



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

7 IGC

CE/13/7.IGC/3
Paris, 8 November 2013
Original: English

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE
FOR THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY
OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS**

**Seventh Ordinary Session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
10 - 13 December 2013**

Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda: Adoption of the detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Committee

This document contains in Annex the draft detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Committee (10 - 14 December 2012) for adoption by the Committee.

Decision required: paragraph 4

1. In accordance with Article 43 of the Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”), the Secretariat prepared a draft detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Committee (10 - 14 December 2012) in the two working languages, English and French. The draft was published electronically on the Convention website (<http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/diversity/convention/>) simultaneously in the two working languages of the Committee on 2 April 2013.

2. Committee members were invited to submit their comments to the Secretariat of the Convention before 6 September 2013. No comments were received by this date.

3. This document contains in Annex, for adoption by the Committee, the draft detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Committee.

4. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 7.IGC 3

The Committee,

1. *Having examined document CE/13/7.IGC/3 and its Annex;*
2. *Adopts the detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions included in the above-mentioned document.*

ANNEX

Draft detailed summary record of the sixth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The sixth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) was held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 10 to 14 December 2012.
2. It was attended by 278 participants, including 73 participants from the 23 States Members of the Committee, 129 participants from 66 Parties non-members of the Committee (65 States Parties and the European Union (EU)), 30 participants from 15 States not Parties to the Convention, 4 participants from a permanent observer mission to UNESCO, 8 participants from 4 intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 34 participants from 17 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with observer status.
3. The **representative of the UNESCO Director-General** explained that due to unforeseen circumstances, the Chairperson of the Sixth Ordinary Session of the Committee, Mr Paul Damasane of Zimbabwe, could not participate in the session, and as soon as the information was received by the Secretariat, an emergency meeting of the bureau took place in Paris on November 20, 2012, that included the Vice-Chairpersons from Brazil, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic (hereafter referred to as the “Lao PDR”), Switzerland and Tunisia. Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee stipulates that in such situations, the function of the Chairperson shall be exercised by a Vice-Chairperson. During the bureau meeting, the Vice-Chairpersons unanimously recommended that His Excellency, the Ambassador Rudolf Imhoof of Switzerland, assume the function of the Chairperson of the Sixth Session of the Committee. The representative of the UNESCO Director-General put forth to the Committee the recommendation of its bureau. The Committee agreed with the recommendation and Ambassador Imhoof was invited to the podium and assumed the function of Chairperson.
4. In opening the session the **Chairperson** welcomed all participants. He then gave the floor to the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Irina Bokova.
5. **UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova** stressed the increasing and concrete results of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereafter referred to as “the Convention”), particularly as recently evidenced by the analyses of the periodic reports which confirm that investing in creativity transforms societies, leading to sustainable, social and economic development. She noted how the work and the outputs relating to the Convention contribute to debates on culture as an integral component in the United Nations post 2015 development agenda, noting in this connection as well that UNESCO is preparing the 2013 Creative Economy Report in cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Director-General also emphasized that Parties need to maximize their fundraising efforts and to give the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereafter referred to as the “IFCD”) the

funding capacities it deserves. She commended the UNESCO/EU project “Expert Facility to Strengthen the System of Governance for Culture in Developing Countries” providing expert assistance to 13 countries and further recognized the EU for its important role in the adoption of the Convention. She stressed the importance of developing policies to support the emergence of the cultural and creative industries in developing countries, and encouraged Parties to build on the achievements to date.

6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Director-General, referring to an event that the Director-General organized earlier in the day to commemorate the courage of a Pakistani school girl, Malala, to stand up for girls’ right to education, and separately to commemorate the tenth of December as International Human Rights Day. He then presented the salient items of this session and invited the Committee to make a critical analysis of the past and future actions of the Convention, especially concerning the IFCD, and international consultation and coordination under Article 21. He then invited the Rapporteur, Mr Artashe Arakelyan of Armenia, to take his seat on the podium. The Chairperson informed the Committee that the simultaneous interpretation as well as all working documents were available in English and French. Recalling that Brazil, the Lao PDR, Switzerland, Tunisia, and Armenia are the members of the Bureau, he announced that the Bureau would be meeting the next morning.

ITEM 1 – ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Document CE/12/6.IGC/1

7. After ensuring the quorum, the **Chairperson** asked the Secretary of the Convention, Ms Danielle Cliche, to present the item. The **Secretary of the Convention** noted that the working documents both in English and French were made available online on 12 November 2012 which was within the statutory deadline established by the Rules of Procedure, with the exception of document 4 that was put online a week later due to a delay in its translation. She noted that there were seventeen documents for this session, and introduced five information documents and their contents. She added that all the documents are available on the Convention website. She reminded the Committee that based on the environmental policy of UNESCO, only a limited number of hardcopies of the documents are available at the *commis de sale*, and she read the list.
8. The **Chairperson** then brought the attention of the Committee to the Provisional timetable presented in information document CE/12/6.IGC/INF.1 and explained that the timetable proposed to slightly change the order of the items relating to the IFCD. He explained that there was no plan to organize a night session or extend the session and invited the Committee to submit any items that should be discussed under item 17 on Other business. He also reminded the Committee to submit amendments to any draft decisions in writing and if possible both in English and French.
9. The delegation of **Canada** requested a clarification about the ordering of the examination of items on the IFCD.
10. The **Chairperson** responded that item 6 on the IFCD fundraising activities was proposed to be discussed after examination of item 8 on the preliminary draft Guidelines on the IFCD.

Decision 6.IGC 1 was adopted.

ITEM 2 – APPROVAL OF THE LIST OF OBSERVERS

11. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretary of the Convention to read out the list of observers: 61 Parties non-members of the Committee, 16 Member States not Parties to the Convention, 1 permanent observer mission to UNESCO, 3 IGOs and 18 NGOs. The delegations of **Côte d'Ivoire**, **Montenegro**, and **Palestine** requested to be included in the list of observers.
12. The **Chairperson** announced the order in which the observers would take the floor during the debates and invited the Committee to adopt the list of observers.

Decision 6.IGC 2 was adopted.

ITEM 3 – ADOPTION OF THE DETAILED SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Document CE/12/6.IGC/3

13. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the examination of item 3 and informed the Committee that no comments on the draft report had been received by the Secretariat. No objections were recorded.

Decision 6.IGC 3 was adopted.

ITEM 4 – ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF THE FIRST QUADRENNIAL PERIODIC REPORTS OF PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

Document CE/12/6.IGC/4

14. The **Chairperson** opened the debate on quadrennial periodic reporting by pointing out that this was the first time that the Parties to the Convention examined its implementation at the national level. He also stressed that 48 Parties submitted their reports at this first exercise, which is a significant number that allowed the Secretariat to carry out an analysis of the trends and to draw some general conclusions. He added that this number also signalled the Parties' strong interest in the Convention and in sharing information related to its implementation. In terms of policy implications, the Chairperson pointed out that these reports provide a good indication of the way in which the Parties interpret the Convention today, seven years after its adoption. The Chairperson then invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the Secretariat's analysis of the periodic reports..
15. The **Secretary of the Convention** began by referring to the working document CE/12/6.IGC/4 that contains, as requested by the third ordinary session of the Conference of Parties, a strategic and action-oriented analytical summary of the Parties' reports and the Executive Summaries of the reports, in English and French. She said that the reports themselves had been made available to Parties on a password-protected website on 12 November 2012, and would be made available to the public following the Committee's deliberation at its present session, in accordance with paragraph 7 of Resolution 3.CP 10. Turning to the discussion of the Parties' reports, the Secretary of the Convention pointed out that 3 out of the 48 reports were received after 31 August 2012 and could not be reflected in the Secretariat's analytical summary due to statutory deadlines. She explained some Parties had informed the Secretariat

that they were unable to submit their periodic reports due to the lack of relevant national expertise or lack of resources to hold the necessary consultations with civil society. The Secretary of the Convention further explained that in analyzing the Parties' reports, the Secretariat had adopted a transversal approach based on five thematic studies conducted by international experts engaged with that purpose as well as to identify innovative examples of policies and measures in the reports. The themes proposed included: (i) cultural policies and measures that aim at supporting the creation, production, distribution, dissemination and enjoyment of cultural goods and services, (ii) international cooperation, (iii) preferential treatment measures aimed at supporting the mobility of artists, providing greater market access and strengthening the cultural industries in developing countries, (iv) the integration of culture in sustainable development policies, and (v) awareness-raising and participation of civil society. With respect to the national statistics, the data provided by the Parties in the optional statistical annex was insufficient to draw any significant conclusions.

16. The **Secretary of the Convention** went on to present some of the conclusions of the Secretariat's analysis of the Parties' quadrennial periodic reports, highlighting the following points:

- due to the fact that 80 percent of the reports were submitted by Parties belonging to electoral groups I, II and III, the information provided in the reports offers a partial view of the implementation of the Convention at the country level;
- ratification of the Convention led to the introduction of new measures and policies to support the cultural industries in a large number of Parties, particularly in developing countries. In Parties where such policies had been introduced prior to the entry into force of the Convention, ratification provided increased impetus to reinforce the existing legal, institutional and financial policies and programmes that adhere to the Convention;
- Parties are increasingly engaged in regional cooperation activities that produce a significant impact on national cultural policy-making through the pooling of resources and experiences, particularly in Latin America;
- facilitating the mobility of artists from developing countries is one of the main objectives reported on by the Parties with respect to the preferential treatment provision of the Convention. It is also one of the biggest challenges considering that the artists' mobility is linked not only to financial concerns but also to many others;
- in fostering sustainable development, Parties have a balanced concern for both economic and social outcomes, and a clear comprehension of the importance of fairness and non-discrimination in the allocation of cultural resources.
- in a number of Parties, civil society is engaged in the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of cultural policies and measures;
- a number of Parties broadened in their reports the original intent of the Convention to reaffirm the sovereign rights of the States to adopt policies and measures aimed at protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions. They interpreted the Convention to cover the entire range of cultural policy development, applying the framework of the 2005 Convention to many cultural forms and manifestations that may relate more closely to the remit of the 2001 Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity and the 2003 Convention on the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage.

17. The main challenges to the implementation of the Convention included:
 - a lack of understanding in some areas of policy-making of the development potential offered by the cultural sector;
 - in some Parties, a lack of dialogue with the Government that impedes civil society engagement in the implementation of the Convention;
 - insufficient development and use of benchmarks and indicators to monitor and evaluate the impact of policies and measures
18. To conclude, the **Secretary of the Convention** highlighted some of the recommendations suggested by the international experts, including providing a clear definition of some terms such as “cultural policies” and “sustainable development”, creating a space within the report template for a narrative description of the overall cultural policy vision of the country, and, finally, creating partnership arrangements between the countries for a period of four years to provide practical assistance to help build national capacities for the preparation of the periodic reports.
19. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for the debate.
20. The delegation of **Tunisia** welcomed the efforts made by the Secretariat to produce an analytical summary that was rich and dense in content. The delegation observed that some of the Parties’ reports revealed their difficulty to determine which cultural policies and measures were directly related to the Convention, as well as certain confusion about its scope of application. Tunisia invited the Secretariat to improve the Periodic Report Form, notably by introducing a space for a narrative description of the Parties’ cultural policy vision, and to reflect upon a possible training programme on preparing the reports. The delegation further remarked that in its analysis the Secretariat identified common implementation challenges and the solutions that had been found by Parties. For some issues, however, no satisfactory solutions were presented (for instance, regarding insufficient partnerships with the private sector, preferential treatment measures and mobility of artists from developing countries). Tunisia suggested that it was up to the Committee to reflect on these issues and identify possible solutions. The delegation concluded by commenting that the Secretariat’s analysis, dense and rich as it was, could still be improved in the future, in particular through better continuity and consistency between different sections.
21. The delegation of the **Lao PDR** commended the work of the Secretariat, while noting that Asia is missing from the picture, for a number of reasons. As concerns the Lao PDR, the delegation commented that the lack of expertise necessary to produce the report, combined with the lack of financial resources to enable translation were the main reasons why the Lao PDR was unable to submit its quadrennial periodic report in 2012. The Lao PDR joined the delegation of Tunisia in calling for strengthening the national capacities to fulfil the Parties’ obligations under the Articles 9 and 19 of the Convention.
22. The delegation of **Viet Nam** joined Tunisia and the Lao PDR in commending the Secretariat for the quality of its analytical summary. Commenting on the various interpretations of the scope of the 2005 Convention, the delegation remarked that the Convention was still very recent and needed more awareness-raising. Viet Nam also supported paragraph 9 (ii) of the draft Decision (training workshops) and suggested that UNESCO Field Offices be involved in this initiative.

23. The delegation of **Canada** began by thanking the Secretariat for its excellent preparation work for the Committee's meeting, highlighting the quality of the Secretariat's working document, the experts' contributions and the Parties' reports. Canada also appealed to the Parties which hadn't done so to present their reports on the implementation of the Convention. The delegation observed that a clearer distinction between the scopes of application of the 2003 and the 2005 Conventions was needed, as well as a space in the Report template to describe the overall cultural policy and strategy in the country. The delegation concluded by announcing that it had prepared a draft amendment on a point requiring further analysis, namely, modernizing cultural policies to take full advantage of the new technologies and digital information so as to ensure the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, and would be pleased to present it to the Committee when appropriate.
24. The delegation of **Switzerland** joined the previous speakers in commending the Secretariat and thanked the Parties which had submitted their reports. The delegation suggested that the reporting methodology could be improved so that the reports be better focused and more targeted. From that perspective, the training programme proposed in the draft Decision was very important. Switzerland also pointed out, like Tunisia before them, that solutions to some of the Convention's challenges were missing or lacking in the analytical summary. The delegation invited the Committee to look to the IOS evaluation of the IFCD pilot phase (document CE/12/6.IGC/7 paragraph 17) for inspiration on how to tap into the corpus of knowledge accumulated in the Parties for common benefit. Switzerland concluded by proposing that at the next meeting of the Governing Bodies there should be a direct exchange between the Parties and the experts who had prepared contributions to the Secretariat's summary to assist the Parties in identifying and focusing on specific topics of common interest within the broad themes of the Convention.
25. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** joined the consensus on the quality of the Secretariat's analysis. The delegation then observed that notwithstanding Africa's enthusiastic response to the 2005 Convention, as is reflected by the high ratification rates, very few Parties from the region had thus far submitted their periodic reports. In speculating on the reasons for this delay, the delegation stressed that many Parties, in particular from Africa, were uncertain about how to compile their reports and hesitant to make them public. The delegation also wondered whether the Secretariat had the capacity to process all of the periodic reports that were expected in 2013. Zimbabwe concluded by pointing out that having the possibility to consult other Parties' reports and the selected good practices would be helpful, and that any form of capacity-building in respect to this exercise would be highly valuable.
26. The **Chairperson** expressed his appreciation of the speakers' comments and pointed out, in relation to one of Zimbabwe's points, that making the periodic reports public was very important as part of the joint learning process.
27. The delegation of **Armenia** stressed the considerable work undertaken by the Secretariat and supported the remarks made by the previous speakers in respect to capacity-building. The delegation highlighted the need to train the national experts in the methodological aspects of data collection required to compile the periodic reports under the Convention. The delegation remarked that even though Armenia had worked for months on its report, it ultimately decided not to submit it in 2012 due to uncertainty about the adequacy of its methodology. Armenia concluded by thanking the Parties who were the first ones to submit their reports, which would now provide a point of reference for the others, and encouraging the other Parties to submit their reports in 2013.

28. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the Secretariat on the quality of its document. The delegation then focused its comments on paragraphs 9 and 12 of Annex I of this document, which observes that a number of Parties described in their reports policies and measures that are within the remit of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage rather than the 2005 Convention. In this connection, the delegation pointed out that many Parties to the 2005 Convention do not have well developed cultural industries. In addition, the delegation remarked that cultural production depends on content, which sometimes has to do with traditional knowledge or cultural practices. Taking these points into account, the importance on reflecting on the relationship between the two Conventions is crucial. The delegation added in this regard that in some cases cultural policies first need to strengthen cultural forms as they are, and only after that build creative industries.
29. The delegation of **Argentina** commended the Secretariat, the experts, and the 48 Parties that submitted their reports. The delegation stated that it did not see any overlap between the 2003 and 2005 Conventions but rather complementarity. It also suggested that the reporting procedure could be amended in the future based on inputs from the national points of contact. In commenting on the analytical summary, the delegation referred to the passages highlighting regional cooperation and/or inclusion of culture in sustainable development policies in Latin America, and mentioned examples such as '*Mercosur cultural*' (Ministers' of Culture meetings), *Ibero-american cultural programmes*, and cultural information systems such as the *Sistema de Información Cultural del Mercosur* (SICSUR). In respect to the latter, the delegation suggested that UNESCO consider SICSUR's research on creative economy and culture's contribution to development as a source for its cultural statistics framework. The delegation also expressed its appreciation about the mention in the analytical summary of the recent regional workshop in Buenos Aires on the implementation of the Convention.
30. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** welcomed the work of the Secretariat and the experts and observed that even though the Convention was 'young', the Parties' reports show that a lot of work has been carried out. The delegation then commended the Latin American and European Parties for their good regional cooperation, as well as Canada and Tunisia for having included a reference to the principles of the Convention in their bilateral and multilateral trade agreements. In respect to the good practices of preferential treatment included in the Secretariat's document, the delegation expressed its regret that they were identified in only nine Parties and wished that more would follow suit. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines also regretted the lack of reports from the Caribbean, and gave its full support to the proposal in paragraph 9 (ii) of the draft Decision on capacity-building. The delegation also suggested that an information exchange session during which Parties would present their reports could be organized during the fourth session of the Conference of Parties in June 2013. To conclude, the delegation referred to the earlier discussion on the relationship between the 2003 and 2005 Conventions pointing out the 2005 Convention is a very particular normative instrument because it is turned towards the future, by viewing culture not only as heritage to be passed on from generation to generation, but also as a product of individual creativity.
31. The **Chairperson** agreed with Saint Vincent and the Grenadines' statement and commented that while the complementarity of the UNESCO Cultural Conventions is an important point to reflect on, the *raison d'être* of each of them addresses a specific need within the Parties.

32. The delegation of **China** thanked the Secretariat and the Parties who submitted reports in time for their work. The delegation then made a reference to the earlier debates of the Committee and the third session of the Conference of Parties on how periodic reports should be prepared. As a result of these debates, it was decided that the framework for the periodic reports should not put too much burden on the Parties and should leave sufficient flexibility in this regard. From that perspective, while the delegation fully understood that in offering the electronic templates the Secretariat aimed to facilitate the Parties task, it admitted that this resulted in some confusion and difficulties on their part. The delegation highlighted that Parties had different situations and institutions, and different methods for collecting data and producing statistics. It suggested that the Secretariat take note that no one size could fit all in this regard and revise the template. The delegation then declared that China's periodic report was ready and would be submitted to the Secretariat shortly. The delegation concluded by joining the previous speakers in supporting the elaboration of a training programme to help the Parties to prepare their periodic reports.
33. The delegation of **Sweden** commended the Secretariat and the experts for their analysis, and pointed out that the main policy focus as reflected in the Parties' report appears to be on distribution rather than on production and creation, which indicates that there is a need for more effort on these two aspects. Another important point under-reported by Parties, according to Sweden, was the issue of gender responsive cultural policies. The delegation observed that this question was, from Sweden's point of view, extremely important, both in relation to the periodic reporting and IFCD.
34. The delegation of **France** joined its voice to that of the previous speakers in thanking the Secretariat for its excellent summary report. Concerning the electronic template, the delegation observed that it had been put online a little bit late in the day, which may have caused difficulties for some Parties, and agreed that it may need some fine-tuning. However, for them it had been very useful to have this template with the precise questions. It was particularly helpful in the inter-ministerial meetings, as a tool in making sure that the different Ministries made an effort to summarize and synthesize their inputs and provide precise information on the policies and projects that had been put in place. The delegation stressed that the exercise of preparing the periodic report contributes to the implementation of the Convention in promoting coordination among different Ministries, civil society, and contributing to a better understanding of the Convention on the part of the general public.
35. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee Members for their comments and gave the floor to the observers.

[Observers]

36. The delegation of **Norway** observed that the analytical summary of the Parties' quadrennial periodic reports was the most important document as regards the actual impact of the Convention at the national level. The real success of the Convention being related to how the Parties are able or willing to take on board the intentions and principles of the Convention, it was clear for the delegation that the understanding of the Convention differed to some extent among the Parties. Norway commented in this regard that some Parties viewed the Convention as a platform for cultural policies in general, whereas others emphasized the development of cultural industries. To Norway, the Convention is a document on cultural policies in general. While taking note that many Parties emphasized the cultural industry perspective, the delegation was convinced that the Convention had both power and potential to be a guiding document for both cultural policies in general and the development of cultural industries in particular. To conclude, the delegation expressed its wish for more external researchers delving into the periodic reports once they were

public in order to analyse how the Parties to the Convention have interpreted and implemented the Convention in its infant stage.

37. The delegation of **Germany** thanked all the Parties who went through the exercise of this pioneering reporting. The delegation explained that in Germany, it was done under the leadership of the Foreign Ministry, but involving several line Ministries, specialists and civil society organizations. The delegation supported Saint Vincent and the Grenadines' view of the Convention as oriented towards the future, as it is the only UNESCO normative instrument that focuses on contemporary artistic creation and production. The delegation then shared five challenges encountered during the compilation of the report:
- policy, which implies a lack of a clear list of priorities and specific objectives for the near future in relation to the Convention;
 - culture is not yet clearly recognized by all relevant private and public partners as a resource for development;
 - knowledge, which relates to the question of how to best use the existing national and regional knowledge base and networks, as well as best practices. In this regard, bringing together the experts who analysed the report for an exchange session before the Conference of Parties would be very helpful;
 - cooperation, i.e., ensuring good cooperation between different line Ministries on the national level, which is much needed considering the gaps in reporting on Article 16 and Article 21 of the Convention.
 - methodology, which was already mentioned by previous speakers.
38. The delegation strongly welcomed the suggestion in the Secretariat's document that Parties be of assistance to each other. In addition, the resources that exist in civil society and academia could be better used. To conclude, the delegation mentioned several important issues that had not yet been sufficiently addressed through the reporting exercise, namely: the challenges of digitization, the role of public service broadcasting and of course status of the artist, including the freedom of expression and freedom of creation.
39. The **Chairperson**, echoing Germany's remarks, stressed the importance of finding the best ways to share the existing knowledge.
40. The delegation of **Bangladesh** commended the Secretariat's and the Parties' work and referred to the Ministerial Forum organized in Dhaka in May 2012 to promote the Convention in the Asia-Pacific region.
41. The delegation of **Nigeria** pointed out that its periodic report was prepared by the Federal Ministry of Culture and Tourism in consultation with civil society. The delegation stressed that one of the main difficulties was with statistics: due to the lack of cultural statistics in Nigeria, it was impossible for the compilers of the report to back up the qualitative information in it with statistical data. The delegation joined the previous speakers in highlighting the importance of capacity-building, in particular in respect to cultural statistics and the methodology of the quadrennial reports.

42. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** commented that, overall, civil society had not been sufficiently involved in the preparation of the reports and that this needed to be addressed in the future. The representative also observed that often Parties described in their reports policies and measures that predated the Convention, or measures that did not support the objectives of the Convention. It was, therefore, important to provide illustrative examples of relevant policies and measures to help the Parties in this regard. It was also necessary to organize a dedicated debate on how to best assess the progress of implementation of the Convention in the future. In this respect, the representative stressed that the status of the artist needed to be better addressed, and that civil society had a valuable perspective, grounded in practice, to contribute to the Parties' work.
43. The representative of the **Organisation internationale de la Francophonie (OIF)** commented on the contribution of the OIF to the effective implementation of the Convention. The representative said that thanks to the mobilisation of the OIF, through its institutional and non-institutional networks, 70 countries that ratified the Convention were from the French-speaking world. However, the same degree of mobilization was not achieved in respect to the compilation of the first quadrennial periodic reports. The representative declared that the OIF was committed to providing on-going support to its Member States in the implementation of the Convention. The OIF had noted the need for support in cooperating between various stakeholders, particularly civil society, as well as the need to be able to have access to statistical instruments and support in using them. In this regard, the OIF undertook to encourage, support and work with its Member States in the preparation of the quadrennial periodic reports and to continue with technical capacity-building hand-in-hand with UNESCO.
44. The **Chairperson** welcomed the commitment of the OIF and noted that it was increasingly important for the various international organizations, including the OIF and UNESCO, to work hand-in-hand.
45. The representative of the **United Cities and Local Governments Organization (UCLG)** announced that the UCLG was preparing a report on the relationship between the Convention and the local cultural policy in the context of the implementation of Agenda 21 on Culture. This report, to be finalized in 2013, will provide complementary information to the periodic reports with regard to the local structures, which is an important dimension to highlight in the context of the Convention. The representative also said that the UCLG was working on a new stage of Agenda 21 Culture and would continue to support the understanding and knowledge of the Convention in local government and civil society.
46. The **Chairperson** thanked the speakers for their comments, all of which were duly noted, and gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention.
47. The **Secretary of the Convention** thanked all the Members of the Committee and the observers for their questions and suggestions, especially those that can help the Secretariat improve on its work. In response to Zimbabwe's question about the capacity of the Secretariat to process the forthcoming reports, the Secretary of the Convention observed that it needed to engage with experts in the different fields covered by the Periodic Report Framework to enable it to process the volume of reports submitted. With regard to public access to the reports, in accordance with the resolution of the Conference of Parties, the Secretariat provided restricted access to Parties in November and will make the entire database accessible to the general public in the coming days. This, as was pointed out by several speakers, serves to contribute to a larger learning and knowledge-management system, which is extremely important for what is required for capacity-

building and a better understanding of what is happening on the ground in respect to the implementation of the Convention. The Secretary of the Convention also referred to the comment on the national points of contact, highlighting that cooperation with them was, indeed, very important, but that not all Parties had as yet identified their point of contact. With regard to the Buenos Aires 2012 workshop, the Secretary of the Convention said that it had helped establish a regional network of contact points and a cooperation platform. In respect to the periodic reporting framework and, in particular, the statistical annex, the Secretary of the Convention recalled the Chairperson's words that it was a joint learning process. In this connection, the Secretary of the Convention welcomed the suggestion made by several speakers to organize an exchange session between the Parties and the experts to share information, experiences and insights and to determine the next steps.

48. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention for her precise answers and asked the Committee Members to move to the examination and adoption of the draft Decision 6.IGC.4, as amended, paying special attention to whether the current draft reflected the debate of the Committee and the suggestions made by different Committee Members.
49. The delegation of **Canada**, having submitted three amendments to the draft decision, explained that in preparing its periodic report Canada had faced some challenges related to the definitions and the type of statistics requested in the statistical annex. Its amendment would make it possible to not only carry out capacity-building activities, but also rethink the reporting framework and its statistical annex to make sure they were as efficient as possible. The delegation pointed out in this respect that, even though it may seem premature to think about revising the Operational Guidelines at this point, the fact that only the Conference of Parties could reopen the Guidelines, in conjuncture with the calendar of its meetings warranted the amendment proposed by Canada. The idea was to have the possibility to revise the Framework before four years, should it be deemed necessary.
50. The delegation of **Switzerland** explained its amendment to paragraph 9 of the draft decision, which consisted in adding a third sub-paragraph to reflect the Committee's wish to develop an information and knowledge-sharing platform involving the Parties, the experts and civil society. This would allow the Parties to keep the momentum, to pursue the discussion in a constructive manner in order to reflect upon solutions, establish priorities and respond to one of the recommendations of the IFCD evaluation.
51. The **Chairperson** thanked the Members for their explanations and proposed to move to examination of the draft decision paragraph by paragraph.
52. After adopting the first three paragraphs without discussion, two questions were raised by the delegations of **Cameroon** and the **Lao PDR** concerning the wording of the first Canadian amendment on lessons learned from the first cycle of periodic reporting, which was to become the new paragraph 4. Taking these questions into consideration, the language of the paragraph was revised, and the new paragraph 4 approved.
53. In respect to the second Canadian amendment concerning a mandate from the Conference of Parties to re-examine and revise the Operational Guidelines that was to become the new paragraph 5, the **Chairperson** commented that even though he found it justified, it was important to bear in mind that certain permanence was required in legal texts such as Operational Guidelines in order to facilitate their implementation at the national level.

54. The delegation of **Brazil** asked to clarify whether ‘requesting a mandate from the Conference of Parties’ meant that the Committee was asking for a mandate to prepare draft revisions to the Operational Guidelines or was requesting a mandate to revise the Guidelines.
55. The delegations of **China, Zimbabwe** and **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** echoed the concern of the Brazilian delegation and asked the Canadian delegation about the rationale and direction of the potential revision on the Operational Guidelines.
56. The **Chairperson** explained that if the Canadian amendment was adopted, the Conference of Parties would effectively revise the Operational Guidelines only in 2015 based on the Committee’s proposals.
57. The delegation of **Albania** requested a clarification from the Legal Advisor on whether the Committee needed a mandate from the Conference of Parties to start the work on the revision of the Guidelines to be presented to the Conference of Parties when appropriate. The **Legal Advisor** explained that the Canadian proposal was based on Article 23 of the Convention and did not pose any legal problems.
58. The delegation of **Canada** explained, in reaction to the questions that were raised that in light of paragraph 4 on the lessons learnt that was adopted, the proposed paragraph was intended to respond to those lessons, which may require certain adjustments of the Operational Guidelines such as, for instance, “to ask for less (i.e., more focused questions) to get more” (i.e., more in-depth and comprehensive responses).
59. In light of the Canadian clarification, the **Chairperson** proposed to amend the paragraph by adding the phrases ‘if needed’ and ‘on the basis of acquired experiences’, as was suggested by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, supported by France. The delegation of **Albania** proposed, taking into account what had been said, the following wording: ‘to re-examine and revise, if appropriate, the Operational Guidelines’. Following the comments by **France** and **Tunisia**, ‘if appropriate’ was changed to ‘if needed’. With these revisions, the new paragraph 5 was adopted.
60. The **Chairperson** moved to paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 6bis proposed by Canada, 7 and 8 that were adopted without amendments as the new paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.
61. In relation to the Swiss amendment in the new paragraph 12, the delegation of **Brazil** requested the Secretariat to outline how the ‘exchange platform’ in question would be implemented. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the Swiss proposal could be implemented in two ways: first, as developing a large information-sharing and knowledge-management system, and, second, as organizing an exchange session between the Parties and the experts. The Secretary of the Convention specified that it was in this latter sense that she understood the proposal, pending Switzerland’s confirmation. She then added that the Secretariat was putting together the building blocks of a knowledge-management system with the IFCD and Periodic Reports platforms that the Committee Members had seen. But a great deal more work was obviously needed to be able to respond to all of the Committee’s requests for information and linking it to the data and information in other databases, such as national and regional databases.
62. While the delegation of **Switzerland** confirmed that it had, indeed, in mind an exchange session as a first step, the delegation of **Brazil**, supported by **Albania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, the **Lao PDR, Tunisia** and **France** proposed to introduce clearer language in the Decision replacing ‘platform’ by ‘exchange session’.

63. The delegation of **Brazil** then proposed to add at the end of the Swiss paragraph the phrase 'issues of common interest, including the relationship with other legal instruments', referring to the Committee's earlier discussion on the relationship between the 2005 and 2003 Conventions. This proposal was supported by the delegations of **Argentina, Cuba** and **Albania**.
64. The **Chairperson** read the revised paragraph 12 (iii). There were no further comments from the floor, and it was adopted.

Decision 6.IGC 4 was adopted as amended

ITEM 5 – SECRETARIAT'S REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE THIRD YEAR OF THE PILOT PHASE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)

Documents CE/12/6.IGC/5 and CE/12/6.IGC/INF4

65. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the item.
66. The **Secretary of the Convention** informed that 23 of the 31 IFCD projects approved by the Committee in 2010 had been completed. Five of the projects requested an extension to 15 December 2012, and three of them were expected to be completed by the end of 2012. Outcomes of these projects have been communicated by the Secretariat through monthly e-updates, and additional information was made available on the website of the Convention. She recalled that in 2011, the Committee approved 17 projects for funding and a provisional budget for 2012, and stated that these are all advancing steadily and can be monitored via the Convention website. She also recalled that the Committee decided to issue a third call for applications in 2012, and to dedicate 70 percent of the funds available on 30 June 2012 for funding projects. Given the total amount available at the time, US\$1.1 million became available to fund IFCD projects that the Committee would review at this session. Taking note of feedback from the Committee and the Panel of Experts, the Secretariat prepared for the third call for projects an annotated guide to the application form in English and French, which was put on the website along with new information about the IFCD and the application process in English and French in March 2012. She further informed that 30 June 2012 marked the deadline for the receipt of applications of the third round of funding requests and the end of the IFCD 36-month pilot phase. For this call, the Secretariat received 219 applications from 68 countries, and from 23 international NGOs, showing an increase in the demand for funding. A significant number of applications integrated in their activities capacity-building elements as well as awareness-raising, network-building, cultural entrepreneurship and mapping among other activities. In terms of the priorities of UNESCO, more than one-third of the applications received were from Africa, and one-third addressed youth. An important amount of the applications also included elements on gender equality, addressed small island developing States, and a high number addressed indigenous peoples. Of the 219 requests for funding received this year, around 22 percent passed the technical evaluation on their eligibility. Those that did not pass received a letter indicating the reasons why, and those that did pass were forwarded to the Panel of Experts, who undertook both a quantitative and qualitative evaluation. The results were entered directly into the database for each project evaluated. A validation was made by the coordinator of the Panel of Experts prior to submitting the final list of 13 projects to the Committee for a total of US\$1,074,826. Five of the 13 projects come from Parties that have not yet received IFCD funding: Croatia; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Indonesia; Mongolia; and Montenegro. Annex II

of document CE/12/6.IGC/5 contains individual evaluation sheets on each project recommended, including a summary of the Panel of Experts' assessment.

67. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and invited Mr Ferdinand Richard, President of the Panel of Experts, to give a summary of the projects recommended.
68. **Mr Richard** thanked the Secretariat for its assistance and its devotion to the Panel of Experts, and thanked his five expert colleagues as well. He identified distinctive characteristics and strengths of the IFCD observed by the Panel over the three calls for applications:
 - support to local projects and cultural programmes, which involve various representatives of civil society and impact beyond their local area;
 - the ease by which there is access to funds, particularly as compared to other funding sources whose complex processes discriminate against applications from developing countries;
 - the resistance to adding domains other than culture; and
 - the space created for the emergence of cultural industries and support for the rights of people to have control over their own development, particularly in the face of threats from globalization.
69. Despite its limited budget, the IFCD has established its place in the world of cultural mediators and is perceived as being a unique, logical, consistent resource that expresses a philosophical approach. It is a true tool for cultural development and its promoters can be justly proud of it. The IFCD's benefits only become globally visible after a few years because of its nature, and it is starting to emerge in the minds of practitioners around the world as an alternative and this is consolidated year by year. Its disappearance would be to the detriment of the benefits accumulated and built up over the past few years.
70. Mr Richard expressed concerns over the examination of projects with regard to potential interpretations of the Convention. He mentioned confusion and a competition between various UNESCO programmes supporting diversity, and noted that complementarity between these projects merits examination. He also underlined the sustainability factor, and noted that most cultural development programmes supported by the IFCD are long-term.
71. Mr Richard presented the 13 new IFCD projects recommended to the Committee. He concluded by stating that there has been an increase in the quality of the projects that the Panel of Experts had recognized.
72. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Richard and the Panel of Experts for their work and commitment, and noted the importance of keeping the long-term perspective of the IFCD in mind.
73. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** noted that a project from its country was rejected because it was not signed by the National Commission, as required, and asked how in the future this could be remedied. Some applications went directly from NGOs to the Secretariat of the Convention without going through the National Commission, and there is a lack of information or awareness regarding the procedure. The delegation also asked about an application that met the technical requirements and

that concerned creole jazz as an instrument of community development, but was rejected by the Panel of Experts. The delegation hoped to have approval on proposed amendments for the draft decision that are contrary to the IOS recommendation not to launch projects for the next year.

74. The delegation of the **Lao PDR**, in referring to the report, noted that there is confusion and a lack of capacity at the national level concerning the preparation of requests for IFCD funding, as there are many incomplete applications and requests from non-Parties to the Convention. The delegation stated the need to strengthen capacity on a continual basis, and asked the Secretariat to enhance the level of knowledge and to strengthen the capacity of the Parties.
75. The delegation of **Brazil** appreciated the recommendations, comments, and evaluations provided, and asked three questions: in general terms, what are the main issues or problems in applications for which the Panel of Experts chose not to recommend them?; does co-financing from applicants pose a problem for implementation of projects?; and what feedback does the Secretariat receive from applicants that received a negative letter?
76. The delegation of **Tunisia** commented on projects rejected for a lack of signature of the National Commission, and asked whether submitting Parties have understood the problem and if it has been well clarified to avoid this in future.
77. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted the importance of and the distinction in cultural policy and cultural industries, and asked whether the Panel of Experts looks for a nexus of both components in a project, or looks for one or the other.
78. The delegation of **Canada** noted that 75 percent of the requests were not eligible, and that in some instances this was due to a missing signature which the Secretariat could point out by making a phone call to the applicant in order that it be corrected. The delegation asked whether, and how many, countries were contacted to point out the need for correction, and if corrections were made as a result and by how many?
79. **Mr Richard** stated that the Panel of Experts does not contact and has no control of National Commissions, but it does see a difference between National Commissions in terms of those that really disseminate information and accompany the process, and those that don't. He noted that National Commissions have a great responsibility in the way in which the call for projects of the IFCD is put underway. Mr Richard explained that each project is scored by two Experts each using a 20-point scale for a total of 40 possible points and those projects scoring 30 or higher are automatically accepted. There are many interesting projects scoring 29 and below, but the budgetary allocation prevents them from being accepted. These projects can be modified and re-apply another year. It is not possible to say why projects score low and are therefore not accepted, as it is in the assessment of each Expert. The Experts look at the clarity, feasibility and sustainability of the projects because the good use of the funds must be guaranteed. Co-financing is not compulsory and many projects without it are accepted, and when there is co-financing and a well-built budget for a project it is well-viewed as it lends to the professionalism of the project. Mr Richard noted that there is flexibility on the question of cultural policy and/or cultural industries components in projects and said that generally a good project supports both as there is a *de facto* association between the two.
80. The **Secretary of the Convention**, on the issue of the signatures and the National Commissions, referred to the Guidelines and said that National Commissions or other official channels designated by the parties not only sign the dossier but are the first point in

project submissions, as they shall ensure that projects are relevant, meet the country's needs and have been subject to consultation among stakeholders. To that effect, there is a specific form that must be completed and sent to the Secretariat with the dossier. If the form is missing, the technical requirement is not met. If all the materials are complete, arrive on time, and the form is completed but not signed, the Secretariat contacts the National Commission, asks them to sign the form and send it by fax or email and it's put into the folder. In the case that only a signature is missing, the Secretariat does everything possible within the timeframe and the resources available to follow up. With regard to informing an applicant that the technical evaluation did not pass, the letter issued by the Secretariat gives a short explanation. The technical evaluation made by the Secretariat is summarized and available on the website. The Secretariat does not accept applications from NGOs directly. In applying the rules, the only applications the Secretariat accepts are those sent by the National Commissions, and by the international NGOs accompanied by letters of support from those countries for which the project is benefiting. Concerning projects that did not receive points above 30 by the Panel of Experts, the Secretariat writes to the applicants and gives the explanation provided by the Panel of Experts as to why the project was not accepted. The Secretariat, within the means available, is reinforcing the IFCD and working on capacity-building.

81. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Richard and the Secretary of the Convention, and noted that this is collective work with transparency and long-term aims. As there were no other comments, the Chairperson proceeded with the approval of the 13 IFCD projects displayed on the screen. There was agreement on all 13 projects. Moving on to the draft decision 6.IGC 5, the Chairperson invited the delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to present its proposed amendments.
82. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by **Tunisia, Brazil, France, the Lao PDR, Albania, Cameroon, Cuba, Armenia, Honduras and Zimbabwe**, stated that a new call for projects should be made, even though the IOS recommended not doing so, because the IFCD and the Convention's visibility relies on projects being implemented in developing countries. The delegation noted that this would require the term of office the Panel of Experts to be renewed for another year, and that if the two amendments were adopted, an eighth paragraph asking the Secretariat to put forward to the Committee, at its seventh session, a new panel of expert membership may be necessary.
83. The delegation of **Sweden**, supported by **Brazil**, and **Canada** suggested that the proposed amendments be discussed under items 6 and 7 when the IOS recommendations are reviewed.
84. The delegation of **Canada** stated that a new call for projects in 2013, will be based on the old Guidelines that the Committee is about to re-examine. Thus the amendments should be examined under item 7.
85. The **Chairperson** advised to separate form and substance. On substance the Committee is aware of the IOS recommendation but desires a new call for projects. On form, the proposed amendments could be examined under item 7, Report of the evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD.
86. The delegation of **Sweden** recalled that the Committee agreed on the need for developing a vision and direction for the IFCD and to increase its strategic focus. The delegation also recalled that the findings of the periodic reports show different countries facing different challenges concerning implementation of the Convention which necessitate IFCD

assistance with capacity-building. IOS recommendation 34 proposes to make 2013 a year for taking care of recommendations, and not to make decisions out of old Guidelines.

87. The **Chairperson** recapped that though in a transitional phase, and with an overlap between the various Guidelines, the overarching interest of the Committee is to promote visibility for the Convention and that a moratorium on new IFCD projects will cause a loss in momentum. The Chairperson therefore suggested examining the draft decision 6.IGC 5 taking into account the amendments. He asked the Legal Advisor to comment.
88. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the Chairperson is acting in line with his role and responsibilities. A body is governed by the rules that it has defined itself, and the Guidelines request that projects be submitted by 30 June. There hasn't been any proposal to modify the Guidelines, but these Guidelines might be examined, and this is the prerogative of the Committee but for decision by the Conference of Parties at its next session. The Legal Advisor stated that he saw no objection to the Committee approving the proposed amendments.
89. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of draft decision 6.IGC 5. Paragraphs 1 through 6 were adopted as is. Paragraph 7 “decides to renew, for the fourth call for projects, the members of the Panel of Experts charged with elaborating recommendations for the seventh ordinary session of the Committee with a view to its examination of requests for funding of projects within the IFCD framework” was adopted.
90. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed adding an eighth paragraph requesting the Secretariat to present to the seventh session of the Committee a proposal for the composition of a new Panel of Experts.
91. The **Chairperson** considered this proposal, and suggested for the French drafting to use the word “groupe” instead of “panel”.
92. The delegation of **Canada** recalled that in the future discussion on the composition of the Panel of Experts, there will be a proposal for a partial rotation of Experts. The delegation asked whether the adoption of the preliminary draft Guidelines by the Conference of Parties will request the Secretariat to prepare for the Committee the proposed composition of the Panel of Experts.
93. The **Chairperson** concluded that it is better to provide this proposed paragraph in order for the Secretariat to be seized of the request now, rather than later. Paragraph 8 “Requests the Secretariat to present to the seventh ordinary session of the Committee a proposal for a new composition of the Panel of Experts” was adopted.

Decision 6.IGC 5 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 6 – FUNDRAISING ACTIVITIES: REPORT ON THE USE OF THE FUNDS INTENDED FOR THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)

Document CE/12/6.IGC/6

94. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled the past years of exchange on the IFCD and the fundraising strategy. Recognizing the need to engage professionals in the field of fundraising at its fifth session in December 2011, the Committee decided to allocate a maximum amount of US\$200,000 for fundraising activities, including the elaboration of a fundraising strategy. A

request for proposals was launched in May 2012 in compliance with procurement regulations, and UNESCO received five proposals, which were evaluated. Two of them earned at least the minimum required points to go on to the second and last step, namely the examination of the financial bids. Small World Stories submitted the highest ranking technical proposal with the lowest ranking financial proposal, which clearly distinguished it as the winning bidder. They conducted over fifty interviews and performed over 120 hours of research and analysis to create an IFCD-capacity assessment and a fundraising and communications strategy, incorporating two fundraising campaigns, with a proposed timeline, workplan and budget.

95. The **Chairperson** welcomed Ms Aguilar from Small World Stories to the podium for her presentation of the strategy “Investing in creativity: transforming societies”.
96. **Ms Aguilar** first thanked everyone who had been contacted in July, including civil society members, for all their input. In developing the assignment, Small World Stories strived to balance the capacity of the IFCD with its potential to grow and to absorb efficiently new streams of resources. The objective was to develop a manageable and sustained growth strategy for the IFCD. The work was based on several principles: first to maximize the support of internal stakeholders such as the Governing bodies of the Convention, Parties, Secretariat, and civil society actors; second to position the IFCD as a strategic and strongly results-oriented mechanism; third to acknowledge that funding would need to come from diverse sources; and fourth, to focus on building surgical and strategic partnerships with a number of high-volume partners. IFCD's potential for growth lies primarily with government, private sector and high net worth individuals.
97. A five-year strategy with three phases was recommended. The first phase expands the existing support base that the IFCD has among governments, while at the same time establishing the building blocks that it will need to reach out to external donors. The estimated cost for phase one is about US\$399,000 and it would run approximately 18 months. Phase one includes an initiative called “Your 1% Counts for Creativity”; an appeal to government donors to contribute to the IFCD at least 1 percent of their regular contributions to UNESCO. It would be launched at the Conference of Parties in June, and last for at least six months. To demonstrate the transformational power of the IFCD, project champions will show projects having a major impact, and a debate will be generated. Also a carefully researched list of companies to be approached would be developed. A set of recognition mechanisms would be established for donors contributing to the IFCD. A rebranding of the IFCD would be undertaken, with a strong visual identity and communication systems and tools, so that the IFCD can be pro-active and communicate through modern mediums with its different stakeholders.
98. Phase two is over a two-year period and costs approximately US\$457,000. The IFCD would develop cases for support that are very targeted, and then reach out to external donors and secure partnerships with the private sector and with high net worth individuals. The recognition and communication campaign would be implemented. How funds are spent would be showcased; donors, both governmental and private, need to know where their funding fits in the bigger picture of the IFCD and the Convention. The goal is to attain six partnerships in this phase.
99. Phase three estimates an 18-month period with a US\$351,000 budget. It is when the IFCD is mature in visibility, fundraising and communication, and can reach out to a corporate partner to establish a “cause marketing, longer-term relationship”, which means a corporate partner raises funds for the IFCD, usually through corporate sales. These partnerships are complicated, hard to negotiate, and require a lot of prior groundwork. This third phase will also generate support and alignment within UNESCO, for example with the partnership and the External Relations and Public Information Sector that are searching for stories or case studies about what the IFCD projects generate. The goal is that by 2018, the IFCD will be highly

respected among government donors and receive regular financial support from at least half the Parties to the Convention, will have developed six key private sector partnerships that bring 30 percent of its resource, will have broad credibility among like-minded networks, and will have a signature partnership, a cause-related marketing, with a global corporation.

100. A cross-cutting element of the strategy that is essential is media engagement. This begins with the existing UNESCO networks, and grows progressively, becoming more independent in how the IFCD engages with media. A strong monitoring and evaluation system for the strategy would include establishing indicators as well as analysis of economic trends and incentives for giving among main donors. The funding objective would be, and through conservative figures, that the IFCD triples its annual income by the end of the strategy. Currently it is US\$800,000 to US\$900,000 annually, so by the end of phase three, it would reach US\$2.5 to US\$3 million.
101. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Aguilar and opened the floor for debate.
102. The delegation of **Sweden** thanked Ms Aguilar for the presentation and for the inclusion of monitoring and evaluation, which are necessary in order to communicate to potential and established donors not only the IFCD objectives but the results as well.
103. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed gratitude for the excellent document, the content of which is useful to the IFCD as well as the Convention. The delegation strongly supported the proposal, but asked for more information on who and what is needed to implement the strategy, in view of the reduced resources and limited staff.
104. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked Ms Aguilar for the presentation and noted that it is optimistic but this is needed to move forward. The delegation asked how the Committee can be sure that the objectives, such as tripling the budget or securing six partnerships, will be reached.
105. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked Ms Aguilar for the presentation, and asked if the target wasn't too low in view of the IFCD's potential, as well as the expectations of Parties.
106. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** commended the strategy developed by Small World Stories and expressed the opinion that it should remain whole and not have any part split from it. The delegation agreed with the strategy slogan "investing in creativity, transforming societies" since this is what IFCD projects do.
107. **Ms Aguilar** began with the question on implementation resources, which she acknowledged would be a challenge. She said that having P-3 or P-2 posts is not necessary to implement this strategy, but skilled human resources, through whatever scheme, will be necessary at different points of the strategy. Projections are standard in the business, and the objectives identified are conservative projections. The objective of six partnerships is a target and is used to develop a detailed budget and projection. Corporate funders may provide cash money or in-kind services or skills-based volunteering.
108. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to observers.

[Observers]

109. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** very strongly supported the strategy and said it is not over ambitious but is reasonable and rational. It is precisely because of the financial situation that the strategy is needed since Parties are not contributing to the IFCD as they are supposed to on a regular basis. The strategy should be implemented and it would be money well invested.

