



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization



Diversity of  
Cultural Expressions

**Paris, 10 September 2015**  
**Original: English**

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

**Eighth Ordinary Session**  
**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters**  
**9 - 11 December 2014**

This document contains the detailed draft summary record of the eighth ordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, 9 - 11 December 2014). Participants may submit comments by email to [convention2005@unesco.org](mailto:convention2005@unesco.org) before 30 October 2015.

## OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The eighth 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 9 to 11 December 2014.
2. It was attended by 294 participants, including 56 participants from the 23 States Members of the Committee, 181 participants from 74 Parties non-members of the Committee (73 States Parties and the European Union (EU)), 31 participants from 13 States not Parties to the Convention, 1 participant from 1 Permanent Observer Mission to UNESCO, 2 participants from 2 intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) and 23 participants from 9 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with observer status.
3. In opening the session, H.E. Mr Jean-Marie Adoua, **Chairperson** of the 8IGC welcomed all participants. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Irina Bokova, for her opening speech.
4. The **Director-General** began her speech by expressing her gratitude towards the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) for the cooperation agreement which was just concluded with UNESCO, worth more than 50 million USD, including a component on the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions with funding of 2.5 million USD. She thanked Sweden for its reaffirmed commitment towards the ideals of the 2005 Convention, 15 years after the Intergovernmental Conference on cultural policies for development held in Stockholm. She also thanked the Government of Spain for its action and support which aimed at raising the visibility of the Convention and the European Union which enabled the launching of the first technical assistance programme for the implementation of the Convention at the country level. She informed that UNESCO would organize a major event in Brussels in 2015 to share the lessons learnt from the programme. She affirmed that the Convention which has been ratified by 134 Parties throughout the world, creates a structure for public debates and international cooperation, bringing about tangible changes as illustrated through the periodic reports submitted by Parties – changes such as the reinforcement of cultural regulations and policies; recognition of the position of culture in sustainable development strategies; and the development of new models of governance for culture. Notwithstanding such positive changes, she pointed out that government leaders too often do not refer sufficiently to these matters and urged Parties to reinforce capacities in this field through more South-South cooperation. The Director-General expressed that the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention represents a strategic opportunity to celebrate the achievement made and called on Parties, organizations and civil society to organize symposia, concerts, and other events. She expressed that this anniversary should be forward-looking, including a focus on emerging issues such as new technologies. In this regard, she paid tribute to the initiative by France and Canada to include the digital challenges in the Committee’s agenda. Referring to the Declaration adopted at the third World Forum on culture and creative industries held in Florence in October 2014, organised in cooperation with the Italian Government, she emphasized the importance of culture for sustainable development and further noted that this anniversary must be a springboard to accelerate advocacy efforts to support the integration of culture in the post-2015 agenda on sustainable development. She urged the Committee to continue emphasizing throughout the upcoming year the role of creativity for development. The 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention, coinciding with the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of UNESCO, provides a perfect example of the power of the Organization to structure the global debates and offer concrete means and tools for action, and in order to substantiate UNESCO’s plea for action, it is essential to present tangible projects and the operational implementation of the Convention on the ground. Referring to such countries as Burkina

Faso, Peru, Brazil and Lithuania that have recently adopted national cultural policies which refer to the objectives of the Convention, she emphasized that the 2005 Convention is designed to nurture and support the emergence of dynamic cultural sectors especially in developing countries, and that the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) is increasingly recognized as an effective international cooperation tool by all stakeholders, attracting a growing number of eligible funding requests every year, covering such critical issues as sustainable capacity development, cultural and creative industry development, governance and public policy. However, only seven requests for a total of 624,000 \$US are recommended to the Committee due to the limited financial availability. She stressed that should Parties provide additional contributions, more projects could be funded, because the fact remains that too many countries continue to lack technical, human or financial resources, as well as relevant data, indicators and available statistics needed to fully implement the Convention. Referring to the recommendation of the External Auditor on the working methods of the Culture Conventions, she expressed her hope that the members of the Committee would agree to give UNESCO the means it needs to sustain and implement this Convention and wished the Committee fruitful discussions.

5. The **Chairperson** then invited H.E. Ms Koumealo ANATE, Minister of the Communication, Culture, Arts and Civil Training of Togo.
6. The **Minister of the Communication, Culture, Arts and Civil Training of Togo** thanked the Committee for the privilege to address it and congratulated the Secretariat and the Committee for the excellent quality of work carried out since 2005. She stated that Togo has been committed to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity as illustrated by the fact that it was the ninth country and the third African country to have ratified it. She informed that as a means to implement this new legal instrument, a cultural policy of Togo has been elaborated and adopted in March 2011. Through UNESCO's financial support and technical expertise in 2010 via the UNESCO office in Accra and in 2011 from the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, Togo has elaborated a 10-year national strategic plan of the cultural policy. The Ministry in charge of culture ensures that the diversity of cultural expressions is taken into account by other national development partners. In order to encourage and support creative work by cultural and artistic professionals, the Government of Togo through the Ministry of Culture has put in place a framework to accompany these actors and to mobilize technical and financial support that they need. With regard to the financing of culture, a fund dedicated to culture has been set up by the Government in 2013, providing subsidies to the creative sector for the promotion and the distribution of culture. With the initial seed money of 400 million CFA franc (equivalent of 800,000 USD), the fund contributes not only to strengthening the capacities of the national cultural actors to foster the emergence of dynamic cultural sector reaching regional and international cultural markets, but also to creating jobs and reducing poverty through the cultural industries. As illustrated in the periodic report Togo submitted to UNESCO in May 2013, she informed that civil society actively participates in the implementation of the Convention through raising awareness actions, such as seminars, conferences, publications, national and international professional gatherings, media communication and through enhancing the capacities of cultural actors. For example, the Togolese Coalition for Cultural Diversity spearheaded the organization of the third international encounter of professional organizations of culture on the challenges of ratification of the Convention. In 2010, thanks to the funding of the IFCD, the Togolese Coalition for Cultural Diversity implemented a project to reinforce the capacity of Togolese cultural professionals. In 2011, an international congress of an African network of cultural promoters and entrepreneurs was organized, reflecting on culture as a motor of social and economic development. In 2012, an association Filbleu and the Togolese Coalition for Cultural Diversity jointly organized a competition for youth called Tasso. Also in 2012, the Ministry of Culture and Arts through the funding from the IFCD elaborated a strategic plan to implement a cultural policy in Togo, which enabled a national mapping of cultural wealth par region. She

announced that this 10-year plan of the Togolese cultural policy is now a part of the global collection of good practices, and a documentary film is planned to be produced on the project to encourage other countries to follow the practice of Togo. She concluded by commending the formidable work carried out by the IFCD and noting its intention to scale up its contribution to the IFCD.

7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister of Culture and Arts and expressed that the 2005 Convention is no longer a dream in Togo but a reality which serves as a model for other countries, especially for sub-Saharan African countries. He then invited the Secretary General of Culture of Morocco to address the assembly.
8. The **Secretary General of Culture of Morocco** informed that while Morocco ratified the Convention only in 2013, the idea of the diversity and culture as part of the fundamental rights of a country has already been stipulated in the Constitution of Morocco, and that the Ministry of Culture has been working to protect and promote the diversity of Morocco's cultural expressions through several actions, namely, through organizing some twenty festivals annually and through supporting cultural industries. Morocco is establishing a National Commission for Cultural Diversity which will be responsible for the implementation of the Convention. By forming various partnerships with different ministries, civil society as well as the private sector, this Commission would aim to highlight the protection and the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. He also announced that as a sign of its commitment, Morocco would contribute 50,000 USD to the IFCD over the next four years, and that in order to celebrate the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of UNESCO and the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention, Morocco would organize an international gathering on the right to culture as well as a travelling exhibition of photography on cultural diversity.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary General of Culture of Morocco noting that the 2005 Convention is a reality also in Morocco and its contribution would help the IFCD.
10. Before starting the examination of items, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the duration of the current session had been reduced to three days and requested the Committee members for their cooperation. He then presented the salient points of the session's agenda and the decisions to be taken by the Committee. He also informed that simultaneous interpretations as well as all working documents are available in English and French, and that based on the environment-friendly policy of UNESCO and cost reduction measures, only one set of working documents is available for each member of the Committee, while all the documents are accessible on the Convention website via the Wifi connection available in the room. He then informed that the Bureau composed of Austria, the United Arab Emirates, Lithuania, Saint Lucia, Viet Nam, and Ms Laure Marie Rabarison as Rapporteur would meet at 9:30 a.m. on 10 December. He also announced that three meetings would be organized on the margins of the Committee: a meeting of points of contact of the Convention; a event by the French National Commission for UNESCO to launch Critical Glossary of the Cultural Diversity in the digital era (*Glossaire critique de la Diversité Culturelle à l'ère du numérique*); as well as an informal meeting by the Réseau international de juristes pour la diversité culturelle to discuss the organization of a Conference on the Convention and digital issues to be held in Mons, Belgium on 25 October 2015.

## ITEM 1 – ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

### Document CE/14/8.IGC/1REV

11. The **Chairperson** announced that the quorum had been reached in accordance with Rule 16.1 and invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the item.
12. The **Secretary of the Convention**, Ms Danielle Cliche, reported that the working documents were made available online both in English and French in the week of 12 November 2014 and that the working documents 12 on the digitization and 13 on the visibility of the Convention were prepared by Canada and France, and they include draft decisions respectively. She proceeded to introduce the additional seven information documents all available in English and French.
13. The **Chairperson** presented the provisional timetable and read out the specific items that would be examined each day. He invited the Committee to inform him of any issues that should be raised under item 17 on “Other Business” and also reminded the Committee to submit in advance amendments to any draft decisions both in English and French. He then invited questions from the members of the Committee.
14. As no question was raised by the Committee members, the **Chairperson** invited **Canada** as Observer to take the floor which informed that the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the First World War was planned for 10 a.m. on Thursday, 11 December 2014 and asked the Committee whether this event might coincide with the agenda item on the digitization. After seeing no comment on the remark of Canada, the Chairperson proceeded to adopt the agenda without amendment.

*Decision 8.IGC 1 was adopted without amendment.*

## ITEM 2 – APPROVAL OF THE LIST OF OBSERVERS

15. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretary of the Convention to read out the list of observers: 74 Parties non-members of the Committee, 13 Member States not Parties to the Convention, 1 IGO and 9 NGOs. The delegations of **Bangladesh, Gabon, Libya, China, Cuba, Guinea Bissau, Democratic Republic of Congo** and **Angola** requested to be included in the list of observers.

*Decision 7.IGC 2 was adopted.*

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

### Document CE/14/8.IGC/3

16. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the adoption of the detailed summary record of the seventh ordinary session of the Committee, held in 2013, and informed the Committee that no comments on the draft report had been received by the Secretariat. No objections were recorded.

*Decision 8.IGC 3 was adopted without amendment.*

## **ITEM 4 – SECRETARIAT’S REPORT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

### **Documents CE/14/8.IGC/4; CE/14/8.IGC/INF.7**

17. The Chairperson invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the report of the Secretariat.
18. The Secretary of the Convention recalled that at its third ordinary session, the Conference of Parties requested the Secretariat to provide, at each of its sessions, a report on its activities. The Secretariat presented its first Report of Activities to the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties covering the period 2011-2013. This was preceded by three interim reports presented to the fifth, sixth and seventh ordinary sessions of the Intergovernmental Committee. She informed that the Secretariat's report presented to this session of the Committee is an overview of the progress and challenges faced by the Secretariat in implementing the decisions of the Convention's governing bodies. Progress is measured against these decisions as well as those defined in the 37 C/5, and defined under MLA 2, Expected Result 7. Together, they define outputs to be reported on both in SISTER as well as through mechanisms such as the Secretariat's report. As indicated in the working document, outputs are identified as the implementation of the Convention at both the global and country level. Given that the majority of the documents submitted to this session of the Committee address the outputs of the Secretariat at the global level, she highlighted some activities implemented by the Secretariat at the country level during the year 2014. Among the performance indicators established to assess the effectiveness of the Secretariat's support to strengthen capacities at the country level are the number of Parties receiving technical assistance to take various initiatives. One is to design/revise/implement policies and/or measures; and second to prepare their quadrennial periodic reports; and third to prepare funding requests for international assistance. Given the necessity for capacity-building to be supported through knowledge management, additional outputs/deliverables have been identified related to the following three areas: one on raising awareness and knowledge of the Convention; two on technical development of an online platform to share knowledge on policy-making actions, tools and methodologies; and three on the production of training modules to support capacity-building activities. All of these outputs are in line with the document examined by the last ordinary session of the Committee on the design and future implementation of a global capacity-building strategy. She indicated that they also form the basis of a Complementary Additional Programme or CAP proposal that has been submitted to potential donors through the UNESCO partnering platform. The workplan to achieve these outputs has the advantage of being informed by the results of the UNESCO/EU funded project on the governance of culture that is coming to its conclusion. The project has led to the introduction of new policies and action plans, the creation of new agencies and governance models that involve new partnerships between the state and civil society stakeholders in the 13 countries where technical assistance was provided. She presented a few examples of physical outputs: one is a publication of a Creative Vietnam: a new framework and investment programme for the creative industries; in Niger a strategy on cultural entrepreneurship and three year action plan were developed and training provided for the agency responsible for implementing the strategy; Creative industry strategies were also produced in Mauritius and Seychelles with the latter creation of a new Agency for the Creative Industries. In order to promote the results of the project and to share these experiences with the wider development community, the Secretariat would organize a high level conference with the European Commission to take place in Brussels in early 2015 in the context of the 10th anniversary celebration of the Convention and the EU's Year of Development. She expressed her expectation that the project would continue, pending extra-budgetary support. She further noted that the Secretariat has begun its work to produce core tools for capacity-building focusing on three modules that contain approximately 10 learning units each. This work was supported through the UNESCO/EU project as well as the funds-in-trust provided by the Government of Spain. These modules

will be made available on the Convention platform later in 2015. Progress towards achieving the targets and benchmarks set for the 2014-2015 Biennium is on track. She stressed that the greatest challenge of the Secretariat remains a steady reduction of Regular Programme funds on the one hand; and the increase in the workload within the Sector and Section, the high expectations by the Convention governing bodies, and the international community of civil society stakeholders on the other. She noted that new developments and solutions proposed to this ongoing challenge figure throughout the documents to be examined by the Committee at this session. In conclusion, she informed that the Secretariat has created a space on the Convention website to enter events that the Convention stakeholders organize during the year 2015 to mark the 10th anniversary of the Convention, and that the information would be channelled to UNESCO's dynamic event calendar to give greater visibility to such activities. She also informed of a third survey will be issued immediately following this session to collect quantitative and qualitative feedback on the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization of statutory meetings. She noted that the results of the survey conducted at the end of the seventh ordinary session of the Committee are presented in information document 7 and that the cumulative results would be presented to the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties.

19. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and opened the floor for debate.
20. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, while expressing its appreciation towards the Secretariat's report for its high quality, requested the Secretariat to reintroduce in the next report the table presenting performance indicators, benchmarks and outputs of the expected result of the 2005 Convention, as was presented in the Secretariat's report for the seventh session of the Committee. Referring to the prioritization exercise by the Executive Board, which placed all Conventions as priority of the Culture Sector and noting that the 2005 Convention seemed to have received less budgets compared to other Conventions despite its equal status, the delegation inquired whether all the staff time of the Secretariat and the budget of the Convention are spent solely on the implementation of the Convention.
21. After thanking the Secretary of the Convention for its presentation of the report, the delegation of **Viet Nam** extended its thanks to UNESCO and its experts as well as the European Union for the technical assistance missions undertaken in Viet Nam. The delegation explained that the "Creative Viet Nam" strategy is a result of the work done by the UNESCO experts and a Viet Nameese think-tank called VICAS (Viet Nam's Institute for Culture and Arts Studies) and that the government has integrated the paper's proposal into Viet Nam's National Strategy for the Development of Viet Nameese Cultural Industries 2020 and with a Vision to 2030, which was recently submitted to the Prime Minister for his consideration and expected to be approved within the month of December 2014.
22. The delegation of **Austria** added its congratulations to the Secretariat for its high quality report and for its continued excellent work and expressed its satisfaction that the Secretariat's activities reflect the priority areas identified by the Committee and the IOS evaluation.
23. The **Secretary** of the Convention expressed her gratitude towards the comments on the quality of the work of the Secretariat. Responding to the question raised by the delegation of Saint Lucia, she stated that the Section for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions where the Convention Secretariat is housed is indeed responsible for not only the Convention but also other activities, such as the monitoring of the 1980 Recommendation on the Status of the Artist which reports to the Convention and Recommendation Commission of the Executive Board and to the General Conference and other extra-budgetary funded projects namely the Creative Cities Network and Third UNESCO World Forum on the Culture and Cultural Industries that took place in Florence in October 2014, as well as other institutional work all Convention Secretariats are responsible for fulfilling.

24. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** took the floor once again to request a clarification and was confirmed that the Convention Secretariat does work on activities that are not the work of the Convention.
25. The **Chairperson** invited observers to make comments. He reminded them that interventions from observers are to start with Parties non-members of the Committee, followed by Member States of UNESCO non Parties to the Convention, associate members and permanent observer mission to UNESCO, Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

#### [Observers]

26. The delegation of **China** congratulated the Secretariat for all of its activities. Recalling the decision of the Executive Board of UNESCO taken at its 195<sup>th</sup> session in October 2014 aiming to enhance the role of culture as a driver for sustainable development and the conference that took place in Florence with the support of the Italian Government, the delegation requested the Secretariat to make available on its website the Florence Declaration for the Cultural Industries.
27. After thanking the Secretariat for its report, the delegation of **Brazil** asked whether there are any activities that are not being implemented or any requests that are not honoured primarily because of the lack of resources, and wondered whether development agencies or the private sector could be approached for the mobilization of funding.
28. The delegation of **Thailand** informed that the government has been maintaining active interest in the progress and development of the Convention, although it has not yet made a decision to ratify it due to various domestic regulations and situations. It informed that Thailand has been taking actions to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions through a creative cities initiative of Thailand and its bilateral and international cooperation with other countries such as through ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) and ASEM (Asia-Europe Meeting) and is learning through observing the work of the Committee and also through regional consultations and exchanges organized by UNESCO Bangkok office in cooperation with the UNESCO Secretariat. It concluded that these experiences would provide positive inputs to the Thai government in the formulation of future policies regarding this Convention.
29. The representative of **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)**, while congratulating all the members and observers, expressed his regret that the seating arrangement places civil society at the back of the room and therefore makes it difficult to actively participate in the work of the Committee.
30. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the Committee undertook the priority agenda setting exercise at the last session of the Committee in December 2013, where the Committee reviewed all the activities that had been decided or asked for by the Conference of Parties for the Committee to address. It was underlined that the Secretariat would not be able to address all these priorities due to the current financial resource situation and that a decision needed to be made on which activities should be prioritized. She stated that the Committee gave priority to capacity-building and evidence-based policy-making. She continued that UNESCO/EU project providing technical assistance for policy-making has been one of those extrabudgetary resources that helped to deliver on the governing bodies' decisions.
31. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to display the draft decision on the screen and proposed to examine it paragraph by paragraph. He then adopted paragraph 1 as no objection was raised.



32. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to amend paragraph 2 by adding “with satisfaction” after “takes note”. Seeing no objection, the **Chairperson** adopted paragraph 2 as amended. He then adopted paragraphs 3 as there was no amendment proposed.
33. The delegation of **Austria** proposed a new paragraph before paragraph 4, which reads: “Brings to the attention of Member States for consideration during the debate on UNESCO’s budget for the next biennium that cultural conventions rely on certain incompressible costs”. The delegation explained that the rationale is to prevent situations where different activities get merged into the work of the Secretariat forcing it to spend its staff time on non-Convention work.
34. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, supported by **Uruguay**, suggested the following slightly modified proposal to the amendment by Austria: “Notes that the cultural conventions rely in part on incompressible costs and urges this to be taken into account during the preparation of the 38 C/5.” The delegation explained that while it is right to draw the attention of the Member States, it is the UNESCO Secretariat that first draws up the budget proposal, so this slight amendment is to ensure that the UNESCO Secretariat properly defines the incompressible costs and enables Member States to react properly. The delegation of **Austria** indicated its agreement with the modification proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The **Chairperson** read out the amendment. Seeing no objection, he adopted the new paragraph 4.
35. As no further amendment or objection was raised, the Chairperson adopted the last paragraph which became paragraph 5 and proceeded to adopt the draft decision 4 in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 4 was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 5A – INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICE’S REPORTS – REPORT ON THE AUDIT ON THE WORKING METHODS OF CULTURAL CONVENTIONS**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/5a**

36. The **Chairperson** moved on to the examination of the reports of the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) of UNESCO which contained a set of recommendations. He informed that the representatives of the IOS and the Bureau of Financial Management are present on the podium and available to clarify any points if necessary or respond to questions of the Committee. He invited the Secretary to introduce the document on the Audit on the working methods of cultural conventions.
37. The **Secretary of the Convention** began by recalling that at the last session, there was an exchange about this audit, and the Committee took a decision requesting the Secretariat to submit to this eighth ordinary session a report concerning the implications of adopting the IOS recommendations for the work of the Convention. This report contains three Annexes, namely Annex I the IOS audit; Annex II a table on the status and action taken for each Recommendation ; and Annex III a comparative table demonstrating the financial regulations of the Funds established in the 1972, 2003 and 2005 Conventions to facilitate the Committee’s discussions on the application of the UNESCO cost-recovery policy that is in response to the Committee’s request to propose such a policy and its application that is based on the same principles as the other culture conventions. In analysing the means of applying the IOS Recommendations as well as their impact on the Convention, the Committee, the Secretariat and the Culture Sector have, in many instances, already taken targeted actions to implement them. For example, in implementing Recommendation 1a to supplement the current funding structure, and Recommendation 1b to prioritize the Secretariat workload and align it with available

resources, the Committee at its seventh session provided the Secretariat with an indicative list of priorities to be undertaken in 2014 and 2015 in an effort to align it with available resources. The Secretariat has also been actively seeking extra-budgetary funds to be able to implement these priorities through the preparation of two CAP pipeline proposals that are available on UNESCO's new fundraising platform. She reported with gratitude on the historic agreement that UNESCO just signed with the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) which includes new extra-budgetary funding worth 2.5 million USD to support capacity building activities designed to facilitate evidenced-based policy-making at the country level that is crucial to monitor the policy impact of the Convention at the global level. While acknowledging achievements made in 2014 and certain actions that fully implement the IOS Recommendations to improve the working methods of the Culture Conventions, she emphasized that the ability of the Secretariat to effectively perform all the priorities that have been determined by the governing bodies remains hindered due to a lack of staff and resources, both regular and extra-budgetary. She further noted that this challenge is felt on a daily basis and that hinders the Secretariat to make long-term commitments, to respond to all the demands by Parties to provide the expertise needed, to support the efforts of the Parties to implement the Convention, to address issues deemed priority by the governing bodies around the implementation of Articles 16 and 21, as well as to further analyse transversal issues of relevance to the Convention such as digital technologies or status of the artist.

38. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee to provide the Secretariat with indications regarding the implementation of the recommendations formulated by the IOS as well as to propose solutions where there are essential needs for its implementation. He then invited the Committee to make comments.
39. The delegation of **Sweden** took the floor to comment on the new programme cooperation agreement between Sweden and UNESCO. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its qualitative and persistent work in creating the best possibilities to implement the Convention with the aim of contributing to the positive development of the world community and noted with satisfaction that this agreement signed between the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Director-General of UNESCO includes, for the first time, a project for the work of the 2005 Convention with a grant of 2.5 million USD. The delegation further elaborated that this cooperation agreement reflects the Swedish commitment to the work of UNESCO and the trust it gives to the Organization, as well as its trust to the effective progress of UNESCO's reform. The agreement also reflects the belief that it is through core programmes and through existing conventions that the work of UNESCO should be executed, as well as the expectations that synergies would be created between the Culture and Communication Sectors in the areas of media diversity, freedom of expression and the diversity of cultural expressions. The delegation highlighted that Sweden would like to emphasize the importance of pursuing work on fundamental freedoms namely the freedom of expression for artists and the freedom of speech as prerequisites for achieving diversity of cultural expressions through intersectorial collaboration within UNESCO. Sweden understands that the Convention is the one and only cultural policy international instrument at the global level and is thus a strategic, core goal for Sweden and for UNESCO. The Swedish financial support for the 2005 Convention targets two already prioritized components decided by the Committee in 2013: namely the capacity-building programme and the preparations of two Global Monitoring Reports including the development of knowledge sharing management tools. Referring to the IFCD, the delegation expressed its regret that there are less donors contributing as compared to the previous year and encouraged Member States to find a way to support the Convention. The delegation ended by thanking the Secretary of the Convention for her open and trustful communication with all Swedish representatives including Sida, the Swedish Delegation in Paris, the Swedish Arts Council and the Swedish Ministry of Culture. The delegation thanked the collective members of the

Committee and observers for continuing the essential dialogue on the protection and the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions and encouraged them to also support the work to implement the Convention.

40. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation of Sweden for its significant contribution and invited other members to follow suit to support the Convention.
41. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** acknowledged that both reports 5a and 5b are thought-provoking and interesting documents. Recalling the Committee's debate on the previous item (item 4, Secretariat's report on its activities) through which the Committee learned that the staff of the Secretariat does work on non-Convention related activities of the Culture Sector, and also referring to paragraph 7 of the document 5a where the Secretariat mentioned its ongoing efforts for extrabudgetary funds and in-kind contributions to support the core priority activities and staffing assistance, the delegation asserted its position that UNESCO must first ensure that the staff of the Secretariat works exclusively on the Convention before requesting for further support. Citing an example of the Creative Cities Network Programme, which was a UK-led initiative conceived to be implemented entirely by extrabudgetary funding without impacting UNESCO's staff time, the delegation emphasized that extrabudgetary activities must remain self-sustainable and that the staff of the Secretariat must be able to devote all its time for the implementation of the Convention. The delegation also referred to paragraph 12 of the document 5a and stated that the cost of ordinary expenses of the Secretariat such as translation and the cost of meetings should be considered as incompressible costs within the regular budget of UNESCO. It recalled the position of the Executive Board of UNESCO which clearly rejected the Director-General's proposal that the Parties to the Conventions cover the running cost of the Conventions. It further explained that the Executive Board took that position because it considered that the Convention is a global activity and that its implementation should be considered as incompressible costs and hence covered by the regular budget of UNESCO. As regards the application of UNESCO's cost recovery policy for cultural conventions, the delegation noted its concern about paragraph 9 of the draft decision and expressed its uneasiness about accepting the application of the cost recovery policy while allocating a separate fund for the IFCD fundraising. It requested the Secretariat to clarify the application of UNESCO's cost recovery policy. While welcoming the Swedish extrabudgetary contribution, it expressed the importance of considering each country's national context when reflecting on ways in which UNESCO Member States support the Organization, stressing that the British Government would consider contributing to UNESCO only if UNESCO ensures that its regular budget is properly spent on priority activities.
42. Concurring with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the delegation of **Saint Lucia**, supported by the **delegation of Honduras**, expressed the uneasiness about paragraph 7 which reads, "The Secretariat is actively searching for extra-budgetary funds and in-kind contributions to contribute to the core priority activities defined by the Committee at its seventh ordinary session, which takes a dedicated amount of staff-time". Referring to paragraph 12, the delegation of Saint Lucia further expressed that the IFCD should not cover the cost of translation and other running cost, because it is not in the spirit of the Fund to pay for the operation of the Convention. It also expressed a concern towards an IOS recommendation about a common fundraising strategy for all Conventions, stating that more visible conventions may be more successful in mobilizing extrabudgetary funding at the detriment of the 2005 Convention. The delegation indicated its willingness to see such a common fundraising strategy, although it is somewhat doubtful about the potential effectiveness of such a strategy.

