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lesson plan

Duration:

7 hours (5 hours in groups, 2 hours in plenary)

Objective(s):

Participants acquire the skills to evaluate an International Assistance request, identify weaknesses and discuss how it could be revised.

Description:

This unit provides a sample International Assistance request (chosen by the facilitators among three options), which participants evaluate in small groups and formulate comments thereon. They may use a guided questionnaire to proceed systematically through the request. The breakout groups reconvene in plenary to report on their conclusions and recommendations.

*Proposed sequence:*

1. The facilitator introduces the session by briefly presenting the sample request (Unit 51 Hand-out 1 *or* 2 *or* 3). Participants are organized into groups that will perform an evaluation of the sample request. 20-30 minutes should be allotted for individual reading.
2. In groups, participants analyse the sample request, identifying its strengths and weaknesses and deciding which missing information or clarifications could be needed from the submitting State Party. Participants note and organize their conclusions and recommendations.
3. Participants present their findings to the other groups in plenary and discuss them. The report-back session can be organized to discuss each section in turn, so as to compare and contrast problems identified by each group, rather than receiving the complete report for each group all at once.

Supporting documents:

* Unit 51 Facilitator’s notes (including detailed notes on each of the three requests)
* Sample requests and questionnaire (Unit 51 Hand-outs 1 *or* 2 *or* 3 + Unit 51 Hand-out 4)
* ICH-04 Timetable and budget form and its instructions (if relevant)
* Basic Texts of the Convention
* Aide-mémoire for completing requests for International Assistance (available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/forms/>)

Notes and suggestions

The facilitator should organize participants into groups of no more than five or six members; there should normally be no more than three or four groups per workshop. Participants should be allocated to groups in such a way as to balance knowledge of the Convention and experience with ICH between them.

Introducing the sample requests

There are three sample requests for use in this session, which are loosely inspired by real files examined by the Committee. The facilitators will typically choose one of the three requests, in consultation with the host country organizers and UNESCO Field Office, well in advance of the workshop. In most cases, the entire workshop will deal with a single request. In exceptional cases, some groups might work with one request and other groups with another, although this substantially complicates the work of the facilitators.

Participants will identify missing and ill-placed information, and detect and discuss discrepancies between the information provided in different sections. They should work systematically through the form, referring as needed to the criteria and considerations for granting International Assistance.

About the exercise

This exercise is based largely on the methods used to treat real requests. Participants will need to read the whole sample request file before starting their discussions. Each group should appoint a chair and a rapporteur. The chair can organize the discussion, and the rapporteur can make notes and report later to the plenary session (using bullet-points). The groups should be discouraged from rewriting or improving the files – they are rather to accept the request as a finished package and decide whether or not in their view it is well conceived and well argued, and if not, where the problems and weaknesses are centred.

To assist participants in identifying problems with the request file, a hand-out with questions applicable to any of the sample requests (Unit 51 Hand-out 4) is attached to this Unit and should be distributed among participants to guide them through the analysis. In the cases where the knowledge of the participants is sufficiently strong, the facilitator may also decide not to distribute this hand-out and let the chairs of the groups lead the discussions without written guidance.

In the discussion of the sample requests facilitators will encourage participants to express their own opinions, and debate the ways in which the criteria and considerations for granting International Assistance can best be satisfied. For that, they should refer frequently to the instructions in the ICH-04 form and to the Aide-mémoire for completing a request for International Assistance. Participants will proceed through the request form section by section and come to a final conclusion.

Reassure participants that they should not worry if they know little or nothing of the locale or subject of their sample request – that is part of the experience. Facilitators can decide, depending on the context, how much time to allow participants to spend working on their sample requests in groups (with or without questionnaire), and how much time to spend reporting and discussing in plenary. If groups struggle to identify problems, the facilitator may assist them using ideas drawn from the Facilitator’s notes below, if necessary.

What is likely to be wrong with the sample requests?

The sample request files contain errors that have been deliberately inserted to demonstrate problems that commonly occur in such requests. These problems may be technical or substantive in nature. Before groups plunge into their evaluation, the facilitator may wish to review these problems briefly with them.

*Technical problems* could include:

* boxes incorrectly ticked;
* missing information;
* information out of place;
* unnecessary information provided;
* too much redundancy (some is unavoidable); and
* confusing or contradictory information about demography, geography or other details.

*Substantive problems* could include:

* threats not appropriately identified or situation not clearly defined;
* safeguarding measures do not sufficiently address the identified threats;
* safeguarding measures are inappropriate to the situation or likely to produce undesired effects;
* safeguarding measures proposed do not reflect the values of the Convention but are borrowed from tangible heritage or another field;
* contradictory information about the activities planned or the roles and responsibilities or different actors;
* lack of appropriate community involvement or lack of clear descriptions explaining how the community was involved.

In the following sections of this document, the facilitator will find background notes for the discussions on each request files section by section. In addition to the guided questionnaire, these notes will assist the facilitator further in responding to any questions that arise and in ensuring that the important points are addressed by the groups.

The facilitator should note that some information may simply be placed in the wrong section; other weak points may become apparent only when the whole file is read.

For this exercise, participants should assume that:

* All the countries are imaginary and proper names have been invented;
* Complete names and addresses are provided wherever required in sections 2, 8 and 25 of the requests;
* All answers in all requests meet the minimum and maximum requirements for word counts and participants should not trouble themselves about this issue (unless, for example, they decide that something is padded or repeated simply to meet the minimum threshold).

For the purposes of this Unit, the participants may wish to disregard the note on the first page of the Unit 51 Hand-outs 1 or 2 or 3 (they reproduce the form ICH-04) which is related to the possibility to request International Assistance when nominating. If the question arises, the facilitator may inform that the experimental form ICH-01bis is based upon the ICH-01 form for nominating elements for inscription on the USL. Section 3 of the form ICH-01 was expanded substantially to integrate most of the relevant sections of the ICH-04 form for requesting International Assistance (except for certain parts such as section 13 on Background and rationale).

Timetable and budget

Timetable and budget represent an important aspect of submitting a complete request for International Assistance that will be likely to be approved by the Committee or the Bureau. But they are even more essential for it to be able to implement a safeguarding project effectively, if the Committee should grant funds. Planning and budgeting always have to be done in parallel and should contribute to a project’s expected results.

In terms of budgeting, an International Assistance request must reflect all of the costs that will be incurred to carry out the activities, whether they be out-of-pocket costs for goods or supplies or in-kind costs for staff members at the ministry. The practical challenge is to look from every direction to be sure that any expenses are not overlooked, particularly when it comes to in-kind costs or time.[[1]](#footnote-1)

As the participants read and discuss a sample request, they will discover that the timetable and budget are lacking certain key details and do not correspond perfectly with the information presented elsewhere in the requests. Issues of a more substantial nature on which participants should concentrate their attention include the following:

* In Section 6 (duration) of each of the sample requests the submitting States have not indicated the number of months, but have instead indicated calendar years. UNESCO advises indicating number of months, given the number of uncertainties between the time a request is granted and the time work may actually begin.
* Many budget items are shown as lump sums, with no idea of how the figure was arrived at. Sometimes an item is not described with sufficient detail, or there is no specificity as to what expenses are included within a line.
* For items that lend themselves to a calculation of number of units and cost per unit, the budget often does not present all of the details resulting in a particular cost in the column for describing the expense item.
* Sometimes very little of the budget is directed to communities and/or NGOs. Community members are generally compensated on an equal basis with government staff for taking part in a training workshop, but their number is usually very small.
* Certain activities or items receive generous allocations of funds even if their overall contribution to safeguarding is questionable at best.

The facilitator should note that in order to keep participants’ focus on questions of substance, certain very common problems have been avoided for the purpose of this exercise:

1. There are no problems with currency conversions, since all costs are expressed in U.S. dollars.
2. There are no direct contradictions between the activities in section 15, timetable and budget, even if they may not always be perfectly aligned with one another.
3. There are no calculation errors. Participants should not lose time to double-check whether the subtotals and totals are correctly calculated.
4. For the purposes of this workshop, budgets show only two sources of funds: UNESCO and the beneficiary State Party. Third-party funds such as those from an NGO or private donor are also welcome.
5. Within the State Party’s share, it has clearly indicated the actual value of its in-kind contributions of staff time.

The facilitator should inform the participants that the Secretariat developed Excel-based ICH-04 Timetable and budget form to assist States Parties to prepare well-structured and technically compliant timetables and budgets. The snapshots of this form containing timetable and budgets have been attached at the end of each mock request.

However, if the time permits, the facilitator may download the ICH-04 Timetable and budget form from the website of the Convention and show them to the participants on the screen to give them an idea about how it looks like and is structured. For this purpose, the facilitator may wish to use the Instructions for completing ICH-04 Timetable and budget form available on the ‘Forms’ page of the Convention website: <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/forms>

1. Inventorying the intangible cultural heritage in Highland Province

### Notes on Specific sections

### 3. Project title

This title accurately describes the scope of the present project, but there is probably a way to suggest a more informative title.

### 4. Summary of the project

The Aide-mémoire reminds States Parties this is a summary and NOT an introduction, and it recommends them to draft this summary after the request itself has been elaborated, and to be certain that it provides a brief overview of the entire request. Participants should be encouraged to read this several times – at the beginning of their evaluation, after they have read the entire request, and again before analysing the request.

Does the present summary provide a good overview of the project as a whole? Are there important activities that go unmentioned or others that receive too much emphasis?

Does the summary already hint at some of the weaknesses or misconceptions that will become more problematic in later sections (e.g., the undue attention to ‘Masterpieces’ that may not be in the spirit of the 2003 Convention, or the notion of ICH as raw material to be perfected by artists)?

Do terms such as ‘precious’ and ‘unique’ have a place in nominations or requests for International Assistance?