110. The delegation of **Germany** joined others in recognizing the excellence of the strategy. It is fresh air that will help with the entire communication challenge of the Convention. The delegation asked what risk elements should be foreseen.
111. **Ms Aguilar** said indeed there are risks but they are not major. The strategy asks 62 countries to contribute to the IFCD. The risks are more within the institutional capacity, than economic, because the strategy depends on the capacity of the IFCD to move freely to respond to the demands that external donors will have. There is no tradition within the UNESCO programmes to respond very promptly, very rapidly, to demands, and to adjust to the working culture that exists outside.
112. There were no more questions or comments, and the **Chairperson** thanked Ms Aguilar for the excellent work, noting that the strategy is both optimistic and balanced.
113. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Members of Committee.
114. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its support for the strategy and noted that though its aim is IFCD fundraising, it goes further to support communication on the Convention as a whole, and could raise awareness thereon among States and civil society.
115. The **representative of the Government of Quebec to UNESCO in the Canadian Delegation** noted the quality of the analysis produced by Small World Stories, and supported the strategy in principle. The delegation inquired whether the implementation of the action plan proposed, which has benefits as well as costs and risks over a term of several years, is appropriate for the current context, as it should be modulated in accordance with available funds and resources. The use of the budget balance of US\$200,000 approved at the last Committee session needs to be optimized when implementing phase one activities. To better monitor the strategy, each stage of the strategy needs to be evaluated year by year.
116. The delegation of **Honduras** supported the strategy as it will contribute to fundraising and promotion of the Convention.
117. The delegation of the **Lao PDR** agreed with the proposed strategy and supported its approval, however they noted that as Canada said, its implementation and impact need to be assessed on a regular basis.
118. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** echoed what was said by Brazil and Honduras. They firmly supported the strategy, noting that it is a very high-quality document and that they would like to adopt it in full. They agreed that part of phase one be implemented with the remaining budget balance. The Secretariat should be carrying out its work as it proposed. They indicated there is no need to be excessively cautious as the strategy is innovative and well thought out.
119. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported the strategy, noting that fundraising, visibility, and encouragement of new ratifications are necessary. While they wished to maintain a spirit of realism, and implement the strategy according to available means and context with regular evaluation, they expressed a wish to adopt it. The delegation requested that the presentation of Small World Stories be made available.
120. The delegation of **France** supported the dynamic objectives of the strategy, but as with Canada, the Lao PDR and Tunisia, they indicated it is important to adapt it to means and resources, and conduct regular evaluations.

121. The delegation of **Switzerland** noted the high quality of the document, however supported Canada in terms of ensuring regular evaluation and the means available for the strategy. They proposed advancing step by step, and to use the resources already available for phase one. They stated they are in favor of an adoption but not of the strategy in full, because of unknowns. However they also stated they would like to avoid separating out the various stages.
122. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** indicated that it is not possible to adopt a part or a phase of the strategy, and they asked Canada for clarification.
123. **The Chairperson** indicated that most are in favour of adopting the strategy as a block in total but that its implementation is in stages.
124. The delegation of **Canada** confirmed their wish to adopt the strategy and to implement it progressively with available funds and regular evaluation, without fragmenting or adjusting it.

[Observers]

125. The delegation of **Norway** added its voice to those delegations appreciating the quality of the document, and advocating proceeding with caution in implementing the strategy. The delegation asked which would receive priority in a situation of scarce funds – the strategy or projects?
126. The delegation of **Malawi** recalled that 62 Parties to the Convention need to contribute to the IFCD to kick-start the strategy; currently some 37 are contributing, and 25 more are still needed. They posed two questions. First, will the additional 25 contributors to the IFCD make any difference as regards the money that is to be raised for the strategy? Second, as the strategy has three phases, can the high-net people be targeted in the first phase?
127. **The Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to make general comments and answer the various questions raised.
128. **The Secretary of the Convention** noted that the strategy prepared by Small World Stories connects to: the objectives and principles of the IFCD; the implementation of the ratification strategy; the success and sustainability of projects on the ground; and the ability of the Secretariat to engage in partnerships with stakeholders be they civil society, governments or private sector. Small World Stories presented a five-year strategy in different phases with different budgets and activities. Their report included the very important aspects of benchmarking, evaluation, and ensuring that the indicators are connected to the overall indicators of the IFCD in terms of the implementation of projects. Success of projects will raise the visibility of the IFCD and therefore raise the potential for raising funds. Project monitoring and the framework for indicators that will be put into place in cooperation with the IOS will also be of importance for the implementation of the strategy. In answering the question about the budget for fundraising activities, she recalled the decision at the previous Committee session granting the Secretariat a maximum amount of US\$200,000. The Secretariat has spent US\$56,000 for the fundraising strategy of Small World Stories; therefore the remaining funds could, if agreed by the Committee, be used to begin the implementation of phase one as indicated in the strategy, and as outlined in document CE/12/6.IGC/6.
129. **The Chairperson**, noting that the Committee and other members in the hall appreciated the quality and vision of the strategy, formally thanked Ms Aguilar of Small World Stories. He then moved to the draft decision 6.IGC 6 which included a request for an addition, and he asked

everyone to read this new point. He proposed to move forward point by point. In view of the exchanges, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft decision were adopted.

130. Regarding paragraph 4, the delegation of **Brazil** asked for clarification from the Secretariat regarding the text “an appropriate mechanism”. The **Secretary of the Convention** referred to a request from the Committee the previous year to examine the possibility of appropriate or easier mechanisms to contribute to the IFCD, because there have been not only Parties contributing to the IFCD, but also individuals. She mentioned those who have been undertaking their own fundraising activities like, for example, climbing Mount Kilimanjaro, or DJs coming together to organize world music parties and giving proceeds to the IFCD. One of the criticisms was that it was very bureaucratic to give to the IFCD and so the Committee asked for solutions. Central Services was consulted and recommended the use of the PayPal system for inclusion on the website of the IFCD. The delegation of **Brazil** noted the response, and agreed that the draft text did not need to be changed. They further suggested that the Secretariat explore ways to facilitate Party payment, such as a circular letter from the Director-General providing an invoice. The delegation of **Canada** proposed an amendment to paragraph 4 by adding “pursue fundraising activities for 2013”, that would accept the strategy for 2013 to be followed by an assessment and review of the 2014-2015 budget. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** disagreed with this proposal as it does not allow for flexibility in the case of on-going projects. The **Chairperson**, to form a compromise for paragraph 4, proposed retaining the Canadian proposal as it reflects the exchange, and adding at the end “and to establish the appropriate mechanism to facilitate the payment of contributions to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity for subsequent years”, to confirm the fundraising strategy is adopted as a whole for five years. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** indicated that fundraising activities are different from contributions by Parties and others, but supported consensus. The paragraph was adopted as amended.
131. Paragraph 5 was adopted as is and the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Brazil to give an explanation of their proposal of paragraph 6.
132. Regarding paragraph 6, the delegation of **Brazil** said the proposal reflects the earlier debate on having updates on the implementation of the strategy and therefore it requests the Secretariat to report on the strategy at the seventh session. The paragraph was adopted.
133. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated for the record that the strategy, cut into pieces, can't be applied, and the delegation wanted the strategy to be adopted and maintained as an actual strategy – and not as a sprinkling on top of other initiatives.

Decision 6.IGC 6 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 7 – REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE PILOT PHASE OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)

Document CE/12/6.IGC/7

134. The **Chairperson** welcomed the representative of the UNESCO Internal Oversight Service (IOS), and gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the item, to be followed by the IOS representative.
135. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that at its third ordinary session in June 2011, the Conference of Parties requested that the Committee formulate terms of reference for the evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD, and invited it to review the Guidelines of the

IFCD. At its fifth ordinary session, the Committee adopted the terms of reference for an evaluation of the pilot phase and invited the evaluators to pay particular attention to the sound management of resources, structuring of the projects, sustainability, as well as complementarity with projects funded by Parties and other funds, when applying the terms of reference.

136. The IOS launched the evaluation in January 2012, in close cooperation with the Secretariat, and was provided relevant documents, information, and assessments in addition to taking part in regular meetings. The IOS report and its recommendations are provided in annex to document CE/12/6.IGC/7. The Secretary of the Convention also noted that adoption of several of the IOS recommendations would have financial implications for the Secretariat, such as the development and implementation of a future knowledge-management system or the development and implementation of a formal system of project monitoring. She concluded that the examination of the IOS evaluation could lead to a possible revision of the Guidelines of the IFCD.

137. The **Director of the IOS** introduced his colleagues, and presented the evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD. He commented that it was carried out six months prior to the end of the pilot phase, and looked at the efficiency and quality of outputs, the governance and management mechanisms, and the Guidelines.

138. **Ms Torggler, IOS representative**, stated that the evaluation took place at the end of the pilot phase, and that the first round of projects, those approved in 2010, was reviewed. The second round of projects, those approved in 2011, was not reviewed. The IOS concluded that the IFCD is a relevant vehicle for the implementation of the Convention, but that more focus on the IFCD is desired. It was noted that the vision of the IFCD is too broad, and clear objectives and indicators, as well as fundraising efforts, should be developed. The projects funded through the IFCD that were completed were generally found to be in line with the priorities stipulated in the Guidelines, and carried out the activities that had been planned, though the long-term outcomes were difficult to establish. This was due to the fact that some projects were still ongoing, needed more time, or had just been completed, while others had not systematically planned for long-term outcomes. Overall, the projects engaged many different stakeholders including government and civil society. The IOS representative identified as a challenge, the sustainability of the benefits of the projects, and said that this should be more in focus in future funding rounds.

139. Regarding governance and management of the IFCD, the IOS representative said that the Secretariat, with very limited resources, had made considerable efforts and there were steady improvements. This was the case, for example, with knowledge-management activities and the website.

140. The IOS representative listed areas needing more work or improvement:

- identify, analyze and share results achieved, good practices and lessons learned, as these are key to the IFCD and the Convention;
- the dissemination of the calls for applications and national selection procedures at the country level, as information is not systematically shared with all stakeholders and the National Commissions need to prepare fuller assessments;
- having consistent quality among expert assessments; and
- the management, monitoring and evaluation of projects.

141. All these require resources; the setting up and running of a fund, by nature of the mechanism, incurs high transaction costs. UNESCO's cost recovery policy is not implemented for funds tied to Conventions. The IOS representative said that the resources needed are not in place, for example to monitor in a satisfactory way, and the Secretariat runs a risk of assigning too many duties to too few people. This cannot all be done from UNESCO Headquarters and the IOS recommends, for example, that UNESCO's available network of field offices be taken advantage of and involved.

142. The IOS representative listed the following recommendations:

- develop a vision for the future direction of the IFCD;
- include in the budget objectives, timeframes and indicators as well as linked resource targets;
- expand the field of cultural policies to take account of other related strategies in an inter-sectoral cooperation;
- identify strategic priorities so as to use resources in the best way;
- projects should include short and long-term targets, output and outcome levels with sustainability built in;
- adapt project duration to one or two years as some projects require more time than others;
- complement the other work of UNESCO, involve the field offices and create synergies;
- share lessons learned and best practices with stakeholders not only through the web and knowledge management but by also creating a learning community where people participate;
- involve the field offices and perhaps other stakeholders in the selection process so as to support the National Commissions;
- do not allow National Commissions and other organizations participating in the selection to apply for funding as it is a conflict of interest;
- engage field offices in project monitoring; and
- strengthen the capacities of the Secretariat.

143. The **Director of the IOS** concluded that much has been achieved in the pilot phase of the IFCD but more needs to be done. The IFCD, at US\$5.4 million, with US\$1.2 million remaining, is not large, and there appear to be a lot of people deciding on how it is spent. He also noted a shortage on capacities and said what is needed is focused strategy, formulation of a vision, objectives, and a timeline. Regarding the recommendation of the IOS against new calls for applications being launched in 2013, he noted the earlier decision of the Committee to launch a new call for applications in 2013, and said the Convention and IFCD are new, face challenges and are showing good results, but we must be careful not to overburden.

144. The **Chairperson** thanked the IOS representatives and noted that good work has been done and more can and will be done, including with voluntary contributions.
145. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the quality of the work, and commented on the need to improve the selection process at the level of the National Commissions, as well as the need for capacity-building of the civil society in order to put together strong proposals.
146. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by **Switzerland**, thanked the representatives and noted with satisfaction that several recommendations have been taken account of in the preliminary draft revisions to the Guidelines under use of the resources of the IFCD. The delegation said that the recommendations to identify strategic considerations and to elaborate a vision and a results-framework are key, and that paragraph 6.1 of the preliminary draft revisions to the Guidelines provides an anchor for the Committee to respond to this. Noting the importance of giving due consideration to all the recommendations, the delegation proposed that each receive a written response, whether favorable or not, by the Committee. This would require a methodical and rigorous follow-up process that will allow the Committee to prioritize and stagger the actions that need to be taken. The delegation of Canada circulated to the Committee a proposed methodology earlier that day.
147. The delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the IOS on the report, and noted that much has been achieved, and that the recommendations are useful to maintaining the sustainability of the Convention.
148. The delegation of **Sweden** thanked the IOS for the report and said some revisions will take time to implement and will necessitate revisions to the Guidelines. The delegation identified in particular the need to increase sustainability in the projects, which in turn requires capacity-building. The delegation proposed that the focus of the 2013 call for applications be exclusively on capacity-building.
149. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** thanked the IOS for the evaluation and presentation. Concerning IOS recommendation 9, the delegation inquired about the exit strategy for the IFCD. Concerning IOS recommendation 20, the delegation expressed shock that National Commissions received contributions to be able to send projects to the Secretariat. The delegation noted several recommendations regarding field offices, which should be grouped, and asked the Secretariat whether, as in recommendations 24 and 29, field offices have the capacity to participate in the pre-selection of projects, and to do follow-up on projects funded. Concerning IOS recommendation 33 on coordination and staff costs of the IFCD, the delegation asked how the voluntary contributions to the IFCD could be used for the salaries of the Secretariat. Finally, the delegation observed that the decision on implementation should reflect reservations held on some of the recommendations.
150. The delegation of the **Lao PDR** congratulated the IOS for a rich document. The delegation questioned whether field offices could have a focal point who works directly with the National Commissions in the call for applications, and follows the different project phases mentioned as needing improvement and for which recommendations were made.
151. The delegation of **Argentina** stated that in connection to recommendation 24, Argentina had put in place a pre-selection procedure and panel that includes the National Commission and the Ministry of Culture. The delegation also suggested that the focal point of the Convention be engaged to work with the IFCD.

152. The delegation of **Switzerland** thanked the IOS for the report. The delegation asked how the recommendation 9 exit strategy could apply, and said that on recommendation 33 concerning the financing of the staff of the Secretariat through the IFCD, there is precedence of discussions on other standard-setting instruments that should be taken into account.

153. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the IOS for their work. The delegation does not support all of the recommendations, in particular the exit strategy of recommendation 9. The delegation said they do not see that the field offices have the resources or competence to undertake all the recommendations suggested, and they are not in favor of financing salaries through the IFCD.

154. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to observers.

[Observers]

155. The delegation of **Norway** thanked the IOS, echoed the comments of Sweden, and said that much was learned from the report and that the recommendations are to the point. The delegation felt the Committee, the IFCD and the Convention could have benefitted from recommendation 34 to not launch a call in 2013, but noted that the Committee decided otherwise. The delegation stressed the need for a strategy for capacity-building, and that the next calls for applications pay specific attention to projects aiming at capacity-building and the principle of sustainability, noting that this could be added to the draft decision. The delegation pointed out the specific programme of capacity-building established by the 2003 Convention as a successful model to look at, in addition to the normal calls for application to the IFCD.

156. The delegation of **South Africa** noted for the record their reservation concerning the exit strategy and the issue of complementarity between the Convention and the work of UNESCO field offices. The Convention is too young to consider an exit strategy for the IFCD, and it would be bad timing when the Convention is battling with visibility and publicity. The delegation stated that they do not support that the work of this Convention be delegated to the field offices. This Convention needs more and intense programmes and projects to build its visibility and credibility. The Convention has competition in the creative industries and culture sector spaces, such as the Beijing Treaty on Audiovisual Performances that is also striving for visibility and that countries are ratifying now. This Convention is regarded as the bible of the creative sector; it is an international instrument that levels the playing field for artists, culture and all forms of expression, and knowledge of it has not reached a level of maturity. The delegation would thus beg to differ with suggestions to be prudent in terms of saving costs or consolidating UNESCO work through field offices. The delegation would like the Convention to remain a focal point for the next five to ten years.

157. The delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** thanked the IOS, and said that capacity-building must be stressed because not all Parties are able to fulfill the conditions to formulate applications to the IFCD for funding. The United Republic of Tanzania joined the Convention in 2012 and does not support the exit strategy of recommendation 9 nor the cost recovery recommendation 33.