43. After thanking Sweden for its contributions, the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** seconded the reservation expressed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Saint Lucia about the IOS recommendation 4 on a common fundraising strategy. It asked the Secretariat to explain how this recommendation would be implemented, especially considering that the 2005 Convention has its special IFCD fundraising strategy. It wondered how such a common fundraising strategy could be coordinated between different conventions, given that other Conventions have obligatory contributions. Referring to Tables 2 and 3 of the document regarding the situations of the conventions and the financial situations, it pointed out that the tables should include the amount of 45,000 USD that the 2005 Convention pays for the panel of experts from the IFCD which is a voluntary fund considering that they indicate how much the 1972 and 2003 Conventions pay for their respective advisory services.
44. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the questions raised concerned the issue of priority and how the Secretariat could meet them with insufficient amount of staff and funds. She stressed that while Sweden's generous contributions would help to address this particular issue, not all of the activities requested by the governing bodies of the Convention could be implemented with the current level of human and financial resources available to the Secretariat. Regarding the specific question on the relationship between paragraphs 7 and 12 of the document dealing with the issue of cost recovery, she recalled the lengthy discussion of the Committee at its seventh session in December 2013 about what is cost recovery and what it covers and the decision of the Committee to request the Director-General to propose to this current session an approach which is in synergy with the other culture conventions. She emphasized that the cost recovery in the context of this document refers only to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and not to the Convention Secretariat as a whole. She explained that the other cultural convention's governing bodies have recently adopted a cost recovery policy on their funds to be used for the management of those funds, and not for any other purposes, including translation, and such cost recovery would then be reported within the financial reports related to those funds at each of their sessions. With regard to the management of extrabudgetary projects, she confirmed that while full time personnel are indeed financed by the projects themselves to work on extrabudgetary projects such as the Creative Cities Network, which is in line with the practice and the regulations of UNESCO, the regular programme staff also provides time advising, supervising, directing and providing inputs to the directions of such programmes. Through the involvement of the regular programme staff, the Secretariat could apply a cost recovery policy to those extrabudgetary programmes. She concluded by reiterating that the cost recovery policy application proposed in the current document refers only to the International Fund for Cultural Diversity.
45. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain** once again requested a clarification: if the regular programme staff supervises the project appointments, is the time of the regular programme staff spent on those extrabudgetary projects reimbursed to the Convention Secretariat?
46. While agreeing with the question raised by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed a concern that if the Secretariat staff does have time to supervise, advise and monitor other activities that are not the priorities identified by the governing bodies, then why does the Secretariat require further money and extra staff to handle the priorities of the Convention?
47. The delegation of **Austria** expressed its understanding that if the Committee agrees to apply UNESCO's cost recovery policy to the IFCD as recommended by the IOS, it would help the Secretariat as the staff time spent on the management of the IFCD would be returned to them which would in turn allow the Secretariat to have more resources for the

core priority activities. Considering the limited amount available in the Fund, the delegation expressed the need for a realistic cost recovery policy for the whole of UNESCO in the first instance, and the need to examine the programme support cost in the second instance.

48. The representative of the **Director-General**, Mr Kishore Rao, further complemented the information provided by the Secretary of the Convention, informing that while extrabudgetary projects are implemented by both professional and administrative staff recruited directly by the extrabudgetary funding, there is a supervisory task assumed by the regular programme staff. He explained that this is the case for all the cultural conventions and if UNESCO does not do so, there would be very little resources to implement the priorities of the Committee. He further informed that the extrabudgetary resources are required to implement core priorities because the scale of activities that can be implemented, for instance, the capacity-building activities, cannot be implemented with the small amount of regular programme budget that is allocated for the activities. UNESCO needs to supplement the regular budget with extrabudgetary resources, and that is the reason why regular programme staff needs to supervise the extrabudgetary project staff. When the cost recovery policy is applied, the cost reimbursed goes directly to the specific unit that used its regular programme staff time to supervise such projects. Referring to the issue raised by the delegation of Austria concerning the limited amount of funds available within the IFCD and how the cost recovery policy would impact the already limited resources of the Fund, the representative of Director-General acknowledged the concern but recalled that the cost recovery that UNESCO could apply for the Fund is indeed low, and it would not be as though the substantial amount of these statutory funds would be used for the cost recovery purposes. He further noted that although rethinking the programme support cost is something that would need to be addressed by the Bureau of the Financial Management, the Chief Financial Officer did provide explanation at the seventh session of the Committee in December 2013 about what the programme support cost covers, and it was noted then that the programme support cost does not cover the full services that the central services provide for various administrative purposes. Concerning the common fundraising strategy, he acknowledged that each of the Conventions does have its own fundraising strategy that reflects attractions that different donors hold for these conventions both bilateral as well as the private sector donors. The recommendation of the IOS is to have a common Convention services unit which was established in July 2014 following the reorganization of the Culture Sector, and this unit handles three main tasks: the logistical management and organization of the governing bodies' meetings including the coordination of the translation of the documents; communication and outreach function including the publications; and finally the fundraising and partnership development activities. When this common services unit goes out prospecting for new donors and new partners, it presents the overall requirements of the cultural conventions and not one particular convention, and depending on the alignment between the needs of the secretariat and those of the potential donor and the interest expressed, UNESCO would refer to specific fundraising strategies developed for each convention. This means that the overall common fundraising strategy for all conventions is at the generic level to present to potential donors what the needs of the Conventions are. Once the interest is expressed, UNESCO moves to specific fundraising and fund mobilization strategy through specific projects and proposals.
49. The representative of the **Bureau of Financial Management** informed that the Executive Board at its last session in October 2014 discussed the question of the programme support cost, and one of the adopted decisions requested the UNESCO Secretariat to present at its 197<sup>th</sup> session of the Executive Board a proposal on the programme support cost. This proposal would address the overall cost recovery policy including the current rate of the programme support cost, aligning it to the practice of other UN agencies and clearly identifying what indirect and direct costs could be recovered from the programme support cost and other projects. He further informed that the Executive Board at the same

decision also requested the Director-General to move from the current 1% of staff time to 2% of staff time by its 199<sup>th</sup> session, which means that the UNESCO Secretariat should generate about 6.8 million USD per biennium.

50. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded to the question about how much is returned to the Section for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions based on the staff time advising, supervising and giving directions for the Creative Cities Network Programme. She informed that this question is difficult to answer at the moment because the Creative Cities Programme has become the part of the management of the Section only recently, and that the staff who spends time on the Creative Cities Programme would need to fill in a time sheet to declare the time spent on the programme and the time sheet processed. She informed that she would be able to provide more precise information on how much is actually reimbursed only next year.
51. The **Chairperson** turned to the delegations of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Austria and requested them whether the responses provided satisfied their questions. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** indicated that while the responses were satisfactory, it would propose amendments when the Committee moves to the draft decision on this item.
52. The **Chairperson** invited observers to make comments.

#### [Observers]

53. The delegation of **Denmark** thanked the Secretariat for the report and particularly highlighted the recommendation to prioritize the workload of the Secretariat in light of the recent discussion, since the workload prioritization is in line with the resolution of the Conference of Parties held in 2013 which called upon the Committee to establish a workplan. The delegation welcomed the priority setting exercise and invited the Committee to formulate the decision that encourages this type of exercise in the future.
54. Seeing no other comments from other observers, the **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the draft decision 8.IGC/5a paragraph by paragraph, which was put on the screen. He informed that amendments have been submitted. The **Chairperson** read out paragraphs 1 and 2 and adopted it as no objection was indicated.
55. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed to add to paragraph 3 “the Committee welcomes most of its conclusions and recommendations” of the IOS, indicating that some recommendations do not apply to the 2005 Convention and other recommendations such as a common fundraising strategy for all Conventions have not been examined by the Committee as it is not yet available. The delegation explained that the amendment reflects more justly the reality as it stands. The **Chairperson** adopted paragraph 3 as amended by Saint Lucia.
56. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** proposed a new paragraph after paragraph 3, which read “Recalls the setting of priorities by the Executive Board, the General Conference and the Committee”. The **Chairperson** adopted it and moved to read the next paragraph.
57. On paragraph 5 (original paragraph 4), the representative of the **Director-General** pointed out the incoherency between the English and French version as the paragraph in English did not contain the word “with satisfaction”. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, supported by **Madagascar and Uruguay**, expressed that while it is not “dissatisfied”, the Committee does not yet know whether the common services unit actually helped save the money or how well the unit is working. The delegation stated that it is too early to “welcome with satisfaction”. The **Chairperson** read out the amended paragraph and adopted it by deleting the word, “with satisfaction” in

French. The **Chairperson** read out paragraph 6 (original paragraph 5) and adopted it as there was no objection by the Committee.

58. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its uneasiness about the last part of paragraph 7 (original paragraph 6) since it considers it difficult to preclude that all the Committee sessions would be for three days only. The duration of the Committee session would inevitably depend on the agenda. The delegation mentioned that while the Committee of the 2005 Convention has been exemplary as it always had the shortest meetings and it hopes that this good practice would continue, it considered that the Committee should have the liberty to decide on the number of days depending on the agenda for the next session. It thus proposed to delete the second part of the paragraph, namely, “instead of 5, and further considers that...”
59. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed that the paragraph should stop after “instead of 5” in order to indicate that the Committee decided to shorten the duration of the Committee session from 5 to 3.
60. The delegation of **Sweden** proposed that since it is better to shorten the duration of the Committee, it could add, “and recommends future ordinary sessions of the Committee to be held in correspondence to Recommendation 1, paragraph c of the IOS audit”.
61. The delegation of **Guinea** indicated its partial agreement with the proposal by Sweden and counter-proposed the second part to add, “and recommends that the ordinary session of the Committee could vary according to the agenda”.
62. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed that the decision should not make a reference to Recommendation 1, paragraph c of the IOS audit, because it talks not only about the frequency of the meetings of the Committee but also the synchronization of Conference of Parties which is not something the Committee could decide on its own. It supported the amendment by Guinea.
63. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** questioned whether the purpose of this paragraph is to congratulate the Committee for having been able to reduce the duration of the current session from 5 to 3, and if it is the case, the paragraph should stop there, but if the purpose of the paragraph is to determine the duration of the future meetings, it is an issue to be taken up when the Committee decides on its agenda of the next meeting. It informed the Committee that Recommendation 1, paragraph c talks about reducing not only the duration of the Committee but also the agenda items. The delegation concluded by recommending the paragraph to end after “instead of 5”, and proposed to take up the issue of the duration of the committee session when it discussed the agenda item of the next session. The **Chairperson** read once again the paragraph 7 as amended by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and adopted it. He then read the paragraph 8 (original paragraph 7). Seeing no objection, it was adopted without amendment.
64. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** then proposed a new paragraph which reads, “Reiterates its understanding that resources and staff allocated to priority activities will remain exclusively focused on those priorities”. It explained that considering the limited resources available, the Committee should ensure that the limited resources will be used exclusively on priority activities.
65. The delegation of **Tunisia** requested the opinion of the Secretariat about the applicability of this paragraph, especially with regard to the personnel and the word, “exclusively”.
66. The representative of the **Director-General** stated that from the perspective of the Secretariat, the proposed paragraph is fine because the UNESCO Secretariat is charged with the implementation of the core activities, and any resources the Secretariat generates including extrabudgetary resources are to be used for implementing such core activities.

The **Chairperson** read once again the new paragraph as proposed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and adopted it.

67. The delegation of **Sweden**, referring to the need for making priorities in the Secretariat's work, proposed to add a new paragraph which reads, "notes with appreciation the priority exercise done at the seventh session and welcomes a similar exercise at the Conference of Parties, if deemed necessary".
68. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed its concern about the new paragraph because the priority exercise is already included in the earlier paragraph and hence redundant and also because the Committee cannot "welcome a similar exercise..." as it is something that does not exist and also questioned who would decide "deemed necessary".
69. The delegation of **Austria** agreed with the position of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by referring to the decision of the Conference of Parties which requested the Committee to set up a workplan and align the resources and activities as well as the need to prioritize these. The Committee would report to the Conference of Parties on the work and the debates of the Committee and on the priorities, and the Conference of Parties would decide what would be the activities of the Committee. The delegation considered that this new paragraph is unnecessary since the draft decision already recalls the priority exercise in the new paragraph 4.
70. The delegation of **Sweden** insisted that it would like to invite the Conference of Parties to continue the prioritization exercise and proposed to change the word "welcome" to "invite". On the question of wording, the **Legal Advisor** proposed to use the term "recommend" instead of "invite".
71. Responding to the question by the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** about the necessity to have a prioritization exercise by the Conference of Parties, the delegation of **Sweden**, supported by **Saint Lucia**, emphasized that the point is to ensure prioritization exercises on an ongoing basis because the problem of the work of the Convention Secretariat is that there are too many things that are prioritized. Such an exercise may not be necessarily done by the Conference of Parties and could be done by the Committee at its next session, but the important point is to note the necessity of continuing the prioritization exercises. It concluded by proposing an amended paragraph, "welcomes a similar exercise in the future". The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** also expressed that the paragraph as amended by Sweden is acceptable.
72. The delegation of **Austria** proposed to specify by including the wording, "for its next workplan", because the prioritization exercise is about deciding on the workplan of the Committee, which was accepted by the delegation of **Sweden**.
73. The delegation of **Australia** proposed the wording "prioritizing exercise," while the delegation of **Honduras** pointed out the discrepancy between the French and English texts. In order to harmonize the two language versions, the **Chairperson** read out the paragraph in French and requested the English version to be aligned to it.
74. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 11 (original paragraph 7) and adopted it as no objection was indicated.
75. Regarding paragraph 12 (original paragraph 9), the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** proposed to put the paragraph in a square bracket and to suspend its consideration for adoption until the Committee has dealt with the document on the IFCD fundraising strategy and the management of the IFCD, because the delegation deemed it premature to adopt this paragraph prior to the examination of the IFCD issues. In response to a question by the **Chairperson** who asked the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland whether it would be ready to adopt this



paragraph without amendment once the Committee has adopted decisions on the IFCD related matters, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** indicated that while it would probably be ready to adopt it as it is, it nonetheless considers it premature to take a position because there are other decisions on the IFCD fundraising and the management of the IFCD that pertain also to the question of the cost recovery policy. Since no objection was raised, the **Chairperson** decided to put this particular paragraph in a square bracket and moved on to the last paragraph.

76. The **Legal Advisor** recommended that the Committee adopts the entire decision only after it adopts the paragraph 12 which is currently put in a bracket. The **Chairperson** consequently decided to keep paragraph 12 in a square bracket and to adopt the decision in its entirety only after the Committee has examined the IFCD-related items.
77. Following the request by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 12 after the Committee adopted decisions on the IFCD-related items whose adoption was postponed until the adoption of decision 10. He read the paragraph in question and adopted it as no objection was raised. He then adopted the entire Decision 5a as amended.

*Decision 8.IGC 5a was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 5B – INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICE’S REPORTS – REPORT ON THE “EVALUATION OF UNESCO’S STANDARD-SETTING WORK OF THE CULTURE SECTOR, PART IV – 2005 CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/5b**

78. The **Chairperson** continued to the next item about the “Report on the “Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard-setting Work of the Culture Sector, Part IV – 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions”. He invited the Director of the IOS to present the report.
79. The **Director of the IOS** reported that this report is part of four evaluations that IOS produced over the years on the UNESCO’s standard-setting work of culture. The first three parts of the evaluations have already been considered by the respective Intergovernmental Committees. There was also a paper on cross-cutting issues that was presented to UNESCO’s Executive Board in spring 2014. The present evaluation is the last of the series to be discussed by this Committee. The purpose of the present report was two-fold: first, to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the standard-setting work related to the 2005 Convention, i.e., what difference did it make? And the second is to inform future work of Secretariat, the Committee, the Parties and UNESCO Member States. Within these purposes, the report focuses more narrowly on the extent to which Parties have integrated the provisions of the 2005 Convention in their legislation, policies, and strategies. It includes 10 recommendations that are directed at the Secretariat and/or at Parties. The present Committee document contains in its annex a status report by the Secretariat on the implementation of the recommendations that are addressed to them. She then highlighted the following five key issues to be considered by the Committee: 1) how to ensure the sharing of good practices among Parties, intergovernmental organizations and civil society organizations on the design and implementation of cultural policies and legislation; integration of culture in sustainable development strategies; strengthening the cultural dimension in international development policies, etc.; 2) the impact of Articles 16 (Preferential Treatment for Developing Countries) and 21 (International consultation and coordination), particularly as regards the international trade agenda; 3) the encouragement of Parties to consider the implications of the 2005 Convention as regards cultural governance, including coordination within national

governments; relationships between different tiers of government (regions, cities etc.); public-private dialogue; participation of civil society and to provide technical assistance focusing on this area; 4) paying particular attention to the conditions (strengths / weaknesses) of cultural industries and to the role of civil society actors in Parties, and considering the adoption of long-term strategies to address the identified needs; and finally, 5) to ensure the development of an overall results framework for the Convention (including SMART objectives, indicators and benchmarks). This is also in line with recommendations for other UNESCO Culture Conventions. She commended the Convention Secretariat's efforts to take the IOS recommendations forward as described in the Secretariat's Status Report in Annex II and acknowledged that the present report has already informed other agenda items to be discussed by the Committee, for instance item 7.b. on the revision of the Operational Guidelines, and item 11 on the Articles 16 and 21 of the Convention. She noted that additional resources would be required for the Secretariat to further advance the implementation of some of the recommendations, such as those related to sharing good practices, capacity-building and the development of an overall results framework for the Convention. She concluded by thanking the Committee for the time it dedicated for the IOS reports and hoped that the Committee would find this one useful.

80. **The Chairperson** reminded that the Committee must provide the Secretariat with the indications as to how to implement the recommendations made by the IOS as well as propose solutions where there are essential needs for such implementation. He then invited the Committee to make comments.
81. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** thanked the IOS and noted that one of the difficulties of UNESCO in recent years is to show evidence that the cultural conventions have an impact. In its opinion, this report begins to make it clear how a convention has an impact, how long it takes to have an impact and why it has an impact. Noting the usefulness of having evidence, the delegation expressed its hope that this report would not be the last and that the IOS would be able to produce another report in a few years' time. This report is particularly useful for governments such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland which may tend to rely on the EU or OECD for reporting. The delegation felt that the report reminded Parties that having a global platform is useful for negotiating on these issues. The delegation invited the Committee to regard the report as a story on "the Convention in action" and urged the Committee to continue such an exercise. The delegation also questioned the status of various training modules developed by the Secretariat and suggested that the training modules on certain articles such as Articles 16 and 21 be tested on the Committee members for their own learning.
82. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the IOS for its excellent report which it considered as eye opener and seconded the opinion expressed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the training modules. Referring to paragraph 10 which reads "the ability of cultural aspects to influence trade negotiations remains indeed one of the touchstones on which the Convention's ultimate effectiveness will be judged", the delegation expressed its full agreement with the stated paragraph. It encouraged the Secretariat to develop a training module for Articles 16 and 21.
83. The delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the Secretariat for its successful report which made clear the relationship between the visibility of this Convention and others and the value of this Convention, and highlighted the importance of all the partners such as National Commissions for UNESCO, Field Offices, the private sector, civil society as well as other partners, because all these partners contribute to the implementation of the Convention.
84. The delegation of **Switzerland** concurred with the comments made by previous speakers regarding the excellent report which it finds relevant not only from the perspective of Articles 16 and 21 but also for the whole host of different dimensions including on the role

of civil society, the importance of the freedom of expression, the role of culture in the post 2015 environment – all these issues for which the Convention is useful not only in economic and financial terms or the digitalization but also from the sociological point of view and the development and protection of culture and the role played by culture within respective countries. The delegation congratulated the holistic approach taken by the report which embraces so many different complementary spheres. It concluded by hoping that the Committee would not limit its attention to only the few aspects but rather pay due attention to all these various problematics being covered by the Convention

85. The delegation of **Honduras** also congratulated the Secretariat for this concise and valuable report and agreed with the proposal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Saint Lucia regarding the preparation of training modules on Articles 16 and 21.
86. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention before opening the floor to observers.
87. The **Secretary of the Convention**, referring to the question raised about the training modules, informed that the modules are currently under preparation which explains why the Committee had not seen them and that they would be available in 2015. She reported that those experts who are elaborating the training modules are those who undertook the technical assistance missions within the context of the UNESCO/EU funded project on the governance of culture in order to ensure that these modules would be informed not only by theory but also by practice. She indicated that the modules are expected to be finalized by the end of 2015 before the next session of the Committee and would be pleased to test them on the Committee members whether through an information session or a workshop, considering that capacity-building and raising awareness about different aspects of the Convention among the Committee members and Parties to the Convention are among the core responsibility of the Secretariat.
88. The **Chairperson** invited observers to take the floor for comments.

#### **[Observers]**

89. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Secretary of the Convention for her excellent performance over the last few months which resulted in the high quality report in which the Egyptian Ministry of Culture and civil society were implicated.
90. The Secretary General of **the International Music Council (IMC)** expressed that the IOS report offers a wide range of useful information and raises the questions that need to be addressed by all Parties to the Convention. She thanked the director of the IOS for pointing out the five key areas for future action that are identical to the key areas of the IMC. She found that the report reflects a number of good examples but also shows a heterogeneous picture of the implementation at the national level, which leads one to think that the Convention is considered as a catalogue from which the Parties find issues they would like to work on, while giving less attention to others. Particularly interesting is the finding of the report that the Convention has so far impacted only some policy areas and only some regions as reflected in paragraph 102. In order to achieve strong and sustainable impact, she stressed that no aspect of the Convention should be left unattended. One aspect of great concern to the IMS is the fact that the Convention's impact is less visible so far when it comes to the evolution of coordination mechanisms and the governance modules. For example, she referred to paragraph 103 which reads, "even though a number of excellent examples of cross-ministerial coordination and participation by local and regional authorities and civil society actors have been identified, further progress in this field is still necessary. Again, awareness-raising and the clarification of the implications of the 2005 Convention, the strengthening of cultural policy departments vis-à-vis other ministries and the empowerment of civil society actors in many countries arise as necessary preconditions for further developments in this field".

91. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)**, while thanking the IOS for its excellent report which led the Committee to have fruitful discussions, expressed the need to move beyond a mere declaration of intention and to discuss concrete ways and means for cooperation. Using a new kitchen as an analogy, he further added that it is not enough to show a picture of a new kitchen explaining how it is going to be furnished and how much it would cost to do so, but must discuss how others could concretely contribute to its furnishing.
92. The **Director of the IOS** thanked the Committee and the observers for all the comments and indicated its delight that they found the report useful and would be interested to hear more in the future. She noted that for an effective evaluation, receiving such user feedback is an important performance indicator because the IOS would like its work used. Informing of the four-year workplan cycle of the IOS, the Director noted the interest of the Committee for continuing this story line because she recognizes that it is important to show how the Convention is evolving. She expressed her thanks to the Government of Flanders for having provided funds through its trust fund on culture that enabled the IOS to do the series of evaluations and invited others to support such work.
93. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine the draft decision 8.IGC 5b and requested the decision to be shown on the screen. He read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph and adopted them one by one. As no objection was raised, the Chairperson declared the adoption of the draft decision in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 5b was adopted without amendment.*

## **ITEM 6 – REPORT CONCERNING THE AUDIT OF THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDENT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES, AND ENTITIES**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/6**

94. The **Chairperson** moved to item 6 on the audit of the governance of UNESCO and Dependent Funds, Programmes and Entities. He noted that he was personally implicated in this process in his capacity as the President of the eighth ordinary session of the Committee. He invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the document.
95. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that in 37 C/Resolution 96, the General Conference decided that a “strategic performance review of all governing bodies shall be carried out with a view to formulating governance reform and cost-saving measures as appropriate”. As one part of that strategic performance review, the General Conference invited “all governing bodies, intergovernmental programmes, committees and organs established by conventions (...) to perform a self-assessment covering the overall relevance of their work in relation to their specific terms of reference as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of their meetings”. The General Conference asked that a common framework be distributed among all entities concerned to facilitate the self-assessment. She informed that the External Auditor is to present the outcomes of the self-assessments in an interim report to the Executive Board at its 196th session, and in a full report to the 197th session of the Executive Board, with a view to recommending relevant follow-up measures for consideration by the General Conference at its 38th session. She recalled that in its seventh ordinary session in Decision 7.IGC 13, paragraph 4, the Committee invited all Parties to participate in the self-assessment exercise and requested the Secretariat to facilitate this work. On 4 April 2014, the External Auditor sent to the heads of all governing bodies of UNESCO or of a dependent fund, intergovernmental programme or entity two questionnaires composing the self-assessment framework, together with the terms of reference of the audit. These were to be completed by 2 September 2014. In providing such technical assistance, the Secretariat met several times with the Chairperson of the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties, and

with the Chairperson of the eighth ordinary session of the Committee, and submitted any factual or technical information they requested to complete their work.

96. The **Chairperson**, in his capacity as the Chair of the eighth ordinary session of the Committee then added supplementary information, informing the Committee that he convened a bureau meeting to review the questionnaires in view of finalizing them. On the basis of the technical information submitted by the Secretariat, the two questionnaires were completed and submitted to the Committee members for comments on 12 September 2014. He further noted that the Ambassador of Oman in her capacity as the Chairperson of the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties which was also involved in this exercise is present at this Committee session and invited her to provide comments.
97. The **Ambassador of Oman** noted that within the framework of the audit of UNESCO's governing bodies and in her capacity as the Chairperson of the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties of the Convention, she was asked to fill in and submit self-assessment questionnaires concerning the Conference of Parties of the Convention. Regarding the process of completing the questionnaires, she collaborated closely with the Secretariat of the Convention to fill in the factual and technical parts of the questionnaires, in particular the questionnaire number one. As for the questionnaire number two, it was prepared in close cooperation with the Conference of Parties Bureau members, and it was then sent to the Parties for their feedback and comments which were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaires. She noted that it was challenging to submit the questionnaires on time as they were meant to be completed over the summer 2014 and the bureau was only able to meet on 5 September 2014. The bureau members were Brazil, Burkina Faso, France, Serbia and Viet Nam. Regarding the major findings of this exercise, she reported that the relevance of the existing institutional model was confirmed with the Conference of Parties as the plenary and supreme body of the Convention; the Conference functions well and increasingly time effective as the last session of the Conference of Parties finished earlier than expected. In terms of resource allocation, a clear need for strengthening the Secretariat of the Convention in terms of human and financial resources was expressed. As the lack of resources can sometimes make the implementation of the resolutions difficult, the comments expressed the need to implement an effective fundraising strategy for the IFCD, as well as enhanced visibility of the Convention. No specific issues of transparency or conflict of interest were raised, although there has never been a reason to adopt a strategy of integrity as such a strategy could strengthen the Conference of Parties.
98. The **Chairperson** thanked the Ambassador of Oman for her intervention and invited the Committee to make comments.
99. The delegation of **Sweden** expressed its thanks to both the Chairperson of the Committee and the Chairperson of the fourth Conference of Parties for undertaking the existing self-assessments.
100. The **Chairperson**, seeing no request for comments by observers, requested the Secretariat to project the draft decision on the screen. He then read the draft decision and adopted it paragraph by paragraph. Considering there was no objection raised, he adopted the decision as a whole.