Does the summary heed the Committee’s advice to use appropriate language that promotes mutual respect? When do comparisons with other countries cross the line and become problematic?

### 5. Is this an emergency request that might receive expedited processing?

The definition here is taken exactly from OD 50. Participants should not confuse the possibility of providing expedited processing for an International Assistance request in case of emergency (as offered here) with the inscription of an element on the USL in case of extreme urgency (OD 32).

The submitting State has ticked the wrong box here – nothing in the request indicates that it responds to an emergency like that described in OD 50.

### 7. Previous financial assistance from UNESCO for similar or related activities

For the purposes of this exercise, participants can ignore this question.

Any implementing organization that is in default of an existing contract with UNESCO cannot receive a new contract, according to UNESCO’s financial regulations. Furthermore, criterion A.7 requires that the beneficiary State has implemented previously financed activities, if any, in line with all regulations.

### 9. Scope of the project

States Parties often use ‘regional’ to refer to an area within a single country, but for the purposes of UNESCO, ‘regional’ refers to an area including several countries. See the discussion of ‘international, regional, subregional, local’ in Unit 3.

### 10. Location of the project

How well does this section respect the Committee’s decision that information placed in inappropriate sections cannot be taken into consideration?[[2]](#footnote-2) Do these remarks characterize the geographical area or rather describe the people?

Do these remarks already reveal a certain assumption that the national majority population (the Latang) are superior to other minority ethnicities, and does this advance the Convention’s principle of mutual respect?

If participants find the response here to be problematic, can they identify any specific criterion to which it would be relevant? Or does it simply create an unfavourable impression that will influence their evaluation of other sections?

### 11. Purpose of request

Here, the submitting State has misunderstood the question. The purpose is obviously ‘elaboration of inventories’.

Should a State be penalized for answering a question incorrectly such as this one? Is this a fatal error, or simply one small fault among many?

### 12. Forms of assistance requested

If the submitting State is requesting financial assistance, as is usually the case, the last box must be ticked. It is also useful to tick other boxes to indicate how financial assistance will be used.

In this case, might the submitting State have also ticked the boxes for ‘provision of experts’ and/or ‘creation and operation of infrastructures’? The categories are not always self-evident, and no State will be penalized for answering incorrectly – but as with other sections above, an answer that is obviously incorrect may influence the evaluator’s reading of the request as a whole.

### 13. Background and rationale

The Aide-mémoire has a lengthy discussion of this section, which is one of the most important for demonstrating that criterion A.3 is met. The activities that follow can only be considered ‘well-conceived and feasible’ if the submitting State has provided a clear description here that explains how and why the request arose and what problems it seeks to address. This section should provide a solid foundation (in the form of a situation analysis or needs assessment) that clearly describes the present circumstances – particularly what the State and community have already done – and justifies why safeguarding efforts are needed at this time.

Participants should be encouraged to re-read this section in its entirety before entering into detailed discussion of its strengths and weaknesses.

The present response provides a generally good overview of the current situation in Wentapur and in Highland Province and describes the lack of an ICH inventory in the sense of Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. In that light, it provides a succinct description of the context in which the project would take place and the thinking underlying it.

Many readers will nevertheless find much of the content will raise serious questions in their minds about the larger cultural policies of the Government of Wentapur since independence. More particularly, readers may wonder whether the orientation of that cultural policy (towards cultural assimilation, a single unified national identity, and a vision of progress in which much of ICH is seen as superstitious and outmoded and is therefore suppressed) is compatible with the values and objectives of the Convention.

In other words, the response in this section may do a very good job of presenting an accurate picture of the actual reality of Wentapur, while at the same time raising serious doubts about the fundamental direction it has taken (and continues to take) in the domain of culture.

Participants should therefore be encouraged to look at the section from two directions: first asking how effectively the text responds to the questions posed and provides a background and rationale for an inventorying project, and second asking whether the premises underlying Wentapur’s approach seem to be consistent with the Convention.

The facilitator may wish to call attention to the following questions in particular:

* Does community identity constitute a threat to national identity? Does the Convention value one more highly than the other? Is a policy of assimilation of minorities to a majority culture one that seems to be in the spirit of the Convention?
* Do the practices, expressions, knowledge and beliefs of ICH constitute a threat to progress, development and/or modernity? Have participants encountered such thinking in their own countries and how do they respond? How can they ground their response in the concepts and language of the Convention?
* Should a country select parts of its ICH as raw material to be ‘perfected’ by artists, choreographers, composers or others?
* What rationales are offered here for undertaking an inventory? Are participants convinced by the arguments justifying the work of inventorying because it will contribute to touristic development and identify traditions that can be commercially exploited or integrated into a hegemonic national cultural identity?
* As with section 10 above, does the response display an attitude of proper respect to the entire population of Wentapur, and does it promote mutual respect, or does it on the contrary trade on negative remarks about others and a spirit of competition rather than cooperation? Should the latter be accepted as a matter to be decided by each State, as its sovereign right?

The response here generally stays within the scope of ‘background and rationale’, while necessarily pointing briefly towards the activities being proposed. If participants wonder whether this constitutes ‘misplaced information’, the facilitator might encourage them to discuss the degree to which it may be necessary to describe the planned activities briefly in order to provide a rationale for them.

### 14. Objectives and expected results

This section is also essential for satisfying criterion A.3. See the Section on Objectives and Expected Results in the Aide-mémoire.

This confused response is a mix of objectives, impacts, results, outcomes and outputs. As with the previous section, it may reveal more than the submitting State intends about the real motivations underlying the International Assistance request.

Each of the activities mentioned is discussed more fully in section 15 below, so participants should not go too deeply into the content of the activities themselves: they should keep their focus here on whether the text provides clear objectives and results.

Here, the facilitator may wish to encourage participants (if time allows) to identify for themselves, from the text here and elsewhere in the request, what they think are (or could be) the project’s primary objective and what they would consider its key expected results. There is not necessarily a right or wrong answer, but there is enough information in the request as a whole to allow them to try to extract one or more objectives and several results in bullet points here.

### 15. Activities

The Aide-mémoire devotes several pages to this section, which is also essential to satisfying criteria A.3 and A.1. The activities should respond directly to the situation analysis in section 13, and should reasonably be expected to achieve the objectives and results in section 14. If those two sections are problematic, there is a high likelihood the activities here will not be well conceived or feasible.

The text in this section is well structured, proposing a logical sequence of activities that could reasonably be expected to be carried out over the course of 24 months. The intention is to have participants not be distracted by the presentation but instead focus on the content of the activities, their appropriateness and their feasibility. Indeed, the structure can serve as a good model. Here it is the activities themselves that are sometimes problematic. Questions and topics for discussion are listed for each activity.

1. Is it true that ‘inventorying requires high-quality audiovisual documentation’? In the Convention, inventorying is characterized as the process of identification and definition (Article 11) – is there any reason this requires audiovisual technology? Might readers wonder (particularly when they see the budget) whether the project is serving as an excuse to equip the Ministry with expensive equipment (see also section 14, section 23)?
2. Does this description focus on the learning that will be accomplished, or on the opening ceremony and media coverage? Is 50 a reasonable number of participants for such a workshop? Who will participate, and who will facilitate? Where are community members in this activity?
3. Do participants believe that a standard questionnaire is the best means of carrying out inventorying? Does this description confuse the purpose of inventorying (identification and definition) with a very different purpose of enhancement and recognition in the form of a ‘Masterpieces’ programme? Is the concept of ‘best’ consistent with the 2003 Convention, and can it be determined scientifically, or doesn’t the Convention say that each community values its own heritage?
4. Do participants agree with the distribution of participants proposed? How well does this activity respond to criterion A.1 (involvement of communities in the implementation of the activities as broadly as possible)? And doesn’t the Convention require participation in inventorying of ‘relevant NGOs’ (Article 11)? As with activity 3 above, is there a confusion between inventorying, on the one hand, and listing or selecting Masterpieces, on the other hand?
5. Do participants think that the composition of the inventorying teams is appropriate (see also the questions posed for activity 4)? Once again, does this description seem to make inventorying not an end in itself or a measure to guide safeguarding decisions, but instead a tool for selecting Masterpieces?
6. Do participants think that it makes sense to proceed with inventorying in additional districts without any evaluation or monitoring of the experience in the first district? Note that the first assessment (activity 7) comes very late in the process and there is no explanation of how the experience in District One will influence the design of activities in the other districts.
7. Is this an appropriate schedule for monitoring and evaluation (see also section 21 below)? Are participants satisfied that the evaluation should focus only on the inventorying teams and their supervisors? Do they think that a self-evaluation questionnaire is likely to produce sufficient information? How well does this activity respond to criterion A.1?
8. With this activity, the confusion between inventorying (i.e. identification and definition) and the planned Masterpieces programme becomes clear. Even if, in many countries, inventorying has an aspect of selectivity and creation of a restricted list, do participants think that the idea of a ‘scientific’ process by which others determine what is ICH is compatible with Article 2 of the Convention, where each community, group or individual decides for itself? Does a body such as an ideology committee (or Ministry of Spiritual Values, or Department of Moral Guidance) have a role in either inventorying or listing? Are participants comfortable with the idea that inventorying and/or listing should aim at identifying heritage elements that can serve as raw material for artists to exploit (see also the similar comments in section 14 above)?
9. The final evaluation is perhaps better than the mid-term evaluation insofar as it includes interviewing (not just a self-administered questionnaire) and goes beyond the inventorying teams to (unspecified) ‘others who were not directly involved as project personnel’. Participants will want to look for consistency between the description here and the one that follows in section 21 below.
10. Reporting project results to high-level officials is an important step, but participants may wonder from the description whether this workshop will be a substantive examination of the project’s experience or a photo/media opportunity. Emphasizing once again the declaration of selected Masterpieces, does this activity raise further doubts about the motivations underlying the inventorying project?
11. Three months is not an unreasonable time to close out a complex project, but participants will want to look closely at the budget to see if this amount of time is really needed or if it may be a way of prolonging the salaries of key personnel.
12. An overall activity of ‘Project management and coordination’ can be an efficient way of presenting the budget information so that the staff costs that span several distinct activities can be shown in one place, rather than distributed among each activity (e.g., 10% for activity A, 15% for activity B, etc.). Since it extends from beginning to end of the project, it could be shown as the first activity or, as here, as the last activity. When they analyse the budget, participants will want to be certain that there is a logic to why personnel are shown in one place or another – and to be certain that the same person is not shown twice.