158. The delegation of **Malawi** stated that it benefitted from UNESCO/EU project of the Expert Facility, and is planning on improving capacity with a view to preparing an application to the IFCD. Therefore the recommended exit strategy is defeatist, even in terms of the Expert Facility whose achievement was to support Malawi's potential in developing its cultural industries.

159. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** stated that the work on the Guidelines should reflect the principle of sustainability. The prevailing rules in culture governance can help determine whether a project might be sustainable or have a long-term impact. The representative also said that there should be a connection between various funding sources to foster long-term impact of projects, and suggested a virtual platform where projects, before the final decisions, are accessible to other international funding agencies in a confidential way and possibly bring in additional, complementary funding. The representative said capacity-building must be strengthened as there is frustration within Parties submitting project applications, and the weakness of National Commissions must be addressed.
160. The **Director of the IOS** acknowledged the role of the Committee to review the IOS recommendations and approve or reject them. He reminded that the work of the IFCD is a process that changes, and that the Secretariat worked closely with the IOS and some changes based on the recommendations were already underway. With regard to sustainability, he said that both the financial and capacity angles of this must be looked at. On the issue of field offices, he was struck that a number of them were not aware of projects taking place in their country.
161. **Ms Torggler, the representative of the IOS**, said that some National Commissions have put in place quite creative mechanisms to help NGOs improve their proposals, for example they convene information sessions and invite stakeholders to inform them about the IFCD and the Convention. The IOS representative pointed out that language, especially in Latin America, is an issue because applications can only be in English or French and this prohibits smaller organizations from submitting applications. When they can, the National Commissions help overcome this language issue. Concerning the exit strategy, the IOS representative acknowledged that the Convention is young, but pointed to the UNESCO history of keeping projects for many years even when they are not working, and noted that in general this needs to be changed and this is why there should be a long-term vision. Concerning the field office recommendations, the IOS representative noted that the selection process in many countries doesn't work the way it should, and there is little monitoring of the projects. Money given to stakeholders must be used in the best way, support must be given, problems must be addressed and the Secretariat must follow progress or help troubleshoot. Not all field offices are able to do this but some are able to help support the selection process or monitor, and since this network exists it should be used. In those countries where there is other activity that supports the Convention, synergies should be created and field offices should be informed so that they, in turn, can share information, help mobilize resources and thus help to ensure the sustainability of the projects.
162. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision 5.IGC 7, for which several amendments had been submitted.
163. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by **Albania**, and **Honduras**, posed a question on methodology, and queried whether the Secretariat could be asked to prepare a table of the IOS recommendations to show which were accepted and need to be followed-up, and which are rejected by the Committee.
164. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to prepare a table of the IOS recommendations with a column to indicate acceptance or rejection by the Committee.
165. The delegation of **Canada** presented their amendment to have a clear plan of action so that the monitoring of each recommendation can be ensured.

166. The delegation of **Sweden** presented their amendment to pay special attention to capacity-building during the call for applications in 2013, using the old Guidelines as a bridge until 2014, when the new, revised Guidelines would be used.
167. The **Chairperson**, turned to the table of IOS recommendations prepared by the Secretariat, and noted that the exercise is not to negotiate the recommendations but only to express whether each recommendation is accepted or not. The Chairperson read through each IOS recommendation beginning with number 1, and with the Committee's agreement, had the Secretariat check approved, or tick rejected. Recommendations 1 through 4 received checks for approved.
168. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated for the record that recommendation 5, in French "cultural and other policies", the word "autres" can have different meanings. The **Chairperson** took note of the comment and recommendation 5 was checked approved. Recommendation 6 was checked approved.
169. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the IOS for an explanation of recommendation 7. The **representative of the IOS** stated that the direction in which the IFCD is going is not specified in the Guidelines. They give broad objectives, and in order to be able to measure achievements of specific results, the exact purposes and short and long term objectives of the IFCD should be made clear, including with specific time frames. The **Chairperson** noted that recommendation 7 follows a normal process and method, and it was checked approved.
170. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** agreed with recommendation 8 but proposed adding "in appropriate time". The **Chairperson** commented that the exercise is not to change or negotiate the IOS recommendations, and recommendation 8 was checked approved.
171. The **Chairperson** read recommendation 9 concerning the exit strategy and recalled the previous discussions, noting that the large majority, if not the unanimity, of the Committee found it unclear and at this time it is giving a wrong message. Recommendation 9 was ticked rejected. Recommendations 10 and 11 were checked approved.
172. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, with regard to recommendation 12 on working with the field offices to ensure synergies between the IFCD projects and other UNESCO work at country level, asked the Secretariat whether they already apply this recommendation and if so, how it is applied. The **Secretary to the Convention** stated that the Secretariat does as much as possible to inform and work with the field offices for the selection process, and some field offices are more equipped to be able to follow-up with projects than others. Field offices do not necessarily exist in every country where there is an IFCD project. The Secretariat provides the field offices with a table of all the projects funded by the IFCD, and information on all the countries which submit periodic reports, have technical assistance missions, and/or have MDG projects as some of them are related. This allows field offices to have an overview of all activities within their region to implement the Convention, and they are asked to develop regional strategies based on follow-up work with the different project managers. Sometimes this is more successful than others. Recommendation 12 was checked approved, as well as recommendation 13.
173. The delegation of **France**, on recommendation 14 concerning the promotion of gender equality as a criterion in the assessment forms, proposed the language "take into account". The **Chairperson** recalled that the exercise is not to negotiate on the recommendations, and recommendation 14 was checked approved.

174. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, on recommendation 15 which concerns making lessons learned available to all stakeholders, asked the Secretariat to explain whether there are funds of the regular budget for this or whether extrabudgetary funds would be needed.
175. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that, as indicated in document CE/12/6.IGC/7, this recommendation would have financial implications for the Secretariat. Due to the financial crisis at UNESCO, the Regular Programme budget for Secretariat activities was significantly reduced. She noted that two recommendations relate to knowledge management, information sharing and building a community of practice, and stressed that this is more extensive than putting project profiles on the website. The synergies and the relationships between the different activities and results relating to the implementation of the Convention by the Parties, and civil society, and the challenges and creative solution-building that needs to take place, all form part of a larger knowledge-learning exchange, which is the direction of recommendation 15. She confirmed that the Secretariat will require extrabudgetary resources to be able to fulfill the demand behind this recommendation. Recommendation 15 was checked approved, as well as recommendations 16 through 19.
176. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, on recommendation 20 concerning whether National Commissions are allowed to charge a fee for services rendered for applications, said it is noted in the record that National Commissions are not authorized to charge fees, so the recommendation is correct. Recommendation 20 was checked approved, as well as recommendations 21 through 23.
177. The **Chairperson** read recommendation 24: “Establish a selection panel composed of members of the National Commission, UNESCO field office, national regional focal point for IFCD, representatives of national NGOs for the selection process at the national level. The selection panel should be appointed by the field office in consultation with the National Commission”. The delegation of the **Lao PDR**, supported by **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Honduras, and China**, stated that field offices may not be equipped or may not necessarily have the expertise needed for this, and it is up to the country to give the necessary political and technical dimensions to the application. The delegation stated that this recommendation should not be approved. The delegation of **Canada** wished to qualify that the exercise is to approve or reject the full recommendation. While recommendation 24 is rejected, the spirit of the recommendation is based on the fact that an issue needs to be settled in the pre-selection process, and this should be reflected in the draft preliminary revision of the Guidelines. The **representative of the IOS** recognized that the Committee cannot negotiate or change the IOS recommendations, but said that the Committee can decide to implement part of a recommendation. Recommendation 24 was ticked rejected. Recommendations 25 and 26 were checked approved.
178. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, on recommendation 27 concerning the rotation, training and meeting of members of the Panel of Experts, noted that there are two different parts in the recommendation; the part on the rotation is acceptable, but the part concerning the training and the meeting could involve costs. The delegation informed that they put forward an amendment to the Guidelines in this connection. The **Chairperson** considered that, as part of implementation of the Convention, members of the Panel of Experts should be qualified, rotate, get acquainted and speak directly to each other, and so the implementation of recommendation 27 is required. Recommendation 27 was checked approved, as well as recommendation 28.

179. The delegation of the **Lao PDR**, on recommendation 29 concerning assigning an official monitoring responsibility to field offices for projects, stated that there must be more capacity-building in place for all stakeholders and that this recommendation is not acceptable. The delegation of **Switzerland** stated that recommendation 29 should be approved. The way the monitoring takes place could be discussed, but it is important to support projects and trouble-shoot, and this is a responsibility of UNESCO, where the Headquarters Secretariat does not have the capacity to monitor projects adequately. The **Secretary of the Convention** said that recommendation 29 can strengthen and give an official role to the field offices so that it becomes part of their normal programming. The delegation of **Canada** commented that recommendation 29 is important, but its wording could be a problem. Since money is invested in a project, there must be accountability, and recommendation 10 indicates that results should be taken into account. The delegation of **Honduras**, supported by **Albania**, **Tunisia** and **France**, raised concerns about the technical capacity of all field offices to fulfill this role, the resources needed, the countries not having a field office and the ongoing process of decentralization of UNESCO. The delegation said they do not agree with this recommendation.
180. The delegation of **Switzerland** indicated that the debate around recommendation 29 should be in light of recommendations 31 and 32, which strengthen the Secretariat's capacities and ensure the review of contract deliverables. The Secretariat of the Convention and field offices are supposed to ensure a smooth implementation of the Convention, and what is important is to make sure that there is full commitment on the part of beneficiary countries themselves and also from the Secretariat of the Convention and from UNESCO. Issues might be raised about recommendation 33, the payment of the Secretariat through the IFCD, which the delegation thinks should not be possible. UNESCO needs to make choices. The delegation asked: Do we want to allocate enough of a budget to implement the Convention at UNESCO level? So it should be part of the regular budget. The responsibilities to obtain the maximum results and the best use of resources should be defined clearly, and recommendation 29 might play a role on that front. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** indicated that the Committee cannot grant all these responsibilities for monitoring to field offices, they're not equipped for it and the Convention Secretariat should take this responsibility. The word "responsibility" is perhaps what is problematic. The **Chairperson** concluded that IOS recommendation 29 is ticked rejected. The Committee can return to these matters and to the spirit behind the rejected recommendations when it examines the IFCD Guidelines. Recommendations 30, 31 and 32 were checked approved. Recommendation 33 on recovery of staff and coordination costs from the IFCD was ticked rejected. Recommendation 34, launch no call in 2013, was ticked rejected.
181. The delegation of **Honduras**, on recommendation 35, noted for the record their position that another evaluation exercise of the IFCD should be undertaken in 2018. Recommendation 35 was checked approved.
182. The **Chairperson** began the examination of draft decision 6.IGC 7.
183. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested for paragraph 6 to make a reference to the annex that will be attached to the decision containing the list of recommendations agreed to or rejected. The delegation of **Albania** stated a preference to simplify and not to refer to the annex in paragraph 6. The delegation of **Honduras** pointed out that in paragraph 4, funds are to be sought for all the IOS recommendations while the Committee did not agree to all of them. The delegation of **Canada** noted that in light of the new paragraph 11 to be proposed by Albania, paragraph 6 of the draft decision is redundant. The **Chairperson** stated that paragraph 4 is clear, it addresses the knowledge

management recommendations, and can be left as is. The original paragraph 6 was deleted. Paragraph 7 was renumbered to 6.

184. The delegation of **Brazil**, asked that the amendment of Canada concerning an action plan be clarified in terms of paragraph 3, as perhaps it is better to have “an implementation plan”. The delegation of **Canada** noted that though certain IOS recommendations were rejected, there was consensus around the spirit behind them. Therefore the paragraph might perhaps say “in accordance with adopted recommendations and studied by the Committee during its present session”. The **Chairperson** consulted the Committee, and concluded to retain the original language for paragraph 6 and it was adopted.

185. Concerning original paragraph 8 (renumbered paragraph 7), the Chairperson recalled the exchange on this issue and the paragraph was deleted, as well as the following paragraph, because of the redundancy with paragraph 3.

186. The **Chairperson**, moved to paragraph 9, renumbered to be paragraph 7: “Decides that the next call for applications should give a special attention to projects aiming at capacity-building”, proposed by Sweden. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the delegation of Sweden what exactly is meant by “capacity-building” in the proposal. The delegation of **Sweden** referred to IOS recommendation 4, and stated that capacity-building and creating sustainability in the projects should be part of the overarching purpose and work of the IFCD. The IFCD should work towards building the capacities in the countries in different levels, both on the ministerial, organizational level and also on the NGO level. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested adding “aiming at capacity-building for cultural policies”. The delegation of **Sweden** agreed. Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

Decision 6.IGC 7 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 8 – PRELIMINARY DRAFT REVISION TO THE GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)

Document CE/12/6.IGC/8

187. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to introduce item 8.

188. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the Secretariat was requested to submit to the Committee a preliminary draft revision to the Guidelines on use of the resources of the IFCD. These revisions are based on the decisions made by the Committee at its third, fourth and fifth sessions, the recommendations of the IOS, and the recommendations of the Panel of Experts in light of the lessons learned during the pilot phase. The main changes proposed concern the following:

- develop a more strategic vision emphasizing the structural impact of projects and their sustainability;
- establish a diversified pre-selection panel that involves relevant stakeholders engaged in the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors;
- link capacity-building with a broadened scope of policies for culture;

- clarify the meaning of institutional infrastructure;
- prohibit National Commissions and other organizations participating in the pre-selection process from being eligible for funding;
- enlarge the timeframe for project implementation to two years;
- establish clear criteria for the selection and working modalities of the six members of the Panel of Experts including gender-balance, rotation, assessment of each application by two experts and not from his/her own country, a meeting of experts every two years, and mandate of experts for a maximum period of four years;
- evaluation of projects on the basis that they could serve as potential cases of good practice and promotion of gender equality; and
- introduction of a results-based project monitoring framework, and engagement of field offices to ensure synergies between the IFCD and other UNESCO work at the country level.

189. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for the very clear Annex to document CE/12/6.IGC/8, *Preliminary draft revisions to the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD*. The Chairperson invited comments from the Members of the Committee.

190. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that they had presented an amendment to the draft decision.

191. The delegation of **Switzerland** stated that in chapters 1 and 7, colleagues should reflect upon the proposals that are made on the description of the objectives of the IFCD, and the nature of the projects it supports, as there is some overlap between the two chapters.

192. The delegation of **France** informed that it would present draft amendments.

193. The **Chairperson** turned to the approval of the proposed revisions to the Guidelines, starting with chapter 1, "*Strategic Considerations and Objectives*".

194. The delegation of **Canada** noted that paragraph 6.1 "meets the programmatic and strategic priorities established by the Committee" will allow the Committee to fulfill the IOS recommendation concerning expected short and long term results for the IFCD.

195. The delegation of **France** proposed under paragraph 2 to change the words "direct effect" in English to "direct impact", and in paragraph 6.4 to remove "where appropriate" and keep "in the cultural field".

196. The delegation of **Sweden** proposed in paragraph 2 to delete the words "cultural goods" and replace it with "cultural expressions". The delegation of **France** said that the proposal of Sweden was not acceptable to them; the expression "cultural goods, services and activities" is necessary to leave no ambiguity vis-à-vis the intangible heritage Convention.

197. The delegation of **Switzerland**, supported by **Brazil, Zimbabwe, Tunisia, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, recalled IOS recommendations for clear, strategic objectives, and stated the introductory text of paragraph 2 should be consistent with

paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 so that the description of the objectives of the IFCD, and the nature of the projects that it supports are coherent.