*Decision 8.IGC 6 was adopted without amendment.*

## ITEM 7A – QUADRENNIAL PERIODIC REPORTING: NEW REPORTS AND ANALYTICAL SUMMARY

### Documents CE/14/8.IGC/7a, CE/14/8.IGC/INF.4, CE/14/8.IGC/INF.5 and CE/14/8.IGC/INF.6

101. The **Chairperson** introduced the item on periodic reports that are to be examined by the committee along with the analytical summary of the Secretariat as well as information documents 4, 5 and 6. He invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the document.
102. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that document 7a contains a review of reports from the following countries: Burundi, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Kenya, Malawi and Ukraine. These reports were made available to Parties on a password-protected website in November 2014, and would be made public after this Committee session in accordance with Resolution 10 of the third ordinary session of the Conference of Parties. The Executive Summaries of these reports, produced by the countries themselves, are provided in Annex II of document 7a. Tajikistan and the Republic of Korea submitted their reports in October 2014, which was too late for the Secretariat to integrate them in its review and thus would be analysed in the next round. After informing that the total number of the reports received to date by the Secretariat is 73, she then requested the Secretariat to project the list of the reports to be submitted in 2015 on the screens, including Parties scheduled to submit their reports in 2015, and those whose reports are overdue. Taking all the reports that the Secretariat has received so far, she noted the following observations:
- The majority of the reports have been submitted by European countries (38 reports from Groups I and II, including the European Union's report). 91% of countries in Group I have submitted their reports.
  - Half of the countries from the Latin American and the Caribbean region have submitted their reports (12 in total), noting that the majority of the Caribbean countries have not yet submitted their reports.
  - The Asia-Pacific region submitted six reports – a little over half of the expected number.
  - Nine reports were received from Africa, corresponding to only one third of the reports that were expected from that region.
  - The Arab States submitted six reports, representing over two-thirds of the expected number.

She further noted that the analysis of reports submitted demonstrate lines of continuity in the direction the Convention's implementation is taking at the country level, in particular, regarding the adoption of new measures to support creativity, to expand domestic markets and to strengthen cultural production and distribution capacities. New policies and programmes around the role of culture in the pursuit of national growth and development are being developed, coupled with the establishment of new coordination mechanisms and governance models. In addition to the analysis conducted by the Secretariat, she informed that the Secretariat commissioned three additional transversal studies from recognized international experts in response to the decisions of the Committee (7.IGC 5 and 7.IGC13) on measures Parties have taken related to digital technologies and public service broadcasting as well as to assess the role of civil society in the implementation of the Convention. The Secretariat also commissioned a separate analysis on measures taken to promote gender equality. The findings were integrated into UNESCO's newly published report on gender and culture. Finally, a transversal study on the status of artists was presented to the Committee at its last session in working document 5, Annex IV. She informed that the collection of good practices from all these commissioned studies have been identified and are made available on the Convention platform. She then commented

on the transversal analyses, beginning with the assessment of the impact of digital technologies. The study on the impact of the digital technologies presented in information document 5 was commissioned to an expert from Argentina who analysed all of the periodic reports and additional sources. The expert concluded that Parties have taken a wide range of measures to promote the diversity of cultural expressions in the digital era. For example, measures to support digital literacy programmes as a means to promote equitable access to culture or measures to promote digital creativity such as the modernisation of certain sectors of publishing, music or cinema as well as to support new forms of electronic art. The expert also noted the unique role of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity providing support to projects that involve digital training and technology transfer as well as multimedia arts production. In conclusion, the expert identified issues of relevance for the future implementation of the Convention for all Parties ranging from the emergence of new giants in cultural markets to the rapid progress of big data and social media to the increasing dynamism of the digital south that necessitates a rethinking of cooperation strategies. Regarding the transversal analysis on media diversity and public service broadcasting presented in information document 6, the expert found that over one third of the Parties reported specific measures taken in the last 3 to 5 years in the field of independent production, public service media and audiovisual-connected policy and regulatory measures. This points to the relevance of media diversity as an objective when implementing the Convention and illustrates the political will to promote the diversity of cultural expressions through the production of high-quality media content. The analysis identified a number of trends in the types of measures reported on by Parties including those that address digitisation of content and media convergence. With the rise of digital networks and online platforms, the analysis noted new types of media actors of relevance to the implementation of the Convention such as citizen journalists and amateur film producers that may be also considered as key stakeholders. The expert concluded that media diversity cannot be enhanced where media freedom and related basic fundamental freedoms are absent, highlighting the importance of the Convention in the context of National Freedom of Information laws. Referring to information document 4, the civil society assessment provides quantitative evidence of the correlation between the strength of civil society generally and its involvement in the implementation of the Convention in particular. Ways and means of creating, maintaining or improving and relevance to this meaningful dialogue between civil society and public authorities are required to overcome the fragile networking between them. In order to overcome some of the challenges related to periodic reporting, a series of recommendations were put forward, including further work on the identification of good practices on state-civil society cooperation and the development of new South-South- North partnerships.

103. The **Chairperson** noted the need for the Committee to profoundly reflect on the current state of the implementation of the Convention as well as on the transversal issues and good practices and invited the members of the Committee to offer comments.
104. The delegation of **Honduras** expressed that the periodic reporting is a valuable tool to assess how the Convention is being implemented and how deeply Parties are appropriating the concepts. Regarding the challenges to the implementation of the Convention, the delegation noted that the lack of financial resources is indeed a recurring one, not only for this Convention but also other Conventions. Citing paragraph 39 on the “absence of enabling legislative and regulatory environments, and the limited capacities for providing the necessary infrastructure” and “low level of awareness, both in governmental circles and the general public, of the issues accompanying the “protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expression””, he also noted that the high number of countries that have not yet submitted their periodic reports are developing countries. For this delegation, capacity-building to strengthen their policy-making capacity seems a priority before expecting them to submit a periodic report. Referring to paragraph 8 of the draft decision which states that the Secretariat is preparing a training programme on the

preparation of the reports, the delegation expressed that the capacity-building at the national level seems a starting point, especially because many countries might not have yet harmonized their legislation in line with the principles of the Convention.

105. Concurring with the delegation of Honduras, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** referred to paragraph 44 of Annex I on the need to develop a results monitoring framework for the Convention and indicated its full agreement with the suggestion of the IOS. The delegation also agreed with the comment of Honduras about paragraph 39. With regard to the low response rate mentioned in paragraph 10 of the main document, the delegation felt that periodic reporting could be a difficult task for some regions. Looking at the type of countries that have already submitted their reports, it underlined that the majority of the reports were from countries belonging to Groups I (western Europe) and II (eastern Europe) and these countries are more used to reporting exercises and also reporting on the issues in question within the framework of the European Union or the OECD exercises. The delegation wondered whether more support should be provided to those countries that have not been able to submit their reports. Considering that most of the responses were provided by OECD countries and if the Committee chooses issues to work on based on the information provided by these reports, the delegation questioned whether the Committee is providing due attention to right issues that need attention. The delegation reiterated that more support should be given to those developing countries to first elaborate their periodic reports and have a dialogue on the result from their responses. It concluded by once again commending Sweden for its support in this area and hoping to see a better response rate in the future.
106. The **Chairperson** acknowledged the need for further capacity-building on periodic reporting.
107. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** seconded the comments by Honduras and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, noting that the response rate highlights the need for capacity-building in the Caribbean region. It expressed its hope to have a regional workshop organized in the Caribbean on the issue in 2015 so that the Parties from the region could submit their reports. Referring to paragraph 43 of the document which said that the IOS was missing data and indicators to measure the progress of the implementation of the Convention, the delegation raised a question about what would be the next step to be taken by the IOS with regards to indicators and what the Parties' responsibilities would be to provide the information necessary to be able to study and assess the impact of the implementation of the Convention in the countries.
108. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** seconded what was said by previous speakers and supported the idea for more capacity-building to help countries develop their cultural policies so that they would have elements to report on and also more capacity-building for those countries that have difficulties filling in the reports. The delegation indicated that information document 4 on the participation of civil society for the elaboration of periodic reports was extremely interesting and indicated that a discussion dedicated solely to this document is necessary. The delegation concluded by stating that it would propose an amendment when it comes to the adoption of the draft decision.
109. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** referred to paragraph 11, noting that some African countries ratified the Convention without knowing the implications of ratification, and therefore asked the Secretariat about what measures could be taken to ensure that the current situation is addressed as expeditiously as possible. For Group Va, the emphasis should be less on ratification but more on strengthening capacities for periodic reporting.
110. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the Swedish contribution would indeed provide capacity building support to help countries prepare their periodic reports. She reminded the Committee that periodic reporting is not a mere technical exercise and is a



complex issue because the Convention is a complex text, demanding involvement of different ministries and subject areas. While acknowledging that periodic reporting is not easy for any country, she expressed her hope that the new training module and the capacity-building programme supported by Sida would lead to better representation in the future. Referring to the difficulty in collecting data, statistics and indicators within the culture sector and the effort of the last thirty years to do so, she informed that UNESCO has been working with national statistical offices in order to create a system of comparative statistics for the culture sector and that this has been a difficult undertaking mostly because the definition of what the culture sector is differs from one country to another. She clarified that periodic reporting within the framework of the Convention is not designed to create a comparative framework but to examine what has been the policy impact of the Convention in certain countries, i.e., to develop a different type of indicators and benchmarks from which information could be further collected. She noted that through the periodic reporting exercise, the Secretariat has learned that those countries that may initially think they have no information, actually do have it through the involvement of civil society in gathering the information requested. This participatory information collection process creates not only an environment of dialogue between the countries and civil society but also informs those policies that are now being created for the very first time. Responding to the question of Honduras about whether to start with policy-making or data collection, she noted that while policy-making and data collection are a part of a cyclical process, it is imperative to know what is going on in the culture sector in order to create pertinent policies. She further noted that the capacity-building strategy adopted to the Committee addresses the cyclical process of evidence-based policy-making and monitoring through different modules including a module on what the Convention is, another on how to develop relevant policies, and a third module on periodic reporting, namely on more technical exercise of how to fill out the framework itself.

#### [Observers]

111. The **Chairperson** invited observers to make their comments.
112. The delegation of **Brazil**, thanking the Secretariat for the document and the analysis, expressed that reporting to intergovernmental organizations including UNESCO is never easy for the Ministry of Culture as it remains overwhelmed with excessive reporting responsibilities and a lack of resources. The delegation considers it important to provide some kinds of incentives to countries. Under the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, for instance, the States Parties see the lists as a great incentive for their reporting effort. Considering that the 2005 Convention does not possess such a list, one incentive could be financial and the other an inclusion of a good policy practice or programme. While providing financial incentives would not be feasible given the regulations governing the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, the enlisting of good practices from periodic reports could offer an incentive for those who must prepare a report, because such a series of good practices could be used as an advocacy tool for continuing the policy listed as a good practice within the national government. Using the information provided through periodic reports for a global publication that the Secretariat is planning is also a good incentive for the countries. In order to promote good reporting, the delegation stressed the importance of creating a mechanism of incentives whereby the countries would feel the relevance of reporting.
113. The **Chairperson** noted that although the opinions expressed by Brazil were not directed towards Togo, the Minister of Culture of Togo present in the room must have taken good note of the comments.
114. The delegation of **Denmark** thanked the Secretariat for its effort to continue producing high quality documents, and noted that the analytical summary of the periodic reports is a very useful tool to better understand how the key messages of the Convention are

translated into concrete policy-oriented actions. Having listened to different opinions expressed by various delegations on periodic reporting, Denmark encouraged all Parties to contribute to the global monitoring exercise by submitting their reports. It agreed with the Secretariat's resource prioritization exercise for in-country training and the preparation of the global monitoring report that would demonstrate to the world what the 2005 Convention is doing. Noting that the 2005 Convention does not have lists like other culture conventions of UNESCO and that it is a policy convention, Denmark stressed that periodic reporting is central to the Convention. Following the invitation by Sweden for support, the delegation announced that the Danish Centre for Culture and Development has decided to finance a study on the freedom of artistic expressions which is intended to contribute to the preparation of the global monitoring report.

115. Concurring with the view expressed by the delegation of Brazil, the delegation of **Egypt** expressed that while the Egyptian Government has experience in drafting reports and is motivated by nominations on lists or funding possibilities, it does not understand clearly why the periodic reporting must be submitted especially in collaboration with civil society. This lack of understanding is almost normal considering that Egypt has undergone an important transition in the last four years. The training is thus urgently needed, especially to become familiar with the 2005 Convention. Referring to the comment raised by Saint Lucia, it questioned whether countries such as Egypt could easily collect the information requested and whether it would be important to foresee a department that would deal specifically with the 2005 Convention and also with the collection of relevant data and information.

116. The **Chairperson** invited other observers to offer comments.

#### **[Observers]**

117. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** (IFCCD) began his intervention by thanking the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO for having enabled his participation in the present Committee session, acknowledging that the financial constraints are also hitting civil society organizations. He informed that the International Network for Cultural policy (INCD) that had for years spearheaded the work which led to the adoption of the Convention is now closed down, and neither the Network nor its website exists any longer. This shows that the partnership with civil society that is expected by the Convention is extremely difficult to implement. Referring to the usefulness of periodic reporting, he wondered how to use the periodic reports to further enrich the understanding of the Convention for today and for the future. Concerning the method of collecting information and data, he questioned whether sending out a questionnaire is actually an effective means considering that there have been a wide range of questionnaires sent out to collect information on the implementation of Articles 16 and 21, digital technologies as well as the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation on the Status of the Artist and that these fall on the same people, be it the national point of contact or a civil society focal point. He called on the Committee to reflect on other ways of working together and collecting information beyond questionnaires.
118. The delegation of **Togo** expressed that the problem of the Ministry of Culture is often related to the lack of means, both financial and human resources, given the marginalized status of culture within the country. The Minister of Culture further noted that if she did not have an expert to support her, she would not have been able to do what she is doing now. She further noted that the Ministry of Culture is not in a position to recruit outside experts nor to undertake training and expressed a general plea that culture as a part of development policy be recognized and that the ministry of finance become aware of this necessity, that cultural policy should be part and parcel of development policy. She summarized that the fault does not necessarily lie with the Ministry of Culture but rather it is a general problem that also requires training of staff of the ministry.

119. The delegation of **Afghanistan** expressed that it is not enough to draft a convention, that real work begins with the implementation of the Convention, and that UNESCO must continue its work in this field. As already mentioned by others, one of the problems is that the notion of culture is understood differently in different countries, and therefore, the cultural policy is also diverse. This difference in understanding makes the work of the Convention difficult. The delegation admitted not forwarding the questionnaire to its capital as it was clear that the colleagues in the capital would not have been able to fill it in. The delegation wondered if Afghanistan might not have ratified the Convention had it noted the definition of culture given in the text. It expressed that the Committee seemed to be discussing more about media and the freedom of expression than culture. According to the delegation, the issue of the 2005 Convention is very topical, and the question with respect to cultural diversity is to find a way to live together with different cultures considering that different cultures exist within a country but also internationally. The delegation concluded by noting that immigration policy is also relevant to cultural diversity in today's context.
120. The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision paragraph by paragraph, which already integrated amendments proposed by the delegation of Saint Lucia.
121. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to add to paragraph 1 a reference to three information documents (CE/14/8.IGC/INF.4, CE/14/8.IGC/INF.5 and CE/14/8.IGC/INF.6) that informed the document on this item 7a. The **Chairperson** then read out the following paragraphs and, seeing no amendment, adopted paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5.
122. On paragraph 6, the delegation of **Australia** raised a question about whether or not the current wording would provide additional discouragement for those countries that already have hard time submitting their reports, if they are to submit the report both in English and French. The delegation proposed to change the end of the paragraph to read, "do so at their earliest convenience in either working language of the Committee, and or possible, in other languages". The delegation felt that this small change could encourage certain countries to submit their report.
123. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the operational guidelines for periodic reporting ask Parties to submit their reports in one of the two working languages of the Committee in either in English or French. A decision was taken to ask Parties to, if possible, submit also in other languages. The practice shows reports are submitted in either English or French and then in a third language, Spanish or Portuguese.
124. The **Chairperson** read out paragraph 6 as amended and adopted it as no further amendment was raised.
125. On paragraph 7, the delegation of **Honduras**, referring to the proposed revised periodic reporting framework under item 7b, suggested that the paragraph provides specific references to various actors who need to be consulted – actors such as ministries of arts and culture, trade, industry, labour and development among others, as well as regional and local governments. The delegation proposed, "consultations in the preparation of their reports involving various government ministries" and add the list of those ministries listed in the proposed revised operational guidelines. The delegation of **Viet Nam**, supported by **Guinea** and **Tunisia**, while agreeing in principle with the proposal by Honduras, suggested to leave Parties the liberty and the flexibility to carry out their work in the consultation process. This is especially so because ministries in different countries have different names; for instance, in Viet Nam, while there is no ministry of development, there are other ministries that take on these portfolios, and it may be necessary to include other ministries, such as the ministries of finance, planning and investment. The delegation feels that the existing wording covers a broader consultation process that involves different ministries.

126. The delegation of **Honduras** appreciated the intervention by Viet Nam and made a counter proposal which reads, “those ministries that are in charge of arts and culture, trade, etc.” and includes finance and planning as well as social and economic development. It proposed to leave it open so that it would not read as an instruction but rather to make it more inclusive.
127. The delegation of **Tunisia** agreed with Viet Nam and Guinea and proposed to say, “various government ministries concerned”, to which the delegation of Honduras indicated its agreement. The **Chairperson** read out paragraph 7 as amended and adopted it as no objection was raised. The **Chairperson** continued and read out paragraph 8 and adopted it.
128. Regarding a new paragraph proposed by the delegation of **Tunisia** on capacity-building that would come before paragraph 8 just adopted, the **Secretary of the Convention** responded that it has already elaborated a capacity-building programme which was presented to the Committee at its previous session in 2013 and adopted. The delegation of Tunisia then proposed its amendment to read, “invites the Secretariat to implement the capacity-building programme aiming at assisting Parties in preparing their reports on the implementation of the Convention, funded by extrabudgetary resources”. The **Chairperson** read out the paragraph as amended by Tunisia and adopted it as no further amendment was proposed. He then moved to read paragraph 10 (original paragraph 9) and adopted it as no objection was proposed.
129. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed a new paragraph which reads, “decides to inscribe an item on the agenda of its ninth ordinary session on the assessment of the participation of civil society in the implementation of the Convention”.
130. The **Chairperson** noted agreement and adopted the proposed paragraph. Seeing no objection, the Chairperson adopted the amended decision 8.IGC 7a in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 7a was adopted with amendments.*

## **ITEM 7B – DRAFT REVISED OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES ON ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/7b**

131. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the document.
132. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that at its seventh ordinary session, the Committee requested that the Secretariat, in cooperation with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), submit to it at its eighth ordinary session preliminary draft revised Operational Guidelines on Article 9, including the Framework for Periodic Reports and its statistical annex. The goal of this revision is to make the Parties’ reports more focused and effective as a tool to monitor the implementation of the Convention and eventually contribute toward a global assessment of its policy impact. The proposed revisions are based on the governing bodies’ debates, the exchange session on periodic reporting held prior to the fourth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties, as well as on the recommendations suggested by the international experts and the IOS. The draft revisions to the Guidelines themselves are presented in the form of a table, with the current text in the first column, the proposed revisions in the second and the source for each revision in the third. She indicated that a number of small changes were introduced for more clarity and consistency. Before proceeding with each paragraph, she highlighted the more substantial revisions as follows:

- New paragraphs 6 and 11 are proposed in order to capture the different tiers of government and actors outside the Ministry of Culture, as well as non-governmental actors involved in drafting the report.
- A new paragraph 8 is proposed in order to reflect in each reporting cycle one or more emerging transversal issues of high relevance to the Parties of the Convention. She stated that this would be referred to in more detail when the Committee examines the revisions in the Reporting Framework.
- A new paragraph 9 is introduced in order to establish a stronger link between the reporting Framework and UNESCO's Global Priority Gender Equality.
- Paragraph 12 which has become new paragraph 17 was amended in order to reflect the Committee's debates at its last session to change the frequency of updating the Secretariat's analytical report, moving from annual to biennial. This means that the Secretariat shall prepare a global report monitoring the implementation of the Convention in all thematic areas addressed in the periodic reporting framework and related monitoring exercises undertaken by the Secretariat. The first Global Monitoring Report would be published before the ninth ordinary session of the Committee in 2015 and is being supported through extrabudgetary resources provided by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida). She acknowledged the important support being given by the Danish Centre for Culture and Development to make available expertise to the Secretariat in its work to develop indicators for monitoring the Convention on issues related to the status of the artist and freedom of artistic expression.

As regards the Framework for Periodic Reports annexed to the Guidelines, she presented what was not changed. First, the key thematic areas identified by Parties remain as follows:

- cultural policies and measures
- international cultural cooperation
- preferential treatment
- culture and sustainable development, and
- awareness-raising and participation of civil society.

Presenting what has changed, she stated that a new section entitled "Overview of cultural policy context" has been introduced in order to give Parties a "free" space for reporting on the key objectives and priorities of their current cultural policy. This rubric also serves to elicit more contextual information linking the policies and measures taken to implement the Convention to the larger socio-economic situation of countries. It also asks Parties to provide information on the impact of the Convention in the formulation or reformulation of policies as reflected not only in the debates of the Convention's governing bodies but those of the Executive Board and its preparatory group to be informed of the impact the Culture Conventions are having on national policies. Secondly, in the section on Cultural Policies and Measures, Parties are asked to provide information on measures aimed at promoting the diversity of cultural expressions in a digital environment, even if the majority of Parties reporting in 2012-2014 have included such information in their reports without a specific mention in the Framework. This revision reflects the results of the survey conducted last year by the Secretariat asking Parties and civil society organisations to identify priority areas for examination. It was also recommended to sharpen the focus on artistic creativity by adding targeted questions on measures taken to improve the status of artists and to promote the freedom of artistic expression, in response to the 2013 report on artistic freedom by Ms Farida Shaheed, UN Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights. However, as the Secretariat is also responsible for monitoring the implementation of

the 1980 Recommendation Concerning the Status of the Artist, which it is mandated by the General Conference to do every four years, it launched a global survey whose results will form the basis of a consolidated report to be presented to the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the General Conference (36 C/Resolution 103). The survey was designed to collect information on issues addressed by both the Recommendation and the Convention in four specific areas: digital technologies, transnational mobility of artists, social protection for artists and freedom of artistic expression. Thirdly, the Secretariat is proposing to separate the international cooperation section into two distinct sections: International Cultural Cooperation and Preferential Treatment. The section on preferential treatment is organised in accordance with the methodology proposed by Keith Nurse in his 2012 analysis of periodic reports, namely asking Parties to identify measures that promote preferential treatment on three levels including the individual, institutional and industry levels. Fourthly, the section on Culture and Development has been clarified in accordance with the methodology proposed by David Throsby that focuses on 4 types of measures implemented at the national level including (i) the integration of culture in national development strategies and plans; (ii) the achievement of economic, social and environmental outcomes; (iii) securing fairness and equitable treatment of individuals and groups; and (iv) equity in the distribution of cultural resources between urban and rural areas. This also reflects the results from the UN Creative Economy Report Special Edition 2013 and the indicators presented therein. Fifth, a new section is introduced on Transversal Issues and UNESCO Priorities following the Committee's debates to introduce a focus on a particular domain of policy-making or a transversal theme for a period of several years in order to allow for a more in-depth reporting and analysis. She stated that the Committee may decide to keep this section or not, and, in the event that the Committee does decide to keep it, it may want to recommend to the Conference of Parties a particular transversal issue for the next reporting cycle that starts in 2016. Sixth, revisions have been made to the statistical annex. She noted that the statistical annex has always deemed optional, because it was always agreed that the purpose of the exercise of periodic reporting is to share information and not to engage in strictly comparative exercise, recognizing that not all Parties would have the same level of data available. She reported that over the past two years, the Secretariat has seen and heard from Parties that the Annex was too complex, so, together with UIS, it has attempted to simplify the indicators in the Annex. It has also harmonized some of the indicators on media and Internet use with those used by the Communication Sector and published in their recent "World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development" report. In conclusion, she noted that the Secretariat has attempted to clarify the questions posed in the framework so as to address the observation that the periodic reporting exercise does not yet fully assess whether a Party is achieving results or not. In this regard, it was suggested during the last Committee session that the focus of the key questions could shift from assessing the impact of policies and measures to measuring the effectiveness of the implementation process. Therefore the Secretariat has revised the key questions to help gather new information on the results expected from the implementation of a particular policy or measure.

133. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and invited the Committee to make comments on document 7b.
134. The delegation of **Sweden** referred to the discussion of the Committee on item 7a and stated that several Parties have difficulties in completing their reports, which demonstrate the importance of making the form as focused and effective as possible. The delegation therefore welcomed the initiative to make the questions more targeted. To be an effective tool, the reports could possibly be even more focused with less questions to make the process easier for the Parties which would possibly and hopefully increase the number of reports submitted. The delegation emphasized the importance of keeping this in mind in the future discussion on the framework and expressed its hesitation to introduce

transversal issues into the framework since this might increase the reporting workload for the Parties. The delegation however welcomed the suggestion to make a strong link to the global priority, gender equality but would suggest slightly different wording in the proposed article 9 in the operational guidelines.

135. The **Chairperson**, seeing no other requests by members of the Committee, invited observers to make comments.

**[Observers]**

136. The delegation of **Ecuador** thanked the Secretariat for the document and raised a question regarding the proposal contained in paragraph 5 which adds guiding principles contained in Article 2 of the Convention which are pertinent as they are principles that have to guide not only the presentation of the report but also the implementation of the Convention. It asked why only the guiding principles have been chosen and not other aspects of the Convention such as the objectives of the Convention. It wondered whether mentioning only the guiding principles would limit all the spheres and actions that should be taken into account by the states in the implementation of the Convention and the presentation of the report.
137. The delegation of **Denmark** expressed its support to make the periodic reports more focused and effective as a tool to monitor the implementation of the Convention and assess the impact on the ground. It supported the changes suggested in the revised operational guidelines, in particular the need to reflect in each reporting cycle one emerging issue of high relevance such as the status of the artist and the freedom of artistic expression. It however called the attention of the Committee to the risk of opening up a Pandora's box, adding a long list of new issues to be treated. It thus supported the Secretariat's approach to seek synergies with the existing standard setting instruments, in particular the survey on the 1980 Recommendation on the Status of the Artist which would furnish the Parties to the Convention with fresh data in the area of digital technologies, transnational mobility, social protection and the freedom of artistic expression. The delegation encouraged all the Parties to contribute to this exercise.
138. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)** expressed that this is indeed an important topic for civil society given that it is solicited for the preparation of the periodic reports. He acknowledged that the exercise is extremely useful as periodic reports should become the very substance of how the Committee proceeds. He indicated his support for focusing on selected topical issues and delving in-depth but expressed his belief that the focus of the periodic reports should remain on what is found in the Convention. It is good to look at all the mechanisms initially, but it is essential to also look at what is specific to the Convention and ask whether measures taken have continued or been abandoned and ask whether it may be worthwhile discontinuing certain activities in the current digital era. He also expressed that periodic reporting should provide a means of measuring the impact or expected goals of measures taken. Regarding the involvement of civil society, it is good to invite Parties to consult, on a priority basis, those NGOs that have the consultative status with UNESCO as a first step. If the involvement of civil society was not possible, the Parties should explain why it was the case, since there could be justifications for the absence of civil society participation, such as that civil society was not sensitized and did not respond.
139. The **Chairperson** thanked all the speakers and invited once again members of the Committee to make comments.
140. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** informed that it proposed two amendments. One was about allowing developing countries to report on the preferential treatment measures they take for other developing countries, since there is no space within the reporting format that would allow developing countries to report on what they do in this area. The second

amendment was about the new section added on the cultural policy context where Parties are requested to report on challenges concerning digital technologies.

141. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to move to the adoption of the draft decision as no other request to take the floor was indicated.
142. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to project the document. He presented paragraph 6 of the Annex (preliminary draft revisions to the operational guidelines on Article 9 “Information Sharing and Transparency”) with a proposed amendment which read “In preparing their reports, Parties will consider the implications of the 2005 Convention on the governance of culture and integrated policy-making for the creative sector. Parties are encouraged to form inter-Ministerial working groups, involving various governmental institutions responsible for arts and culture, education, trade, industry, tourism, labour, social and economic development, finance, planning, investment, communications and other governmental institutions concerned. They are also encouraged to ensure that different government tiers, such as regions and cities, contribute to the preparation of the report.” He requested the Committee to react to the proposed amendment.
143. The delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that the amendment was proposed together with Honduras in order to reflect the discussion of the Committee on item 7a. The delegation proposed the wording of “various governmental institutions” and “other governmental institutions concerned” in order to avoid naming the exact ministries that may vary from one country to another and also to provide non-exhaustive list. It also stated that the status of governmental institutions may also vary depending on countries, ministries, departments, councils, national boards. The delegations of **Argentina, Saint Lucia, Armenia, Madagascar, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Austria and Switzerland** indicated their agreement with the amendment proposed by Viet Nam and Honduras. Thanking Viet Nam and Honduras, the **Chairperson** adopted the amendment since it had unanimous support of the Committee.
144. The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 17 which has been amended by Switzerland. He presented the paragraph in question which reads, “The Secretariat forwards to the Committee before its ordinary sessions preceding the Conference of Parties a report monitoring the implementation of the Convention at the international and national levels on the basis of the information and data derived from the quadrennial periodic reports and other sources. The report will indicate transversal issues as well as challenges identified in the reports to be addressed in the future implementation of the Convention.” He requested the delegation of Switzerland to explain the rationale of the amendment.
145. The delegation of **Switzerland** explained that the word, control, appeared not appropriate in French, since the word “control” has a negative connotation. The amendment is a question of suggesting a different terminology, to make the French text in line with the wording used in English.
146. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested that in English, it could say, “a report monitoring...”, and in French, “un rapport de suivi sur la mise en oeuvre de la Convention”, to which both the Chairperson and the delegation of **Switzerland** expressed their agreement. Noting the editorial remark by the delegation of **Uruguay** to change the French text from “la mise en oeuvre future de la Convention” to “la mise en oeuvre de la future Convention”, the Chairperson adopted it as no further comment was raised.
147. The delegation of **Sweden** requested to go back to paragraph 9 as it had an amendment to that paragraph and suggested deleting “integrate the special needs of” from the middle of paragraph 9 and instead write, “facilitate the access for...”. It also suggested a correction to the English text and proposed changing the wording from “participating” to “to participate”.



148. The **Chairperson** read the paragraph in question as amended by Sweden which reads, “In accordance with Article 7 of the Convention and UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality, the reports shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate access for women as creators and producers of cultural expressions, as well as citizens to participate in the cultural life of societies.”
149. The delegation of **Argentina** pointed out that while Article 7 of the Convention refers both gender and persons belonging to minorities, paragraph 9 refers only to women but not persons belonging to minorities. The delegation therefore suggested that paragraph 9 only refers to the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality and delete reference to Article 7.
150. Noting that the language of paragraph 9 should be in line with the language commonly used within the United Nations system which is the promotion of gender equality, the delegation of **Kuwait** suggested adding the wording, “promote,” before access.
151. The delegation of **Australia** expressed its preference towards the original wording of “facilitating the access for...” suggested by Sweden, because it recognizes women’s active role as creators and producers. Regarding whether or not the word “citizen” detracts from the meaning of the paragraph, it suggested adding “all citizens” in order to emphasize the inclusiveness of this new paragraph and also refers to the other aspect of Article 7 which talks about persons belonging to minorities and other social groups.
152. The **Chairperson** proposed to delete Article 7 and read the amendment, “In accordance with the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality, the reports shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions, as well as the participation of women in the cultural life of societies.”
153. The delegation of **Switzerland** indicated its support to the amendment to focus on gender equality. It supported the wording the “promotion of access.” Stating that the wording in French was rather complicated, it suggested that the paragraph could be “promote access and participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions” and also include “participation”.
154. The delegation of **Austria** stated that the purpose of this paragraph is to introduce a new section with regard to the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality and it was about women as citizens to participate in the cultural life. It pointed out that including all citizens means more people than just women. Looking at the overall framework, the delegation warned that referring to all citizens risks repeating the reporting of same measures as Parties are already requested to report on Article 7 which refers to needs of women and various special groups and risks diluting the focus from the gender equality, and the notion of women as creators and producers but also as citizens participating in the cultural life. It therefore proposed to delete “all” before “citizens”.
155. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** warned the Committee to be cautious, because mentioning Article 7 and including all citizens enlarges the scope of Article 7 and enlarges the reporting obligations of Parties. If the purpose of the paragraph was about introducing a gender equality issue, it expressed that the paragraph should focus on it, without referring to Article 7.
156. The delegation of **Switzerland** acknowledged that the Committee must first settle the matter of the substance and clarify who is referred to in this paragraph. For this delegation, the focus was the gender equality and emphasis was on the participation of women in the cultural life. The delegation of **Sweden** reiterated that the focus should remain gender equality and suggested removing reference to Article 7.
157. The delegation of **Australia** agreed to removing the wording, “all,” from the paragraph. In order to clarify who the citizens are, it suggested adding, “women as citizens to participate in the cultural life...”

158. The delegation of **Argentina** insisted on removing reference to Article 7 because the focus is about the Global Priority Gender Equality and women's participation. It also suggested keeping "all citizens" in line with the Australian proposal.
159. The delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the proposal of Saint Lucia to delete the reference to Article 7. It also supported the Swiss proposal to include, "facilitate and promote access..."
160. The delegation of **Tunisia** expressed that it does not see any inconvenience in leaving the reference to Article 7 because the operational guidelines are there to apply the Convention. It expressed that referencing Article 7 would not enlarge the scope of the Convention but rather specify certain segments of population. It also suggested including youth.
161. Taking into account that the focus of paragraph is the women, the **Chairperson** read out the paragraph as it stood: "In accordance with the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality, the reports shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions, as well as citizens who participate in the cultural life of societies."
162. The delegation of **Austria**, supported by the delegation of **Australia**, insisted on the need keeping the reference to women having access to cultural participation. It proposed "as well as their participation in the cultural life of societies". The delegation of **Saint Lucia** urged the members of the Committee to clarify what Parties must report on. It proposed to end the sentence before "participation", which was seconded by the delegations of **Lithuania** and **Tunisia**.
163. The delegation of **Armenia**, supported by the delegation of **Argentina**, pointed out that the word participation is used twice in the paragraph and suggested, "promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions in the cultural life of societies" and suggested to delete the rest. The delegation of **Switzerland** supported the proposal by Armenia and Argentina with a minor correction to French which should read, "à la vie culturelle des sociétés". The delegation of **Viet Nam** supported Austria and Australia as it believed it important to report on measures to promote not only right of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions but also their right to participate in cultural life.
164. The delegation of **Guinea** expressed that since the main issue is to emphasize the equality between men and women, the paragraph should read, "in accordance with... the reports shall include information on the measures taken to facilitate and promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions on an equal footing with men".
165. The **Chairperson** proposed a new amendment which reads, "In accordance with the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality, the reports shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions, as well as their participation in the cultural life of societies." He asked for support to this compromise paragraph.
166. The delegation of **Uruguay** maintained that the question is not about the participation of women creators and producers participating in cultural life. What is important is the participation of women in the cultural life of societies.
167. The **Chairperson** re-read the paragraph, "In accordance with the UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality, the reports shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and promote access for and the participation of women as creators and producers of cultural expressions, as well as the participation of women in the cultural life of societies." After receiving unanimous support, the Chairperson adopted the paragraph.

168. The Chairperson then moved to paragraph 18 and invited Switzerland to introduce its amendments.
169. The delegation of **Switzerland** explained that it proposed to change the word in French from “rapport de contrôle” to “rapport de suivi”. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 18 as amended by Switzerland which read as follows: “In accordance with Articles 22.4 (b) and 23.6 (c) of the Convention, quadrennial periodic reports will, after deliberation by the Committee, be forwarded to the Conference of Parties for review. These reports will be accompanied by the Committee's comments...” Seeing no objection, he adopted the paragraph in question as amended.
170. The delegation of **Tunisia** raised a question about including a section on youth, noting that the last General Conference adopted an overall strategy for youth (2014 to 2021). The issue of youth is a major concern to many countries, in particular in developing countries. Youth plays a key role in development and peace. The **Chairperson** requested reaction of other members of the Committee to the Tunisian proposal to take into account the dimension of young people in addition to gender equality.
171. The delegation of **Guinea** supported the proposal of Tunisia. In the same way as facilitating and promoting access of women, the same could be included on youth as an important indicator of development. The **Chairperson** requested Tunisia or Guinea to make a concrete proposal.
172. Referring to the equality between women and men, the delegation of **Kuwait** expressed that young people are indeed included either as women or men under gender equality.
173. Referring to the debate on new technologies, the delegation of **Tunisia** further added that access to digital facilities for young people is a reality in a large number of countries, paving the way for the transmission of certain values from one society to another. The delegation asked the Secretariat whether it would be possible to make a reference to the operational strategy of UNESCO for youth in the report and if that would add additional burden for the preparation of the report. It noted that a number of countries are witnessing the growth of NGOs and civil society bodies which are mostly composed of young people.
174. The **Chairperson** reiterated its request for a concrete proposal.
175. The delegation of **Viet Nam** drew the attention of the Committee to the optional Annex. It raised a question about the selection of sectors. Referring to the Annex which includes books, music and media and some other important elements, it suggested incorporating a film industry which is a very important industry within the creative economy. It wondered whether a paragraph could be inserted for the film industry with a question regarding the number of films produced or the number of film companies or studios, and revenues generated from the films.
176. At the request of the **Chairperson** to respond to the question of Viet Nam, the **Secretary of the Convention** suggested that the Committee first concentrates its discussion on the reporting framework before discussing the statistical annex. Referring to the statistical annex, she explained that the indicators presented in this simplified form were done so in order to enable all countries to provide data and participate in this exercise and that it is the minimum that is being asked for. Should countries have additional data that they would like to share, they are welcome to do so. She explained that the Secretariat tried not to include too many indicators in order to enable the participation of all countries. The delegation of **Viet Nam** indicated its satisfaction towards the response provided.
177. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to project the reporting framework on the screen and invited Saint Lucia to present its amendments.

178. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that one of its proposal concerns the new section on the cultural policy context to include a reference to digital issues, and the other concerns south-south cooperation under the heading of preferential treatment.
179. The **Chairperson** presented the first amendment and read, “Parties shall describe the key objectives and priorities of their current cultural policy and the impact the Convention has had in their formulation or reformulation. They will also report on the challenges to promote the diversity of cultural expressions in a digital environment.” He invited the members of the Committee to react to the proposal by Saint Lucia.
180. The delegations of **Switzerland, Uruguay and Tunisia** endorsed the proposal by Saint Lucia. The delegation of **Viet Nam** further suggested adding the word, “also” to the last sentence of the paragraph, noting that the main part of this section is about the key objectives and priorities of their current cultural policy and the impact of the Convention and that they will also report on the challenges posed by digital issues. The delegation of **Madagascar** indicated its support to the amendments by Saint Lucia and Viet Nam.
181. The delegation of **Sweden** suggested adding the word “possibilities” before “challenges”. The **Secretary of the Convention** suggested the word “opportunities” instead of “possibilities”, to which Sweden indicated its support. The **Chairperson** adopted the amendment proposed by Saint Lucia. The Chairperson moved to the second amendment and invited Saint Lucia to present it.
182. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** reiterated that while the framework provides space for developed countries to report on preferential treatment measures, there is no space for developing countries to discuss preferential treatment. The amendment aims at creating this space.
183. The **Chairperson** read the amendment, “In this Section, Parties from developing countries describe the measures they have adopted to identify their priorities, specific needs and interests, and enhance their benefit from preferential treatment. These Parties will also report on preferential treatment measures they have taken to promote South-South cooperation.” He specified that the last sentence is the addition by Saint Lucia.
184. The delegation of **Argentina** supported the amendment by Saint Lucia stressing that south-south cooperation is very important and needs to be included. The delegations of **Uruguay, Honduras and Zimbabwe** also supported the amendment by Saint Lucia. Seeing support for the amendment, the Chairperson adopted it.
185. The Chairperson invited Tunisia to propose a paragraph on youth which becomes paragraph 10. The delegation of **Tunisia** proposed a new paragraph which reads, “Pursuant to the new UNESCO operational strategy 2014-2021 for youth, the reports of the Parties shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and encourage the participation of youth in cultural life and on their role as creators and beneficiaries of cultural goods in order to promote and preserve cultural diversity.”
186. The **Chairperson** thanked Tunisia and Guinea and read out the proposed paragraph.
187. The delegations of **Sweden** and **Uruguay** supported the proposal by Tunisia. The delegation of **Zimbabwe**, while supporting the proposal by Tunisia, proposed to add the word “services” as “cultural goods and services” normally go together in this Convention, which was seconded by the delegation of **Honduras**.
188. The delegation of **Saint Lucia**, while supporting the proposal, suggested the inclusion of the word, “cultural expressions” in order to perpetuate the diversity of cultural expressions, which was seconded by the delegation of **Armenia**.
189. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** also indicated its support to the amendment especially considering that within the operational guidelines, there is a chapter

on education and public awareness addressing youth. It asked the Secretariat whether within Annex, there would have to be a paragraph on youth.

190. The **Secretary of the Convention** confirmed that within the periodic reporting framework, youth could be added to point 6. In order to harmonize with the text adopted on gender equality, she suggested putting, “encouraging the participation of youth in the cultural life and as creators and producers of cultural goods and services”.
191. The delegation of **Switzerland** supported “the participation of youth in cultural life and their role as creators...” since the idea of beneficiary is pertinent. It also suggested adding “cultural activities, goods and services”.
192. The **Chairperson** read the paragraph proposed by Tunisia. “Pursuant to the new UNESCO operational strategy 2014-2021 for youth, the reports of the Parties shall include information on the measures taken in order to facilitate and encourage the participation of youth in cultural life as creators, producers and beneficiaries of cultural activities, goods and services.” Seeing no objection, he adopted the paragraph.
193. The **Chairperson** then moved to the adoption of the draft decision which was projected on the screen. He read it paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. He then presented paragraph 6 as proposed by Switzerland and adopted it as no objection was raised. He adopted the decision in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 7b was adopted with amends.*

194. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture.
195. Mr Alfredo Pérez de Armiñán introduced himself as the new Assistant Director-General for Culture. He commended the work of the Committee and expressed his regret for not having been present at the opening ceremony. He expressed his gratitude for the commitment of the Committee towards the development of the Convention and conveyed that he remains at their disposal.

## **ITEM 8 – SECRETARIAT’S REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)**

### **Documents CE/14/8.IGC/8 and CE/14/8.IGC/INF.3**

196. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine item 8 on the implementation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and asked the Secretary of the Convention to present the item.
197. The **Secretary of the Convention** stated that in order to facilitate the Committee’s discussions, the Secretariat is presenting three separate documents on the International Fund for Cultural Diversity for the Committee’s review in the following order: document 8 presents the Secretariat’s report on the implementation of the IFCD projects under the 4 previous cycles and their corresponding status and also 7 projects recommended under the fifth and current funding cycle for the Committee’s approval. The coordinator of the Panel of Experts, Mr Ferdinand Richard, has been invited to present the recommended projects and to give the Committee a brief overview of its work during the evaluation phase. As per Decision 5.IGC 7, all files were made publicly available on the Convention’s website within the statutory time frame. Document 8 presents the status of the implementation of the recommendations made by UNESCO’ Internal Oversight Service (IOS) for the IFCD, including a new results-based management framework. She continued that Committee would then examine document 9 in which the Secretariat presents a report on the implementation of the IFCD fundraising strategy and document 10 presenting a report on the use of the financial resources of the IFCD, including the financial statements for the period for 2013 and until 30 June 2014. The Committee is also to examine the

provisional draft budget for 2015 and possibly adopt it. The draft decision contained in document 10 is the last one to be presented, as it refers to all financial implications included in previously adopted decisions related to the IFCD.

198. The **Chairperson** proceeded to examine the documents one by one for the sake of clarity and requested the Committee to be precise in their comments. He then gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention to present document 8.
199. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that at its fourth ordinary session in December 2010, the Committee approved 31 projects for funding and adopted a provisional budget for 2011. As of November 2014, all 31 approved projects have been completed. As five out of these 31 projects had declared their inability to ensure a successful continuation, the Secretariat proceeded with the official termination of the contracts for these projects by requesting the concerned beneficiary institutions to reimburse all outstanding sums to the IFCD in a letter dated 29 October 2014. As consequence, the Secretariat would like to request the Committee to credit back to the IFCD 81,850 USD, which represents the unpaid balance from the funds initially allocated for these 5 projects. She clarified that the project managers of the five projects in question were unable to finalize the last segment of the projects, and did not receive payments for activities they did not implement. She continued that at its fifth and sixth ordinary sessions, the Committee approved another 30 projects in total of which 22 have been completed. At its seventh ordinary session, the Committee approved 10 projects for funding. She reported that all projects are advancing steadily in their implementation as planned. She noted that the Committee could monitor progress of these projects on the new IFCD website where each project has its own project profile page available in English, French and Spanish. Outcomes and emerging results from the projects have also been communicated by the Secretariat through regular e-updates and the annual end-of-year brochure as well as the multimedia stories available from the website. The third edition of the brochure is presented as information document 3. She further recalled that the Committee decided to issue a fifth call for funding requests and dedicate 70% of funds available on June 30, 2014 as the budget. She reported that taking note of the experience of the previous calls for funding requests and based on the feedback received from the Committee and the Panel of Experts, the Secretariat undertook a wide range of activities to improve the application forms, the annotated guides, evaluation forms for National Commissions for UNESCO, as well as the training provided to the panel of experts. As indicated in the document, 172 funding requests were received from 67 countries and 17 international NGOs. While funding requests came from the same number of countries, there was an overall decrease of 13% of total number of funding requests transmitted by the National Commissions compared to the previous call for funding requests. Compared to the fourth call for applications, the high number of funding requests received from African and Latin American countries remained consistent. The total number of requests submitted by international NGOs and NGOs remained high, making up close to 3/4 of all applications received. Of the 172 requests for funding received for the 2014 funding cycle, around 43% passed the technical assessment on their eligibility that was entrusted to the Secretariat, which represents an increase of 15% compared to the previous call for funding requests, reflecting an improved understanding of the objectives and scope of intervention of the IFCD by the applicants and National Commissions. The total worth of these applications was almost 7 million USD. Those funding requests that did not pass this technical assessment received a letter from the Secretariat indicating the reasons why. Each application was reviewed independently by two different members of the Panel of Experts, who entered both qualitative and quantitative evaluation results for each project directly into the new online evaluation platform. The evaluation was undertaken against the criteria established in paragraph 19 of the new Guidelines for the IFCD, which determine the relevance, feasibility, financial management and accountability, impact and sustainability of the proposed project. In accordance with paragraph 16.3 of the Guidelines and paragraph 8 of the decision taken

at the seventh ordinary session of the Committee, the Secretariat organized, for the first time, a meeting for the members of the Panel of Experts at UNESCO Headquarters in July 2014. During this meeting, the experts had the opportunity to exchange on the approach they took in the evaluation process, discuss the challenges they faced and reach a consensus about the projects to be recommended for funding. Once both evaluators submitted their evaluation results, the coordinator of the Panel of Experts reviewed the evaluations and conducted a last process of validation prior to submitting the final list of projects recommended to the Committee. She further noted that this list, provided in Annex I of document 8, is in line with the Committee's decision that requested the Panel of Experts to draw up recommendations for the Committee's examination within the limits of the funds available. All the project files, including the project applications, the National Commissions Review Forms, the Secretariat's technical assessments, the evaluations by the Panel of Experts and the final list of projects recommended to the Committee, were made available online by the Secretariat on the Convention's website within the statutory deadline. Out of 7 projects recommended for the Committee, five Parties that have not yet received funding from the IFCD would benefit from funding for the first time should the Committee so decide, namely the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Morocco and the United Republic of Tanzania. She further noted that the Secretariat has prepared individual evaluation sheets on each project recommended that include a summary of the Panel of Experts' assessment, found in Annex II of document 8. She recalled that at its sixth ordinary session in December 2012, the Committee examined the IOS report on the evaluation of the pilot phase of the IFCD and adopted the majority of the 35 recommendations made. An overview of the state of the implementation of the approved recommendations, together with key results achieved, is presented in Annex III of document 8, including the development of a results-based management framework with short- and long-term objectives, timeframes and SMART indicators as presented in Annex IV of document 8.

200. The **Chairperson**, in the name of the Committee, commended the Secretariat for its excellent work on the fourth call for the IFCD funding requests. In conformity with Article 16 of the revised Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD approved by the Conference of Parties at its fourth ordinary session, he then invited Mr Ferdinand Richard, coordinator of the Panel of Experts to present to the Committee the experience of the Panel during the evaluation of funding requests and present the recommended projects.
201. **Mr Ferdinand Richard**, Coordinator of the Panel of Experts, thanked the Committee for the invitation to present the recommended projects on behalf of the experts involved in the evaluation. He also thanked, on behalf of the experts, the Secretary of the Convention and the IFCD team for its professionalism and engagement. He highlighted the fact that half of the experts of the Panel of Experts was renewed this year and thanked outgoing experts, namely Mr Li He, Mr Kokou Denakpo and Mr Khamis Al Shamakhi for their expertise provided for the last four calls, mentioning that their work laid the foundation for the IFCD. He then reported that these three experts were replaced by Ms Yarri Kamara et Ouafa Belgacem and Mr Monsieur Yudhishtir Raj Isar. He further informed that the experts had a chance to physically meet for the first time from 28 to 29 July 2014 at UNESCO Headquarters as provided by the Operational Guidelines, allowing them to undertake collective analysis of the funding requests, exchange on the evaluation methods and the scoring process, and to develop a system of information exchange. He once again expressed its thanks to UNESCO for having made the meeting possible and assured the Committee that the meeting was indeed extremely useful. He continued to present the 7 recommended projects one by one.
  - Project number 041, entitled, "Empowering African youth to harness the potential of the music sector" is a large, multi-layered training programme for African festival managers/emerging cultural managers, and the project builds predominantly on South-South cooperation as the training courses, internships and traineeships would

be implemented among African training institutes and festivals. This project received the highest score and was presented by the International Council of Music (ICM) to be implemented in: Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, , the United Republic of Tanzania.

- Project number 040, entitled “Building a sustainable performing arts industry in Cambodia” provides capacity-building to Cambodian performing arts actors working towards sustainable cultural industries. It is designed by a local association in Battambang and aims to strengthen different skills across the entire range of performing arts for the local community and its region. The association has already been associated with a significant range of local initiatives and cultural infrastructure.
- Project number 131, entitled “Strengthening local and regional institutional capacities to develop cultural industries policies in Serbia” involves two types of activities: one is to produce a hand book on good governance in cultural industries, including case studies and a white paper on the cultural industries of the city of Pirot which would serve as a model; and the other is a capacity-building programme for 50 representatives developing local and regional cultural industries.
- Project number 045, entitled “Emerging Youth: Strengthening sub-regional cooperation and promoting young talents in the African music sector”. The project, proposed by a cultural NGO specialized in music in Chad, has the following main activities: training of artists and musicians in vocal techniques; training of sound technicians, and organisation of meetings with various stakeholders of the music industry. It is an interesting project considering that Chad is a country that needs to develop structural initiatives in the field of culture and engage in inter-African cooperation.
- Project number 075, entitled “Developing an efficient policy for the promotion of cultural industries in Morocco”. It is an exemplary project showing what civil society can do to accompany the democratic development of the country. Taking into account the past and looking into the future, the project aims at having a long-term impact through training young people.
- Project 078, entitled “Promoting young people’s participation in the book and music industries in Mexico”. It aims to strengthen local capacities in cultural entrepreneurship, notably among disadvantaged young people, as well as open up markets for their products in local, national and international arenas. It provides capacity-building for a large number of beneficiaries..
- Project number 126, entitled “Fostering an active participation of vulnerable groups in the creative sector in Uruguay”, aims at strengthening the capacities of cultural factories as creative industries for the development of communities in different vulnerable situations. The proposed project is a continuation of a programme that has been running since 2008, targeting the promotion of cultural industries as a means for economic development and social inclusion. The project aims at reaching over 200 beneficiaries working in 14 cultural factories spread over 9 localities throughout the country who are developing various cultural undertakings.

**Mr Richard** continued to make the following final remarks:

- The quality of the projects for this call was outstanding. The oldest members of the Panel of Experts, namely, Ms Baiba Tjarve and Mr Richard himself, noted that the general quality of the funding requests has improved with each successive funding cycle. They have clear presentations of activities and their budgetary implications. There is also an increasing indication of co-financing opportunities so that the IFCD can also be seen as something that provides leverage for broader funding. In other



words, the IFCD is able to garner additional resources. There remains room for further improvement as regards the role of National Commissions.

- Considering that the 2014 call for funding did not have any specific theme, it opened a broader spectrum of projects submitted. This corresponds well with the suggestions made by the Panel of Experts in 2013 with a view to ensuring the widest possible diversity of projects and avoiding cookie cutter types of presentation.
  - While geographical distribution was not among the selection criteria for the experts, the experts did keep in mind the question of geographical diversity in order to maintain the spirit of the IFCD as a fund reaching all corners of the world.
  - The 2014 funding cycle witnessed a considerable increase in the applications from Latin America and the Caribbean as well as proposals from international NGOs. Contrary to previous years where Arab countries were well represented, there was only one eligible funding request, which is one of the projects that the Panel of Experts is recommending for funding.
  - Regarding the diversity of the status of the applicants, while some 50 funding requests out of 74 were submitted by international and national NGOs, or 60% of the projects, the 4 out of 7 recommended projects are submitted by international NGOs. He expressed a concern that international NGOs that have better opportunities to present high quality projects may in the future end up submitting the majority of the projects triggering an undesired spin-off effect. He therefore suggested that there might be a limitation on the number that each international NGO can submit, e.g., one per year, so that they would not be the majority of the funding receivers. During the debate on the IFCD in 2013, it was discussed that the concept of the diversity of cultural expressions is not a philosophical or philanthropic questions, but it is a concrete process, a territorial project, and a collective construction that raises new questions and find new solutions. The IFCD is more than ever the leverage that stimulates creativity, growth of cultural industries and local inputs. Concrete examples of the IFCD projects indeed provide a reference point demonstrating that culture does contribute to sustainable development and peace.
202. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Richard for his presentation and the Panel of Experts for their engagement and the work carried out to ensure that the IFCD supports those projects that encourage the implementation of the Convention. He invited the Committee members to indicate if they wished any complementary information or clarifications from the Secretariat or the Coordinator.
203. While acknowledging the good quality of document 8, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed its concern noting that if the Committee was presented with only those projects recommended for funding and without those that were not recommended for funding, it is not possible for it to know whether the right choice has been made. Listening to the presentation of the Coordinator, the delegation felt the need for the Committee to debate on the selection criteria for the IFCD, particularly on what is meant by sustainability, because one of the ways that “sustainability” was interpreted seemed the availability of matching funds from other donors. The delegation indicated its uneasiness to interpret it in such a way, because the IFCD for this delegation should fund projects that are new and not those projects that request only 10% of the budget from it while securing 90% of its funding from other funding sources. It proposed that the question of the need could be one of the selection criteria considering that some projects seem capable of self-financing without the IFCD funding and there are proposals from countries that can afford to fund such projects. The delegation concurred with Mr Richard about limiting the number of funding requests to be submitted by international NGOs. The delegation asked the Secretariat why it requires the Committee’s permission to re-credit the unspent money from those discontinued projects

to the IFCD, considering that such action should be automatic. The delegation further expressed that the Committee must revisit the IFCD process in light of the fact that only 7 projects out of 172 funding requests can be funded and that close to 60% of funding requests are deemed ineligible.