Overall, are participants convinced from this section that ‘the proposed activities are well-conceived and feasible’ (criterion A.3)? Are there other activities that they would deem to be essential for an inventorying project that are not included here? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s grasp of the key concepts of the Convention, particularly the nature of inventorying as a process of identification and definition to be carried out with the communities concerned and with relevant NGOs (Article 11)? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s motivations for inventorying, which seem to have less to do with safeguarding than with competition and identifying raw materials for artistic exploitation?

### 18. Community involvement

The very first criterion for granting International Assistance (A.1) requires that communities concerned should have participated in the preparation of the request and will be involved in the implementation of the activities, their evaluation and follow-up. Participants will already have noted problems with community involvement in the description of activities (section 15) and elsewhere. This is particularly problematic for an inventorying project because the Convention explicitly requires that inventories be drawn up with the participation of communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organizations (Article 11).

Participants should be encouraged to evaluate this section from two perspectives: first, community involvement in the preparation of the request and implementation of the proposed activities as members of the inventorying teams, and second, the role of community members as informants and the question of their free, prior and informed consent to the inventorying.

It seems to be no accident that the submitting State makes no mention of community involvement in the preparation of the request. Participants can discuss whether in their view this silence offers a good indication that communities were not actually involved – if they had been, it would have been easy enough for the State to point to such involvement.

With regard to participation of community members in the inventorying teams, trainees will probably already have discussed this when analysing the activities in section 15 above. Here, the submitting State offers further precision (notably, an important reference to gender equity in their selection), and introduces the information that the few community representatives will be selected not only for their stature within the community, but ‘for their prior service to the nation’. Participants may be encouraged to discuss how such a qualification might skew the already-weak community involvement, if for instance they are perceived as State agents rather than community members.

The question of free, prior and informed consent to participate as informants or collaborators in an inventory is of the highest importance. International Assistance is the only one of the Convention’s international mechanisms in which the submitting State is not required to provide documentary evidence of the free, prior and informed consent of the community, group or individuals concerned. This does not mean that such consent is not fundamental, but it recognizes that an International Assistance request may be elaborated before specific communities have been identified as beneficiaries. The final paragraph of the section expresses this, and previous evaluation bodies have accepted similar arguments in the past (if perhaps not expressed as bluntly as here). Nevertheless, for an inventory to succeed, free, prior and informed consent will be essential.

Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether the present text indicates that the submitting State has a proper attitude towards community consent. Do the calls for ‘a citizen’s obligation’ and ‘civic duty’ imply that community members will not have the possibility to freely decline their consent? At what point do such ideas indicate that they may face coercive pressures? Note that the Committee decided that all safeguarding measures should be voluntary and reflect the will and aspirations of the community concerned. Compulsion should have no place among these measures.[[3]](#footnote-3)

### 19. Implementing organization and strategy

This section is directly relevant to criterion A.3, whether the activities are feasible. See the Section 19 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is perhaps the one section of the request that is most responsive to the instructions provided in the ICH-04 form. It adequately identifies the human resources within the provincial Department of Culture that will be responsible for implementing the project, as well as their qualifications. While the text does not provide detail about the specific tasks of each member and the amount of time each will be involved, the text does point to such information within the budget. If participants find that the information in the budget is clear and correct, it need not be repeated here in detail.

The text here is also good insofar as it focuses on the implementing organization (i.e., the Department of Culture) and not on partners or collaborators (see section 20 below). One of the most common weaknesses in International Assistance requests is to include information here about partners rather than concentrating on the primary implementing organization.

### 20. Partners

See Section 20 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is more problematic than that in the previous section (19). On the one hand, participants may wonder why it is necessary to involve so many persons from the Ministry of Culture if the ICH Service is still small and the project will have to stretch to include staff members in Fine Arts, Mass Culture and Moral Guidance. Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether this raises questions about the Ministry’s underlying agenda in the project, and whether it might not be better to involve more team members at the province and district levels – and of course, more community members – rather than devoting so many slots to Ministry personnel whose connection to ICH seems weak.

The text here also mentions – for the first time – that the provincial Radio and Television will provide technical training in media documentation. Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether this information is in the proper place, or whether they are surprised to learn this only at this point in the request.

Participants will likely already have discussed the question of the research equipment and its disposition at the end of the project. Do they consider it correct that all such equipment is retained by the Ministry, and not shared with the Highland Province Department of Culture? Might this raise further questions in their minds about the underlying motivations of the project?

Participants may also be uneasy about the situation described in the final paragraph, where project personnel will be selected only if they are ‘properly imbued with the values of patriotism and national identity’. As with the question of project team members selected from the communities on the basis of their prior service to the nation (see section 18 above), participants should be encouraged to discuss whether such considerations should enter into the selection of project personnel. Within their own national context, would such language be normal or unusual? Even if they are familiar with such formulations, do they see why other readers might find them problematic and they might therefore better be avoided in a request?

### 21. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Monitoring, reporting and evaluation are relevant to satisfying criterion A.1 (involvement of communities in evaluation and follow-up) and criterion A.3 (feasibility of the safeguarding measures). See Section 21 of the Aide-mémoire.

As with the section on community involvement in elaborating, implementing and monitoring (18, above), the present section is notably silent on the question of how communities will be involved in evaluation and follow-up, yet this is an important component of criterion A.1.

Participants should also be encouraged to discuss whether the evaluation schedule proposed here and in section 15 seems to them to be adequate. Does it come too early in the implementation? Too late? Is there a feedback mechanism so that the lessons learnt in District One can be applied when inventorying begins in Districts Two and Three? Or will any lessons be learnt too late to influence the project design?

Do participants agree that questionnaires with project team members constitute an adequate basis for monitoring and evaluation? Who else do they believe should be involved? What other research methods (e.g. interviews, focus groups, etc.) do they think have a place in monitoring and evaluation?

### 22. Capacity-building

The information in this section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.4 (lasting results) and A.6 (building up or reinforcing capacities), as explained in Section 22 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here correctly notes that two capacity-building workshops figure into the implementation (activities 2 and 4) and that the closing workshop has an important aspect of building national capacities.

Are participants satisfied that the submitting State has adequately responded to the instructions in the form, specifically those asking for special emphasis on the capacities of the communities concerned? Is this once again an example where the State’s almost total silence on that question implies that it has little real interest in communities?

Do participants consider that purchasing digital audiovisual equipment for the Ministry constitutes ‘capacity building’ as understood in the Convention and ODs? Can a legitimate argument be made that increasing the technical capacities and infrastructure of an implementing body is indeed capacity-building? Does the reference to ‘supply of equipment and know-how’ in Article 21 (f) of the Convention settle the question, or does it remain one of finding an overall balance between other forms of capacity-building versus provision of equipment?

### 23. Sustainability after the assistance ends

As the Aide-mémoire explains, the present section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.3 (well-conceived activities) and A.4 (lasting results).

Are participants satisfied that the text in this section responds to the instructions in the form? Does it describe any concrete lasting results, or is it more a statement of good intentions?

Does the idea of generating revenues for the Ministry by charging users a fee for using the audiovisual equipment seem appropriate to participants? If they do think it is a creative strategy, does the submitting State have an obligation to describe here more precisely how much revenue it anticipates and how those revenues will be utilized?

### 24. Multiplier effects

This section is important to demonstrating whether consideration 10 (b) is satisfied: ‘the assistance may have a multiplier effect and may stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources’. Note that ‘multiplier effects’ here is different than sustainability or long-term impacts in section 23. Here, the point is whether funding from the Convention can leverage other sources of funding or assistance, now or later.

The Convention requires that ‘the beneficiary State Party shall, within the limits of its resources, share the cost of the safeguarding measures for which International Assistance is provided’ (Article 24.2). The response here correctly notes that the funds from the Convention will leverage cost-sharing contributions from the State budget. Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether there are other possibilities for multiplier effects. Despite the perhaps unfortunate formulation of the last sentence, do they think that corporate sponsorship of future safeguarding efforts would be an example of a multiplier effect?

### ICH-04 Timetable and Budget Form (extracts)

### Timetable

The submitting State ignored the explicit instructions in the ICH-04 form by showing the projects beginning in January 2016, well before the earliest start date of ‘approximately three months after approval of the request’. The facilitator may wish to draw the attention of the participants to the timetable of the following activities in particular:

* Activity 2: The note may raise concerns in the minds of workshop participants. Is the workshop organized to benefit participants, or as a photo opportunity for VIPs?
* Activity 4: The note may raise the same concerns as above.
* Activity 7: Participants will be reminded that this assessment comes very late and that the inventorying in Districts Two and Three cannot benefit from the experience gained in District One.
* Activity 8: A disproportionate amount of time for activity 8 as compared to activity 9 – which seems to be more important to the submitting State?
* Activity 10: The note may remind workshop participants that Wentapur seems to confuse the task of inventorying ICH with the different task of ‘enhancing’ (i.e., selecting and recognizing) certain elements.

### Budget

Participants may discuss whether the budget reinforces the doubts they may already have expressed about the overall project design. The facilitator may note that there is no limit to the amount of an International Assistance request, although few have exceeded US$350,000. The State Party’s contribution is about 6% - relatively low, and notably a good bit of that is in costs that are not adequately detailed so it will be difficult to trace them at the reporting stage.