198. The delegation of **Brazil**, supported by **Argentina** and **Zimbabwe**, proposed changing the term “viable cultural industries” in the Swiss amendment to “creative economy”.
199. The delegation of **Sweden** proposed to insert after “diversity of culture”, “expressions including goods, services and activities” to be consistent with the previous paragraph.
200. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by the **Lao PDR**, asked Brazil to explain “creative economy”, as they prefer to keep “cultural industries” which is the term of the Convention, and not introduce new terms. The **representative of the UNESCO Director-General** said there are terms which are in the Convention which the Committee has the right to keep in a conservative manner, but the world talks about creative economy, which is a more recent term. The United Nations, and the UNDP, have given UNESCO the task of writing the Creative Economy Report, that the Secretary of the Convention is coordinating, and that other UN agencies are contributing to. The creative economy is also part and parcel of the discourse on culture and development. The **Chairperson** summarized that the term “creative economy” is a larger term than “cultural industries”, more encompassing and innovative, and it removes the dust, as it were, from what was written in 2005. He considered that the Guidelines could go in this direction and take into account the evolution of the general situation which is more forward-looking. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by **France**, and **Canada**, stated that creative economy goes beyond the scope of the Convention and cannot be included in the IFCD Guidelines. The delegation of **Switzerland** said they have no strong feeling on the substance of this term but stressed that their intention was to ensure coherence and consistency between paragraphs 2 and 7.1. The delegation of **Brazil** summarized that this is a conceptual debate in which creative economy and cultural industries are linked but not the same. Cultural industries concern specific sectors such as cinema or music; the industry in the larger sense of the term. It is restrictive of cultural diversity and typical of developed countries, not of developing countries. Creative economy is more open to the diversity of cultural expressions, production, distribution, and the organization of producers, in order to transform this cultural wealth into economic revenue. This can advance the spirit of the Convention. The **Chairperson**, noting the reticence of some Committee Members to be innovative and incorporate the trend on creative economy, secured from Brazil their agreement to withdraw their proposal and retain “cultural industries” in the amendment to paragraph 2. The Chairperson read paragraph 2 as amended by Switzerland and Sweden, and it was adopted. The first chapter was adopted as amended.
201. The **Chairperson** turned to the second chapter, “*Areas of Intervention*”. The delegation of **France**, supported by **Canada**, proposed the deletion of paragraph 7.3 on raising awareness because the aim is not to make the Convention known, but to present real projects. The **Chairperson** noted no opinion contrary to the proposal and paragraph 7.3 was deleted. There were no further comments and the second chapter was adopted as amended.
202. The **Chairperson** reviewed the third chapter, “*Beneficiaries*”. There were no comments and all the paragraphs of the chapter were adopted as is.
203. The fourth chapter “*Funding and Submission Ceilings*” was then considered. The chapeau, paragraph 11, was adopted. The delegation of **China** asked in paragraph 11.1 whether the maximum amount for each project is US\$100,000. The **Rapporteur** proposed adding “for each project” to paragraph 11.1 and the paragraph was adopted with this amendment, as

well paragraph 11.2 as is. The delegation of **Cameroon** asked with reference to paragraph 11.3 whether it was not a limitation to specify two projects per party and two projects per NGO. The **Chairperson** recalled Decision 4.IGC.10.A, where this was taken from, and it was agreed to adopt paragraph 11.3 as well as paragraph 11.4 as is.

204. The **Chairperson** moved to the fifth chapter, “*Pre-selection Process at the Country Level*”. Paragraph 12 the chapeau, and paragraph 12.1 were adopted as is. In paragraph 12.2 the delegation of **France**, supported by **Tunisia, Cameroon, Sweden, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Kenya and Switzerland**, proposed deleting the term “representative of field offices of UNESCO”. The delegation of **Canada** suggested that this term could be retained if “as appropriate” were added. The **Chairperson** added that even if the terms are deleted it would not prevent field offices from taking part in the process. The delegation of **China**, recalling the earlier debate on IOS recommendation 24, stated that due to diverse situations in every country, it depends on the capacity of the Parties themselves to run the pre-selection process at the national level, and giving too many specific details should be avoided. Therefore **China**, supported by the **Lao PDR**, proposed deletion of paragraph 12.2. The delegation of **Honduras** supported France’s proposal to delete “the representatives of the field offices”, but wished to retain the rest of paragraph 12.2. The delegations of **China** and the **Lao PDR** went with the majority and paragraph 12.2 was adopted with the amendment. Paragraph 12.3 was adopted as is.

205. The **Chairperson** turned to the sixth chapter, “*Procedure for the submission of funding requests*”. No comments were made on paragraphs 13 through 13.4 and the chapter was adopted as is.

206. The **Chairperson** took up the seventh chapter, “*Funding Request Forms*”. Paragraphs 14 through 15.2 were adopted as is. The delegation of **Switzerland**, supported by **Canada**, proposed to amend paragraph 15.3 by adding in a bracket, “title, objectives”, “measurable objectives”, “short-term and long-term measurable objectives”. Paragraph 15.3 was adopted with this amendment. Paragraphs 15.4 and 15.5 were adopted as is. Regarding paragraph 15.6, the delegation of **Canada**, supported by **Switzerland**, proposed to replace the word “measures” with “result indicators”. The delegation of **Honduras** pointed out that measures are actions and indicators are mechanisms to measure. The delegation of **France**, supported by the **Lao PDR**, noted that paragraph 15.6 reads “measures to promote the sustainability of the proposed project”, and it should be retained. The delegation of **Canada** withdrew their proposal and paragraph 15.6 was adopted as is. The delegation of **Cameroon**, referring to paragraph 15.7, questioned the relevance of establishing specifically 30 percent of the project budget, given the wide variety of factors involved. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that this was a proposal made by the Panel of Experts to set a maximum ceiling on the project budgets allocated to overheads. The Committee agreed to strike the extensive list in paragraph 15.7, and amend the phrase as “for the implementation of a project are limited to a maximum of 30 percent of the total project budget”. Paragraph 15.8 was adopted as is.

207. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the eighth chapter, “*Panel of Experts*”. The delegation of **France** proposed that in the French version the word “panel” be replaced with “groupe”. The **Chairperson** took this on board and stated that this word change would take effect everywhere. The Delegation of **France**, supported by **Canada**, stressed the importance of understanding both of the two working languages, French and English, and proposed as the last bullet point of paragraph 16 “fluency in English and/or French, and an understanding of the other language”. The delegation of **Honduras** indicated that they are not in favor of the inclusion of “and an understanding of the other language” as proposed by France because it may exclude experts who, because of a geographical situation, may

not know both French and English. The delegation of **Brazil** proposed “fluency in French or English and, if possible, understanding of the other working language of UNESCO”. As a compromise, **France**, supported by **Brazil, Honduras, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Tunisia, Cameroon, and Sweden** made a new proposal: “fluency in French or English and, if possible, a good understanding of the other language”. The proposal met with approval and was adopted as an amendment to paragraph 16. There were no comments on paragraphs 16.1 and 16.2 and they were adopted as is. On paragraph 16.3 concerning training for the Panel of Experts, the delegation of **France**, supported by **Tunisia**, proposed to strike out “training shall be provided”, as there is no need to train the experts nor to have this added cost. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by **Brazil**, supported the part of paragraph 16.3 to have a meeting of the experts every two years, keeping in mind the question of costs and the possibility of teleconferencing with the Secretariat. The **Secretariat** confirmed that the cost of a meeting is approximately US\$25,000, from the IFCD. Paragraph 16.3 was approved as amended. There were no comments on paragraphs 16.4 and 16.5 and these were adopted as is. The chapter was adopted as amended.

208. The **Chairperson** turned to the ninth chapter “*Recommendations by the Panel of Experts*”. Paragraphs 17 through 17.2 were adopted as is.

209. The **Chairperson** opened the tenth chapter “*Decision-making of the Committee*”. The delegation of **France** made several proposals. On paragraph 18, it proposed to delete the words “each year” and the paragraph was adopted as amended. Paragraphs 19 through 19.6 were adopted as is. The delegation of **France** went on to further propose to amend paragraph 19.7 by deleting the “innovative” reference and having it read “An assessment of the interest of the project”, since a project does not necessarily have to be innovative to receive IFCD funding. The paragraph was adopted as amended. It also proposed to amend paragraph 19.8 by deleting “promote” and having it read “assessment of how the project takes into consideration gender equality”. Paragraph 19.8 was adopted as amended.

210. The **Chairperson** moved to the eleventh chapter, “*Monitoring*”. The delegation of **France** proposed an amendment to paragraph 20 to include “to the extent possible” as regards financial costs. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by **Switzerland and Sweden**, rejected the proposed addition because monitoring of projects cannot be optional. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** noted that monitoring is carried out by the Secretariat, and the delegation inquired whether the Secretariat has the funding to undertake monitoring activities as proposed by the IOS. The **Secretary of the Convention** replied that since the IOS evaluation, the Secretariat is in dialogue with the IOS about the creation of an extensive monitoring system. Implementing the monitoring system will require, however, significant resources that the Secretariat will have to seek out. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, supported by **Honduras**, said the amendment proposed by France to add “to the extent possible” in paragraph 20 should be retained because there is a need for monitoring projects but the Secretariat needs flexibility. The delegation of **Canada** encouraged the Members of the Committee to take into account the fact that fundraising efforts are to seek new donors, and the best way to attract donors is to demonstrate systematic and exemplary management methods for the IFCD and its projects, with good results. If resources are a problem, then the soundest and wisest way forward is to fund fewer projects, fund them better, and provide the necessary resources for each and every project to ensure monitoring so that they can be completed in due form. The delegation of **Brazil** asked the Secretariat what is meant by this monitoring system and how it will take place. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the Secretariat what SMART, in paragraph 20, stands for, and whether the Secretariat is carrying out project monitoring.

211. The **Secretary of the Convention** replied that currently the Secretariat monitors project implementation through a formal system of reporting by the beneficiaries. In other words, it requires each project to submit a report at the beginning, middle and end of the project and the deliverables are evaluated before the project can receive payment. These deliverables include the report, a completed questionnaire, photos, videos. The Secretariat also communicates with project managers by phone or email, and often is able to meet them when they come to Paris or when the Secretariat is travelling in the region and can visit the project in its local context, all within the limited means of the Secretariat. The Secretariat welcomes what is being proposed within the context of the IOS evaluation as something more systematic and scientific, which can be followed in the spirit of good management and governance. The IOS has expertise in developing monitoring systems and the Secretariat is working closely with them on developing this new system.
212. The delegation of **Brazil** stated that paragraph 20 resembles paragraph 25 concerning project report submissions. The **Chairperson** said his reading is that paragraph 25 is for individual projects, while 20 concerns the entire IFCD system. The **Secretary of the Convention** confirmed this reading, adding that the IOS evaluation defined short and long term objectives with SMART, meaning specific measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound, for paragraph 20, including a system of indicators. The **Chairperson** proposed to change the word “provide” to the word “develop”, giving UNESCO flexibility in developing the monitoring system. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the Chairperson’s proposal, and suggested deleting the word “sustainability”. The **Chairperson** concluded that paragraph 20 would be amended as proposed, and retains its original last sentence, to which the delegation of Brazil consented. The paragraph was then adopted as amended.
213. The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 21. The delegation of **Honduras**, recalling IOS recommendation 29 on field office monitoring which the Committee rejected, proposed deletion of the phrase “the function to ensure ongoing monitoring of the IFCD projects”. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported leaving paragraph 21 as is. The delegation of **Albania** stated that what was rejected in IOS recommendation 29 was the responsibility of field offices for monitoring projects, and it was a matter of designating focal points for coordination. The delegation of **Tunisia** said that the field offices are a link to the Secretariat and help coordination, but they should not be involved in pre-selection of projects. The delegation of **Honduras** summarized that the reason IOS recommendation 29 was rejected was because of the monitoring role of the field offices, and the aspect that should be deleted in paragraph 21 is the participation of the UNESCO field offices in this process. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that IOS recommendations 12 on field offices ensuring synergy, and 22 on the need for focal points in field offices, were adopted, and recommendation 29 was rejected for its field office monitoring role. The delegation then proposed to have field offices designate a focal point in charge of ensuring complementarity and synergies between funded projects by the IFCD and with the other activities carried out by the organization at the country level, and leave the remainder unchanged. The delegation of **Sweden** stated that field offices, as they are closest to the projects, should be involved in the monitoring process. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** said the Secretariat and the field offices communicate and cooperate and as this is an internal issue, they decide how to monitor projects without the Committee micromanaging, therefore the delegation proposed not to amend the paragraph. The **Chairperson** asked if Zimbabwe’s proposal had any objections, and there were none. Paragraph 21 was adopted as is.
214. The **Chairperson** began the twelfth chapter, “*Evaluation*”. The delegation of **France** proposed to delete “at the request of the Committee and/or the Conference of Parties” and amend paragraph 22 to read “an evaluation and audit of the IFCD shall be carried out every five years”. The delegation of **Honduras** proposed to leave the prerogative for the

Committee and the Conference of Parties to request an additional evaluation or audit. The **Chairperson** commented that it is self-evident that as the supreme governing bodies of the Convention, the Conference of Parties can do whatever they like. Paragraph 22 was adopted as amended by France. On paragraph 23, the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** referred to the term “Convention knowledge platform” and asked if this platform exists, and if it does not, what is the cost to set it up and how will it be funded. The **Secretary of the Convention** replied that the platform does not yet exist, but added that there is a growing critical mass of information, both qualitative and quantitative, to form the building blocks of a knowledge platform or community. Resources are being sought to consolidate the material available and build a dynamic platform. The **Chairperson** asked if all agreed to paragraphs 23, 24 and 25, and these were adopted as is.

215. The **Chairperson** invited observers to take the floor.

[Observers]

216. The delegation of **South Africa**, in an effort to strengthen the Convention, shared several points of constructive criticism to be sure the new Guidelines do not retract from the spirit and intention of the IFCD. First, the Guidelines should reflect the objectives of the Convention. In 2009 the Guidelines purported to ensure that the IFCD supports projects for the totality of the Convention, and now a change is introduced to focus the IFCD on capacity-building, leaving out other aspects of the Convention. Second, the new Guidelines introduce a third dimension to the pre-selection at national level by making civil society a part of the selection team, but the manner to do this can be complicated, there is no criteria to select members of civil society, and those who are on the pre-selection panel are not eligible to submit applications to the IFCD. The Committee’s deliberation on IOS recommendation 24 only concerned the inclusion of the field offices of UNESCO and there was no deliberation on the new addition of “members of civil society”. Third, International Non-Governmental Organizations should not be given new, special procedures. The **Secretary of the Convention** noted that the countries themselves should decide on the pre-selection panel and that the individual civil society organization on the pre-selection panel should not then be a beneficiary of the IFCD to avoid conflict of interest as foreseen under paragraph 10.2 of the revised Guidelines.

217. The delegation of **Malawi** made the observation that since the IFCD will focus next on capacity-building, projects will necessarily involve ministries as they develop and strengthen related cultural policy. However if ministries are now to form part of the pre-selection panel, they are not eligible to apply for IFCD funding. This would impede the IFCD from supporting capacity-building that helps develop cultural policies.

218. The delegation of **Norway** expressed satisfaction with the fact that the Committee took on board most of the recommendations made by the IOS, as these are crucial for the future of the IFCD.

219. The representative of the **Parliamentary Assembly of Francophonie** stated their commitment to diversity and viewed the IFCD as a contributor to peace as it encourages the emergence of a dynamic cultural sector in developing countries. They encourage their members to financially support the IFCD. The essence of the Convention is the relationship between culture and trade, and industry within the national cultural sector, and this requires development tools and support from the IFCD.

220. The representative of the **International Federation of the Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** commented that for the IFCD to foster structural change, the projects should also strengthen governance and the institutional capacity of the organizations. Regarding paragraph 6.12 on complementing other international funds, the notion should not be just to complete, but to have consultation for concerted action. A third point concerns strengthening and accompanying the learning community that will be future applicants to the IFCD. The representative also stressed the continuing impact of a project after its completion. The representative noted that the Secretariat, Parties and civil society are working toward the same objective, and thus should share in an open, upstream way, without excluding stakeholders. The representative informed that a paper with suggestions will be circulated.

221. The **Chairperson** then declared the adoption of the entire draft revisions of the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD, as amended. He then called attention to the draft decision 6.IGC 8. A new paragraph 5 was presented by the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** as follows: “decides to continue the application of the Guidelines as approved by the second ordinary session of the Conference of Parties (2009) for the fourth call for projects in 2013”. There being no comments or objections to this proposed amendment, paragraph 5 was adopted.

Decision 6.IGC 8 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 9 – USE OF THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)

Document CE/12/6.IGC/9

222. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the item.

223. The **Secretary of the Convention** indicated that document CE/12/6.IGC/9 provides the Committee with a complete overview of the financial transactions of the IFCD, including income and expenditures, since 2007 when contributions were first received. As of 30 November 2012, the cumulative income credited to the IFCD stood at over US\$5.7 million, showing a steady increase over the last few years. To date, a total of US\$3.6 million, including the 10 percent support costs, have been allocated by the Committee from the IFCD. Almost US\$500,000 were received in 2012 in voluntary contributions. In compliance with previous decisions, 82 percent of the budget is allocated directly for project funding so the majority of the funds go to projects and not to the overhead or operating costs of the Secretariat. Operating costs include US\$20,000 for the Secretariat, participatory assistance to bring Committee Members from least developed countries to statutory meetings, and follow-up of projects.