204. The delegation of **Guinea** also expressed its concern that only 7 projects are recommended for funding out of 172 submitted, qualifying the situation as “paradoxical” as it would expect that the Committee accepts at least half of the submitted projects. It asked whether the limited available funds were the cause for the small number of recommended projects. It also noted that while the Secretariat preselected two out of four funding requests that Guinea submitted, neither of the two projects was actually recommended for funding. Noting that the same countries seem to be receiving IFCD funding, the delegation stressed the need for geographical balance as the IFCD is intended for every country.
205. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked a question to Mr Richard concerning those projects that received more than 30 points but were not recommended for funding. The delegation asked whether the reason was due to the lack of available funding.
206. **Mr Richard**, while noting that the question of co-funding would require more time for debate, responded that co-funding was considered as a sign of professionalism of the proposed projects, because it meant that they are able to find resources from other funding bodies. Responding to the question by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, he confirmed that the limited available funds were the cause for recommending only 7 projects. He explained that the experts are there to evaluate the funding requests and recommend projects that received the highest scores, and it is up to UNESCO and donors to increase the funding base as the quality of the IFCD funding requests improves every year. Concerning the question by Guinea, he confirmed that one project by Guinea was considered of good quality, but it did not receive enough overall points. He also informed that some applicants did re-submit funding requests which were not recommended under the 2013 cycle and did receive a higher score and are being recommended for this funding cycle, because their resubmitted projects corrected problems raised by the experts. This means that if Guinea decides to resubmit the same funding request taking into account the comments of the experts, it may have the chance of being recommended in the next funding cycle. Concurring the sentiment expressed by several delegations, he deplored that there are not enough funds available to support more projects.
207. When the delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked Mr Richard whether significant co-funding was an important factor to receive higher scores, **Mr Richard** responded by saying no and further elaborated that the availability of co-funding is just a good indication of the project managers having a good grip of the situation. He explained that the Panel of Experts did not recommend certain projects even if they had significant co-funding, while it recommended those projects that had no co-funding. It depends on the nature of the project in question; certain projects need to rely on multi-funding, while others are more institutional, requiring just one funding source. He noted that the utmost selection criterion for the experts was the sustainability and impact that the proposed projects could achieve on their territory or region.
208. The delegation of **Sweden** indicated its appreciation about the work of the IFCD and pleased to hear that several projects are of high quality. It also thanked the Secretariat for its good work with the IFCD during the past years in terms of reducing the number of ineligible funding requests. It highlighted that it is indeed a challenge to have such a limited resource available for funding projects and noted the importance of continuing discussion on the guidelines and the evaluation. It also noted that the diminishing number of Parties contributing to the IFCD is a problem as the contribution by Parties is the funding base of the IFCD.

209. Seeing no other members of the Committee wishing to take the floor, the **Chairperson** invited observers to make comments.

**[Observers]**

210. The delegation of **Cameroon** referred to the recommended project 41 and proposed that the International Music Council works with its local branch on the ground in addition to the proposed universities. It further noted that since national music councils exist in some of the beneficiary countries, it hopes that the project would be implemented in collaboration with these local associations instead of going directly to universities.

211. The delegation of **Brazil** noted that in light of the high number of good projects and insufficient available financial resources to support such high quality projects, the Committee in the future may consider establishing a mechanism that would assess the projects and the Committee would approve those projects with a symbolic amount. Such a mechanism would not only give a sign of encouragement to NGOs and institutions but also enable them to ask for resources from other donors. In the case of Brazil, the Ministry of Culture gives a symbolic amount to an NGO, which functions as a quality label, helping it to obtain support from other stakeholders/donors such as a private party. It suggested that the Committee creates a list of 20 projects that are of high quality deserving the IFCD funding, and if the IFCD has the resources to fund only 5 projects, the remaining 15 projects could receive a symbolic amount of money with the mention that they have been approved by the Panel of Expert of the Convention and thus approved by UNESCO, quality wise. This could facilitate their getting support from other parties and function as a means to encourage those applicants that have invested a lot of effort to formulate a proposal to UNESCO.

212. The delegation of **Germany** noted that the report by Mr Richard gives an encouraging sign about the beauty of the Convention and cumulative effects of this Convention through not only the IFCD but also the periodic reports and the technical assistance project on the cultural governance. It noted that within this expanding landscape of the Convention, it is important to ensure that new comers understand how the Convention works. It noted with satisfaction that an increasing number of governments, NGOs and National Commissions have a better understanding of the IFCD, while there remains room for improvement on how the gatekeepers at the national level work. Considering that more funding is available both at the local and regional levels for international cooperation projects, the delegation agreed with Brazil and supported the idea of creating a mechanism to provide those good quality projects with UNESCO's quality stamp. The delegation considered co-funding as a good way to provide a different type of visibility to the project connected through the Convention.

213. After supporting the intervention by Brazil and Germany, the representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** (IFCCD) commended the work of the Secretariat and expressed its satisfaction that after many years, there is now a better understanding of the IFCD. He also noted the need to continue training that has a structuring impact. He congratulated those projects that managed to obtain co-funding in view of ensuring the sustainability of the project impact, where UNESCO plays a complementary role. He then invited the Committee to reflect on the structuring of the coordination with other funds that are bilateral or multilateral, or sometime regional and stressed the need to ask about how to achieve the structuralization of professionals that over time could have a sustainable effect. He noted that UNESCO participated in a round table discussion on donors in Brussels in December 2013 and once again in February 2014 and encouraged UNESCO to pursue such exchanges in order to better understand other mechanisms so that UNESCO would play not only a lead role but also a complementary role.

214. **Mr Richard** responded to Cameroon that while he as an expert could not offer a judgment, the fact that the International Music Council, instead of a national music council, would implement the project could have a unifying effect. The project is about the mobility of operators between different festivals, meaning that these festivals would mutually reinforce each other through exchanging their personnel, knowhow and their good practices. It is eminently international in scope, and he finds it appropriate that the project is coordinated by an international institution. He however added that the national music council could perfectly be among the beneficiaries of the project. Regarding Brazil's idea of labelling good projects that are not funded, he personally found it a good idea, noting that it indeed already is the case since the scores are made public, so others know of the quality of these projects.
215. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** highlighted several problems of the IFCD that started at the moment that Member States of UNESCO accepted to make the IFCD a voluntary fund at the time of the adoption of the Convention. Member States of UNESCO accepted to make the IFCD a voluntary fund to accommodate the legislation of some Member States who could no longer ratify a convention with a compulsory fund attached to it. The IFCD being a voluntary fund means that Parties do not receive an official letter from UNESCO with a specific figure asking them to pay, and when the Ministry of Finance does not get this kind of letter, they just do not pay. There are several Parties who find themselves in this situation. Another problem is that some of those countries who asked the IFCD to be a voluntary fund are not making their voluntary contributions, and some of such countries have created a Fund-in-Trust and not paying into the Fund, and this is contrary to the gentleman's agreement made at the time of the Convention's adoption. The delegation emphasized that the work done by the Fund-in-Trust is very much appreciated, especially considering that the activities are totally in line with the priorities of the governing bodies, but that the problem is that money goes into the Funds-in-Trust and not into the IFCD. The delegation reminded that although the IFCD is only operational for the last four years, it has achieved a lot and did everything that donors have asked for, including an evaluation, clarifications of objectives and the purpose, introduction of the results-based management framework, transparent financial and project management, communication of the impact of the projects achieving sustainable development. It expressed that there must be other funds that are older than the IFCD but have not done all that the IFCD has done so far. The delegation made an official appeal to donors to contribute to the IFCD and fund those three projects that were given the high enough scores to be funded, namely the projects from Croatia, El Salvador and Paraguay. It also appealed to those developing countries that have the resources or access to other funding to refrain from submitting funding requests because the limited amount of the IFCD should be reserved for those who really need the IFCD funding. It ended its intervention by mentioning that it would propose amendments when the Committee moves to the adoption of the draft decision on this item.
216. The **Chairperson** indicated its agreement that the IFCD indeed needs a lot more contributions.
217. The delegation of **Kuwait** thanked Mr Richard for his presentation and concurred with the intervention of Saint Lucia that the IFCD requires more financial contributions. The delegation expressed that the IFCD needs a strategy to reinforce the financial resources, contacting the private sector and other partners, to which the **Chairperson** responded that the IFCD does already have a fundraising strategy.
218. The delegation of **Guinea** posed a question to Mr Richard about whether those projects that were not recommended for funding could receive a response explaining why their projects were not recommended in order for them to improve their projects in the future, to which **Mr Richard** responded that the experts evaluated only 73 funding requests that the Secretariat deemed eligible. For each of the 73 funding requests evaluated by the experts, the evaluations are publicly available, and there have been several resubmission of

projects previously submitted taking into account the experts' previous evaluation, demonstrating the interactive project development process. He expressed that not being recommended for funding should not be considered as "rejection".

219. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed that the time has come for the Conference of Parties to discuss what is meant by "sustainability" and the question of whether the fund should be allocated based on a criterion of need. Furthermore, it expressed the need for either the Conference of Parties or the Committee to discuss IFCD's overall funding request process and the overall large volume of funding requests vis-à-vis the actual number of projects that the IFCD could fund. The delegation expressed its uneasiness to be requested to validate the outcome of the process when it is presented only with the recommended projects. Notwithstanding the valuable evaluation by the experts, the delegation felt it important to verify whether the recommendation of the experts is appropriate. Referring to the intervention by Saint Lucia on the three good projects which were not recommended, the delegation expressed that had the Committee been presented these three projects, they might have been chosen over those projects that could have been funded elsewhere, especially considering that the project that received the highest score receives 90% of its budget from other funding sources.
220. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that all the funding requests, irrespective of the outcome of their evaluation, are publically available on the website of the 2005 Convention.
221. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled the previous decision of the Committee that requested the Secretariat to create a knowledge management system and informed the Committee that an online platform including a database has been developed in which all the applications, evaluations by National Commissions, letters that the Secretariat sends to the project applicants explaining reasons why their applications were rejected or not, all the evaluations including final validation comments by the Panel of Experts, as well as the points allocated to each of the projects for all the funding cycles are made public and accessible to anyone wishing to consult them. The platform represents the best effort of the Secretariat in response to the Committee's request within its limited resource.
222. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** asked whether those projects that were not recommended are accessible in the online platform. The delegation further expressed that if ten projects received the high enough score to receive funding, the Committee should have been presented with all the ten projects rather than with the seven recommended projects.
223. In response, the **Secretary of the Convention** stated that while it is the Committee's prerogative to decide, there has been a decision of the Committee asking the Panel of Experts to recommend only those projects that are worthy of financing that are equal to the available budget envelope. The Committee could indeed decide otherwise by changing that process and ask the Panel of Experts to recommend best projects from which the Committee would then decide.
224. The **Chairperson** expressed that the Panel of Experts and the Secretariat have carried out the tasks requested by the Committee in a satisfactory manner and suggested that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland could perhaps propose a new procedure for the next session of the Committee about the way of approving the projects. For this funding cycle, he considered that the Committee needs to follow the current application procedure, to which the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** responded that it is not in a position to propose an alternative procedure and commended the work of the Secretariat including its attention to those rejected projects by sending a letter indicating where other funding opportunities may be available. It however reiterated its reservation about deciding to approve the seven

recommended projects when the Committee did not see the other three that had high scores as well. It indicated that it would be ready to discuss with the Secretariat before the next session of the Committee to figure out other methods.

225. The **Chairperson** mentioned that it is important to offer suggestions and work with the Secretariat on the selection method or choice, or improve the selection process. He then opened the floor to observers.

#### [Observers]

226. The delegation of **Brazil** reacted to the comment by Saint Lucia regarding the contribution to the IFCD and confirmed that countries like Brazil do require an official invoice in order to be able to make the payment. It provided an example of the 2003 Convention which Brazil ratified with a special clause indicating that it would not be bound by the obligatory contribution to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (ICH Fund). This made Brazil to be listed under those countries that provide voluntary contributions, and the UNESCO Secretariat requested Brazil to declare how much it would voluntarily contribute to the ICH Fund. Brazil at the end decided that it would voluntarily pay the same amount as it would have paid as its obligatory contribution. This way, Brazil receives every year a letter from UNESCO with an invoice indicating 95,000 USD as Brazil's voluntary contribution, in the same manner it pays its obligatory contribution to the 1972 Convention fund. The delegation proposed that the similar exercise could be undertaken for the 2005 Convention, whereby the UNESCO Secretariat asks all Parties to the Convention to declare how much they would be willing to pay annually on a voluntary basis. With this amount fixed, all those Parties that agree to make voluntary contributions would receive annually an invoice stating the exact amount it should contribute.
227. Being the second largest contributor to the IFCD, the delegation of **France** expressed its continuing commitment and announced its contribution to the IFCD for the year 2015. It further expressed its attachment to the IFCD and its hope that the momentum created around the IFCD fundraising would foster the increased and widened participation of new Parties to allow the IFCD to increase its available resources.
228. The delegation of **El Salvador** expressed its thanks to the delegation of Saint Lucia for making an important point about those countries namely as El Salvador, Paraguay and Croatia which received enough points to be funded by the IFCD but did not get recommended for funding. Considering that the budget of each of those projects that were being recommended for funding was between 96,000 USD and 100,000 USD, the delegation wondered whether the available IFCD resources could have been more equally distributed, taking into account the tremendous efforts of these three countries that would not get funding. The delegation expressed that it is not suggesting that all three projects should have been recommended, but at least one among the three should have gotten some of the funds. Thanking once again the delegation of Saint Lucia for its comment, the delegation hoped that more consideration would be given to this kind of issue in the future because it is not easy for countries like El Salvador to come up with a viable project and then be told that there is no money to fund it.
229. While acknowledging the proposal by Brazil as an excellent idea that should be discussed by the Conference of Parties and notwithstanding potential legal impediments or legal problems, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** restated its belief that there are ways around it. The question is how to frame the issue and present it. The delegation stressed that the question of the contribution to the IFCD must be addressed and recommended that the Conference of Parties discuss it and find solutions because otherwise, the financing of the IFCD would completely disappear in a few years from now.
230. The **Secretary of the Convention** reported that the Director General sends every year a letter to all Parties to recall the voluntary and regular contribution which corresponds to 1%

of the contributions of each Party to UNESCO within the framework of the IFCD fundraising strategy approved by the Committee two years ago.

231. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to examine the projects recommended by the Panel of Experts and invited the Committee to move to the approval of the recommended projects. He requested the Secretariat to project it on the screen. He gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention.
232. The **Secretary of the Convention** informed that she would read out the projects one by one and that the Committee is to take a decision to confirm the amount recommended by the Panel of Experts.
233. The **Chairperson** declared that no objection was registered and therefore declared all projects approved. He then moved to the adoption of the draft decision and requested the Secretariat to project the draft decision on the screen.
234. The delegation of **Guinea** expressed its observation that most of the projects were submitted by NGOs and that public institutions need capacity-building. The **Chairperson** responded by reiterating that capacity-building is already planned and would be implemented. He then read paragraphs 1 to 8 of the draft decision and adopted them.
235. Responding to a question posed by the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** on paragraph 9 requesting what was meant by “updated status of the IOS recommendations”, the **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the IFCD was evaluated by the IOS in 2012 and that there was a series of 35 recommendations that were made by the IOS. The Secretariat prepared a table reporting on the status of the implementation of those recommendations, which is presented in document 8 in Annex III. Annex III presents all the recommendations including what the Secretariat has done to implement them and indicates if there are challenges in implementing some of them. She provided an example of a results-based framework which is presented in Annex IV on which the Secretariat has been working with a specialist. She informed that the results-based framework requires additional resources, primarily about monitoring the implementation of the projects on the ground which is difficult to follow up from the Headquarters. She then proposed to make it more precise, paragraph 9 could read, “the implementation of the IOS recommendations”, to keep the Committee updated on the IOS recommendations. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed its satisfaction to the proposal made by the Secretary of the Convention. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 9 as proposed by the Secretary of the Convention and adopted it. He then read paragraph 10 and adopted it since no objection was raised.
236. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** proposed a new paragraph after paragraph 10 and read its amendment, “Invites the Conference of Parties at its fifth ordinary session to consider the most appropriate criteria for the allocation of funds from the IFCD, in particular, sustainability and need.” The **Chairperson** read the paragraph proposed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and adopted it as no objection was raised.
237. The **Chairperson** then read a new paragraph proposed by Saint Lucia and adopted it as no objection was raised.
238. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed a new paragraph which reads, “Invites the Secretariat to present to the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties a mechanism by which Parties could declare the amount they wish to voluntarily contribute to the IFCD.” The delegation of **Uruguay** proposed to add a word “regularly” concerning the contribution to the IFCD. When the delegation of **Guinea** expressed that adding the word “regularly” makes it sound like it is an obligation, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** explained that the word “regularly” is already in the text of the Convention. The

**Chairperson** expressed that the word “regularly” appears too constraining to him as well, but noted that if the wording is already within the text of the Convention, the Committee must be able to accept it. He read out once again the paragraph as proposed by Saint Lucia and amended by Uruguay. He adopted it as no objection was raised.

239. The **Chairperson** adopted the decision 8.IGC 8 in its entirety. He invited observers wishing to take the floor to make comments.

#### [Observers]

240. The representative of the **International Music Council (IMC)** thanked the members of the Committee for having granted the IFCD funding to its project, on behalf of the INGO and its partners, i.e., National Councils of Music in the beneficiary countries with whom the IMC has worked closely in the elaboration of the project and also thanked the Panel of Experts for their positive comments. She also expressed its thanks to the donors and seconded those comments that appealed to those donors to contribute to the IFCD not only voluntarily but also regularly.
241. The representative of the **Arterial network** and the **Association Racine** which presented a project also thanked the members of the Committee as well as the Panel of Experts especially the Coordinator, noting that the IFCD funding provides credibility to the work of NGOs. He expressed that this Convention allows NGOs to work with governments in their respective countries, and although NGOs and governments do not always have common objectives, this Convention allows NGOs to have an intersection with governments. He expressed that the collaboration framework proposed by the Convention goes beyond cultural policy, and addresses the questions of human development, social development, peace as well as economic development. He emphasized that this Convention is about the freedom of expression, human rights and about how cultural policies contributes to building democracy in countries. He highlighted that NGOs know wholeheartedly how essential the series of transversal criteria proposed by the Convention are for the citizens, and NGOs advocate for public space and also for economic development.
242. The delegation of **Serbia** expressed its gratitude to the Committee for having granted the funding to the project submitted by a Serbian NGO. It stated that it is the first systematic project for enhancing capacities of local governments and managers of cultural industries. The delegation informed that the project would use the methodology introduced by a pilot study on measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries, case studies on Serbia done by the UNESCO Institute of Statistics. The first results of the project would be presented in November 2015 at the International Conference entitled “Cultural Diversity and Challenges in Creative Economy”. The event would be among other programmes dedicated to the celebration of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention.
243. The **Chairperson** thanked the Coordinator and the Panel of Experts and concluded the item 8.

*Decision 8.IGC 8 was adopted with amendment.*

## ITEM 9 – REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IFCD FUNDING STRATEGY

### Document CE/14/8.IGC/9

244. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine document 9 concerning the report on the implementation of the IFCD fundraising strategy. He requested the Secretary to present the document.
245. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that in December 2012, the Committee adopted a five-year (2013-2018) fundraising and communication strategy for the IFCD that is to be progressively implemented according to three different phases and that at this



session, the Committee is expected to review progress made during phase one of the strategy's implementation, take note of the targets and challenges for implementing phase two and assign a budget for activities to be carried out in 2015. The first phase of the fundraising strategy was implemented from January 2013 to June 2014 with the objective to consolidate and expand the IFCD's existing donor base among governments. Several actions were taken during this period to achieve the target amount US\$ 1,434,875, including the call for contributions to Parties in March 2014 requesting regular voluntary contributions equivalent to at least 1 per cent of their total contribution to UNESCO, as well as the preparation of promotional activities increasing the visibility of the IFCD through various communication tools. The result of phase one was that just over one million USD was raised, which represents 75 per cent of the target amount. On the one hand, this could certainly be considered as a successful implementation of the first phase of the strategy considering the global economic crisis and reduced budgets for culture in many countries, as well as the fact that the IFCD is based on voluntary contributions. On the other hand, the total number of Parties that have contributed to this amount is only 20 out of 134 Parties, drawing immediate attention and concern of the Committee. This implies that only 15 per cent of the Parties have made a contribution to the IFCD during this period, of which only 5% (7 Parties) make an annual and regular contribution. She reminded that the overall goal of the fundraising strategy expects the IFCD to receive, by 2018, regular financial support from at least half of the Parties to the Convention. From July 2014, the IFCD entered into phase two of the fundraising strategy. During this period of transition from phase one to phase two, the Secretariat began to establish the building blocks needed to reach out to external donors, while continuing to strengthen the existing donor base. It initiated private sector prospect research in order to expand IFCD's donor support base and to seek alternative funding sources, namely the private sector and high-net-worth individuals. The challenge for this new phase is to pursue, secure and maintain a steady pipeline of private sector partnerships. The next step is to develop and implement an action plan for elaborating tailor-made arguments and implementing systems necessary for collaborating effectively with the private sector. This means developing different modalities of partnerships and incentive programmes identifying partner benefits as well as creating cases for support outlining the key advantages and selling points for potential funding partners. All these actions fundamentally hinge on the engagement of skilled human resources with the required expertise in the field of communication and professional fundraising backgrounds. She noted that special assistance through staff secondment schemes would be a valuable support and contribution to the IFCD's fundraising and communication strategy. According to the IFCD strategy that was presented and adopted by the Committee, a total of 95,125 USD were foreseen to implement fundraising activities for phase two over a 24-month period. She informed that the Secretariat is requesting the Committee to allocate US\$ 47,563 from unassigned funds, which corresponds to 50% of the total budget foreseen for phase two activities including developing the prospects list and an action plan for private sector partnerships. Lastly, she provided a brief overview of the promotional activities that were undertaken in 2014 that successfully contributed to establishing a clear message and visible identity for the IFCD. Five electronic newsletters called "IFCD e-updates" have been sent to over 3,000 subscribers in English, French and Spanish, presenting results, impact and status reports on the different funded projects. They were developed in such a way so that the each e-update corresponded to the priority themes defined by the Committee or the Fund, be it evidence-based policy-making, promotion of gender equality, support for projects which place new technologies at their core activity. Four new multimedia stories are being produced with a selected number of IFCD-funded projects as a means to communicate the results of the projects on the ground. Four have already been produced and presented to the Committee previously, and three new films are being produced in Guatemala, Tajikistan and Togo addressing different aspects of capacity-building, market access and policy action. She further informed that the Secretariat is also working to produce an IFCD

impact film, a fast-paced comprehensive clip that would help in its effort to appeal to potential private sector donors. She thanked different delegations that have engaged in translating and providing subtitles for the IFCD corporate film which are now available in Chinese and in German in addition to English, French and Spanish. She concluded by saying that the most important thing is to distribute the variety of communication tools that the Secretariat has produced over the years, particularly the films, and that the Secretariat is actively looking for ways to distribute them through public sector broadcasting agencies and other film distribution networks.

246. The **Chairperson** invited the members of the Committee to make comments.
247. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** congratulated the Secretariat for the work done in this field and expressed that the Committee was well advised to invest from the Fund despite the scarce resources in order to get professional support and materials that come with it. The delegation further expressed that it is now time to go further. Referring to the IFCD strategy, the delegation suggested that rather than having professionals embedded into the Secretariat for fundraising, it is better to continue seeking external professionals. Recalling an idea put forward by Brazil at the time of the establishment of the IFCD to create crowd funding, the delegation expressed that now is the time to reflect on such innovative ideas. It believes that if the international community is to sustain policies and cultural industries in the Parties, the Convention requires a lot more resources, and it hence supported the idea of seeking a professional company specialized in fundraising to fundraise for the IFCD on behalf of the Committee. The company could then be paid from the percentage of the funds that it would raise, noting that other UN agencies including UNICEF already engage in such a mechanism. The delegation urged the Committee to ask the Secretariat to seek a professional company that could fundraise with all the support materials that the Convention already possesses. It concluded by informing the Committee that it would propose an amendment when it comes to the adoption of the draft decision, if the Committee agrees with its proposal.
248. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** seconded the proposal of Saint Lucia to rely on a private company to help the Committee with fundraising. It noted that this is particularly important since phase two is about reaching out to high-net-worth individuals and the private sector, and doing so requires specialized skill sets and there are companies that have extensive experience in doing this type of work externally. Notwithstanding that hiring a private fundraising company would evidently require close management to ensure that fundraising is done keeping in mind the priority of the funds and the Convention as well as within the legal constraints of UNESCO, it indicated its preference to call on professional companies to do the fundraising, instead of the Secretariat recruiting a fundraiser to be integrated into the Secretariat. It proposed that an engagement with a fundraising company could start with a two-year test phase which covers phase two of the fundraising strategy.
249. The delegation of **Austria** commended the great deal of materials that have been produced showcasing the impact of the funded projects and agreed to outsource fundraising to a professional company. It however posed a question about whether the implementation of the IFCD fundraising strategy lies with the Secretariat, even though it was elaborated by a company called Small World Stories.
250. The **Secretary of the Convention** confirmed that it was Small World Stories that developed the strategy and that it is the Secretariat implementing it to the best of its ability. She indicated that the first phase of the strategy was focused on consolidating the donor base by creating communication tools. The latest magazine that the Secretariat produced on the impact of the projects is available in the room, and members could receive extra copies for distribution within their countries or to approach other potential donors in their own fundraising efforts, because fundraising is not the sole responsibility of the Secretariat, but of all Parties. Noting that many civil society organizations as well as some

Parties are already closely working together with the Secretariat to implement the strategy, she encouraged the members of the Committee to work with the Secretariat to distribute these printed materials and multi-media project stories. She informed that the Ambassador of Canada for instance organized a meeting for the Secretariat to meet representatives of TV5 Monde to discuss the possibility of making a programme on the IFCD and distributing the films. While the films showing the impact of the project through the voices of the project managers have not yet been distributed, the response from the President of TV5 Monde has been positive.