There are several issues that would require the attention of participants across different expense lines and conformity with other sections of the request. Does the budget for the equipment seem to be proportionate? Do the remuneration rates shown for different personnel seem to be reasonable (i.e., no glaring discrepancies at different levels)? Do the costs for VIP hospitality seem to be appropriate?

There is also the issue of remuneration of communities. The budget indicates that community members who cooperate with the inventorying will not be remunerated. There are legitimate reasons to avoid remuneration for informants during an inventorying project (e.g., it is hard to know who to include, payment for services can create rivalries or resentments among those who are not interviewed, payment for services can induce informants to invent information to increase their remuneration, it creates expectations that cannot be sustained in the future, etc.). There are also legitimate reasons to argue for remuneration (e.g., everyone else involved in the process is being paid, from researcher to driver, so why not the informants? Community members who cooperate with inventorying often put aside other work and may even need to pay someone to fill in for them, so their time should be remunerated, etc.). There is no right or wrong answer to this question, but participants should be encouraged to discuss it since it will have to be decided if they undertake an inventorying project. See also the discussion of section 18 below.

The facilitator may wish to draw the attention of the participants to the following expense lines in particular:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expense** | **Notes for facilitators** |
| I.a. | Monthly salary of $800 seems reasonable compared to salary of other personnel. |
| I.b. | Participants can assume that the Director is working only part time (perhaps 10%, if we compare to the Chief of the Cultural Heritage Team below). |
| I.d. | Once again, participants can assume this is part-time work, but it would be useful to see it specified here and above. |
| I.e. | No description of what costs are included here: Travel? Per diem? Fees? Banquets? |
| *II.* | Disproportionate amount to be spent on high-quality equipment to remain with the Ministry, rather than on lower-price equipment better suited to fieldwork. This raises concerns about the State’s real intentions with the project. |
| II.a. | Completely inadequate description – without mark (maker) and model number, there is no way to evaluate the reasonableness of this item or the two that follow. |
| II.d. | Here, several distinct items are put together with no supporting detail (i.e., quantities and unit prices). |
| II.e. | An attempt to provide better detail, although mark and model number would be desirable for the most expensive item, the video recorder. Note that 12 teams of inventory researchers will have to share only 6 sets of equipment – perhaps a reasonable economy since they will work intermittently, but indicative that the priority of the request is not really on inventorying. |
| II.f. | Lump sum, no detail here or in the narrative about what activities or costs will be involved. |
| III.a. | FYI, UNESCO standard rate is up to US$250/day, including days for preparation and reporting. Here, it should be specified that one international facilitator per workshop is involved; the rate is reasonable (3+7 days, $250/day, plus 10 days for preparation and reporting). |
| III.b. | The fee to national facilitators seems reasonable, including preparation and reporting time (3+7 days, $100/day, plus 10 days for preparation and reporting, for 2 facilitators). |
| III.c. | Could provide better detail on number of days in country for per diem – if we guess airfare is $1000 each, that leaves $100/day for 10 days for per diem. N.b. each workshop has only one international facilitator: thus two airfares (one for each of the two workshops), but only 10 days of per diem. |
| III.d. | Needs to provide better detail on number of days per diem as well as daily rate. |
| III.f. | Compare information in the narrative: 50 persons x 3 days for one workshop plus 18 persons x 7 days for the other – why do they all receive the same rate regardless of length of participation? |
| III.g. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| III.h.,  III.i., VIII.a. | No idea what is included in this expenses – how many people, how much time, and with what result? |
| IV.a. | We can deduce this refers to the Province Radio and Television trainers (see narrative), but how many persons for how many days? |
| IV.b. | Calculates to 150 person-days, i.e. 10 days per researcher per month over 15 months. |
| IV.c. | Here we see confirmation that it is 150 person-days; we can deduce that the daily rate is $15/person. |
| IV.d. | Further detail would be desirable on mode of transport (bus, van, car), number of days or kilometres. |
| IV.e. | Units and unit costs would be desirable. |
| V.a. | Once again, we can match this to the reference in the narrative to trainers from Province Radio and Television but still lack details on who and how long. |
| V.b. | N.b. only 14 months of inventorying, not 15 as in District One. Same rates apply here – 10 days/month. |
| V.d. | Once again, further detail would be desirable. |
| V.e. | And further detail desirable here. |
| VI.a. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time, and with what result? |
| VI.b. | This is a lump sum, but it is modest and need not require further detail. |
| VII.a. | Considering daily and monthly fees elsewhere in the budget, this rate seems high. Is the purpose to reward certain VIPs who will do little real work? |
| VII.b. | Lump sum mixes expenditures of various sorts; better to be disaggregated. |
| VII.c. | A certificate is the only benefit that the communities whose heritage is selected will receive? |
| IX.b. | Seems to be insufficient compared to other participants. |
| IX.c. | Is this consistent with rates for participants in two previous workshops? N.b. this is only 2 days (although many of the participants are VIPs). |
| IX.e. | This could be interpreted as the State prioritizing a big banquet, with a cost of at least $25/plate (up to 100 participants). |

1. Strengthening Frulonia’s national capacities

### Notes on Specific sections

### 3. Project title

This title partially describes the scope of the present project, since it is implicit that the capacities have something to do with ICH. There is a way to provide a more informative title.

### 4. Summary of the project

The Aide-mémoire reminds States Parties this is a summary and NOT an introduction, and it recommends them to draft this summary after the request itself has been elaborated, and to be certain that it provides a brief overview of the entire request. Participants should be encouraged to read this several times – at the beginning of their evaluation, after they have read the entire request, and again before analysing the request.

Does the present summary provide a good overview of the project as a whole? Are there important activities that go unmentioned or others that receive too much emphasis?

Does the summary already hint at some of the weaknesses or misconceptions that will become more problematic in later sections (e.g., the undue attention to nomination of ‘masterpieces’ to the international lists)?

Should plans for sustaining the project after its conclusion be more concrete than simply saying ‘it is hoped’?

### 5. Is this an emergency request that might receive expedited processing?

The definition here is taken exactly from OD 50. Participants should not confuse the possibility of providing expedited processing for an International Assistance request in case of emergency (as offered here) with the inscription of an element on the USL in case of extreme urgency (OD 32).

The submitting State has ticked the wrong box here – nothing in the request indicates that it responds to an emergency like that described in OD 50.

### 7. Previous financial assistance from UNESCO for similar or related activities

For the purposes of this exercise, participants can ignore this question.

Any implementing organization that is in default of an existing contract with UNESCO cannot receive a new contract, according to UNESCO’s financial regulations. Furthermore, criterion A.7 requires that the beneficiary state has implemented previously financed activities, if any, in line with all regulations.

### 9. Scope of the project

States Parties often use ‘regional’ to refer to an area within a single country, but for the purposes of UNESCO, ‘regional’ refers to an area including several countries. See the discussion of ‘international, regional, subregional, local’ in Unit 3.

### 10. Location of the project

How well does this section respect the Committee’s decision that information placed in inappropriate sections cannot be taken into consideration?[[4]](#footnote-4) Do these remarks characterize the geographical area or rather describe the people?

Do these remarks already reveal a certain assumption that Frulonia’s heritage is more valuable than that of its neighbours, and does this advance the Convention’s principle of mutual respect? Does the remark about neighbours imitating Frulonia’s ICH demonstrate the required respect?

Are terms such as ‘splendour’ and ‘unique beauty’ consistent with the spirit of the 2003 Convention?

If participants find the response here to be problematic, can they identify any specific criterion to which it would be relevant? Or does it simply create an unfavourable impression that will influence their evaluation of other sections?

### 11. Purpose of request

Here, the submitting State has misunderstood the question. The purpose should be ‘implementation of programmes, projects and activities for safeguarding’.

Should a State be penalized for answering a question incorrectly such as this one? Is this a fatal error, or simply one small fault among many?

### 12. Forms of assistance requested

If the submitting State is requesting financial assistance, as is usually the case, the last box must be ticked. It is also useful to tick other boxes to indicate how financial assistance will be used.

In this case, do participants agree with the submitting State’s choice of ‘creation and operation of infrastructures’? The categories are not always self-evident, and no State will be penalized for answering incorrectly – but as with other sections above, an answer that is obviously incorrect may influence the evaluator’s reading of the request as a whole.

### 13. Background and rationale

The Aide-mémoire has a lengthy discussion of this section, which is one of the most important for demonstrating that criterion A.3 is met. The activities that follow can only be considered ‘well-conceived and feasible’ if the submitting State has provided a clear description here that explains how and why the request arose and what problems it seeks to address. This section should provide a solid foundation (in the form of a situation analysis or needs assessment) that clearly describes the present circumstances – particularly what the State and community have already done – and justifies why safeguarding efforts are needed at this time.

Participants should be encouraged to re-read this section in its entirety before entering into detailed discussion of its strengths and weaknesses.

The present response provides a generally good overview of the current situation in Frulonia and describes the process of consultation prior to ratification. In that sense, it provides a succinct description of the context in which the project would take place and the thinking underlying it.

Many readers will nevertheless find much of the content will raise serious questions in their minds about many of the authors’ assumptions – for instance, that ‘the basic concepts and orientations for protecting monuments and sites and those for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage are identical’. From their own experience, do participants find this credible? Note that the project design is based upon the notion that national experts (or at least a few) already possess all the information needed to conduct capacity-building activities, so if this is a false premise it will create larger problems throughout the request.

Similarly, the focus on other ministries such as Tourism, Commerce, Agriculture and Forestry, etc. may signal a view of ICH as important primarily because of its income-generating potential, rather than something valuable in itself.

In other words, the response in this section may do a very good job of presenting an accurate picture of the actual reality of Frulonia and the thinking of its Ministry of Culture, while at the same time raising serious doubts about the fundamental direction it has taken (and continues to take) in implementing the Convention.