224. The **Chairperson** indicated the presence of colleagues from UNESCO's Bureau of Financial Management to answer questions if necessary. For the discussion on draft decision 9, he proposed beginning with paragraphs 7 and 8 as amendments had been tabled thereon. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** introduced their amendment, and stated that it corresponded to decisions previously made to launch a fourth call for projects in 2013, and that there is a need to allocate US\$65,000 in the budget in order for the Panel of Experts to assess the requests for funding. The **Chairperson** stated the amendment was clear and could be adopted. He invited the Secretariat to explain the impact of the proposal on the budget. The **Chief of the Administrative Office of the Culture Sector of UNESCO** replied that with the addition of

the budget for the Panel of Experts line, expenses will increase by US\$65,000 plus the corresponding 10 percent for support costs; the principle of using only 70 percent of the available funds could therefore not be applied, which means the reserve will be used. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that the preparatory assistance support in the budget should be removed, because the IOS recommendation to do away with it was approved. The delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the proposition of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines but added that regarding preparatory assistance, the call for projects in 2013 applies the current Guidelines, not the revised Guidelines, so preparatory assistance should remain in the current budget. The delegation of **China** asked whether this budget should be based on the new Guidelines or the old ones. The **Chairperson** replied that the old, current Guidelines would be used and that the text is clear.

225. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of draft decision 9.

226. The delegation of **Switzerland**, with regard to paragraph 5 on the budget for 2013, requested to insert the words “as amended”. Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

227. The delegation of **Brazil** commented on paragraph 7 requesting the Director-General to launch a new appeal for contributions, noting that a call for contributions should come with an invoice for payment. The **Legal Advisor** clarified that an invoice means there is a debt, but this is not the case for this Convention and an invoice in the traditional form cannot be issued. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that the Committee should look to the Small World Stories strategy and its proposals for a call for contributions. The **Chairperson** declared paragraph 7 of the draft decision 9 adopted.

228. Turning to paragraph 8, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Honduras. The delegation of **Honduras** suggested changing the word “panel” to “group” in French. The delegation of **France** suggested placing paragraph 8 concerning allocating the additional US\$65,000, in between paragraphs 4 and 5. The **Chairperson** appreciated these suggestions and there were no objections from the Committee. The delegation of **China** proposed an amendment, to request the Secretariat to have a face-to-face meeting of the current Panel of Experts and to allocate an amount from the budget for this purpose. The **Chairperson** reflected that the budget has already been adopted, and that unless China was to contribute the funds for such meeting, he found it difficult to reopen the debate to change the budget. The delegation of **France** supported the Chairperson’s observations and noted that the Panel of Experts is renewed on a gradual basis, so there is always one expert to pass on knowledge and experience acquired to the others. The delegation of **China** proposed that the allocation of funds for such a meeting could come from the unassigned budget, as inspired by the earlier proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. It added that if the Committee did not agree, the delegation would withdraw its proposal. The **Chairperson** posed that if the Committee agreed to exceed the 70 percent ratio for projects, then paragraph 5 of draft decision 9 could be amended by adding “a maximum of US\$25,000 from unassigned funds for a meeting of the Panel of Experts”. To not exceed 30 percent of administrative costs, the ratio would increase to around 71 percent or 72 percent. The delegation of **Canada**, supported by **France**, noted that this addition would create a precedent regarding the 70 percent standard that has been set, and that the budget is adopted. A two-thirds majority is required to go back on a decision taken. Finally, it was noted that these experts are on their fourth call for projects so they are trained. The delegation of **Argentina**, supported by **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, inquired about the timing of the proposed meeting of the Panel of Experts, noting it may be more useful to consider this in the next Committee, when there is a new Panel of Experts. The delegation of **China** pointed out that the proposal comes from the recommendation of the IOS and the Panel of Experts themselves, and confirmed the

flexibility of the delegation on this point. The **Chairperson** then agreed to adopt paragraph 5 unchanged.

Decision 6.IGC 9 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 10 – PROGRESS OF RATIFICATIONS TO THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS (2011-2012)

Documents CE/12/6.IGC/10 and CE/12/6.IGC/INF.5

229. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that, in addition to the countries listed in CE/12/6.IGC/INF.5, notification of an additional ratification from Swaziland was just received by the Secretariat, bringing the total number of Parties to the Convention to 126. He congratulated Swaziland for ratifying the Convention on behalf of the Committee.

230. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled the adoption of the strategy of ratification in 2009, and the action plan for 2010-2013. This action plan encourages Parties, the Secretariat and civil society to intensify their efforts and improve their cooperation so that the strategy may be implemented in a coordinated and consistent manner. To recall, the objectives of the strategy and its action plan are to improve the geographical balance of Parties by addressing under-represented regions or sub regions and raise the visibility of the Convention through its promotion in international and other forums. According to the action plan, 35 to 40 additional ratifications were expected during the period 2010-2013; this is the benchmark that the Committee had set at that time. At its fourth session, the Committee requested the Secretariat to report to it at its sixth session on further progress, as well as on steps taken and actions carried out in 2011 and 2012. The Secretariat sent out letters on 19 July 2012 to all Parties, inviting them to communicate to the Secretariat any relevant information about activities undertaken as part of the strategy to encourage ratification. Eight Parties and two international civil society organizations submitted responses. The cumulative number of ratifications achieved since the start of the implementation of the strategy is 21. In order to achieve the goal set by the action plan of the strategy – namely at least 35 new ratifications by 2013 – 14 new ratifications need to be obtained by the end of 2013.

231. The delegation of **Tunisia** noted that Group V(b) has reached the threshold of 50 percent with recent ratifications from the United Arab Emirates and Palestine. The delegation congratulated the Secretariat on research undertaken regarding ratifications in the Arab region, and thanked Germany for organizing, from 6 to 8 September 2012, the international seminar ““Connexions” for a Richer Cultural Life and Human Development Perspectives, Actions, Commitments”, bringing together experts from the Arab world so as to make the Convention better known and provide civil society with the means to launch advocacy actions. The delegation welcomed the Secretariat’s plans to organize in the second half of 2013, in cooperation with the European Commission, a regional seminar, and also welcomed the translation made of the fundamental basic texts in six languages, and the Arabic version of the information kit.

232. The delegation of the **Lao PDR** noted that Asia is lagging behind because only 12 of 44 countries have ratified the Convention. The Ministerial Forum held in Dhaka, Bangladesh in May 2012, attended by the UNESCO Director-General, was an effort towards increasing ratifications, and that during the Vientiane Summit the issue of the cultural industries and

their significance was included in the exchanges between Europe and Asia. The delegation will work with others in the region to organize national and regional seminars to raise the awareness of the Convention with government authorities, particularly in the context of ASEAN summits.

233. The delegation of **Brazil** noted that there has been progress in ratifications in South America, welcomed the news that Colombia is in the final stages of ratification, and recalled that Venezuela is also working towards this goal. Promotion of the Convention among the Portuguese-speaking countries has been undertaken. Brazil, as regional coordinator of the South America-Arab Countries Summit next year in Saudi Arabia, will ensure this topic is included in the meeting of ministers of culture. The delegation stated that more efforts are needed among Group IV countries.

[Observers]

234. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by **Belgium**, commented that it is necessary to motivate those who have already ratified the Convention as well as civil society to implement the Convention. The delegation thanked Switzerland for the initiative of organizing a meeting prior to the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties covering subjects addressed in the periodic reports such as preferential treatment, the mobility and status of artists, Article 21 and digital technologies. These are more important than putting efforts into promoting ratification.

235. The representative of the **Parliamentary Assembly of Francophonie** stated that efforts have been made to have its 78 members ratify the Convention and this work continues.

236. The **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** praised the work done in Bangladesh, Tunisia and South America and informed that civil society is regularly invited to discuss the implementation of the Convention. The representative noted that often repeated questions such as: what is the point of the Convention? How does it help trade or with getting access to markets in the north? What does it have to do with sustainable development? ... require concrete responses and policies, as well as a pedagogical approach which is closer to countries' own realities, in order to advance ratification as well as implementation.

237. The **Secretary of the Convention** added that there has been excellent cooperation with civil society in the past year and years. She noted the work that the German National Commission for UNESCO in the Arab region, and that of the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity at the international, national and local levels to engage young professionals interested in the Convention, and in particular the U40 Network, attending the session as observers.

238. The Chairperson turned to draft decision 6.IGC 10. No amendments were proposed.

Decision 6.IGC 10 was adopted.

ITEM 11 – INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION: TAKING STOCK OF ARTICLE 21 OF THE CONVENTION

Document CE/12/6.IGC/11

239. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the item.

240. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the Secretariat was requested to present, in relation to Article 21, a compendium of cases wherein the Convention is invoked or utilized in other international fora. In 2011 and 2012, the Secretariat consulted with the Parties through a questionnaire concerning Article 21 and information obtained from 38 Parties was provided in Document CE/12/6.IGC/11. The results of the consultation show that the definition of international forum continues to be broad, encompassing fora whose primary mission may or may not be cultural, that the Parties had invoked the Convention in a variety of contexts and ways, for example in statements at meetings and conferences, in declarations and resolutions adopted at international meetings, in cultural and bilateral trade agreements, in discussions on the link between culture and development, and dialogue with States that were not Parties to the Convention in order to encourage them to ratify. An inventory of experiences and practices on the implementation of Article 21 has been posted to the Convention's website. She added that the provision of information on the implementation of the Convention helps raise the visibility of the Convention, concrete impact, and fosters international cooperation, information-sharing and transparency.
241. The delegation of **Brazil** commented that a recent meeting of MERCOSUR culture ministers agreed to enhance dialogue and promote the objectives and principles of the Convention on the international scene where debates take place on the protection and promotion of a diversity of cultural expressions and the contribution of culture in sustainable development, such as, for example, at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the World Trade Organization. These countries are engaging in a dialogue on the relationship with other conventions of UNESCO – intangible heritage, for example – because intangible heritage is essential to all those cultural goods produced by developing countries. He added that the same countries stressed the challenges of the Convention's implementation, the link with national cultural policies as well as with issues such as sustainable development and the promotion of peace.
242. The delegation of **Canada** expressed great satisfaction with the results presented in the report and with the online database. It suggested that to build on this progress the questionnaire should be sent to the Parties at regular intervals. Canada also welcomed the preparation of the information document that will allow the Conference of Parties to discuss the Convention's status and implementation. Canada invited the Secretariat to use the wording: "promoting the principles and objectives of the Convention" for the title of the database.
243. The delegation of the **Lao PDR** noted that in promoting Article 21 in international and regional activities, they made sure that cultural goods, enterprises and initiatives are part and parcel of their work, and that culture is the accelerator of development.
244. The delegation of **France** fully supported the Article 21 exercise, and noted that it is a major article for improving the credibility of the Convention and for including the Convention's objectives in other fora.

[Observers]

245. The **Parliamentary Assembly of the Francophonie**, noting Articles 20 and 21 are the core of the Convention, expressed concern about the inclusion of culture in trade agreements. National cultural sectors and industries require a number of tools to fully develop and governments have to ensure this development is protected from negative trade impacts. The representative stressed the importance of opening up this space to other stakeholders of the Convention including parliamentarians and civil society in order to pool experiences and create an extended consultation mechanism, as well as of ensuring capacity-building for parliamentarians so that they can initiate and develop national cultural policies. In organizing trainings for this, they work with the *Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie*, including

on their program to support the development of public policies and strategies for the cultural industries in Gabon, Niger, Burkina Faso and Senegal.

246. The representative from the **International Telecommunication Union** (“ITU”) stated their commitment to promoting access of underprivileged communities to information technologies and communication. Use of the Internet will transform our society in the way it thinks, works, creates and disseminates. The representative offered ITU’s participation in the Convention on the basis of their expertise.
247. The representative from the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** agreed that Articles 20 and 21 form the core of the Convention and as trade and cultural exception are being discussed between the European Union and Canada, these Articles provide an opportunity to defend and test values and legal validity of the Convention. There are threats to the Convention and it is important to remain alert in this early period of implementation. The representative encouraged regular and in-depth reporting for the database.
248. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no more speakers and moved to the draft decision for item 11.
249. The delegation of **Brazil** proposed amending paragraph 6 to use the term “a working document” so that Article 21 is in the agenda of the Conference of Parties. The **Chairperson** noted that there was agreement. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested that for the working document that would be submitted to the Conference of Parties, the questionnaire on Article 21 should be sent out to civil society.

Decision 6.IGC 11 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 12 – SELECTION OF AN EMBLEM FOR THE CONVENTION AND PRELIMINARY DRAFT OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR ITS USE

Document CE/12/6.IGC/12

250. The **Chairperson** welcomed Ms Haas, who developed the emblem options submitted to the Committee, and invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the document. He reminded Committee Members that Ms Haas was the artist who designed the Convention Information Kit (2006) as well as the Basic Texts publication (2011).
251. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that the Committee decided that the purpose of having an emblem is to give visual identity to and raise awareness of the Convention, and be useful in fundraising activities. The visual signature of the circles currently in use on Convention communication tools should provide the basis for development of the emblem. The Committee also decided that the emblem could be used with or without the UNESCO logo. The preliminary draft Operational Guidelines on the use of the emblem are presented in document CE/12/6.IGC/12 in eight sections. They include provision for the Director-General to have the delegated authority to grant the use of the linked emblem in connection with patronage, contractual arrangements, and promotional activities, and for donations to the IFCD as a result of the commercial use of the emblem.
252. The **Chairperson** invited Ms Haas to present the three emblem options that were projected on the screens.

253. **Ms Haas** discussed the themes underpinning each option. The circles are omnipresent in each of the three options, presented as both a container and the entity contained; in other words a circle around and circles within the emblem. This supports the message that because of the dynamism that it conveys – a circle is always in movement, creating its own space.

- Option 1 incorporates circles that are multiplying allegiances and partnerships. It also suggests the globe and an international scope. The circles slip easily from boundary to boundary within the circle and create constant interconnections. This option expresses the notion of working together and intercultural exchange. The effect is sculptural and architectural, and is inspired by the works of Bernar Venet, Chillida, Richard Serra, Marc di Suvero.
- Option 2 has a more playful, more sensitive, human representation with a suggestion of multiple interconnections and evolution or growth. Normally you can only produce a perfect circle using tools, this option is more free form – the shapes and the sizes are random. Constant movement is suggested, and yet the circles are piled up one on top of the other, again suggesting a multitude of interconnections. From this super imposition emerges the idea of a spiral, a symbol of creation and the evolution of the entire universe. One could draw a parallel with Calder's mobiles, Kandinsky's paintings or again Venet.
- Option 3 represents the unique character and also the idea of multitude in the Convention, and the notion of synergies. A group of spots form part of a circle, with the perspective suggesting a globe, a sphere. They pile up, add to each other, and are all moving in the same direction. One has the idea of wanting to group together, to associate with others, to create a larger impact than acting alone. It conveys the notion of synergies, and suggests pictorial art as inspired by the Japanese artist Kusama.

254. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the objective is to contribute to the visibility of the Convention and the IFCD; the exercise is not to choose the image that pleases us the most, but rather the image that has the greatest impact and represents the principles of the Convention.

255. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on the *emblem proposals*.

256. The delegation of the **former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**, supported by **Congo**, the **Lao PDR**, **Viet Nam**, **Argentina**, **France**, **Zimbabwe**, **Honduras**, **Kenya**, **Cameroon**, **China**, **Kuwait** thanked Ms Haas for her work and stated a preference for Option 1, which symbolizes continuation and connection between diversity of cultural expressions and dialogue among cultures.

257. The delegation of **Brazil**, supported by **Albania**, **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, and **Tunisia** thanked Ms Haas and noted that the Convention needs good promotion. The delegation recalled that the fundraising strategy was adopted with a visual identity, and indicated that the Convention and the IFCD should have one sole visual identity. The delegation recommended that the Committee consider using it as the Convention emblem.

258. The delegation of **Sweden** stated their satisfaction with the three options adding there is no need to look for other options at this point. Option 2 resembles the emblem of the Telia-Sonera company and in general resemblances to big companies should be avoided. The delegation expressed a preference for Option 1 but was flexible.

259. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed difficulty in accepting the three options, and proposed that another option be proposed.

260. The delegation of **Switzerland**, supported by **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Brazil, and Albania** queried whether Ms Haas would be willing or able to work with the company that proposed the IFCD fundraising strategy, and to come up with a single option to present to the June 2013 Conference of Parties.
261. **Ms Haas** stated that an emblem has to be simple, show well in black and white, be identifiable in a small square, and combine easily with the UNESCO logo. The fan in the IFCD strategy design would have to be reworked, and would not include the notion of circles.
262. The delegation of **Switzerland**, observing that many Members favored Option 1, said they could also go with Option 1 but asked Ms Haas if it was possible to develop further Option 1 based on comments made.
263. **Ms Haas** replied that she was open to suggestions and new proposals, but stressed that an emblem must be extremely simple, in order to be effective.