251. The **Chairperson** agreed that fundraising for the IFCD is not only the responsibility of the Secretariat but the responsibility of all involved. Seeing no observers wishing to make a comment, he moved to the adoption of the draft decision and asked the Secretariat to project it on the screen. He read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraphs 1 to 4 as no objection was raised.
252. On paragraph 5, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed the following amendment: "Requests the Secretariat to seek a professional company specialized in fundraising to implement the IFCD fundraising strategy, taking into consideration its debate". The delegation of **Sweden**, while agreeing with the proposed amendment, requested whether the Secretariat considers feasible to implement the amended paragraph. The representative of the **Director-General** stated that the Secretariat would work in close cooperation with the Bureau of Strategic Planning (BSP) which deals with cooperation with private sector funding sources, and there are legal frameworks which can be put in place when hiring such a company or an individual. He indicated that the amended paragraph is appropriately drafted. The delegation of Sweden was satisfied with the response. The Chairperson then read out the amended paragraph once again and adopted it as no objection was raised.
253. The **Chairperson** read the next paragraph (original paragraph 5) and adopted as no objection was raised. He then adopted the decision 8.IGC 9 in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 9 was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 10 – USE OF THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY (IFCD)**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/10**

254. The **Chairperson** continued to document 10 on the use of the financial resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity and invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the item in question.
255. The **Secretary of the Convention** reported that the Secretariat has prepared this document in order to provide the Committee with financial statements of the Fund that indicate the income and expenditures for the period 1 January 2013 until 30 June 2014. She reminded that the date of 30 June is used as it is a part of the decision of the Committee that the budget for the following year for the IFCD is always taken based on the amount of contributions available in the Fund on that date. Since 30 June, additional voluntary contributions have been received amounting to 324,175 USD which is more than the amount received between January and June 2014, i.e., 249,894 USD. She drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that there has been a change in the procedures for crediting contributions to the Special account, namely a new requirement to sign an agreement letter, and without this signed agreement, voluntary contributions will not be credited by the Bureau of Financial Management to the Special account. She therefore urged Parties to sign this letter, referring to two cases where contributions have been announced and the funds transferred to UNESCO, but they have not yet been credited to

the IFCD. She stated that the Committee is invited to examine the use of the resources of the IFCD through the statements of income and expenditure, as well as adopt the draft provisional budget for 2015. The draft provisional budget is presented in Annex II of document 10, and is broken down into two main sections that have been determined by the Committee's decisions, namely fixed costs and funding of projects. In line with the guidelines provided by the Committee, it is to approve the budget in accordance with the resources available in the IFCD. For the provisional draft budget for 2015, 82% of the budget funds are allocated to the funding of projects, while 18% is allocated to the fixed costs which include the evaluation of funding requests and the cost of participation in statutory meetings of Committee members from least developed countries. Past practice for the preparation of the provisional draft budget for the IFCD has been that a minimum of 82% of the budget is allocated to the funding of projects. While this practice has been rigorously implemented during the pilot phase of the IFCD since its adoption in 2009 (Decision 3.IGC 5) and allocations of fixed costs have been adjusted to the actual expenditures over time to ensure the majority of the funds of the budget to be dedicated to funding projects, she reported that there has been a stagnation of contributions to the Fund that may jeopardize this percentage in the future. She also recalled that 325,897 USD are available from unassigned funds, and that should activities be foreseen for the continuation of fundraising, namely with an estimated cost of 47,563 USD as presented in document 9, the Committee may decide to take this amount from unassigned funds as was the case in the previous decisions taken by the fifth, sixth and seventh ordinary sessions of the Committee.

256. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and invited the Committee to make comments. He informed that the Chief of the Administrative Office of the Culture Sector of UNESCO and a representative of the Bureau of Financial Management are present on the podium to offer any necessary clarifications.
257. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** informed the Committee that it contributed 5,000 euros to the IFCD in December 2014, and it invited all the Parties to follow suit. It stressed that the projects funded by the IFCD represent a great visibility of Convention, and unless Parties contribute, the IFCD risks disappearing. Referring to the difficulty of signing the agreement letter mentioned by the Secretary of the Convention, the delegation requested the reasons why two countries that have not been able to do so. It also added that the Committee might perhaps need to add 81,500 USD in the table which is in line with the decision taken on item 8.
258. Referring to its earlier request to leave aside the paragraph about the application of the cost recovery policy under item 5a, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** explained that the word "cost-recovery" within UNESCO documents includes two aspects: one is the process by which all activities of Sectors are properly budgeted including the staff time and the time staff spent on implementing the activities get reimbursed by the project; and the other is the programme support cost of 10%, whose overall approach is currently being questioned by members of the Executive Board. It informed that the Executive Board is currently requesting the UNESCO Secretariat to lower the programme support costs while agreeing to the full application of the cost-recovery policy including staff time spent on programme implementation. With respect to the IFCD, the delegation maintained that the fundraising activities seemed covered by the current Programme Support Cost of 10%, since these activities do not represent the implementation of the projects. For the sake of transparency, it supported proper budgeting including cost-recovery for staff time spent implementing the IFCD and stressed that the IFCD should not pay twice for the same service, namely, once under the cost-recovery and the other under the Programme Support Cost.

259. The **Secretary of the Convention** noted the importance of distinguishing the two things: one is the programme support cost which is a percentage amount and which will be discussed by the upcoming Executive Board; and the second is the cost recovery for the implementation of the activities which is what the Secretariat is asking the Committee to approve which would allow the Secretariat to apply the policy in line with the practice of the funds of other cultural conventions of UNESCO. Concerning the question of whether the IFCD would be paying twice for the same thing, she clarified that the amounts asked for the IFCD fundraising are for actual physical activities, meaning that it is to produce brochures, films, the private sector prospect research, as outlined in the document. She underscored that it is thus not to pay for those engaged in fundraising. In terms of the cost recovery that is different from the Programme Support Cost, its application would not be on a percentage basis: to be able to recover the time spent by the Secretariat on the implementation and monitoring of projects, staff must fill in the time sheets and declare the time spent on activity implementation, and the specific time declared would then be reimbursed to the Secretariat.
260. The representative of the **Bureau of Financial Management** informed that the current Programme Support Cost (PSC) have been covering only the administrative services, and that the PSC rate would now be reviewed since the Secretariat should charge the programme support costs either as a direct percentage or through proper budgeting of all costs relating to a particular project. He further informed that the cost-recovery tool has since been greatly improved, and that at the 197<sup>th</sup> session of the Executive Board, the Secretariat would present a proposal looking at the overall budgeting rather than talking only about cost-recovery. It would thus be about the full budgeting which would not only cover the PSC but also ensure all direct costs to a fund or to a project. Under the current PSC, it only covers administrative services of the Central Services and field offices and does not cover the direct costs related to the Fund or a particular project.
261. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the cost-recovery is indeed a complicated issue because the Programme Support Cost of 10% only covers the central services, and at the last session of the Committee (in 2014), the Committee realized that most of the services to the IFCD were actually provided by the Sector itself. It asked whether the minimum of 10% for the Programme Support Cost applies to all Special Accounts and also whether the cost recovery is applied only to activities, and if that is the case, the money should be returned to the Sector.
262. The delegation of **Austria**, referring to the draft budget presented in the Annex, asked whether the staff time spent is not included in the 2015 budget. If the staff cost recovery would be included only in 2016 onward, it would depend on how many projects are submitted and how much time would be spent, so that the Secretariat would not be in a position to say at this point what would be the amount to be recovered. While supporting the full and timely application of the cost-recovery policy concerning the reimbursement of regular programme staff time invested in the management of the projects, it expressed its reservation about the Programme Support Cost and encouraged the Committee to re-examine the cost-recovery discussion after the Executive Board's discussion on the issue. The Committee should have this item on the agenda so as to develop a specific cost-recovery strategy based on the strategy of the Executive Board.
263. The representative of the **Bureau of Financial Management** (BFM) responded to Saint Lucia and confirmed that the UNESCO Secretariat applies the minimum of 10% of the Programme Support Cost on all Special Accounts, except for prizes where the Secretariat applies 13% just like the Funds-in-Trust. Regarding the reimbursement of the cost-recovery, he also confirmed that 100% of the reimbursed amounts are always given back to the sector concerned, and there is no charge. He also informed that the Culture Sector has benefited from FITOCA posts even though these FITOCA posts are normally to be used for the central services.

264. The **Chairperson** requested whether the Committee is satisfied by the responses provided by the Secretariat, to which the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland indicated that the responses were as clear as the current policies, and the delegation of Austria indicated its satisfaction.
265. The Chairperson then invited observers to make comments.

#### **[Observers]**

266. The delegation of **Mexico** commented that it is well aware of the obligation to sign the agreement letter in question, and that it is working with the national authorities to sign it. Noting that the contribution of Mexico for the IFCD has been sent to UNESCO since June 2014, it explained that the problem with the letter concerns one specific paragraph which mentions that on the closure of the account, the Director-General has the ability to decide what to do with any remaining money on the Special Account. According to the information provided by BFM, the legal base for this paragraph comes from the administrative manual of UNESCO, while this paragraph is included in neither the financial regulations of the IFCD nor the financial regulations of UNESCO. The delegation assured that it is clarifying the matter so that the Government of Mexico could sign the letter.
267. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** requested whether the BFM would provide further explanations in light of the response by Mexico.
268. Noting that BFM has already had discussion with the delegation of Mexico, the representative of the **Bureau of Financial Management (BFM)** informed that according to the current rules of the Organization, the financial regulations 6.5 and 6.6 stipulate that all Special Accounts are established by the Director-General, and Article 8 of the financial regulations of the IFCD states that the “Director-General may decide upon the closure of the Special Account at such time as he deems that its operation is no longer necessary and inform the Executive Board accordingly”. He explained that the agreement letter in question attempts to clarify the question of the Director-General having the authority on the Special Account. He further stated that BFM has already shown all the legal provisions the Organization disposes to the Mexican delegation, that is presenting to its authorities and that they are working to resolve the issue. He noted that while most donors are comfortable with the clauses of the Special Accounts, there are several others who are not, and BFM works with such states to find solutions. These texts clearly indicate that the Director-General has the authority to not only open but also close Special Accounts. He stressed that what is at stake is about the closure, and the implementation is to be decided upon by concerned committees, and if there is no committee, it is to be approved by the Director-General.
269. The **Chairperson**, seeing no other requests for comments, invited the Committee to examine the draft decision and requested the Secretariat to project it on the screen. He read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, since no objection was raised.
270. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed to amend paragraph 6 and proposed to add “to provide information on the cost recovery reattributed to the Secretariat of the Convention”. The **Chairperson** proposed the Legal Advisor to make comments should there be any legal problem. The Legal Advisor indicated that there is no legal problem.
271. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked whether the amount approved for fundraising is properly included in this draft budget for 2015, to which the **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the Committee had indeed already approved the amount requested for fundraising to be taken from the unassigned amount through its decision under item 9.

272. The **Chairperson** once again asked the Committee whether it agrees to adopt the amended paragraph 6, and as there was no objection, he adopted it. The **Chairperson** read paragraphs 7 and 8 and adopted them as no objection was raised.
273. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed an additional paragraph that reads, “invite or encourage the Executive Board to review the Programme Support Costs for the IFCD, taking into account the work done by the Convention’s Secretariat to raise and manage the funds for the IFCD”. The **Legal Advisor** indicated that it is more appropriate to request the Director-General to address the issue to the Executive Board, instead of the Committee directly addressing to the Executive Board, to which the delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed.
274. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** requested a clarification about what was meant by “taking into account the work done by the Convention’s Secretariat to raise and manage the funds for the IFCD”. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** concurred with the proposal of Saint Lucia and clarified the question by Zimbabwe that what was meant was that the Secretariat is executing those tasks that the central services may be otherwise to undertake. For instance, if the Secretariat of the Convention is producing brochures and other fundraising materials and not the central services, then the IFCD should not be paying the Programme Support Cost because the job is being done within the Convention Secretariat. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed that while hearing the explanation from the President of the Finance and Administration Commission of the Executive Board clarifies the question, it wondered whether those who are not informed of the issue would be able to understand the paragraph. It nonetheless indicated its agreement to go along with the proposed amendment.
275. The **Chairperson** requested the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to reformulate the paragraph as it clarified the question by Zimbabwe, to which the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** responded that the paragraph projected on the screen reflects what it explained.
276. The representative of the **Bureau of Financial Management** proposed that if the Committee is concerned about the nature of the Convention, the paragraph could read: “requests the Director-General when submitting proposals on the cost recovery to the Executive Board to take into account the particular nature of the Convention”, since such a wording would cover all the Conventions, to which the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** indicated that the Committee could only speak about this Convention and could not speak about others.
277. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** indicated that the text as it stands satisfied its question.
278. The **Chairperson** read out the amended paragraph and adopted as no objection was raised. He then adopted the draft decision 8 in its entirety as amended.

*Decision 8.IGC 10 was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 11 – PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT AND INTERNATIONAL CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION: REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF ARTICLES 16 AND 21 OF THE CONVENTION**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/11**

279. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine document 11 on the preferential treatment and international consultation and coordination.
280. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the Conference of Parties at its third ordinary session in June 2011 and the Committee at its fifth ordinary session in December 2011 requested the Secretariat to begin its work to collect and analyse information on the implementation of Article 21 on international consultation. At its seventh ordinary session

in December 2013, the Committee decided to expand this work to include Article 16 on preferential treatment for developing countries. In conformity with this decision, the Secretariat collected information in the following ways:

1) *consultations* were launched with Parties, international organisations, and civil society through two questionnaires;

2) *all quadrennial periodic reports* (71 reports) submitted by the Parties since 2012 were analysed; and

3) *additional research and analysis* was conducted to complement information provided through the consultations including the analysis of 38 bilateral trade agreements that involve 49 Parties to the Convention.

In addition, the Secretariat created an online platform to collect and distribute documents directly related to the implementation of Article 21, regularly updating the platform in 2013 and 2014. The first report providing preliminary observations on the implementation and impact of both Articles 16 and 21 is presented in Annex III to document 11 and is structured in three main parts:

- The first part underlines the *raison d'être* of Articles 16 and 21 in the Convention, i.e. the objective of Member States when they negotiated these provisions in order to understand their origins;
- The second part presents the interpretation by Parties of these two articles based on the evidence available to date and seeks to present a framework for analysing their intersection along both cultural and trade dimensions;
- The third part makes preliminary observations on the implementation of these articles in the areas of international cooperation to promote preferential treatment, multilateral and bilateral trade agreements, advocacy to promote the inclusion of culture in the global development agenda.

One of the main questions asked at the beginning of this exercise was whether or not the implementation of these Articles has achieved the intended outcome. Among the answers this preliminary study provides are the following:

- First, in the field of international cooperation to promote preferential treatment, the evidence shows that there are changes emerging regarding new measures to promote the mobility of artists from developing countries, together with a growing number of film and audiovisual co-production agreements, which suggests that short-term results have been achieved, thus laying the foundations for potential and real impact in the future.
- Second, in the field of trade, the analysis shows that three trade agreements took into account Articles 16 and 21 in the form of a new tool that is the cultural protocol. Several other bilateral trade agreements use other legal means such as introducing a cultural clause and reservations, making commitments according to positive and negative lists. Jurisprudence, for its part, is still in its infancy.
- Third, with regard to culture and development, the Parties have amended or adopted new national policies that draw on the Convention and have placed it at the centre of the process designed to include culture in the post-2015 UN sustainable development agenda. These short-term results show that the application of Article 21 in the area of development is having an impact.

The study concludes with a proposed programme of activities to be undertaken over the next two years that is based on recommendations presented in the IOS evaluation report on the implementation of the Convention that the Committee had already examined. This includes continuation of the Secretariat's efforts to report on the implementation and



impact of these two Articles including the preparation of case studies on fifteen trade agreements according to a model case presented in Annex B of document 11. These case studies would provide information determining the specific references to the Convention, how they have treated cultural goods and services, identifying specific clauses that provide preferential treatment for cultural goods and services as well as those that specifically address e-commerce. The results of this exercise would be the subject of a high level panel to be organised prior to the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties in June 2015.

281. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make comments.
282. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** noted the importance of the document and commended the Secretariat for its excellent quality and all the information provided. It also noted that while an important step has been taken with respect to the application of Articles 16 and 21 in the trade agreements cited in the document, there remains a lot to do. Referring to paragraph 5 of Annex III about the future steps that the Secretariat proposes, the delegation acknowledged many tangible examples such as the change in immigration policy in New Zealand but drew attention to the paragraph, "This is to be achieved through the introduction of appropriate legal and institutional frameworks both by receiving and beneficiary countries". The delegation requested the Secretariat to advise the Committee about what role the Committee could play with respect to the application of Article 23.6(e) of the Convention which stipulates that "the functions of the Committee shall be...to establish procedures and other mechanisms for consultation aimed at promoting the objectives and principles of this Convention in other international forums".
283. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** joined Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in commending the work of the Secretariat and noted that there is a long way to go to get into the spirit of the Articles and the body of it. It requested that the Secretariat provides concrete proposals about what Parties must do to address these issues, given that some Parties already expressed their reservations at the time of ratification about the application of these Articles.
284. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** also congratulated the Secretariat for the important document and indicated that Saint Lucia is fully in support of the Secretariat continuing its work analysing the impact of these Articles which it considers as being the core of the Convention and requested the Secretariat to continue its work and report it to the Conference of Parties. It acknowledged the lack of statistics and data as one of the challenges felt in the Caribbean hindering the development of measures to deal with various challenges. It also expressed the need to understand what obstacles exist for preferential treatment to work and to learn more about south-south cooperation which should be integrated into the periodic reporting framework (document 7b. Regarding Article 21, the delegation stated that there is still a lot to be done in raising awareness of Parties on how they can use this Article and highlighted the need for capacity-building in this field. It informed of its intention to propose an amendment requesting the Secretariat to develop a training module for Articles 16 and 21, which it considers to be immensely useful for officials working in both the culture and trade sectors.
285. The delegation of **Argentina** also thanked the Secretariat for the informative document and indicated its support for the continuation of this exercise. It then informed that the last meeting of the Ministers of Culture of the MERCOSUR approved a plan to review policies applicable for artists in order to guarantee their mobility and their production within the MERCOSUR zone which is an important decision reflecting the enhanced commitment on the part of MERCOSUR countries towards the Convention.

286. The delegation of **Austria** concurred with the previous speakers and congratulated the Secretariat for the informative and yet instructive preliminary document on the impact of the implementation of Articles 16 and 21. The document provided the Committee with a clearer picture of the way forward and how to reshape international cooperation in the spirit and the word of the Convention. This new cooperation model takes in account cultural cooperation but also indicated where more needs to be done in the field of trade. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for looking at not only inputs but also short-term and long-term impact of this new mode of cooperation. It then raised a question about how to monitor the implementation of these pertinent Articles, referring to the paragraph stating that “to measure impact takes time, and transformation in interministerial cooperation and in negotiation of bilateral or multilateral agreements is a long-term process”. The delegation wondered whether the reporting mechanism used for this year with biennial questionnaires is the way forward or not, because if Parties are to report on the implementation of Article 16 every two years, some Parties may be reporting on it in a given year and then again in the following year within their quadrennial periodic report, and it may even be the case that some Parties may be reporting on Article 16 on the one hand and the same information within their quadrennial periodic reports within the same year. It requested a clarification from the Secretariat.
287. Referring to the question raised by the delegation of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines concerning Article 23.6(e), the **Secretary of the Convention** stated that it is up for debate, and it is the Committee and not the Secretariat to decide. She informed that the role of the Secretariat is to provide a platform to share information on the impact of the implementation of these Articles. In terms of monitoring the implementation, she added that the exercise that the Secretariat has been doing so far either through periodic reports or through this separate questionnaire has generated the evidence that helped the Secretariat to refine the indicators and to develop a methodology. She informed that the Secretariat continues to work with an expert, Mr Keith Nurse, to refine the indicators and methodology used to monitor the impact of Article 16 at individual, institutional and industrial levels. As the work progresses, there may be no need to have a separate questionnaire on a biennial basis, but in order to be able to inform the future monitoring instrument, the Secretariat has proposed to continue this exercise until it has collected enough physical evidence to be able to have a systematic monitoring in place.
288. Referring to the comment of the Secretary of the Convention, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that the Committee had already taken a decision by deciding to hold an exchange session for Articles 16 and 21 which was the opportunity for the Committee to consult and interact with others. It noted that this exchange session was not held at this Committee session because the identified speakers were not available, but that the session is supposed to take place in the margin of the Conference of Parties (in June 2015) which would be the first opportunity for the Committee to start implementing Article 23 of the Convention.
289. The **Chairperson** invited observers to make comments.

#### **[Observers]**

290. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Secretariat for the excellent document because reading the document and learning what other Parties or regions are doing offer ideas about what could still be done. It supported the idea of continuing the exercise of asking Parties for information so as to produce a good summary of everything that has been done around the world which could serve as an incentive for those Parties that are still lagging behind. Referring to the comment by Argentina, it confirmed that the MERCOSUR indeed is working to facilitate the exchange of artists through a specific group on cultural diversity. MERCOSUR is also considering to join the Convention as an economic organization. It supported the proposal of Saint Lucia to develop capacity-building materials about how Parties could implement Articles 16 and 21 using concrete examples that different

ministries could consider in trade negotiations. It also proposed that the Committee fosters cooperation between states in how to implement Articles 16 and 21 by creating a list of Parties requesting capacity-building in these areas on the one hand and another list of Parties volunteering to help Member States that need some support in capacity-building on the other. This would allow for capacity-building without necessarily using resources from the Fund. For instance, Brazil could volunteer to help two countries from its own resources and ask the Secretariat to find two countries from West Africa, South America or Caribbean that are in need of assistance. This mechanism could help achieve some targets of the Convention with resources of Member States, while the Secretariat helps Member States organize themselves to engage in cooperation activities on how to implement specific Articles of the Convention.

291. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil for its suggestions, namely about the cooperation between States, and highlighted the importance for Parties to respond to the questionnaires.
292. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)** concurred with other speakers about the excellent quality of the document and agreed to continue collecting data. Referring to box 11 (of Annex III) where different initiatives are presented, he expressed that while many examples are taken from Europe, the information provided brings the Convention closer to its originally-intended aim. He noted that it is now the time to start showing that the Convention is having an impact. Regarding Articles 16 and 21, notwithstanding the importance of having an inventory of relevant measures and detailed information as a first step to define good practices, it is important to go beyond and discuss concrete measures for actions that would include civil society organizations.
293. The **Chairperson** seeing no other observers wishing to take the floor invited the members of the Committee to make further comments if they have any.
294. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** added that the proposals made by Brazil are interesting and that it would propose an amendment requesting the Secretariat to prepare a training module for Articles 16 and 21 which could then be used by any mechanisms, be it between States or financed by any other entities. Such a training module could be used to facilitate the cooperation between states including within the form of south-south cooperation.
295. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed its support toward the proposals by Brazil and indicated its intention to propose an amendment concerning an exchange session which was proposed by the IFCCD at the last session of the Committee as reflected in paragraphs between 342 and 347 of the detailed summary record but which was not held this year. It believes that organizing such an exchange session with trade experts would be a first step for the Committee to implement Article 23.6(e).
296. While waiting to receive amendments by certain Committee members, the **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to project the draft decision. He read it paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 since no objection was raised.
297. The **Chairperson** then presented a new paragraph 6 proposed by Saint Lucia which reads, "Requests the Secretariat to reschedule the exchange session planned in December 2014 on the implementation and impact of Articles 16 and 21 between economists, trade experts and Parties, and to organize it before the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties in June 2015". While expressing its agreement with the paragraph, the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested adding "with the involvement of civil society" after "trade experts and Parties".

298. The delegation of **Australia** questioned whether having such an exchange session before the upcoming session of the Conference of Parties would be useful considering that the Committee just examined a preliminary report on the implementation of Articles 16 and 21 and that an updated report is to be presented to the Conference of Parties at its forthcoming session in June 2015. It wondered whether it would be better to organize the exchange session in question after the Conference of Parties. While acknowledging the point made by the delegation of Australia, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** recalled that considering that this exchange session was originally to be held before the current session of the Committee, it is important to organize it before the Conference of Parties to ensure the maximum participation of Parties. It indicated that it is up to the Secretariat to manage the date for such a session because changing the date of the exchange session may cause technical problems in terms of room reservation and the availability of the experts invited.
299. The **Secretary of the Convention** clarified that the exchange session could not be organized prior to this session because the two experts that the Secretariat invited were unfortunately unable, and that is why the session has been postponed until 9 June 2015. An invitation letter has already been sent to the individuals concerned by the Director-General.
300. The delegation of **Tunisia** expressed that the idea of organizing such an exchange session is indeed very interesting in the margin of the Conference of Parties, especially because Parties do need to exchange on it. It is even more pertinent as it coincides with the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention.
301. The **Chairperson** read the amended paragraph 6 once again and adopted it as no objection was raised.
302. The **Chairperson** then continued to read a new paragraph (paragraph 7) proposed by Saint Lucia which reads, "Requests the Secretariat to develop training modules on the implementation of Articles 16 and 21 as part of its work based on the global capacity-building strategy". The delegation of **Kuwait** pointed out that the wording "mise en œuvre" in the present paragraph in French is used twice within a same sentence and proposed to replace it by another word.
303. The **Chairperson** read a slightly modified paragraph which reads, "Requests the Secretariat to develop training modules on the implementation of Articles 16 and 21 as part of its work based on the Global Capacity-Building Strategy". The delegation of **Tunisia** expressed that it does not understand what is meant by "develop training modules" and requested the Secretariat to explain how it intends to implement this paragraph. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that as part of the global capacity-building strategy, the Secretariat has already started working on the development of three training modules which are made up of approximately ten units. Each of these units contains training/pedagogical materials, hand-outs, PowerPoint Presentations, interpretations and analysis of good practices that can be used in capacity-building workshops. She stated that the paragraph requests, that based on the analysis of information gathered, the Secretariat should work together with experts to prepare training materials that are packaged in a coherent manner that can be used by different types of trainers, including members of the Committee, the Secretariat and any Convention stakeholders wishing to hold workshops of different scale. The delegation of **Tunisia** indicated that the explanation of the Secretary of the Convention clarified its question. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, adopted the paragraph in question.
304. The **Chairperson** then moved on to paragraph 8. Seeing no request for amendment, he adopted the paragraph in question.

*Decision 8.IGC 11 was adopted as amended.*

## ITEM 12 – CURRENT STATE AND ACTION TO ADDRESS THE CHALLENGES POSED BY DIGITISATION

### Documents CE/14/8.IGC/12 and CE/14/8.IGC/INF.5

305. The **Chairperson** stated that this point was proposed to be added to the provisional agenda of the Committee at the request of two Parties, Canada and France. Upon the reception of their official request, the Secretary of the Convention forwarded it to him who then informed the Bureau. He explained that this item concerns the impact of digitization on the Convention and reminded the Committee of several issues. First of all, he recalled the work carried out so far by the Committee and the Conference of Parties. He noted that at the time of its sixth ordinary session held in December 2012, the Committee took into account the interest shown by several Parties in their quadrennial periodic reports for the modernization of their cultural policies and measures in the digital era (Decision 6.IGC 17). The Committee then invited the Parties as well as civil society who wished to do so to submit for its seventh session in 2013 a state of affairs on the issue about the aspects of digital developments which had an impact on the Convention and proposals for actions. During the fourth ordinary session, the Conference of Parties gave the Committee a mandate to work on this question (Resolution 4.CP 13, para 6). During its sessions, the Committee heard several presentations by civil society representatives and Parties, debated these questions and decided that the periodic reports do contain important information on this question and that the Parties that so wished could from now on forward information on digital issues in their periodic reports. He further noted that the current session of the Committee has already touched upon this question. For example, when the Committee reviewed the analysis of the Secretariat on the periodic reports or revised the draft operational guidelines concerning Article 9, the Committee had indeed taken note of the state of affairs on this question. Furthermore, at the request of the Committee, the Secretariat produced an information document analysing the information collected on digitization within the periodic reports and presenting innovative examples. He then invited the Committee to turn to document 12 which contains the explicative note transmitted by Canada and France to the Secretariat. Before starting the debate on the subject and in conformity with Article 20 of the Rules of Regulations, he requested the authorization of the Committee to give the floor to Canada and France who are not the members of the Committee in order for them to present the document. Seeing no objection, he gave the floor to Canada and France.
306. The delegation of **Canada** began by thanking the Committee members for allowing it to present this item, which is of high importance for Canada and also thanking the Secretariat for the excellent quality of the documents for this Committee meeting. It stated that the changes brought about by the advent of digital technologies have an impact on all the forms of cultural expressions at each step of the value chain for all players and all countries, and that each person could bear witness to its positive and negative impact. The mode of creation, distribution and the consumption of cultural goods and services have indeed been completely changed since the arrival of the digital technology. The delegation further continued that the authors of the Convention were visionary enough by crafting a text that is apt to overcome these challenge: the text of the Convention is technologically neutral, and it is adaptable and thus a relevant tool for all forms of creation. For these reasons, Canada considers unnecessary to modify neither the Convention's goals nor its scope. It however believes that reflection on the question of digital technologies must continue and must be looked at more in depth in order to seize all the opportunities and avoid downfalls. A first step of reflection has already been done during this session with the analysis of the periodic reports by the Secretariat and Mr Octavio Kulesz. These analyses are very interesting, enabling the Committee to have a new perspective on global trends in the area of digital technologies. The delegation recalled that Recommendation 7

of the IOS evaluation on the implementation of the Convention called for continued work on the implications of changes due to digital technologies. Expressing that all Parties need cultural policies that are capable of protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions, the delegation raised several questions. The first is the possibility to create and transpose cultural policies to the digital environment based on the experience of other Parties to the Convention. The second is the issue concerning international cooperation and capacity-building in this field. The third concerns the means of the Parties and civil society to protect, enhance and promote the diversity of cultural expressions in the digital era, while respecting the principles of the Convention including the principle of equitable access, openness and balance. It passed the floor to Ms Line Beauchamp, new representative of the Government of Quebec within the delegation of Canada to UNESCO.