Participants should therefore be encouraged to look at the section from two directions: first asking how effectively the text responds to the questions posed and provides a background and rationale for a capacity-building project, and second asking whether the premises underlying Frulonia’s approach seem to be consistent with the Convention.

The facilitator may wish to call attention to the following questions in particular:

* Can ICH be safeguarded in the same way as built heritage, or does it demand its own methodology and toolkit?
* Does the Minister’s urgent concern to see a precious masterpiece inscribed on the Representative List constitute a convincing rationale for a project such as this? What risks may exist that such an agenda may distort the capacity-building programme?
* Do Frulonia’s confidence in its own capacities and its refusal to follow the sequence and logic of UNESCO’s global capacity-building programme give reason to question the efficacy of the planned project?
* Who seems to be the target audience for the capacity-building activities (e.g. government officials)? Who is missing (e.g., communities and NGOs)?
* Are participants concerned by the mention of a ‘nice opening VIP reception’ for a workshop, or do they see that as a necessary component?
* Do participants agree that ‘selected staff of relevant ministries at the national level and departments at the provincial and district levels…are the people primarily responsible for safeguarding the country’s heritage’?
* Does the absolute silence about communities give rise to apprehensions on the part of workshop members?

The response here generally stays within the scope of ‘background and rationale’, while necessarily pointing briefly towards the activities being proposed. If participants wonder whether this constitutes ‘misplaced information’, the facilitator might encourage them to discuss the degree to which it may be necessary to describe the planned activities briefly in order to provide a rationale for them.

### 14. Objectives and expected results

This section is also essential for satisfying criterion A.3. See the Section on Objectives and Expected Results in the Aide-mémoire.

This confused response is a mix of objectives, results, outcomes, outputs and assumptions. As with the previous section, it may reveal more than the submitting State intends about the real motivations underlying the International Assistance request.

Each of the activities mentioned is discussed more fully in section 15 below, so participants should not go too deeply into the content of the activities themselves: they should keep their focus here on whether the text provides clear objectives and results.

Here, the facilitator may wish to encourage participants (if time allows) to identify for themselves, from the text here and elsewhere in the request, what they think are (or could be) the project’s primary objective and what they would consider its key expected results. There is not necessarily a right or wrong answer, but there is enough information in the request as a whole to allow them to try to extract one or more objectives and several results in bullet points here.

### 15. Activities

The Aide-mémoire devotes several pages to this section, which is also essential to satisfying criteria A.3 and A.1. The activities should respond directly to the situation analysis in section 13, and should reasonably be expected to achieve the objectives and results in section 14. If those two sections are problematic, there is a high likelihood the activities here will not be well conceived or feasible.

The text in this section is well structured, proposing a logical sequence of activities that could reasonably be expected to be carried out over the course of 24 months. The intention is to have participants not be distracted by the presentation but instead focus on the content of the activities, their appropriateness and their feasibility. Indeed, the structure can serve as a good model. Here it is the activities themselves that are sometimes problematic. Questions and topics for discussion are listed for each activity.

1. Do participants find it reasonable that the staff from the Department of Training would only be assigned to the project at the time of its inception? Should they not already be known at the time the request is submitted?
2. Are participants convinced by Frulonia’s argument that the nomination workshop should precede the rest? Are they concerned by the emphasis given throughout the request to the Minister of Culture’s impatience to see a ‘masterpiece’ inscribed on the Convention’s Lists? Does the text here respect the Committee’s repeated injunctions to use ‘appropriate language’ or do references to ‘world heritage’ signal a certain conceptual confusion between the 2003 Convention and the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (i.e. the World Heritage Convention)?
3. Do participants agree that inventorying is important primarily because lack of an inventory will be an impediment to an inscription on the Representative List? Do they think that the composition of the workshop (only 3 of 30 participants are representing communities and NGOs) properly responds to Article 11 of the Convention? If the content of the workshop is to be ‘community-based inventorying’, can it feasibly succeed if community members are hardly involved?
4. Are participants convinced by the overall sequence that Frulonia has proposed, which diverges very markedly from the model sequence adopted by UNESCO? Once again, does it seem appropriate that of 40 trainees, only 5 are community members and/or NGO representatives?
5. Throughout, the number of participants per workshop is much higher than recommended by UNESCO. Do participants find it reasonable to expect such workshops to accomplish their objectives, or do the numbers raise concerns in their minds (based, in particular, on their own experience)?
6. Questions arise about when would be the right moment for this policy advice to happen. Should not such advice happen at an earlier stage of the project? Other activities/workshops planned could be better shaped based on the results of such policy advice.
7. The proposed workshop on International Assistance is the same as the one that participants are currently engaged in. Do they think it comes at an appropriate time in the sequence of workshops?
8. Is this an appropriate schedule for monitoring and evaluation (see also section 21 below)? Are participants satisfied that the evaluation should focus only on the workshop trainees? Do they think that a self-evaluation questionnaire is likely to produce sufficient information? How well does this activity respond to criterion A.1 (‘The community, group and/or individuals concerned…will be involved in…their evaluation and follow-up…as broadly as possible’)?
9. Reporting project results to UNESCO is an important step, but participants may wonder from the description whether this is sufficient. In their view, does this constitute timely feedback to those responsible for project implementation, allowing for corrective action if needed? Three months is not an unreasonable time to close out a complex project, but participants will want to look closely at the budget to see if this amount of time is really needed or if it may be a way of prolonging the salaries of key personnel.
10. An overall activity of ‘Project management and coordination’ can be an efficient way of presenting the budget information so that the staff costs that span several distinct activities can be shown in one place, rather than distributed among each activity (e.g., 10% for activity A, 15% for activity B, etc.). Since it extends from beginning to end of the project, it could be shown as the first activity or, as here, as the last activity. When they analyse the budget, participants will want to be certain that there is a logic to why personnel are shown in one place or another – and to be certain that the same person is not shown twice.

Overall, are participants convinced from this section that ‘the proposed activities are well-conceived and feasible’ (criterion A.3)? Are there other activities that they would deem to be essential for a capacity-building project that are not included here? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s grasp of the key concepts of the Convention, particularly the differences between protecting tangible heritage and safeguarding ICH? Are participants troubled by the use of inappropriate language such as ‘masterpieces’ and ‘world heritage’? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s motivations for the request, which seem to have less to do with strengthening capacities for safeguarding than with inscribing a ‘masterpiece’? And, most important (see section 18 below), are participants satisfied that communities are adequately included in the project’s activities?

### 18. Community involvement

The very first criterion for granting International Assistance (A.1) requires that communities concerned should have participated in the preparation of the request and will be involved in the implementation of the activities, their evaluation and follow-up. The Aide-mémoire devotes considerable attention to this topic. Participants will already have noted problems with community involvement in the description of activities (section 15) and elsewhere. This is particularly problematic because UNESCO’s capacity-building strategy seeks to include communities, groups (including NGOs) and individuals as well as government officials.

Participants should be encouraged to evaluate this section from two perspectives: first, community involvement in the preparation of the request, and second, the role of community members as beneficiaries of the capacity-building activities.

It seems to be no accident that the submitting State makes no mention of community involvement in the preparation of the request. Participants can discuss whether in their view this silence offers a good indication that communities were not actually involved – if they had been, it would have been easy enough for the State to point to such involvement. Do participants think that the programme design would have been different (and if so, how) if community members had been broadly involved in the preparation, as required by criterion A.1?

With regard to participation of community members as beneficiaries of the capacity-building programme, do workshop members accept the submitting State’s assertion that ‘community members and/or civil society representatives are key participants in three of the five workshops’? In the description of activities (section 15), were they satisfied with the proportion of trainees who would be community members?

Similarly, do they think the formulation ‘it is the entire population that are beneficiaries of this programme’ is credible?

Are participants concerned by the attitude towards community members that seems to pervade this section – i.e., that they are unlikely to have the ‘capacity to participate correctly’ in the more technical workshops? Do attitudes like this prevail in their own experience, and do they have ideas of how to surmount them?

As above (section 4), the long-term extension of capacity-building to other levels (including communities) is expressed as simply being a hope, rather than a firm commitment. Are participants troubled by this?

### 19. Implementing organization and strategy

This section is directly relevant to criterion A.3, whether the activities are feasible. See the Section 19 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is perhaps the one section of the request that is most responsive to the instructions provided in the ICH-04 form. It adequately identifies the human resources within the Department of Training that will be responsible for implementing the project, as well as their qualifications. While the text does not provide detail about the specific tasks of each member and the amount of time each will be involved, the text does point to such information within the budget. If participants find that the information in the budget is clear and correct, it need not be repeated here in detail.

The text here is also good insofar as it focuses on the implementing organization (i.e., the Department of Training) and not on partners or collaborators (see section 20 below). One of the most common weaknesses in International Assistance requests is to include information here about partners rather than concentrating on the primary implementing organization.

### 20. Partners

See the Section 20 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is more problematic than that in the previous section (19). If staff from the Division of Heritage will be the key facilitators (trainers) for four of the five workshops, does the present text provide enough information about their qualifications and responsibilities?

Participants may already have expressed concern about the credibility of the submitting State’s claim that ‘the basic concepts and orientations for protecting monuments and sites and those for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage are identical’. Does the present text reassure them, or reinforce their previous doubts?

Frulonia has decided to use international trainers only for the workshop on preparing nominations. Are participants convinced by the justification for selecting specific trainers (i.e., that they will be able to offer priceless ‘insider’ knowledge that will increase Frulonia’s prospects for submitting a successful nomination)?

### 21. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Monitoring, reporting and evaluation are relevant to satisfying criterion A.1 (involvement of communities in evaluation and follow-up) and criterion A.3 (feasibility of the safeguarding measures). See Section 21 of the Aide-mémoire.

As with the section on community involvement in elaborating, implementing and monitoring (18, above), the present section is notably silent on the question of how communities will be involved in evaluation and follow-up, yet this is an important component of criterion A.1.

