includes selected citations to relevant provisions of the Convention, Operational Directives, or Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, for reference during the Committee’s debates. It is proposed that this column not be adopted formally as a part of the results framework; however, the citations would be integrated into the respective guidance notes. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. . UNEG Handbook for Conducting Evaluations of Normative Work in the UN System, 2013, para. 70 <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1484> (available in English, French and Spanish). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. . *Results-Based Programming, Management, Monitoring and Reporting (RBM) approach as applied at UNESCO: Guiding Principles* (Document BSP/RBM/2008/1.REV.6), p. 26. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001775/177568E.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. . Ibid., p. 26. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. After the meeting in Chengdu, the Bureau of the Committee decided to extend the twelfth session of the Committee by one day, until 9 December. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. . This indicator is monitored and reported only at the global level. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. . This indicator is monitored and reported only at the global level. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. . This column presents a partial list of some relevant provisions of the Convention, Operational Directives, and Ethical Principles, for the information of the working group. It is proposed that this column not be adopted formally as a part of the results framework; however, the citations would be integrated into the respective guidance notes. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. . References to ‘whether or not inscribed’ should be understood to mean ‘inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity’. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. . References to ‘inclusive’, ‘inclusively’ or ‘on an inclusive basis’ should be understood to mean ‘inclusive of all sectors and strata of society, including indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees, people of different ages and genders, persons with disabilities and members of vulnerable groups’ (cf. Operational Directives 174 and 194). When these actions and outcomes are reported, States Parties will be encouraged to provide disaggregated data or to explain how such inclusiveness is ensured. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. . Although the Convention consistently utilizes the expression, ‘communities, groups and individuals’, several assessment factors, like some Operational Directives, choose to refer to ‘practitioners and bearers’ to better identify certain of their members who play a specific role with regards to their ICH. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. . In conformity with Chapter VI of the Operational Directives, ‘inclusive social development’ comprises food security, health care, gender equality, access to clean and safe water and sustainable water use; quality education is included within indicator 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. . In conformity with Chapter VI of the Operational Directives, ‘inclusive economic development’ comprises income generation and sustainable livelihoods, productive employment and decent work, and impact of tourism on the safeguarding of ICH and vice versa. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. . This indicator is monitored and reported only at the global level. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. . This indicator is monitored and reported only at the global level. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. The two sample guidance notes were prepared for the open-ended working group as they are presented in this document. Following the changes operated by the working group on some of the core indicators and assessment factors, their numbering and content are no longer the same. These two guidance notes will be therefore revised to reflect the core indicators and assessment factors of the final version of the overall results framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)