307. The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the delegation of **Canada** to UNESCO also thanked the Secretariat for all the work carried out so far, allowing the governing bodies of the Convention to measure more precisely the impact of the digital technology on the diversity of cultural expressions. Referring to the speech of the Director-General of UNESCO stressing the importance of the challenges of digital technologies, she informed that at the initiative of Québec and the Wallonie-Bruxelles Federation, the heads of the states and the government members of the International Organization of the Francophonie (OIF) adopted a resolution in Dakar which re-stated the technological neutrality of the Convention and how important it is to take up the challenges posed by the digital era, calling on Parties to not only think about the issue but to also take action. She expressed its support towards the participation of experts and civil society in the Committee's discussions, especially the work done by the International Network of Lawyers for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (RIJDEC) and the quality of their contributions. She appealed to the Convention's governing bodies to continue their work on the digital environment, to meet a number of objectives, for instance, the acquisition of knowledge, to exchange best practices and build capacities. The draft decision that is presented by Canada and France aims at fostering dialogue with a number of exchanges in the fringes of the Conference of Parties. The delegation of Canada is very clear that this Convention should become very modern and flexible in its means and wished therefore that the Committee and the Conference of Parties identify next steps in this process because digital technologies have transformed the whole cultural value chain, namely creation, production, distribution, broadcasting, promotion or the payment of artists in any country.
308. The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to France.
309. Stating that the delegation of Canada explained the challenges very aptly, the delegation of **France** further stressed the following three points. Firstly, while the Convention is a wonderful tool to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions, it is also an important instrument for international solidarity and cooperation. It explained that the intension of Canada and France is neither to negotiate a new legally binding instrument nor to reopen the Convention. While the Convention is perfect in its principles and implementation, the environment is changing. It has been completely overturned by the development of digital technologies with positive and negative consequences. Secondly, UNESCO has played a pioneering role in cultural diversity, and the Convention provides a legitimate forum for the Parties to continue the discussion on digital technologies. It expressed that UNESCO with all its Member States would make a big mistake if they do not develop competencies in the field of digital technologies, because it is at the heart of the historic mandate of the Organization. It is not a coincidence that the Dakar Summit invited the Parties to the Convention to do so with the resolution just adopted. Thirdly, the objective of Canada and France is to have an in-depth discussion and thinking, which the Committee had already started with the excellent document provided by the Secretariat. It stressed the need to have something more formal about the digital challenges which Canada and France attempted to analyse. The delegation believes that it is in the general

interest of all states to do so. The notes prepared by Canada and France show that digital technologies offer as many opportunities as risks that Parties should protect themselves against. The delegation invited the Committee to refer to the note, which it believes is a first draft requiring further elaboration within the framework of the Convention with diverse indicators and exchange of best practices. The note also discusses operational guidelines. The delegation underlined that this instrument is at the disposal of the Parties, and it would enable Parties to formalize their thinking on this topic. The delegation wished to have a broad debate among the Parties to the Convention and with those who are interested in the topic at the Conference of Parties in June 2015 and prior to the Committee in December 2015, believing that it is the right way to celebrate the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention in 2015.

310. The **Chairperson** expressed his thanks to Canada and France for having introduced this item. He then invited the Committee to make comments.
311. The delegation of **Lithuania** acknowledged that the Committee has explored the issue of digitization in its previous work and thanked Canada and France for its initiative to look again at the digitization beyond its link to innovation, because as is the case in the audiovisual sector, the digitization is no longer just an innovation and has now become a part of everyday life. The delegation believes that digitization is a key issue for the Committee to look at today and it very much welcomed the item. It concurred with France and Canada that while the content remains the key, new possibilities to create that content and distribute it globally are both challenging and encouraging. In this context, it invited the Committee to be part of the process.
312. The delegation of **Switzerland** thanked Canada and France for having added this item to the agenda of the Committee, stating that the digital world indeed changed people's life as well as cultural production and creation and indicated its full support towards the proposal. The delegation however recalled that the issue of digital technology had already been discussed when the Committee examined item 7a of the agenda and stated that there is a series of other themes that are equally important. For Switzerland, it is important to consider the digital issue as something new to modernize the Convention, but it should be done in light of all cultural production, also taking into account what is not digital and considering it as a whole. In other words, it is important not to focus only on the digital so as to avoid losing sight of the whole spectrum of cultural production and avoid a possible digital and non-digital dichotomy. It further expressed that it is important to look at the quality of cultural production and distribution platforms. There is a number of issues to be discussed in order to provide an answer to challenges, opportunities and advantages of digitalization to cultural diversity, including freedom of press or media and the freedom of speech; these are fundamental issues as well which could enrich the thinking of the Committee about digitization. It asked whether it is relevant to prepare a questionnaire on this issue. The delegation believed that there should be an in-depth analysis produced by experts and not simply political analysis, and it expressed its reservation towards the proposed questionnaire to be undertaken and instead indicated its preference to mobilize civil society and invite experts enrich the debate.
313. The delegation of **Armenia** expressed its appreciation and support to the addition suggested by France, Belgium, Switzerland and Canada.
314. The delegation of **Austria** joined previous speakers in thanking the delegations of Canada and France which allowed the Committee to continue discussing this most relevant issue, because it is about keeping the Convention relevant within an evolving environment. It stressed that no matter what platform or technology is used, when it comes to creation, production, distribution and access to cultural goods and services, be it on the Internet or via a mobile device, culture counts and it is not only about economics. It recalled that the technological neutrality was already enshrined at the time of the drafting of the Convention and that the Convention's principles remain intact, and the new modes of production, when

it comes to digital, only adds additional layers to all provisions of the Convention, starting from the sovereign right of the States to introduce measures to react to this development, to educational measures to international cooperation. The delegation affirmed that whatever the technology is used, the same principles and articles are to be applied. It then thanked the Secretariat for having provided an interesting analysis from the expert who analysed the 71 reports which shows that numerous Parties have already reacted to this new development and introduced measures. Referring to the questionnaire on the 1980 Recommendation on the Status of the Artist, the delegation informed that one question specifically deals with digital technologies and the Internet, which promises to provide additional information to the Committee. It cautioned that when it comes to the digital, one must be very clear and focus on a particular question and avoid talking about the whole range of issues. It suggested that the Committee will wait for the result of the questionnaire in order to avoid consulting concerned ministries again on the same issue. While expressing its scepticism towards the suggested questionnaire and its agreement with Switzerland to go for an in-depth analysis of what is already there, it reiterated its support that the Committee should continue discussing digital issues.

315. The delegation of **Sweden** also thanked France and Canada for the item because it considers it important to continue the debate regarding digital issues. Concurring with previous speakers, it affirmed that the Convention is technologically neutral; no matter which technological development takes place, the Convention would remain relevant. Referring to the Chairperson's introduction, it noted that several activities have already been done, making it clear that digital issues already have a place within the Parties' periodic reports. Having in mind the prioritization exercise that was undertaken at the last Committee session in 2013 as well as the lack of financial and human resources of the Secretariat, the delegation requested further clarifications about the exact purpose and the value of the proposed questionnaire and asked how much time the Secretariat would estimate for creating and sending out the proposed questionnaire, as well as analyzing the results.
316. The delegation of **Kuwait** indicated its support towards the proposal by Canada and France.
317. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked France and Canada for this initiative. It noted that for developing countries, it is a real challenge to devise cultural policies within the evolving digital context and that it is a chance for the Committee to grasp the opportunities of digitization and to discuss the problems that it poses. It expressed that the implementation of the Convention and the strengthening of international cooperation should take into account digital issues because they have undoubtedly an impact on promoting the diversity of cultural expressions. The delegation believes that UNESCO is an appropriate forum to discuss this issue, especially after the organization in February 2013 of the World Summit on the Information Society +10 (WSIS +10). As far as the text of the draft decision is concerned, it needs some rewording so that the decision would be linked to the debate of the Committee.
318. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** thanked France and Canada for drawing the attention of the Committee to this important issue and also thanked the Secretariat for the papers including information document 5 which the delegation found helpful in highlighting the issues that need to be considered. The delegation noted that governments are always playing a catch-up game, whether it is about regulating technologies or using the technology itself and believed that it is indeed the case with respect to this Convention. It acknowledged that the information document 5 gives useful areas where the Committee could think of positive measures, including access to culture, support for creativity, for promoting spaces related to digital art, supporting modernization of the creative sector. The information document however also talks about those issues which are not yet discussed such as what big internet companies



are doing, and it pointed out a worrying tendency to package it as some kinds of “big internet evil”. It then raised two questions for the Committee to reflect on: how has the situation changed since the arrival of the digital platform; and what would it be like if it did not exist? It explained that asking these questions is important because the Committee may think that digital issues needs regulation, while there is no evidence so far that the situation for cultural diversity is worse as a result of these digital platforms, calling the Committee to remain open-minded. It informed that while the British Government is very much willing to engage in the discussion about how to take advantage of the opportunities of digitization and is ready to talk about positive measures as indicated in the information document, it is not ready to talk about any form of protectionism through the use of this Convention.

319. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined other speakers to thank Canada and France for the presentation and the introduction of the item in question and also thanked the Secretariat for information document 5, which it considers is very useful for the Committee to decide on how to go forward with this item. After noting that it had submitted amendments to the draft decision proposed by Canada and France, the delegation explained that a lot of studies have been commissioned, seminars organized, and documents written, and adding a questionnaire on this issue would not really be useful because the Committee already has enough information to go forward. It thus proposed in its amendment to delete the paragraph requesting a questionnaire and requesting the Secretariat to analyse its results. Its amendment instead requests the Secretariat to send to the Conference of Parties the results of the information they have compiled so far which would serve as a comprehensive document that the Committee has so far including information document 5. It further expressed that the proposed exchange session could be organized in the afternoon of the same day as the exchange session on Articles 16 and 21 which would enable all Parties present and their experts to exchange about digitization, while qualifying that this session should be held only if extrabudgetary funding is made available. It stated that the last paragraph is proposed in light of the fact that the only tools to adapt the implementation of the Convention to the changing world are the operational guidelines so that the Committee should go ahead and recommend to the Conference of Parties to mandate the Committee to draft the operational guidelines on digitization.
320. The **Chairperson**, seeing no other Committee members wishing to take the floor, he invited observers to make comments.

#### [Observers]

321. The delegation of **Grenada** welcomed the introduction of the item proposed by France and Canada, noting that the digital world and the use of the information and communication technology (ICTs) have become part of daily life. Since several activities and studies have already been undertaken, this issue should be discussed and developed in a more intersectoral manner within UNESCO, particularly in cooperation with the Communication and Information (CI) Sector and its Information for All Programme, since CI sector and the Information for All Programme have expertise and experience in this domain and the programme’s priority areas include: information for development; information literacy; information preservation; information ethics; and information accessibility; and multilingualism in cyberspace. All these priority areas can touch upon what is discussed by the Committee, and the Programme also has a working group in each of the priority areas. Such cooperation with CI sector and the Information for All Programme could bring a valuable contribution to the work of the Committee, in particular in the preparation of operational guidelines.
322. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked France and Canada for the excellent proposal. Seconding the comment by Austria, it indicated its agreement about the importance of this theme to the creation, distribution, production and access of cultural expressions. It also supported the technical neutrality of the Convention, the idea to elaborate operational

guidelines on digital issues, as well as Grenada's idea to work in cooperation with the CI Sector.

323. The delegation of **Belgium** affirmed the importance of the Convention for Belgium and indicated its support for the cultural exception. It further expressed that there can be no cultural exception without formally recognizing the principle of technological neutrality of the Convention. It supported the proposal made by France and Canada and indicated its intention to contribute to it. It further informed that the International Network of Lawyers for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (RIJDEC) has been asked by Belgian authorities in Brussels to draft a document which would be presented in Mons when it becomes the European capital of culture in 2015. It encouraged Member States to participate in that symposium. It also indicated its support towards comments by Tunisia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, saying that cultural exception is not a protectionist concept but rather a way of promoting the diversity of cultural expressions.
324. After thanking the delegations of Canada and France for the proposal made, the delegation of **Ecuador** drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that different countries have different levels of implementation of the Convention and different countries may not have clear ideas about what the cultural industries are in spite of their rich cultural expressions. It appealed to the Committee to take into account the situation of these countries.
325. The delegation of **China** expressed its admiration and appreciation to France and Canada for having called the attention of Parties to digital issues. It agreed that digital technologies have tremendously changed people's lives and indicated that it would look forward to the study to be prepared by France on the application of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in the digital age.
326. The delegation of **Germany** commended the joint initiative and agreed that the world has entered into a new eco system requiring new types of policies. It supported the idea of elaborating operational guidelines, stressing that the guidelines should be forward looking and be flexible taking into account lessons learnt from the last decade. It also supported the idea of working together with the CI Sector and encouraged the Committee to be innovative, adopting an open, *creative commons* approach to ensure that the role of culture as providing public service is enhanced in this new eco system.
327. The delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its appreciation to Canada and France for their thoughtful proposal on this item. While refraining from restating the reservations and concerns of the United States Government vis-à-vis the Convention as a whole, it shared the following analogy: no culture or no cultural goods or services evolves or develops in isolation. They are both impacts or impacted by its environment and that no culture convention exists in vacuum. It stated that UNESCO plays a lead role in international discussions on internet governance which is very relevant to the discussion at hand and that UNESCO is currently undertaking a comprehensive study on internet-related issues at the request of Member States made at the last General Conference. It further noted that UNESCO is also responsible for implementing a number of action lines emerging from the World Summit on the Information Society, working together with the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) of UN's ECOSOC on the review report to be submitted to the General Assembly in 2015. The delegation invited the Committee to take into account these other activities and discussions underway within UNESCO that also focus on the digital environment, as it believes that all of these efforts should move forward in concert to avoid potential unintended consequences that might retard the work of UNESCO and that of its Member States in other related and important areas.

328. The delegation of **Japan** also thanked France and Canada for its proposal. Key questions for the delegation on how to promote culture including the preservation of a public domain within the internet on the one hand and how to strengthen regulatory frameworks such as intellectual property and protection against internet piracy on the other. Digital issues can be discussed not only here in UNESCO but also in other international organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) which actually have the mandate to establish legal frameworks deemed necessary. The delegation encouraged the Secretariat to coordinate its effort within UNESCO as well as with other international organizations especially when elaborating operational guidelines.
329. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** (IFCCD) agreed that digital issues are indeed relevant but emphasized that the topic is huge. He sent a sign of caution that given the limited resources, the Committee must concentrate its actions because digital challenges are not just a question of access and creation but also involves industrial issues such as trademarks, taxation and dematerialization of contents. He encouraged the Committee to take its time to reach an agreement on the scope of its action, because the issues are much wider than what the Committee could tackle within the framework of the Convention. After indicating its reservation towards the proposed questionnaire, he suggested that the Committee solicit cooperation with civil society including young people, the video games people and other relevant sub-sectors.
330. The representative the **International Music Council** (IMC) also echoed the words of appreciation of previous speakers. Referring to information document 5, she acknowledged that the study was well researched, offering a lot of inspiration for international NGOs like IMC, and the recommendations put forward are especially useful. She stated that as far as the IMC is concerned, the main issue with regards the digital technologies is the fair remuneration of creators and performers, since fair remuneration represents the fifth of the musical rights for which the IMC stands. Noting a recent study concerning fair compensation for music creators in the digital age published by the IMC and the Budapest Declaration of the International Federation of Musicians, she informed that performers demand their proportionate shares of online revenues and indicated the willingness of the IMC and its members to offer their vision of the opportunities and challenges of digital technologies in the questionnaire on the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation on the Status of the Artist. She further noted that as information document 5 provide only few examples from Africa, it would be interesting in the future to learn more about measures taken to use digital technologies in African countries that favour increased access to culture since there actually exists a variety of examples.
331. Seeing no other observers indicating their wish to make a comment, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention.
332. The **Secretary of the Convention** joined voices to thank Canada and France for this initiative and for all of the work they have done to feed the debate. Responding to the questions raised about possible cooperation between the Culture Sector and the Communication Sector with respect to the issues of media diversity, internet governance, etc., she noted that the capacity development programme supported by Sweden helps to strengthen cooperation within UNESCO. She informed that the project includes a common expected result with the CI Sector which would be reported on via SISTER. In terms of cooperation with other international organizations, she informed that ITU is a regular participant in meetings of the Committee and the Conference of Parties and the Secretariat maintains exchange with international organisations dealing with issues related to the Convention. She gave the example of the production of the Creative Economy Report 2013, through which the Secretariat had a very formal, fruitful and productive cooperation with UNDP, WIPO and UNCTAD. Thanking the Secretary of the Convention

for her reply, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Canada and France asking them to clarify some points raised.

333. The delegation of **Canada** thanked all the colleagues for their useful, fruitful and informed contributions and agreed that since cultural conventions cannot live in a closed space, it is indeed essential to cooperate with other sectors and activities of UNESCO and also outside UNESCO. The delegation took due note of the comment raised by the delegation of Ecuador about the differentiated impact of digitization on different countries, namely on the populations that can feel marginalized in the face of the digitization and the comment by the IFCCD about the importance of involving various digital culture consumers and creators, namely young people. About the questionnaire, the delegation acknowledged the reservation expressed about the proposed questionnaire. Considering that the issue of digital technologies and culture involves a lot of unknown issues as pointed out by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the delegation expressed its conviction that collecting knowledge and working with experts is indispensable. It found that discussing digital issues at this session provided the Committee with a possibility to talk about the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions and looked forward to continuing the discussion.
334. The delegation of **France** indicated its agreement with various comments made and also thanked the Secretary of the Convention and Canada for their replies. Duly noting reservations expressed about the proposed questionnaire, it informed that the study that is currently being undertaken already included a questionnaire and that the result of the study and the recommendations would be made available to Parties in early 2015. It agreed with the proposed amendment by Saint Lucia to delete the mention of the questionnaire in the draft decision. Responding to the word of caution by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the delegation assured that the Committee should move forward cautiously, taking into account various situations.
335. The **Chairperson** once again thanked the delegations of France and Canada, as well as the members of the Committee and observers who took part in the debate. He invited the Committee to move to the adoption of the draft decision. He requested the Secretariat to project the draft decision on the screen with all the amendments which have already been submitted. He read it paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraph 1.
336. On paragraph 2, the delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** requested to add "information document 5" as this document is rich in information which could help the development of future operational guidelines. The **Chairperson** read once more paragraph 2 as amended and adopted it as no objection was raised. He then read paragraph 3 and adopted as no objection was raised.
337. The **Chairperson** continued and read out two new paragraphs (paragraphs 4 and 5), proposed by Saint Lucia. As no objection was raised, he adopted both of them.
338. Concerning paragraph 6, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** questioned whether the Committee meant "activities and events" instead of "manifestations" because manifestations in French often mean strikes. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 6 as corrected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and adopted it as no objection was raised.
339. The **Chairperson** read paragraphs 7 proposed by Saint Lucia and adopted it as no objection was raised.
340. On paragraph 8, the delegation of **Switzerland** proposed to complement the paragraph by adding the inclusion of experts and civil society as well as taking into account the work of other international organizations and other ongoing processes. It wished to add at the end of the paragraph, "as well as avenues for ideas to associate experts, civil society and other international organizations that have expertise in the subject." Responding to the question

by the **Chairperson** about the purpose of the proposed amendment and what was meant by “other avenues”, the delegation of **Switzerland** further explained that in the discussion planned for the Conference of Parties, there would be a document recalling all existing activities, as well as a summary of the current debate of the Committee. The delegation expressed that it is important to associate civil society and international organizations to the work of the Committee after the Conference of Parties.

341. The **Chairperson** came back to the original amendment proposed by Saint Lucia which reads, “Requests the Secretariat to submit to the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties a document covering all the work undertaken on digital issues in the framework of the Convention as well as the summary of its debates”. The delegation of **Austria** asked who is to do the report referred to in paragraph 8, to which the **delegation of Saint Lucia** responded that it meant the work done by UNESCO, such as information document 5, and all the papers that have been commissioned, and the analysis of the reports. The **Secretary of the Convention** proposed that instead of saying “by UNESCO”, it could say “by the governing bodies of the Convention”, because if it is “by UNESCO”, it could include the whole range of work by the CI sector. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** clarified that the document is meant to include what is within the framework of the work of the Convention. The **Chairperson** read once again paragraph 8 as proposed by Saint Lucia and amended by the Secretary of the Convention and adopted it as no objection was raised.
342. Responding to the delegation of **Tunisia** that proposed to incorporate paragraph 9 into paragraph 10, the **Secretary of the Convention** explained that paragraph 10 is about the organization of an exchange session before the fifth session of the Conference of Parties, while the proposal by Switzerland is asking the Secretariat to continue working in cooperation with civil society and international organisations. The delegation of **Switzerland** confirmed that paragraph 9 is a separate issue from paragraph 10, noting that the focus of paragraph 9 is to ensure that experts, civil society, as well as other international organizations are involved in the work on digital issues and also to ensure that the Committee be kept informed of the outcome of this cooperation. Paragraph 10 is about a specific event at a given point in time.
343. After the explanation by the Secretary of the Convention and the delegation of Switzerland, the delegation of **Tunisia** nonetheless expressed the need to further clarify the paragraphs in question. In the effort of finding a solution, the delegation of **Switzerland** once again proposed its amendment which reads, “Further request the Secretariat to continue its cooperation with other relevant international organizations, experts and civil society”. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed that paragraph 9 seems requesting something that the Secretariat is already doing and thus a repetition with paragraph 3. In reply, the delegation of the **Switzerland** stated that sometimes it is better to explicitly write, instead of deducing from paragraph 3. It maintained that it is important to explicitly mention the aspect of cooperation.
344. The **Chairperson** read out paragraph 9 with the latest addition by Switzerland, which read, “Further request the Secretariat to continue its cooperation with other relevant international organizations, experts and civil society, and to keep it informed”. The **Chairperson** adopted paragraph 9 as amended by Switzerland as no objections were raised.
345. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 10 proposed by Saint Lucia and adopted it as no objection was raised.
346. On paragraph 11, the delegation of **Switzerland** requested the authors of the proposed paragraph to clarify whether it is about specific operational guidelines only on digital technology with links to international cooperation, and whether or not the Committee is too rapidly pre-empting on the result of the discussion that would take place at the Conference of Parties. It wondered whether it is a good idea to already decide to elaborate operational guidelines at this stage. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** maintained

that operational guidelines are necessary as fast as possible, since the Committee should not be discussing this issue eternally; the issue has already been discussed by the Conference of Parties and by the Committee. It proposed to add “digital technology and the diversity of cultural expressions”. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** further clarified that the proposed paragraph does not request operational guidelines dedicated to international cooperation and digital technology. The proposed paragraph rightly mentions, “in particular”, meaning among others. This is to demonstrate that it is important that the aspect of international cooperation is taken into account and this to include what was said in the debate by Ecuador and others about the importance of cooperation in this domain given the different levels of development between countries on this subject. While the Conference of Parties would take the final decision on this subject, the Committee must make this recommendation because in its opinion, there is nothing else that could be recommended.

347. The delegation of **Sweden** indicated its agreement with Switzerland and asked how the consultation would be undertaken, whether there would be a separate consultation with Parties, and whether there would be really enough time to prepare operational guidelines within a year. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** responded by saying that the consultation is not to be held before the Conference of Parties but that operational guidelines would be prepared by the Committee after consultation with all Parties. Preliminary draft operational guidelines could be prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the debates to be held at the Conference of Parties and then examined by the Committee. The Secretariat could be requested to invite all Parties to comment on the preliminary draft. The **Chairperson** read out once again paragraph 11 and adopted it as no objection was raised.

348. The Chairperson adopted decision 8.IGC 12 in its entirety as amended.

*Decision 8.IGC 12 was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 13 – INITIATIVE TO INCREASE THE VISIBILITY OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/13**

349. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to proceed to item 13 which was placed on the provisional agenda at the request of Canada. He informed that as soon as the Secretariat received the official request, the Secretary of the Convention forwarded it to him who then informed the Bureau. He stated that this item concerns the visibility of the Convention. He recalled that a series of actions and decisions have already been taken concerning the visibility of the Convention. For example, the Conference of Parties approved, in 2011, operational guidelines concerning measures to ensure the visibility and the promotion of the Convention. These guidelines have proven useful to all stakeholders of the Convention. Furthermore, work on this question by the Committee started as early as 2009 when it considered the possibility of appointing public personalities to promote the Convention. The Conference of Parties at its third session took a decision to encourage the Parties to choose the most appropriate mechanism to promote the objectives of the Convention, including the appointment of nationally well-known figures to enhance the visibility of the Convention. He also reminded that this decision of the Conference of Parties was taken following the decision of the Committee at its sixth ordinary session in 2010. He also cited the Committee’s work on the emblem which began in 2009 when the Committee decided to create a logo for the Convention and assess the associated costs. This was concluded in 2013 with the selection of an emblem by the Conference of Parties and approval of the operational guidelines for its use. He further noted the ratification strategy that the Committee adopted in 2009 and completed in 2013 as well as the IFCD fundraising strategy which was endorsed in 2013 by the Conference of Parties. He then invited the members of the Committee to refer to document 13, specifying that the

explanatory note was provided by Canada. In pursuant with Article 20 of the Rules of Procedure, the Chairperson requested the authorization of the Committee to give the floor to Canada which is not a Committee member in order for it to present the document. Seeing no objections, he invited Canada to present the document.

350. The delegation of **Canada** thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for having given it a floor. It explained that it worked on a proposal with a dozen delegations because it felt that the Convention was in a shadow of the 1972 and 2003 Conventions. For the 1972 World Heritage Convention, new sites are added to the World Heritage List every year, and the countries whose sites are added to the List are greatly honoured. The same thing for the Intangible Heritage Convention. Lists indeed bring a great deal of visibility. The Convention however does not have anything equivalent, and the delegation wondered what could be done to raise its visibility. The delegation further informed that during the course of the discussion and consultations, it thought that the Convention needed something that was not too expensive and that would have credibility and would also involve National Commissions for UNESCO. This was the reason why it proposed that the Committee recognizes every year or every other year a person or an entity for their contribution to the protection of the diversity of cultural expressions in his or her countries. The delegation consulted a number of people as well as the Organisation de la Francophonie (OIF), all of whom showed their support to the proposed idea. The delegation of Canada examined and took into account questions raised by various delegations in the preparation of the final proposal. During the preparatory meeting held about 10 days prior to the current Committee session, however, the delegation of Canada discovered that there was no more consensus on the proposal. The delegation further explained that while it thought about withdrawing this item, the Bureau recommended keeping the item as a talking point for discussing the visibility of the Convention. The delegation conceded that while the proposal may not be the right solution, it was still important to maintain this agenda item to serve as a basis for discussing what could be done to increase the visibility of the Convention. The delegation confirmed that it withdrew the draft decision contained in the document.
351. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation of Canada. He invited the Committee members to offer their comments.
352. The delegation of **Honduras** expressed its gratitude to the delegation of Canada. It was very happy to see the engagement, commitment and interest that Canada had shown to the Convention. Canada enriched the agenda by proposing two new agenda items, both of which are very pertinent to the Convention. It expressed however that since the Committee would commission a professional company to fundraise for the Convention, the best option is to leave the communication professionals to propose a strategy. While acknowledging the best intention and the engagement of the delegation of Canada, it believed that any initiative to promote the visibility of the Convention should come from the same strategy.
353. The delegation of **Guinea** also expressed its gratitude to the Ambassador of Canada for the proposal and noted that it deserves the support of the Committee. It noted that in developing countries, most people who work in the cultural industries do not have enough training to understand the nature or the content of the Convention. This project should be supported in general to enable developing countries to take actions promoting the visibility of the Convention.
354. The delegation of **Kuwait** also thanked the Ambassador of Canada for the initiative, which it considers of high importance and should be supported. Believing that the visibility of the Convention is a key priority, it informed that Kuwait intends to organize a regional meeting for the Arab region in May 2015 in order to give more visibility to the Convention and to build capacities in Arab countries. It believes that the visibility of the Convention is something fundamental and relevant.

355. Echoing the opinion expressed by Honduras, the delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed that although the proposal is a well-meaning initiative, given that the primary purpose is awareness-raising, such initiatives are more properly left to communication professionals.
356. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined others in thanking the Ambassador of Canada for his presentation of the document and for all his effort for triggering this debate on the visibility of the Convention. While agreeing that the visibility of the Convention is of crucial importance, it noted that the question of visibility is a part of the communication strategy, the image of the Convention, the fundraising strategy. This Convention has been investing in communication messages and tools, and it has been investing from the IFCD, which is not the case for other Conventions which rely on the UNESCO regular budget for communication materials and for fundraising. It expressed that the Committee must be consistent and continue in the same vein and believed that all communication strategies be aligned. It recalled that the Committee supports the idea of entrusting professionals with such tasks, and there could be options of having collaboration with international festivals which bring high-level visibility taking place in all continents. It recommended that the Committee should explore all these possibilities and let professionals give the Committee options. Further to the proposal of the Canadian Ambassador to create a prize, it reminded, that because not all UNESCO prizes have the level of visibility that UNESCO wishes them to have, and those that have the visibility are funded by millions of dollars to achieve visibility. For instance, it cited the l'Oréal prize. The delegation urged the Committee not to hurry, considering that the Committee has been investing and has been dealing with the visibility issue within the framework of the overall comprehensive strategy. It once again thanked Canada for triggering the debate and expressed that the Committee could perhaps ask those communication professionals helping the Secretariat on this subject to consider having some kind of collaboration or organise events with other international festivals in all continents to enhance the visibility of the Convention.
357. The delegation of **Lithuania** also thanked the delegation of Canada and the Ambassador of Canada. It considered the item of great importance, remembering the discussion between the Assistant Director-General for Culture and Group II where he expressed gratitude that this Convention does not have a list. Creating a list for this Convention would really be a grave mistake, because the focus is about living culture, managers and educators, arts and culture actors. Creating such an award emphasizing the importance of culture is a very good idea. The delegation echoed the idea put forward by Saint Lucia that it should be a promotion action because many Committee members sitting with non-culture politicians/actors know very well how difficult it is to promote culture as a means for sustainable development or as a major player within the whole political landscape. Cooperation with important festivals is a great idea, and the Committee needs to define which form such cooperation would take. It drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that culture needs support and there are various players who are promoting culture in extremely difficult conditions within crisis contexts or in a context that is hostile to culture. The delegation thus welcomed the idea of emphasizing the role of those managers, artists and educators and proposed the creation of a Nobel Prize for culture.
358. The delegation of **Austria** also congratulated and thanked the delegation of Canada for having reminded the Committee of this crucial issue and expressed that the document showed the Committee a way how to cooperate with private partners and to reach out to new audiences that the Convention has not reached so far.
359. The delegation of **Sweden** also thanked the delegation of Canada for the important initiative. It expressed that the issue is of great relevance, and it is in the interest of all Parties that the messages of the Convention spread as broadly as possible. As regards the establishment of a prize which has since been withdrawn, the delegation indicated that the UNESCO strategy on prizes should be applied, and it is the Executive Board that takes



a decision on prizes. It noted that it has been a challenge in creating visibility for prizes and cited as an example a UNESCO IPDC Prize which was cancelled in the fall of 2014 due to the lack of visibility and funding. It expressed that it is important for the Committee to come up with other initiatives to increase the visibility of the Convention. It supported the idea to engage professional companies specialized in fundraising that would implement the IFCD strategy and indicated its willingness to discuss how the Committee could use all the work done, namely, fundraising strategy, ratification strategy, and past discussions on how to use the emblem of the Convention and the excellent brochures produced for the IFCD.

360. The Chairperson opened the floor to observers.

#### **[Observers]**

361. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked the delegation of Canada, particularly the Ambassador of Canada, for having brought back the issue of visibility to the Committee. It noted that given that there are a number of options and opinions about how to raise the visibility of the Convention, the Committee needs to agree on the proposed options.

362. The delegation of **Morocco** also thanked the delegation of Canada, in particular, the Ambassador of Canada. While it is supportive of the initiative, it had some questions about the options proposed, for example, the lottery system which it is not in favour of.

363. The representative of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** (IFCCD) also paid tribute to the Ambassador of Canada whom civil society considered as a friend and thanked the Committee for having this debate. He expressed that the problem is not necessarily about creating a prize but rather about getting visibility for the prize in this digital world, because setting up a prize does not mean that the media are going to be interested in it. Getting visibility requires means.

364. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to the adoption of the draft decision. He read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph. He then gave the floor to Switzerland who asked for the point of order. Recalling that the delegation of Canada withdrew the draft decision, the delegation of **Switzerland** wondered what the status of the draft decision was. The Chairperson turned to the delegation of Canada and asked for the confirmation of the withdrawal of the draft decision. The delegation of **Canada** confirmed that the draft decision has been withdrawn since there was no consensus on the item during the preparatory group meetings but that the Committee could decide to continue discussing the issue by establishing a working group, etc.

365. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation of Switzerland for its comment. He indicated that the Convention does not stipulate an establishment of working groups, but the issue could indeed be taken up by other members of the Committee to continue the discussion.

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

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/14**

366. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to discuss the report of the Committee on its activities and decisions to be submitted to the Conference of Parties. Considering that the report must also reflect the debate and decisions of the Committee held at this session, he informed that the Secretariat has completed and updated the document. He invited the Secretary of the Convention to present the document.

367. The **Secretary of the Convention** informed that the document CE/14/8.IGC/14 originally sent to the Committee was replaced by a revised document CE/14/8.IGC/14REV. According to Rule 45.1 of the Committee's Rules of Procedure, this document presents in

Annex the draft report of the Committee that will be submitted to the Conference of Parties at its fifth ordinary session in June 2015. It mentions the composition of the Committee, its two respective meetings since the fourth session of the Conference of the Parties and summarizes the decisions taken by the Committee at these meetings. The report of the Committee on its activities and decisions refers to various priorities discussed at the seventh and eighth sessions. These include:

- the implementation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) including, the implementation of the recommendations of the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) on the pilot phase of the IFCD and the implementation of the first and second phases of the strategy for raising funds;
- the new quadrennial periodic reports and a draft revision of the operational guidelines relative to Article 9 ("Information sharing and transparency") which the Committee adopted at this session;
- the examination of the results of the Committee's ratification strategy;
- the examination of the report on the use of the Convention's emblem;
- the examination of the information collected on the implementation and impact of Articles 16 "Preferential treatment for developing countries" and 21 "International cooperation and consultation" of the Convention;
- the examination of the audits and evaluation from the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) concerning the working methods and implementation of the Convention;
- the examination of the report on the audit of UNESCO's governance;
- other activities, particularly: the impact of digital technologies on the Convention, the role of public service broadcasting in attaining the objectives of the Convention, the participation of civil society in the implementation of the Convention, the discussion on the tenth anniversary of the Convention; and
- the prioritization exercise on the future activities of the Committee as determined by the Conference of Parties.

368. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and invited members of the Committee to make comments.

369. The delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked the Secretariat for its hard work. After the quick screening, it requested the Secretariat to include the important work done regarding the revision of the operational guidelines on Article 9 and the decision of the Committee requesting the Secretariat to transmit the revised guidelines to the Conference of Parties at its fifth session in June 2015. The **Secretary of the Convention** mentioned that the point raised by Viet Nam is indeed very important and suggested inserting after the end of paragraph 17 a new paragraph which reads, "The Committee held important debates on the revision of the operational guidelines on Article 9 including the Framework for Quadrennial Periodic Reporting and after its adoption submitted it to the fifth session of the Conference of Parties for approval". The delegation of **Viet Nam** indicated its satisfaction to the proposal of the Secretary of the Convention.

370. Concerning the question by the delegation of **Zimbabwe** that there was a substantive discussion on the issue of the global priority gender and the inclusion of the youth dimension, the **Secretary of the Convention** proposed to add at the end of the paragraph, "a substantive debate was held on UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality and youth and were added to the draft operational guidelines." The delegation of **Tunisia** suggested using the proper terminology of UNESCO which is "UNESCO Global Priority Gender Equality" and the UNESCO Operational Strategy on Youth.

371. After thanking the excellent work of the Secretariat, the delegation of **Kuwait** referred to the Committee's debate on cooperation and collaboration with civil society, international organizations and others and expressed that the private sector comprises one of the important contributors to sustainable development and proposed to include a mention of the private sector, to which the **Chairperson** responded that the suggestion was already included in paragraph 30.
372. Seeing no more comments, the **Chairperson** invited the Committee to move to the adoption of the draft decision. He read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph and adopted paragraphs 1, 2 and 3. He then adopted the Decision 8.IGC 14 in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 14 was adopted without amendment.*

## **ITEM 15 – DATE OF THE NEXT SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/15**

373. The **Chairperson** stated that in accordance with Article 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee is to determine in consultation with the Director-General the date of its next session. Article 4.2 of the Rules of Procedure also specifies that the Committee sessions are to be held in Paris at UNESCO Headquarters. He requested that the Committee takes into account the results of the audit on the working methods of the cultural conventions by IOS whose report was published in September 2013 concerning the frequency and the synchronization of statutory meetings. He stated that deciding on the duration and the agenda of the meetings is the prerogative of the statutory bodies of the Convention and that in keeping with prior practice, the Committee adopted Decision 7.IGC 14 which reduced the duration of the eighth session from five to three days. He reminded that the synchronization of meetings of the statutory bodies of the cultural conventions was discussed at the previous meetings. In 2012 at its sixth ordinary session, the members of the Committee expressed their concerns regarding the synchronization of meetings as there was relatively short time between the sessions of the Committee of the 2003 Convention and of the 2005 Convention. They felt that having so many meetings that are so close to each other was not effective, because Parties did not have enough time to properly prepare for the debates, and sometimes unable to attend the entire sessions given their busy schedule. This feeling was also expressed at the World Heritage Committee in the decision adopted at its 38<sup>th</sup> session in June 2014, emphasizing that the synchronization of meetings of State Parties to different Conventions would not be an advantage for the States Parties given the duration and the venues of these sessions (Decision 38 COM 5F.1). The Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage took a decision on this question at its ninth ordinary session, concluding that the potential advantages in the effectiveness of the synchronization of meetings of the States Parties of different Conventions might endanger other effective measures. The Chairperson therefore invited the Committee members to take these into account in choosing the date for the ninth ordinary session of the Committee of the 2005 Convention. He informed the Committee that the Secretariat has reserved a meeting room from 14 to 16 December 2015 and requested the Committee whether it supports the proposal.
374. The delegation of **Tunisia** proposed to reserve room I, expressing that room I is more appropriate for the work of the Committee considering some difficulties in room II. It also noted that the Committee of the 2003 Convention was held in room I and it went smoothly. The **Chairperson** responded that the Committee members seem comfortable in room II and also informed that there were about 800 participants for the Intangible Heritage Committee session. The delegation of Tunisia stressed that the question is not about the number of participants but rather the question of audio which is difficult to hear in room II. It however indicated that if other members of the Committee feel comfortable in room II, it

would not insist. Considering that the Secretariat had already reserved room II for the mentioned dates, the Chairperson invited the Committee to approve the proposal of the Secretariat. He read the draft decision 8.IGC 15 and adopted the dates of 14-16 December 2015 as no objection was raised.

*Decision 8.IGC 15 was adopted without amendment.*

## **ITEM 16 – ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE NINTH ORDINARY SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/16**

375. The **Chairperson** explained that now that the Committee has decided on the dates of its next session, the Committee was to elect its next Bureau. He invited the Committee to refer to document 16. He recalled that in accordance with Article 12.1 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee elects, at the end of each ordinary session, among the members of the Committee whose mandate is continuing until the next ordinary session, a chairperson, vice chairperson and a rapporteur until the end of that session and would not be eligible for another Bureau function immediately after. In accordance with Article 11.1 of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau of the Committee is constituted on the basis of the principle of equitable geographical distribution including a Chairperson and several vice-Chairpersons and a rapporteur. The Committee therefore needs to elect a Bureau composed of six representatives, one from each electoral group. He then invited the members of the Committee to propose the name of a chairperson.
376. The **Secretary of the Convention** informed that the Secretariat has received the name of Eva Nowotny of Austria for the Chairperson. The delegation of **Switzerland** confirmed the nomination of Eva Nowotny for the Chairperson of the ninth ordinary session of the Committee. It then asked the Legal Advisor if the Committee need to suspend Article 12.1 of the Rules of the Procedure of the Committee, considering that Austria is currently a member of the Bureau of the Committee as a Vice-Chairperson. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that in keeping with Article 12.1 of the Rule of Procedure, the members of the Bureau cannot be immediately re-elected. Therefore, the Committee must suspend Article 12.1 of the Rule of Procedure of the Committee temporarily in order to do so. The Chairperson proposed to suspend Article 12.1.
377. The delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** explained that the Article in question was intended to ensure within the different regional groups that there is a rotation of membership of the Bureau, but the eligibility of the Bureau is only the continuing members of the group. Considering that the only other continuing member of Group I is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the delegation expressed its full and total support for the Austrian chairmanship.
378. With the confirmation of the Legal Advisor that the Committee is allowed to suspend Article 12.1 and with agreement of the Committee members, the **Chairperson** decided to suspend the application of Article 12.1 and elected Eva Nowotny for the Chairperson for the next Committee meeting. On behalf of Ambassador Nowotny, the delegation of **Austria** thanked the members of the Committee for their support. The **Chairperson** asked the delegation of Austria to convey the congratulations of the Committee to Ambassador Nowotny.
379. The **Chairperson** then invited other members of the Committee to make proposals for the rapporteur. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed Uruguay for the role of rapporteur representing GRULAC. At the request of the Chairperson who asked for the name of the rapporteur, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** replied that it would be Ms. Mariella Crosta. As no objection was made, the **Chairperson** declared Ms. Mariella Crosta elected as rapporteur of the ninth ordinary session of the Committee.

380. For the role of the vice-Chairperson, the **Chairperson** noted Lithuania for Group II. He asked whether Afghanistan or Australia would become the vice-Chairperson for Group IV. The delegation of **Australia** explained that Group IV held consultations but no consensus was reached. It asked whether a concerned Article of the Rules of Procedure could be suspended since there is no candidate for the time being. The **Legal Advisor** informed that UNESCO has never had such a situation because so far, all groups were involved in the Bureau and indicated that Group IV should continue its consultations to find a solution. The Chairperson therefore requested the delegation of Australia to take its responsibility, to which the delegation of Australia replied that it was not ready to take up the responsibility given the absence of Canberra-based representatives. It confirmed that it would take up the suggestion of the Legal Advisor to continue the consultations with the Afghani Ambassador. When the Chairperson asked the delegation of Australia whether it would be able to provide the Committee by the afternoon with a candidate, the delegation of Australia expressed that considering the time difference with its capital, it would be difficult to get a candidate today, but it would consult the Afghani Ambassador. The Chairperson turned to the Legal Advisor and asked if Group IV could be left in a bracket. The Legal Advisor confirmed that Group IV could be left blank while the Committee elects the vice-Chairpersons from Group Va and Vb.
381. The **Chairperson** moved on to Group Va and Vb and requested Group IV to return to the Committee with a candidate. He specified that the vice-Chairperson from Group Va must be either Ethiopia or Madagascar since they are the two countries who would stay on the Committee beyond 2015. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** proposed Ethiopia for Group Va. Since no objection was raised, Ethiopia was elected as the vice-Chairperson for Group Va.
382. The delegation of **Kuwait** proposed Tunisia as the vice-Chairperson for Group Vb, which the **Chairperson** approved.
383. At the request of the **Chairperson** to propose a candidate for the vice-Chairperson for Group IV, the delegation of **Viet Nam** announced that the delegation of Australia received an approval from its capital to be the representative of Group IV in the Bureau. The Chairperson congratulated Australia for its election.
384. The Chairperson read the draft decision 8.IGC 16 paragraph by paragraph and adopted it.  
*Decision 8.IGC 16 was adopted as amended.*

## **ITEM 17 – OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Document CE/14/8.IGC/17**

385. The **Chairperson** moved to item 17. He gave the floor to the delegation of Lithuania.
386. The delegation of **Lithuania** expressed that the Committee did not finish its discussion on visibility and proposed that the Conference of Parties include a question of visibility of the Convention on the agenda of its fifth ordinary session, noting that if the Committee does not take such a decision, the issue of visibility risks disappearing from the agenda.
387. After thanking Lithuania, the **Chairperson** stated that the idea of having the question of visibility of the Convention on the agenda of the fifth ordinary session of the Conference of Parties was in fact included in the draft decision under item 13, but since the delegation of Canada withdrew its draft decision, the idea to have visibility included on the agenda of the Conference of Parties was also withdrawn. He indicated that the question of visibility of the Convention is indeed important especially considering that the year 2015 is the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention.

388. The delegation of **Australia** supported the proposal of Lithuania expressing that the delegation did feel that the Committee began a good conversation about the issue that could continue. The Conference of Parties would be an appropriate time and place in the context of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention.
389. The delegation of **Switzerland** raised a question whether the agenda of the Conference of Parties has already been established. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the agenda items for the Conference of Parties reflect the long list of decisions which have already been taken. For instance, the Conference of Parties would discuss the IFCD, the periodic reports, etc. She stated that the Committee could indeed take a decision to inscribe the item in question on the agenda of the Conference of Parties. While the Secretariat has not yet prepared the agenda, it would reflect all the decisions already taken by the Committee.
390. The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to project the draft decision proposed by the delegation of Lithuania. He read the draft decision 8.IGC 17 paragraph by paragraph. He started with paragraph 1 which reads, "Considering the debates under item 13 on the visibility of the Convention and the options that were debated".
391. On paragraph 1, the delegation of **Tunisia** pointed out that the Committee did not actually discuss the options. The debate was of a general nature and the Committee did not have the time to delve into the options, while the draft decision is presented as if the Committee discussed the options. It asked the paragraph to be reworded.
392. The delegation of **Lithuania** proposed that the end of the paragraph could read, "...the visibility of the Convention and the issues that were debated". The delegation of **Tunisia** replied that ambiguity continues even with the modified wording. The Committee did discuss the involvement of experts, communication professionals, fundraising, and the proposed paragraph does not reflect these issues. The delegation of **Switzerland** expressed its agreement with Tunisia by saying that item 13 focused on a specific dimension of the question of the visibility of the Convention. The Committee did have a discussion around particular proposals and discussed the visibility of the Convention particularly related to fundraising. Considering that it was the choice of the Committee not to take a decision on item 13, the delegation of Switzerland proposed to delete the first paragraph and indicated that it could agree to keep paragraph 2, to which the delegation of **Lithuania** agreed.
393. At the request of the **Chairperson**, the delegation of **Lithuania** proposed to amend the first paragraph to read "Considering the debates under item 13 on the specific aspects of the visibility of the Convention." The delegation of **Viet Nam** indicated that while it could go along with paragraph 2, paragraph 1 should read "Consider the debates regarding the visibility of the Convention" in order to refer to the Committee's debate that took place. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the phrasing proposed by Viet Nam. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported the amendment by Viet Nam and reiterated that it is problematic to refer to item 13.
394. The delegation of **Sweden** proposed a new paragraph after paragraph 2, "Request the Conference of Parties to make use of the strategies already adopted such as fundraising and ratification strategies, as well as the discussions held in the past on the emblem". This is to ensure that all the work already done would be duly taken into account. This new paragraph was supported by the delegation of **Saint-Lucia**.
395. The **Chairperson** requested that the Committee first deals with paragraph 1 and repeated the question of whether to delete paragraph 1 or not. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** stated that paragraph 1 is a preamble so it is weird to start with paragraph 2 without a background to it. The Chairperson summarized that indeed paragraph 1 is a preamble referring to what was discussed at the Committee and move to a decision.

396. The delegation of **Tunisia** asked whether the Secretariat could add a paragraph to the Committee's report on its activities after paragraph 36 referring to that debate on the visibility of the Convention and its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary. In reply, the **Secretary of the Convention** reminded that the report of the activities of the Committee has already been adopted. She turned to the Legal Advisor in case the Committee wishes to add something to the already adopted document. The **Legal Advisor** indicated that since the activities of the Committee has already been adopted, the reference could be made in the detailed summary record. The **Chairperson** agreed that the reference should be made in the Summary Record, rather than adding a paragraph into a document already adopted.
397. The delegation of **Lithuania** insisted on having a decision since the issue of the visibility has been discussed by the Committee for one hour and especially since the draft decision is only requesting the Conference of Parties to continue the discussion on the item.
398. The delegation of **Australia** supported the retention of paragraph 1 which reflects the fact that the Committee did have a debate and it adds a context, and the context is necessary to recommend the Conference of Parties to discuss the issue again. The proposal of Sweden helps to further contextualize what should be considered. It also supported paragraph 3 as proposed by Sweden.
399. The **Chairperson** expressed that the importance of the visibility was well debated, but the draft decision was withdrawn by the author. Had the draft decision not been withdrawn, the Committee would not have been discussing this issue at the moment. Given that the Committee would not wish that the debate on the visibility is lost, the point of Lithuania is precisely to ensure that the issue of the visibility of the Convention be taken up at the Conference of Parties at its next session.
400. The delegation of **Uruguay** indicated that paragraph 1 should read, "Considering its debates at its eighth ordinary session regarding the visibility of the Convention" in order to specify that the debates referred to what was discussed at this current session of the Committee. The **Chairperson** read paragraph 1 as amended by Uruguay and adopted it. The Chairperson then continued to paragraph 2 and adopted it as no objection was raised.
401. On paragraph 3, the delegation of **Sweden** proposed a slightly differently wording which reads, "Requests the Secretariat to compile all relevant information such as strategies and past discussions on the emblem in order for the Conference of Parties to base the discussion thereon." The **Secretary of the Convention** proposed to change the word "compile" to "summarize" or "provide an overview" because compile would mean that the Secretariat would just gather all the concerned documents and give them to the Conference of Parties, to which the delegation of Sweden indicated its agreement. The **Chairperson** re-read the paragraph as amended by Sweden then by the Secretary of the Convention. As no objection was raised, he adopted it.
402. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the **Secretary of the Convention** took the floor to suggest adding another paragraph which becomes paragraph 4. The proposed paragraph would read, "Invites all Parties and civil society organizations to send to the Secretariat information on events they are planning to organize in 2015 to celebrate the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention." The delegation of **Australia** pointed out that this point is already covered within the report on the activities of the Committee which mentions that the Secretariat invited all stakeholders to submit relevant information using the tenth anniversary online tool. It wondered if this is not sufficient enough for the Secretariat's interest in receiving information. The **Secretary of the Convention** responded that the draft decision proposed is different in a sense that it is the Committee asking the Parties and not the Secretariat. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** proposed to replace the word, "send" by "communicate" since sending is a one way process. The **Chairperson** then adopted paragraph 4 as no further objection was raised. He then invited other members of the Committee to raise any points under this item, Other business.

403. The **Chairperson** invited observers to make comments if they have any with the authorization of the Committee to do so.

#### [Observers]

404. The delegation of **Palestine** thanked the Secretariat and the Chairperson for the excellent work carried out during the current Committee session. Concerning the last decision adopted, it pointed out that three distinct subjects were included within a same decision, namely, the visibility, the emblem of the Convention and the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and that each of these subjects deserves to be separate.

405. The representative of the **International Federation for Coalitions for Cultural Diversity** (IFCCD) thanked the Chairperson on behalf of all the participants of this Committee session and applauded him for his excellent work. He then extended him an invitation to participate in an international conference which would highlight the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention, to take place in Québec City from 28-30 May 2015. The **Chairperson** responded positively towards the invitation.

406. The delegation of **Zimbabwe** paid tribute to the outstanding chairmanship of Ambassador Adoua. The Committee gave a round of applause.

407. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** also expressed its gratitude towards the Chairperson. Noting that it was the last Committee session for Saint Vincent and the Grenadines as an outgoing Committee member and that other members are also leaving the Committee, the delegation sincerely thanked the Secretariat for the last four years. It commended the work of the Secretariat for the Convention that is like no other cultural convention of UNESCO – the Convention that has no lists and no compensation and that is based on international cooperation, on preferential treatment for developing countries and on projects that change society. The delegation affirmed that the Convention is very rich and is successful as evidenced by the number of ratifications achieved within the last ten years. It highlighted that if the Parties contribute voluntarily and regularly to the IFCD, the Convention would become even more visible in the future.

408. The delegation of **Uruguay** also expressed its gratitude towards the Chairperson and the Secretariat.

409. The delegation of **China** expressed that as a Party non-member of the Committee, it supports all the decisions adopted. It also thanked the Chairperson, the Committee, as well as the Secretariat for the excellent work. It wished that the year 2015 would be a fruitful year for the Convention.

410. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to move to the adoption of the draft decision. Seeing no objection, he adopted the decision in its entirety.

*Decision 8.IGC 17 was adopted as amended.*

411. The **Chairperson** thanked the members of the Committee and observers for all their interventions and efforts. He then passed the floor to the Rapporteur, Ms Laure Rabarison, who was asked to present an oral report.

412. The **Rapporteur** presented an oral report, summarizing the discussion and outlining the decisions that had been adopted.

413. After thanking the Rapporteur for her report, the **Chairperson** noted that the applause to the Rapporteur must be the sign of non-objection towards the decisions adopted at this session. He further noted that the responsible conduct of the Committee has resulted in the adoption of important decisions and thanked the Secretariat, in particular the Secretary



of the Convention, for their excellent work, which led to the fruitful results of this Committee. He also extended his gratitude to translators, interpreters, technical staff, as well as all other colleagues who enabled this session to be a success. After expressing his support to the Bureau for its work at the next session and wishing season's greetings, he declared the eighth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions closed.

## **CLOSING OF THE SESSION**