UNIT 51

Hand-out 4:

Questionnaire for evaluation of a sample request

Use this hand-out to guide your analysis of a sample request. The example is purely imaginary, but the request is typical of those that are submitted to UNESCO. Often, a project that could potentially be valuable and effective in safeguarding is unacceptable because of deficiencies in the request submitted. Your task during this exercise is to find such deficiencies in the present request and identify what would be needed to demonstrate more fully that the request responds to the criteria and considerations for granting assistance.

Before beginning to analyse the request section by section, you will want to be certain that you have read it through from beginning to end at least once, if not several times. As you read, jot notes about questions that arise in your mind, underlining passages that you find particularly informative or problematic.

At this time, you will not need to decide if each of the criteria and considerations for granting assistance is satisfied, but you will certainly want to keep them in mind as you analyse each section. The Aide-mémoire for completing a request for International Assistance provides detailed discussions of most sections of the form, and you should often refer to it.

**Sections 1-12**

The problems you encounter here are likely to be of a technical nature, although there may also be substantive problems in the summary (section 4) and location (section 10). The request has to be considered as a single whole, so if you note incoherencies or errors here, or language that is not in line with the Convention, that will doubtless influence your overall conclusions about the merits of the request.

**Section 13**

The activities that are proposed 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. Has it done so? Are there red flags here that provoke any concerns?

**Section 14**

The Aide-mémoire explains that before a State can demonstrate that the proposed activities are well conceived and feasible (criterion A.3), it must identify well-defined objectives and expected results of a project, always keeping a clear focus on the overall safeguarding goal of ‘ensuring the viability’ of the ICH. Has it done so? If not, from your own reading of the request as a whole are you able to better identify clear objectives and results?

**Section 15**

Do the activities proposed respond directly to the situation analysis in section 13, and can they reasonably be expected to achieve the objectives and results in section 14? Does the submitting State provide a clear description of each activity and of its contribution to the overall project? For each activity, what are the strengths and weaknesses (if any)? For the project as a whole, has the State proposed a logical sequence of activities and a proper balance among them? From your own experience with safeguarding, do certain of the activities seem more likely (or less likely) to succeed, and are there essential activities that have been forgotten? Does this section raise doubts about the submitting State’s grasp of the key concepts of the Convention?

**Section 16**

Does the State clearly indicate the number of calendar months? Do you think the amount of time for activities seems to be appropriate?

**Section 17**

Do all the budget lines contain explanations on how the figures were calculated? Do you see any contradictions between timetable and budget? Are there any contradictions between the information in the narrative and that in the timetable and budget?

**Section 18**

The request needs to describe the specific mechanisms that were already used to involve communities during the preparation of the request as well as those that will be used at every stage of the project’s implementation, evaluation and follow-up; this is particularly important for inventorying, since Article 11 (b) of the Convention requires community participation. Has the submitting State responded adequately to the instructions in the form and to criterion A.1?

**Section 19 and Section 20**

Do these two sections give you a clear idea of who will do what during the implementation of the project? Do the personnel identified seem to have appropriate backgrounds and are the working relations among them well conceived and clear? Is their compensation reasonable?

**Section 21**

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). Has the submitting State provided a convincing plan here (and in section 15) for monitoring, evaluation and follow-up?

**Section 22**

International Assistance requests need to demonstrate how national capacities – including particularly those of the communities concerned – will be strengthened during the course of the project so they will be better able to continue safeguarding efforts in the future. Has the submitting State done so here? Does information elsewhere in the form (for instance, sections 18 and 23) support the idea of strengthening capacities? Is this information coherent with section 22?

**Section 23**

The present section is relevant to satisfying criteria A.3 (well-conceived activities) and A.4 (lasting results). Does the text here describe concrete lasting results, or is it more a statement of good intentions?

**Section 24**

According to OD 10 (b) the Committee may consider whether the assistance may have a multiplier effect and may stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources. Does the present text provide an adequate response to the instructions in the form?

**Overall**

Do you consider that the request, as a whole, offers a convincing justification for the safeguarding measures proposed? Are they ‘well-conceived and feasible’ (criterion A.3) and do you have a clear sense of what will happen throughout the project, who will do what, and when key activities will take place? Are there contradictions or ambiguities that leave you wondering just what will actually happen? In your view, is the request in harmony with the spirit of the Convention, or does it seem to you that the submitting State has misunderstood or chosen to ignore certain principles of the Convention (and if so, which principles are not respected)? Throughout the request, has the State given due attention to the broadest possible participation of communities, groups or individuals, both in the preparation of the request and in the implementation of all activities (including monitoring and follow-up)?