Participants should also be encouraged to discuss whether the evaluation schedule proposed here and in section 15 seems to them to be adequate. Does it come too early in the implementation? Too late? Is there a feedback mechanism so that lessons can be learnt and influence later activities? Or will any lessons be learnt too late to influence the project design?

Do participants agree that questionnaires filled out by trainees themselves constitute an adequate basis for monitoring and evaluation? Who else do they believe should be involved? What other research methods (e.g. interviews, focus groups, etc.) do they think have a place in monitoring and evaluation?

### 22. Capacity-building

The information in this section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.4 (lasting results) and A.6 (building up or reinforcing capacities), as explained in the Section 22 of the Aide-mémoire.

Are participants satisfied that the submitting State has adequately responded to the instructions in the form, specifically those asking for special emphasis on the capacities of the communities concerned? Is this once again an example where the State’s almost total silence on that question implies it has little real interest in communities?

Participants will already have discussed whether the number of people to be served is appropriate or too large, and whether providing a single training experience to a larger number is preferable to providing more intensive training to a fewer number.

Once again, the submitting State expresses its ‘hope’ that capacities will continue to be built in a subsequent phase. Are workshop participants convinced?

### 23. Sustainability after the assistance ends

As the Aide-mémoire explains, the present section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.3 (well-conceived activities) and A.4 (lasting results).

Are participants satisfied that the text in this section responds to the instructions in the form? Does it describe any concrete lasting results, or is it more a statement of good intentions?

Are participants convinced by the State’s optimism that a successful inscription of a ‘masterpiece’ as ‘world intangible heritage’ would unlock additional resources in the future? Do they think this is a legitimate argument for giving so much emphasis to a possible inscription?

Can participants identify concretely what else they would like to see included in a discussion of sustainability?

### 24. Multiplier effects

This section is important to demonstrating whether consideration 10 (b) is satisfied: ‘the assistance may have a multiplier effect and may stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources’. Note that ‘multiplier effects’ here is different than sustainability or long-term impacts in section 23. Here, the point is whether funding from the Convention can leverage other sources of funding or assistance, now or later.

The Convention requires that ‘the beneficiary State Party shall, within the limits of its resources, share the cost of the safeguarding measures for which International Assistance is provided (Article 24.2). The response here correctly notes that the funds from the Convention will leverage cost-sharing contributions from the State budget. Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether there are other possibilities for multiplier effects.

### ICH-04 Timetable and Budget Form (extracts)

### Timetable

The submitting State ignored the explicit instructions in the ICH-04 form by showing the projects beginning in January 2016, well before the earliest start date of ‘approximately three months after approval of the request’. It is also uncertain if the activities in section 15 are all included in the timetable. Participants should also check if there are any contradictions between the timetable and the narrative of the request.

The facilitator may wish to draw the attention of the participants to the note in Activity 2 – it may raise concerns in the minds of workshop participants. Is the workshop organized to benefit participants, or as a photo opportunity for VIPs?

### Budget

Participants may discuss whether the budget reinforces the doubts they may already have expressed about the overall project design. The facilitator may note that there is no limit to the amount of an International Assistance request, although few have exceeded US$350,000. The State Party’s contribution is about 35% - relatively high, even if some of it is in costs that are not adequately detailed so it will be difficult to trace them at the reporting stage.

Participants should get a general sense of whether the activities in section 15 are all included in the budget and whether there are contradictions between the information in the narrative and that in the budget. Does the personnel budget seem to be proportionate? Do the remuneration rates shown for different personnel seem to be reasonable (i.e., no glaring discrepancies at different levels)? Do the costs for VIP hospitality seem to be appropriate?

The facilitator may wish to draw the attention of the participants to the following expense lines in particular:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expense** | **Notes for facilitators** |
| *I.* | This activity also includes two others from the timetable and section 15: reporting and project close-out. Not contradictory, but not well-aligned. |
| I.a. | Monthly salary of $1000 seems reasonable in light of other personnel rates. |
| I.b. | Works out to $1500 per month, full-time; proportionate to other personnel rates |
| I.c. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time, with what result? Even if this is the beneficiary country’s share, it will be difficult to trace and verify later. |
| II.a. | FYI, UNESCO standard rate is up to $250/day, including days for preparation and reporting. This works out to 2 facilitators @ $250/day @ 10 days each – reasonable for a five-day workshop plus preparation and reporting. |
| II.b. | Could provide better detail on number of days in country for per diem – if we guess airfare is $750 each, that leaves $107/day for 7 days for per diem (workshop plus one extra night before and after). |
| II.c. | Needs to provide better detail on number of days per diem as well as daily rate. A lower per diem for domestic participants than for international trainers is typical, although they may be closer than they are here. |
| II.d. | Daily rate is substantially higher than Director of Department of Training receives per day, but perhaps this can be justified since it is not regular employment. |
| II.e. | No idea what is included in this expense. |
| II.f. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| III.a. | Can be calculated at 2 persons @ $100/day @ 15 days (including preparation and reporting). |
| III.b. | As above, daily rate for per diem should be shown. |
| III.c. | Daily rate is substantially higher than Director of Department of Training receives per day, but perhaps this can be justified since it is not regular employment. But when do these fees for attending workshops become a pretext for distributing cash to as many participants as possible? |
| III.d. | No idea what is included in this expense. |
| III.e. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| III.g. | This is the only compensation foreseen for community members who cooperate in inventorying. Does it seem adequate (on the one hand), and is it wise to provide junk food rather than something useful? |
| III.h. | Lump sum mixes expenditures of various sorts; better to be disaggregated with model numbers, unit costs, quantities. |
| IV.a. | Same fee for a 3-day workshop here as for the 7-day workshop above; does this seem reasonable? |
| IV.b. | As above, per diem rate would be useful. |
| IV.c. | Daily rate is substantially higher than Director of Department of Training receives per day, but perhaps this can be justified since it is not regular employment. But when does this become a pretext for distributing cash to as many participants as possible? |
| IV.d. | No idea what is included in this expense. |
| IV.e. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| V.a. | Once again, same total for 3-day workshop as was used for 7-day inventorying workshop. |
| V.b. | The number of provincial or district officers or community members is shrinking. |
| V.c. | Once again, a relatively high daily rate. |
| V.d. | No idea what is included in this expense. |
| V.e. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| VI.a | A lump sum is given here. No explanation on how the fees are calculated. |
| VI.b. | Could provide better detail on the number of days for the mission of the consultant. |
| VII.a. | Here we learn from the narrative it is a 5-day workshop, although once again it is the same total fee without regard to duration. |
| VII.b. | Again a relatively low number of local officers, and no community or NGO participants. |
| VII.c. | Again the largest part of the budget goes to pay government officials to be trained; do participants find this troubling? |
| VII.d. | No idea what is included in this expense. |
| VII.e. | Daily rate and number of days would be helpful here. |
| VIII.a. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time, with what result? |
| VIII.b. | This is a lump sum, but it is modest and need not require further detail. |

N.b. see first budget line at top: activities 9 and 10 in the timetable and section 15 are presumably included in the general staff expenditures, but this should be explained somewhere.

3. Satsowa system of communal labour, together with its associated oral traditions

### Notes on Specific sections

### 3. Project title

This title accurately describes the subject of the present project, but not necessarily its content: is it an element being nominated for inscription, or should the title of a request focus more on what will be done (e.g., ‘Safeguarding of XXX’ or ‘Revitalization of XXX’)?

### 4. Summary of the project

The Aide-mémoire reminds States Parties this is a summary and NOT an introduction, and it recommends them to draft this summary after the request itself has been elaborated, and to be certain that it provides a brief overview of the entire request. Participants should be encouraged to read this several times – at the beginning of their evaluation, after they have read the entire request, and again before analysing the request.

Does the present summary provide a good overview of the project as a whole? Are there important activities that go unmentioned or others that receive too much emphasis?

Does the summary already hint at some of the weaknesses or misconceptions that will become more problematic in later sections (e.g., the suggestion that Satsowa is effectively obsolete and only memories can be preserved, or the idea that it once had a ‘pure form’, prior to independence, or a persistent fuzziness over just what Satsowa is, a social institution or a verbal art or both)?

### 5. Is this an emergency request that might receive expedited processing?

The definition here is taken exactly from OD 50. Participants should not confuse the possibility of providing expedited processing for an International Assistance request in case of emergency (as offered here) with the inscription of an element on the USL in case of extreme urgency (OD 32).

The submitting State has ticked the wrong box here – nothing in the request indicates that it responds to an emergency like that described in OD 50.

### 7. Previous financial assistance from UNESCO for similar or related activities

For the purposes of this exercise, participants can ignore this question.

Any implementing organization that is in default of an existing contract with UNESCO cannot receive a new contract, according to UNESCO’s financial regulations. Furthermore, criterion A.7 requires that the beneficiary state has implemented previously financed activities, if any, in line with all regulations applied thereto.

### 9. Scope of the project

States Parties often use ‘regional’ to refer to an area within a single country, but for the purposes of UNESCO, ‘regional’ refers to an area including several countries. See the discussion of ‘international, regional, subregional, local’ in Unit 3.

### 10. Location of the project

Do these remarks adequately characterize the geographical area, particularly for someone who is not already familiar with the geography of Gloawana? Is there information elsewhere in the request that could have been integrated here to give a fuller sense of the project’s location?

### 11. Purpose of request

Here, the submitting State has misunderstood the question. The purpose is obviously ‘implementation of programmes, projects and activities for safeguarding’.

Should a State be penalized for answering a question incorrectly such as this one? Is this a fatal error, or simply one small fault among many?

### 12. Forms of assistance requested

If the submitting State is requesting financial assistance, as is usually the case, the last box must be ticked. It is also useful to tick other boxes to indicate how financial assistance will be used.

In this case, might the submitting State have also ticked the boxes for ‘provision of experts’? The categories are not always self-evident, and no State will be penalized for answering incorrectly – but as with other sections above, an answer that is obviously incorrect may influence the evaluator’s reading of the request as a whole.

### 13. Background and rationale

The Aide-mémoire has a lengthy discussion of this section, which is one of the most important for demonstrating that criterion A.3 is met. The activities that follow can only be considered ‘well-conceived and feasible’ if the submitting State has provided a clear description here that explains how and why the request arose and what problems it seeks to address. This section should provide a solid foundation (in the form of a situation analysis or needs assessment) that clearly describes the present circumstances – particularly what the State and community have already done – and justifies why safeguarding efforts are needed at this time.

Participants should be encouraged to re-read this section in its entirety before entering into detailed discussion of its strengths and weaknesses.

Although relatively detailed and concrete, the description here may create uncertainty in the minds of readers, both because the nature of Satsowa seems a little elusive at times and because the submitting State paints it as obsolete and no longer a part of Sowara life. Indeed, perhaps the text reveals more than the State might wish about the attitude that it holds toward this particular form of ICH, or even towards ICH in general.

Participants should therefore be encouraged to look at the section from two directions: first asking how effectively the text responds to the questions posed and provides a background and rationale for a safeguarding project, and second asking whether the premises underlying Gloawana’s approach seem to be consistent with the Convention.

The facilitator may wish to call attention to the following questions in particular:

* Does the text here give a clear enough description of the element? Perhaps some readers will understand Satsowa as a social institution and others will see it as an oral tradition. It is evidently both at the same time, but has the submitting State provided readers with a clear and comprehensive view of a single, complex system?
* The text seems to describe Satsowa’s former social and cultural functions while indicating that it no longer has such functions in everyday Sowara life and is not adapted to contemporary contexts. If the latter is true, does it still constitute ICH according to the Convention’s definition?
* Beyond the question of whether Satsowa may still have certain social functions, the text also implies that its viability may have passed the point of no return. If the element is of no interest to young people, none wish to learn it and its meaning has been lost, is it still sufficiently viable to be safeguarded?
* Are participants convinced by the vague threats facing Satsowa today? If indeed it is ‘severely challenged by modernization and globalization’, is the State in a position to propose measure that would reverse those processes? If such threats may actually exist at the broadest, most general level, doesn’t an adequate situation analysis here require identifying much more concrete threats that can be addressed directly by the safeguarding measures?
* Do participants think that the description sometimes confuses cause and effect? For instance, is Satsowa obsolete because ‘Sowara settlements are beset by problems such as alcoholism, burglary and domestic abuse’, or are Sowara settlements ‘beset by problems such as alcoholism, burglary and domestic abuse’ because Satsowa is no longer practised?
* Are participants convinced by the rationale of seeking to document memories of a golden-age Satsowa? Although the text here avoids use of the word ‘pure’ (see section 4), does it still imply the same sense of recovering some older, ‘accurate’ form of the element, rather than identifying and defining it as it is practised today? Under what conditions might participants find such an approach convincing, and has the State convinced them here?
* At the same time, the description here points to some kind of a revitalization effort, aimed at promoting occasions for Satsowa to be practised. The section on activities below (section 15) will give greater precision to what is meant here, but do readers already have a certain apprehension that the remedies being suggested (e.g. festivals, newly choreographed dances) do not really address the problems that are identified?
* Do participants agree that the methodology of oral history is the most appropriate for the fieldwork and interviewing that will occur in the project? Does this again keep the focus too much on the past and not enough on the present reality of Satsowa?
* Videographers have sometimes re-created former practices for the purpose of filming them, as is proposed here. While this can sometimes work to provide a simulation of an element’s actual context, are readers convinced that it would be a good approach here?

The response here generally stays within the scope of ‘background and rationale’, while necessarily pointing briefly towards the activities being proposed. If participants wonder whether this constitutes ‘misplaced information’, the facilitator might encourage them to discuss the degree to which it may be necessary to describe the planned activities briefly in order to provide a rationale for them. Would they prefer to have a stricter separation between the diagnosis (here) and the remedy (sections 14 and 15) or do they find it helpful to justify specific actions that might respond to specific aspects of the present context?

### 14. Objectives and expected results

This section is also essential for satisfying criterion A.3. See the Section on Objectives and Expected Results in the Aide-mémoire.

This confused response is a mix of objectives, impacts, results, outcomes and outputs. As with the previous section, it may reveal more than the submitting State intends about the assumptions underlying the International Assistance request.

Each of the activities mentioned is discussed more fully in section 15 below, so participants should not go too deeply into the content of the activities themselves: they should keep their focus here on whether the text provides clear objectives and results.

Here, the facilitator may wish to encourage participants (if time allows) to identify for themselves, from the text here and elsewhere in the request, what they think are (or could be) the project’s primary objective and what they would consider its key expected results. There is not necessarily a right or wrong answer, but there is enough information in the request as a whole to allow them to try to extract one or more objectives and several results in bullet points here.

### 15. Activities

The Aide-mémoire devotes several pages to this section, which is also essential to satisfying criteria A.3 and A.1. The activities should respond directly to the situation analysis in section 13, and should reasonably be expected to achieve the objectives and results in section 14. If those two sections are problematic, there is a high likelihood the activities here will not be well conceived or feasible.

The text in this section is well structured, proposing a logical sequence of activities that could reasonably be expected to be carried out over the course of 24 months. The intention is to have participants not be distracted by the presentation but instead focus on the content of the activities, their appropriateness and their feasibility. Indeed, the structure can serve as a good model. Here it is the activities themselves that are sometimes problematic. Questions and topics for discussion are listed for each activity.

1. Do participants think that detailed project timetables and cooperation agreements should only be developed after a contract is signed with UNESCO, or could they be substantially completed sooner?
2. Does this activity seem to conform to the spirit of the Convention, insofar as it seeks to establish a historical record of how an element was once practised, rather than how it is practised today? Do participants consider that the methodology of oral history is the one best adapted to a documentation project of this type? Do they think that Sowara elders who cooperate should receive some form of compensation beyond ‘an impressive certificate’ (this question will recur in section 18, where it becomes clear that Sowara elders will not be remunerated for their time and services)?
3. Once again, the awareness-raising activities seem to imply a view of Satsowa focussed entirely on its past and not on its present. If participants have not already discussed the merits of re-creating the element’s previous form for the purpose of a video, the pros and cons of such an approach should be explored in depth here.
4. The motivation to ‘create new opportunities for Satsowa to be performed’ is laudable, but participants may wonder if the several new opportunities proposed here are likely to produce positive benefits. Based upon their own experiences with State-organized festivals, choreographed dances and media events, do readers think they are reasonable suggestions? Can participants think of other ‘new opportunities’ that might be more effective by reinvesting Satsowa with social function and cultural meaning, rather than simply reducing it to ‘performance’? Are participants troubled by the idea that something that is described as a social institution and an oral tradition should be taken as the subject or inspiration for a choreographed dance to be performed by the national dance troupe?
5. Here again, the intention is very laudable, but participants may have certain doubts about the concrete activities proposed. Are history classes the best place to learn about Satsowa, or might it fit better into other subjects (and if so, which)? Note that this is the first we have learned about a ‘book of Satsowa verses’, even if it seems to be part of activity 2 rather than activity 5.
6. Is this an appropriate schedule for monitoring and evaluation (see also section 21 below)? Are participants satisfied that the evaluation should focus only on ‘project team members, local officials and policy makers’? How well does this activity respond to criterion A.1 (‘broad involvement of communities in evaluation and follow-up’)?
7. Three months is not an unreasonable time to close out a complex project, but participants will want to look closely at the budget to see if this amount of time is really needed or if it may be a way of prolonging the salaries of key personnel.
8. An overall activity of ‘Project management and coordination’ can be an efficient way of presenting the budget information so that the staff costs that span several distinct activities can be shown in one place, rather than distributed among each activity (e.g., 10% for activity A, 15% for activity B, etc.). Since it extends from beginning to end of the project, it could be shown as the first activity or, as here, as the last activity. When they analyse the budget, participants will want to be certain that there is a logic to why personnel are shown in one place or another – and to be certain that the same person is not shown twice.

Overall, are participants convinced from this section that ‘the proposed activities are well-conceived and feasible’ (criterion A.3)? Are there other activities that they would deem to be essential for safeguarding Satsowa that are not included here? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s grasp of the key concepts of the Convention, particularly the very nature of ICH as a contemporary phenomenon rather than something of the past that exists today only as memory?

### 18. Community involvement

The very first criterion for granting International Assistance (A.1) requires that communities concerned should have participated in the preparation of the request and will be involved in the implementation of the activities, their evaluation and follow-up. The Aide-mémoire devotes considerable attention to this topic.

Participants will already have noted problems with community involvement in the description of activities (section 15) and elsewhere. This is particularly problematic for a safeguarding project because any real safeguarding effort requires community involvement, if not leadership.

Participants should be encouraged to evaluate this section from two perspectives: first, community involvement in the preparation of the request and implementation of the proposed activities, and second, the role of community members as informants and the question of their free, prior and informed consent to the research and documentation.

It seems that this project originated with the Association for Sowara Culture, and the first sentence implies that they arrived with a more interesting project than the one that is proposed here. For example, they were speaking of restoring Satsowa’s social functions, while the project as proposed is about remembering its former functions. Participants should be encouraged to discuss what the proper relation should be between a community with vision and imagination and a Ministry that may lack imagination or creativity.

The Ministry’s attitude towards community members’ own perspectives is apparent in the end of the first paragraph, where experts from the ICH Council took it upon themselves to ‘correct’ the communities’ misconceptions. Have participants encountered similar circumstances in their own contexts? What would be a better relation between the Association and the national experts?

With regard to participation of community members in the research and documentation effort (activity 2), trainees will probably already have discussed this when analysing the activities in section 15 above. Here, the submitting State makes it clear that community members will be expected (indeed, almost obliged) to contribute, always without compensation. Note that the Association does not share this opinion. See the discussion under section 17 about the complex question of remuneration to informants. In the spirit of Satsowa, might workshop members think of some other forms of compensation, between fee-for-services and a nice certificate?

The question of free, prior and informed consent to participate as informants or collaborators in an inventory or research and safeguarding effort is of the highest importance. International Assistance is the only one of the Convention’s international mechanisms in which the submitting State is not required to provide documentary evidence of the free, prior and informed consent of the community, group or individuals concerned. This does not mean that such consent is not fundamental, but it recognizes that an International Assistance request may be elaborated before specific communities have been identified as beneficiaries. Nevertheless, free, prior and informed consent is essential if the project is to succeed.

Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether the present text indicates that the submitting State has a proper attitude towards community consent. Do the calls for people’s ‘obligation’, ‘civic duty’ and ‘responsibility’ imply that community members will not have the possibility to freely decline their consent? At what point do such ideas indicate that they may face coercive pressures? Note that the Committee decided that all safeguarding measures should be voluntary and reflect the will and aspirations of the community concerned. Compulsion should have no place among these measures.[[5]](#footnote-5)

### 19. Implementing organization and strategy

This section is directly relevant to criterion A.3, whether the activities are feasible. See the Section 19 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is perhaps the one section of the request that is most responsive to the instructions provided in the ICH-04 form. It adequately identifies the human resources within the Department of Intangible Cultural Heritage that will be responsible for implementing the project, as well as their qualifications. While the text does not provide detail about the specific tasks of each member and the amount of time each will be involved, the text does point to such information within the budget. If participants find that the information in the budget is clear and correct, it need not be repeated here in detail.

The text here is also good insofar as it focuses on the implementing organization (i.e., the Department of ICH) and not on partners or collaborators (see section 20 below). One of the most common weaknesses in International Assistance requests is to include information here about partners rather than concentrating on the primary implementing organization.

### 20. Partners

See the Section 20 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here is also responsive, if perhaps a little more problematic than that in the previous section (19).

Considering that the entire project was initiated by the Association for Sowara Culture, are participants convinced that the role foreseen for it is appropriate? Beyond the name, we know little about the Association, its mission, its members, its size, etc. This would have been the place for the submitting State to say more.

If participants have not already discussed the question whether history is the proper discipline for those involved in such a project, they should be encouraged to do so. What other disciplines (Anthropology, Sociology, Cultural Studies, etc.) could they identify as appropriate?

### 21. Monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Monitoring, reporting and evaluation are relevant to satisfying criterion A.1 (involvement of communities in evaluation and follow-up) and criterion A.3 (feasibility of the safeguarding measures). See Section 21 of the Aide-mémoire.

As with the section on community involvement in elaborating, implementing and monitoring (18, above), the present section is notably silent on the question of how communities will be involved in evaluation and follow-up, yet this is an important component of criterion A.1.

Participants should also be encouraged to discuss whether the evaluation schedule proposed here and in section 15 seems to them to be adequate. Does it come too early in the implementation? Too late? Is there a feedback mechanism so that the lessons learnt can be applied in due time? Or will any lessons be learnt too late to influence the project design?

### 22. Capacity-building

The information in this section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.4 (lasting results) and A.6 (building up or reinforcing capacities), as explained in the Section 22 of the Aide-mémoire.

The text here correctly notes that capacity building figures into the implementation of several activities.

Are participants satisfied that the submitting State has adequately responded to the instructions in the form, specifically those asking for special emphasis on the capacities of the communities concerned? Is this once again an example where the State’s almost total silence on that question implies it has little real interest in strengthening communities to safeguard their own heritage?

### 23. Sustainability after the assistance ends

As the Aide-mémoire explains, the present section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.3 (well-conceived activities) and A.4 (lasting results).

Are participants satisfied that the text in this section responds to the instructions in the form? Does it describe any concrete lasting results, or is it more a statement of good intentions? Does it point to any basis for the Sowara community themselves to continue to maintain the Satsowa, or is it only audiovisual documentation that will persist after the project has ended? Are participants concerned by the formulation indicating that Satsowa is obsolete and lives only in memory – and that those memories will soon perish?

### 24. Multiplier effects

This section is important to demonstrating whether consideration 10 (b) is satisfied: ‘the assistance may have a multiplier effect and may stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources’. Note that ‘multiplier effects’ here is different than sustainability or long-term impacts in section 23. Here, the point is whether funding from the Convention can leverage other sources of funding or assistance, now or later.

The Convention requires that ‘the beneficiary State Party shall, within the limits of its resources, share the cost of the safeguarding measures for which International Assistance is provided (Article 24.2). The response here correctly notes that the funds from the Convention will leverage cost-sharing contributions from the State budget. Participants should be encouraged to discuss whether there are other possibilities for multiplier effects.

### ICH-04 Timetable and Budget Form (extracts)

### Timetable

Participants should get a general sense of whether the activities in section 15 are all included in the timetable and whether there are contradictions between the information in the narrative and that in the timetable. The facilitator should draw the attention of participants that the submitting State ignored the explicit instructions in the ICH-04 form by showing the projects beginning in January of the 1st year, well before the earliest start date of ‘approximately three months after approval of the request’. In addition to this, the facilitator may wish to provide focus on more specific concerns about the timetable of the following activities:

* Activity 4: Narrative provides little explanation for what else may be included in this activity to justify 12 months duration.
* Activity 5: Nowhere is it explained why this activity goes from September to August when the school year runs from January to October. It may be reasonable, but it requires an explanation.

### Budget

Participants may discuss whether the budget reinforces the doubts they may already have expressed about the overall project design. The facilitator may note that there is no limit to the amount of an International Assistance request, although few have exceeded US$350,000. The State Party’s contribution is about 16% - relatively high, even if some of it is in costs that are not adequately detailed so it will be difficult to trace them at the reporting stage.

There are several issues that would require the attention of participants across different expense lines and conformity with other sections of the request. Does the equipment budget seem to be proportionate? Do the remuneration rates shown for different personnel seem to be reasonable (i.e., no glaring discrepancies at different levels)? Do the costs for VIP hospitality seem to be appropriate?

The budget indicates that community members who cooperate with the research will not be remunerated. There are legitimate reasons to avoid remuneration for informants during an inventorying or documentation project (e.g., it is hard to know who to include, payment for services can create rivalries or resentments among those who are not interviewed, payment for services can induce informants to invent information to increase their remuneration, it creates expectations that cannot be sustained in the future, etc.). There are also legitimate reasons to argue for remuneration (e.g., everyone else involved in the process is being paid, from researcher to driver, so why not the informants? Community members who cooperate with research and documentation often put aside other work and may even need to pay someone to fill in for them, so their time should be remunerated, etc.). There is no right or wrong answer to this question, but participants should be encouraged to discuss it. See also the discussion of section 18.

The facilitator may wish to draw the attention of the participants to the following expense lines in particular:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expense** | **Notes for facilitators** |
| I.a. | Monthly salary of US$1000 seems reasonable compared to salary of other personnel; narrative tells us this is full-time position, but it should be detailed here as well as monthly rate. |
| I.b. | Participants might guess that the Director is working only part time. If it is 10% (one half-day per week), the monthly salary is $2000. |
| I.c. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time, with what result? Even if this is the beneficiary country’s share, it will be difficult to trace and verify later. |
| II.a. | Completely inadequate description – without mark (maker) and model number, there is no way to evaluate the reasonableness of this item or the two that follow. |
| II.d. | Here, several distinct items are put together with no supporting detail (i.e., quantities and unit prices). |
| II.e. | Needs to be specified whether this if full-time or part-time commitment. |
| II.f. | Equivalent to full-time employment (130 days over 6 months). |
| II.g. | Further detail would be desirable on mode of transport (bus, van, car), number of days or kilometres. |
| II.i. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time? |
| II.j. | Presumably part-time (one-third?) but this needs to be specified. |
| II.k | This needs to be better described – what services are included and how is cost calculated? A single lump sum of $500 with no detail might be tolerated, but multiplied by 18 months it becomes more problematic. |
| III.a. | No idea what is included in this expense – how many people, how much time, to what effect? |
| III.b. | What is the basis for this figure? It does not seem unreasonable, but how did they arrive at it? |
| III.c. | Almost the only compensation foreseen for members of the Sowara community (except the researchers), and substantially less per day than the various experts and government personnel. |
| III.d. | How many people, how many days, how much per day? |
| III.f. | How is this figure arrived at? How many times will announcements be broadcast and what is the rate per minute for buying ads or valuing time? |
| IV.a. | A huge lump sum with absolutely no detail or justification. Who would receive how much for what services? |
| IV.b. | If this is a fee to a single choreographer it seems very high; if it also covers rehearsals and performances it may be reasonable – but we have no way to know. |
| IV.c. | How was this figure arrived at? |
| V.a. | We have virtually no information on this book: how many pages, how many words, how many illustrations? Is there a distribution plan other than using in schools, and what would happen to any income generated by sales? |
| V.b. | Publication costs cannot be understood without knowing the length of the work, its dimensions and the number of copies to be published. |
| V.c. | Cost seems high, but perhaps such technical services are not readily available in Gloawana and it is necessary to go abroad. |
| V.d. | Lump sum without adequate description of why this will require money. |
| VI.b. | This is a lump sum, but it is modest and need not require further detail. |

1. . ‘In-kind’ contributions usually refer to provision of services that are quantified just as any other expense; if these contributions are not described fully and clearly the evaluators and Committee cannot take them into account as part of the State’s share of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . Decision 7.COM 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. . Decision 8.COM 7.a.6 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. . Decision 7.COM 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. . Decision 8.COM 7.a.6 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)