[Observers]

264. The delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** supported by **Namibia, and Italy** stated a preference for Option 1, and suggested developing it further.
265. The delegation of **Albania** stated a preference for Option 3, and noted that since there is no clear majority, a preference for Option 1 should not be reflected in the decision. There could be a proposal to request another option, and then the Conference of Parties could make the final choice between Option 1 and another new option. It was not the Committee's decision.
266. The **Chairperson** stated that the Committee did not appear so divided and the majority of voices were for Option 1. An instruction could be given to develop another option linking Option 1 and the visual identity of the IFCD fundraising strategy.
267. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked Ms Haas if she could work further on Option 1 on the basis of Switzerland's request to link to the fan of the strategy.
268. **Ms Haas** said it was possible to work again on Option 1, but it would be a new proposal.
269. The delegation of **Argentina** stated that Option 1 was a distinct design and was not changeable, and there was a strong majority for it.
270. The delegation of **France**, supported by **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, proposed keeping Option 1, and asked Ms Haas to work on another option – an option 2 – and present both to the Conference of Parties.
271. The delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that in view of budget and time, new proposals cannot be requested and the Committee should make a decision that day.
272. The **Chairperson** began the discussion on the *preliminary draft Operational Guidelines on the use of the Emblem of the Convention*, presented in Annex II of document CE/12/6.IGC/12, starting with general comments. As there were no general comments from the Committee or from observers, the Chairperson decided to examine the document chapter by chapter. As there were no amendments or comments under the first chapter "General considerations", the first five paragraphs were adopted. Under the "Graphic design of stand-alone and linked emblems", the Chairperson noted that as the stand-alone emblem was to be decided, the boxes in paragraphs 6 and 7 would be filled in, and the chapter was adopted. For the third

and fourth chapters “Rights of use of the emblem” and “Graphical standards”, there were no comments and these were adopted.

273. The delegation of **Brazil** in discussing chapter five on “Authorization procedure for use of the stand-alone emblem”, proposed more flexibility and to authorize the Director-General in exceptional cases to bypass the procedures of Step 3 and Step 4. **The Representative of the UNESCO Director-General** indicated that the Director-General will not, on her own, use such an exception to the rule on authorizing use of the emblem, and that the proposed paragraph is not needed. The delegation of **Brazil** withdrew the proposal, and chapter five was adopted.
274. Concerning chapter six “Authorization of the linked emblem” and chapter seven “Donation to the IFCD through the commercial use of the emblem”, there were no comments and the chapters were adopted.
275. The delegation of **Canada**, in discussing chapter eight “Protection”, paragraph 33, proposed removing the last words of the first sentence and the entire last sentence, so from “at the international level” to the end. It would read “The Director-General of UNESCO is responsible for instituting proceedings in the event of unauthorized use of the emblem of the Convention.”
276. The **Legal Advisor** noted that the language proposed for deletion appears in other UNESCO Conventions, and also referred to the language in paragraph 34, which follows. Following an exchange with the delegation of Canada, where it was recognized that Canada’s legislation is incompatible with paragraph 33, as well as comments from the Chairperson, the Legal Advisor suggested the following language based on the World Heritage Convention, which Canada is a Party to: “Parties to the Convention must take all the necessary steps to make sure that the emblem is not used in their respective countries by any group or for any reason that is not specifically recognized by the Committee or the statutory body of the Convention”.
277. The **Chairperson**, following the exchanges, had the agreement of the Committee on the following language for paragraph 33: “The Director-General of UNESCO is responsible for instituting proceedings in the event of unauthorized use of the emblem of the Convention at the international level. Parties to the Convention should take all possible measures to prevent the use of the emblem in their respective countries by any group or for any purpose not explicitly recognized by the statutory bodies of the Convention”. Chapter eight was then adopted as amended.
278. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of draft decision 6IGC 12. He noted that some consultations had taken place, and said the idea was to submit proposals for emblems in the plural form, and the draft Operational Guidelines, to the Conference of Parties. New paragraphs prepared by the Secretariat in respect of the earlier debate were considered.
279. On paragraph 4 the delegation of **France** suggested in the French version, instead of saying “*recommande qu’il devrait y avoir*” to say “*recommande qu’il y ait seulement.*”
280. The delegation of **Albania**, supported by **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**, and **Brazil**, expressed support for all the new paragraphs and proposed an amendment to paragraph 6 concerning another design based on Option 1, to say “and transmit all the options for consideration by the Conference of Parties.”
281. The delegation of **Tunisia** noted that paragraph 5 states that a majority expressed a preference for Option 1, and that paragraph 6 asks for a fourth proposal, which sounds like a contradiction. The delegation of **Albania** recapped that paragraph 4 states a principle of

having a single emblem and paragraph 6 is more practical, allowing the Conference of Parties to examine the options, including a fourth option, and make a choice.

Decision 6.IGC 12 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 13 – DOCUMENTS TO BE APPROVED BY THE FOURTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES

Document CE/12/6.IGC/13

282. The **Secretary to the Convention** recalled that the Conference of Parties at its last session requested the Committee to develop draft Operational Guidelines for the use of the emblem of the Convention and in this context, the Committee invited the Secretariat to submit proposals for the emblem, taking into consideration the Convention's existing visual identity. The third ordinary session of the Conference of Parties invited the Committee to review the Guidelines on the use of resources of the IFCD in view of the evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD. She noted that the Guidelines adopted during the current session would be included in a compilation document to be submitted for approval to the Conference of Parties.

283. As there was no comment from the Committee or observers, the **Chairperson** proceeded to the draft decision 6 IGC 13, and suggested as an amendment to delete the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 3 concerning the emblem for the Convention. The Chairperson suggested that paragraph 3 read as follows: "Submits to the Conference of Parties for approval at its fourth ordinary session, as annexed to this decision, the following documents: draft Operational Guidelines governing the use of the emblem of the Convention, and the draft revisions to the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD." He noted that the emblem would be placed on the agenda of the Conference of Parties, but that no decision had been made in this respect. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft decision were then adopted.

284. The delegation of **Brazil** commented that in view of the decisions taken by the Committee on the revision to the IFCD Guidelines and on the draft Operational Guidelines on the use of the emblem as well as the annexes, this draft decision 13 may not be necessary, but added that they could go along with the proposal of the Chairperson to delete the first subparagraph of paragraph 3. The delegation asked the Secretariat, in view of Resolution 3 CP.11 adopted at the last Conference of Parties, when the "Report of the Committee on its activities" is to be made to the Conference of Parties and whether there is to be an agenda item on this.

285. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that a working document will be submitted to the Conference of Parties that will include the draft Operational Guidelines governing the use of the emblem, and the draft revisions to the IFCD Guidelines. The Conference of Parties will select and adopt the emblem based on a specific working document that will include all the Committee's discussion on four different options. Once an emblem has been approved, it will be inserted into the draft Operational Guidelines.

Decision 6.IGC 13 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 14 – REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND DECISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE OF PARTIES

Document CE/12/6.IGC/14

286. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretary of the Convention to present to the Committee item 14.

287. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the original version CE/12/6.IGC/14 was made available on line along with other working documents and that it had been replaced by a revised version that morning, in which all additions are indicated in red. The additions are the discussions and decisions taken during this current session of the Committee, in order to provide to the Conference of Parties complete information about the Committee's activities during its fifth and sixth sessions. The activities of the Committee are presented in the document as follows:

- implementation of the IFCD;
- evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD;
- revision of the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the IFCD;
- fundraising strategy;
- emblem of the Convention;
- strategic and action-oriented analytical summary of the quadrennial periodic reports;
- implementation of Article 21;
- strategy for encouraging ratifications of the Convention; and
- promotion and visibility of the Convention.

288. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine those sections that have been added to the original document.

289. Referring to paragraph 19 of the document, the delegation of **Brazil** recalled that the Committee decided in Decision 6.IGC 4 to organize an exchange session between Parties and experts on the periodic reports and requested that the relation with other UNESCO Conventions be reflected in the report.

Decision 6.IGC 14 was adopted.

ITEM 15 – DATE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Document CE/12/6.IGC/15

290. The **Chairperson** informed that the Bureau had discussed holding the seventh ordinary session of the Committee in Paris from 10 to 13 December 2013. This takes into account the fact that until 8 December, many Members will be taking part in the meeting of the Committee of the 2003 Convention in Baku, Azerbaijan. It was proposed that the

Committee session be preceded by an information session to take place on the morning of 10 December. The dates of 10 through 13 December 2013 were agreed upon.

Decision 6.IGC 15 was adopted as amended.

ITEM 16 – ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE SEVENTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Document CE/12/6.IGC/16

291. The **Chairperson** introduced the item explaining that since the Bureau is composed of six members each representing six electoral groups of UNESCO, the Committee needs to elect one Chairperson and four Vice-Chairpersons, and a Rapporteur. He invited the Committee Members to present the outcome of their consultations within each electoral group.
292. The delegation of **Switzerland** proposed Sweden to serve as a Vice-Chairperson for the Electoral Group I, to which the delegation of **Canada** expressed its support. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** put forward Congo to be the Electoral Group V(a)'s Vice-Chairperson, while Kuwait was proposed by the delegation of **Tunisia** to be the Vice-Chairperson representing the Electoral Group V(b). The delegation of **Honduras** proposed Saint Vincent and the Grenadines as the Vice-Chairperson for the Electoral Group III, and the delegation of the **Lao PDR** proposed Viet Nam to be the Vice-Chairperson for the Electoral Group IV.
293. The delegation of **Switzerland** proposed Ms Arev Samuelyan, the current Vice-Minister of Culture of Armenia, to be Chairperson of the seventh session of the Committee. The delegation asked the Legal Advisor whether the Committee could have one Chairperson, five vice-chairpersons, and one rapporteur in addition.
294. Referring to Rules 11 and 12 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, the **Legal Advisor** explained that the customary practice is for the Committee to nominate the rapporteur in person among the four vice-chairpersons.
295. The **Chairperson**, referring to Rule 12.1, stated that the Rules of Procedure do not specify how many vice-chairpersons must be elected.
296. The **Legal Adviser** raised Rule 15.2 of the Rules of Procedure, which stipulates that if a rapporteur ceases to represent a Member of the Committee or is unable to complete his/her term of office, he/she must be replaced by a Vice-Chairperson.
297. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the approval of the members of the Bureau. With no other candidates and no opposition by the Committee, the Chairperson approved the nomination of Ms Arev Samuelyan to become the next Chairperson of the Committee and Sweden, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Viet Nam, Congo, and Kuwait to be Vice-Chairpersons. Recalling that the Electoral Groups I, II, III, V(a), and V(b) have already provided a rapporteur in past sessions, the Chairperson requested that the delegation of Viet Nam accept the responsibility and to propose the name of the person who could become the rapporteur. The Chairperson adjourned the session so as to allow Viet Nam time to reflect. The delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed that it was unfortunately not ready to assume the role of rapporteur. The Chairperson urged the five members of the future Bureau to find a rapporteur among themselves. Ultimately, Mr Nicolas Mathieu of Switzerland was named

to be the next Rapporteur of the Committee, which was accepted by the Committee with applause.

298. The Chairperson summarized that the Bureau of the seventh session of the Committee would be composed of one chairperson, one rapporteur, and five vice-chairpersons, which the Committee adopted.

Decision 6.IGC 16 was adopted.

ITEM 17 – OTHER BUSINESS

299. The **Chairperson** invited Argentina and Canada to make their presentations.

300. The delegation of **Canada** recalled that this was its last session as a Committee Member and wanted to make a proposal for a new initiative aimed at promoting discussion on the theme “cultural expressions in the digital era”. The delegation explained that technological advancement since the adoption of the Convention has created new challenges as well as new opportunities at the global level. These technological changes raise questions on the mode of intervention regarding culture and the model of creation, production, and diffusion of cultural expressions. Considering that countries in both the North as well as the South have been impacted by such changes, Canada proposed that Parties to the Convention have an opportunity to exchange good practices in this area. Adding this subject into the work of the Committee would ensure that the implementation of the Convention is modern, effective, and dynamic and that the current challenges impacting cultural expressions find their place within debates by the Convention’s statutory bodies. Canada proposed a draft decision which aims at submitting to the Conference of Parties two proposals. The first is to include in the agenda of the seventh session of the Committee an item aiming at reflection on these challenges, while the second invites those willing Parties to submit a report on the state of the challenges to enrich the future debate on the question. The delegation announced that both Quebec and Canada would contribute their expertise in this exercise.

301. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation, and added that such reflection should involve Parties in coordination with civil society, noting that the principal user of the new technologies is civil society. Since the intervention of Canada involved a draft decision, the Chairperson invited the Committee to discuss the proposal.

302. The delegations of **Brazil, the Lao PDR, France, Honduras, Cameroon, Tunisia, Congo, Viet Nam, Cuba, Zimbabwe, Sweden, Switzerland,** and the **former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** supported the Canadian proposal. While supporting the proposal, the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed a word of caution citing possible cost implications of the proposed item. Before proceeding to the adoption of the draft decision for which the Committee expressed its unanimous support, the Chairperson invited observers to take the floor.

[Observers]

303. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** noted that what differentiates the 2005 Convention from other Conventions is that it addresses contemporary cultural expressions. The digital challenge is at the heart of the Convention, and discussion on this subject would help clarify the terms of reference of the Convention. Noting the subject is a theme that is of common interest to various Parties,

the representative highlighted the importance of defining a field of discussion, considering that the digital domain is very vast, and other UN forums such as WIPO are also looking at the question. The representative concluded by informing that civil society is already working to organize a conference to be held in May 2013 in order to identify the main issues and challenges from its point of view.

304. The **Chairperson** proceeded to adopt the draft decision. The delegation of **China** proposed to add “if possible” or “if wish so” after “invite” under paragraph 5.ii, explaining that only those Parties that wish to participate in the discussion would do so. The Committee accepted the amendment.

Decision 6.IGC 17 was adopted as amended.

305. The **Chairperson** invited the delegation of Argentina to make their presentation.

306. The delegation of **Argentina** explained that the expert who had planned to make a presentation was absent due to health reasons and announced that the presentation would be circulated by e-mail. The **Chairperson** invited Argentina to share the presentation with the Secretariat so as to ensure its wide diffusion among the Committee Members.

307. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** said the 2005 Convention is different from other heritage-based Conventions and is forward-looking. As the IFCD is based on voluntary contributions, the delegation appealed to all Parties to make contributions. Concurring with the delegation of Brazil, the delegation expressed its trust in the Director-General and the Secretariat to implement the “1% Counts for creativity” campaign that was included in the communication and fundraising strategy that the Committee adopted. The delegation further noted that the contributions are important also for the development of the knowledge platform to facilitate the exchange of information, be it on periodic reports, the implementation of Article 21, or preferential treatment in the future.

308. The **Chairperson** added that although the contribution of one percent of Parties’ contribution to UNESCO is not inscribed in the Convention text, it is a creative indication that Parties could use vis-à-vis their authorities to convince them to make their voluntary contribution. He noted that he would do his part as the Chairperson of the Committee to urge his government to make its contribution to the IFCD. Seeing no further request for intervention from Committee Members nor other Parties to the Convention, he invited observers wishing to take the floor to make interventions.

[Observers]

309. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity**, referring to the earlier debate on periodic reports, requested clarification about whether contributions of civil society for the periodic reports could be submitted to the Committee Members in advance so as to ensure that their contributions would be taken into account during the Committee debate.

310. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** supported this request and asked the Secretariat to clarify. It added that the information provided by civil society could be important input to the future knowledge platform.

311. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded by referring to paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines on the role and participation of civil society, and with the authorization of the Chairperson, that civil society organizations may “submit contributions relevant to the work of the respective bodies...to be circulated to all delegations and observers by the Secretariat to the Convention as information documents”. The Secretary of the Convention noted that such information documents should reach the Secretariat in time for statutory deadlines, in English and/or French.
312. Supporting the intervention of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines concerning the importance of the knowledge platform, the delegation of **Tunisia** asked whether documents that were submitted to the Committee in its previous session examining the question of preferential treatment could constitute the base for the platform on the question as they were rich in information.
313. At the Chairperson’s request, the **Rapporteur** presented an oral report, summarizing the discussion and outlining the decisions that had been adopted.
314. After thanking the Rapporteur for his comprehensive report, the **Chairperson** announced that the decisions adopted would be made available on the Convention’s website in the coming days and declared that the sixth ordinary session of the Committee had adopted its decisions in full and has exhausted its agenda. The Chairperson then thanked and congratulated Committee Members for their hard work. He also congratulated Mrs Cliche and her team for their excellent support during this sixth session. The Chairperson declared the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions closed.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION