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Lesson Plan

**DURATION**

3 hours

**Objectives**

Develop participants’ competencies in results-based monitoring based on the Convention’s overall results framework.

**Description**

This unit contains information on the background to the development of the overall results framework, the thematic areas of the framework and how they relate to the core indicators developed for evaluating and monitoring them. It introduces the methodology of results-based monitoring and how baselines are identified through the online periodic reporting form. It also discusses how countries can use this information to their own benefit and set their own targets for future performance and how countries can set and monitor their own baselines. The nature of the core indicators and assessment factors is presented and the logic behind their choice. Participants have the opportunity to consider the different thematic areas in depth and the nature of the indicators and assessment factors chosen for each one, examining a number of examples selected from each of the thematic areas. This approach aims to demonstrate the diversity of the requirements of different thematic areas in terms of data set(s) required, methodology used, level of information needed, information sources, etc.

**SEQUENCE OF SESSIONS**

**Session 1: Introduction to results-based monitoring, indicators and baselines (30 mins):** This session presents the results-based monitoring methodology and its potential benefits when applied to evaluating and monitoring implementation of the Convention. The choice of indicators for a results-based monitoring system and how they are used are also explained.

**Session 2:** **Introducing the thematic areas of the overall results framework (90 mins):** This session comprises a detailed examination of the thematic areas of the overall results framework and the core indicators and assessment factors developed for each area. It includes two group exercises.

**Session 3: Understanding the weightings (60 mins):** The weightings assigned to each assessment factor are presented, the rationale behind these explained, as well as how baselines can be set and performance evaluated through identifying baselines and setting future targets.

**Supporting documents:**

Facilitator’s notes Unit 58

PowerPoint presentation Unit 58

Participant’s text Unit 58

Handout 1 Unit 58 Assessment factors

Handout 2 Unit 58 Quiz on sources of assessment factors

Handout 3 Unit 58 Quiz answer key

Handout 4 Unit 58 Weightings

Guidance notes

Document [ITH/18/7.GA/9](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-7.GA-9-EN.docx) presenting the draft overall results framework to the General Assembly in June 2018

UNESCO. Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (referred to in this unit as Basic Texts). Paris, UNESCO. Available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00503>.

Facilitator’s Narrative

**Session 1: Introduction to results-based monitoring, indicators and baselines

***Estimated time: 30 minutes***

A results framework is the essential tool used in results-based management[[1]](#footnote-1) that explains how results are to be achieved, including causal relationships and underlying assumptions and risks. This reflects the strategic thinking across an entire organization or programme – in this case an international Convention. If it is well-constructed, a results-framework can support monitoring, management and evaluation in multiple ways:

* It helps focus on specific outcomes;
* It highlights the key linkages in the theory of change that underpin interventions;
* It helps establish an evidence-based approach to monitoring and evaluation;
* It helps measure progress towards strategic objectives;
* It helps achieve strategic objectives.[[2]](#footnote-2)

#### Slide 2

#### Results-based management: a cyclical process:

Within the United Nations system, results-based management is understood as a *cyclical management strategy* by which ‘all actors, contributing directly or indirectly to achieving a set of results, ensure that their processes, products and services contribute to the achievement of desired results (outputs, outcomes and higher level goals or impact). The actors in turn use information and evidence on actual results to inform decision making on the design, resourcing and delivery of programmes and activities as well as for accountability and reporting.’[[3]](#footnote-3) Results frameworks are articulations in graphic or tabular form of such strategies that clearly display the relationship between objectives, actions and the measurement of indicators showing progress towards expected outcomes. The three phases of the RBM process - planning, monitoring and evaluation - are not fixed but allow for flexibility and feed into each other (see: [Document ITH/16/11.COM/14](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-14-EN.docx) and [Document ITH/17/12.COM WG/3](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM_WG-3-EN.docx)).

In the case of periodic reporting on the Convention, such an approach creates a linkage between evaluating the success, or otherwise, of measures taken and future policy-setting by States Parties. It also brings the clear benefit (and added level of complexity) of providing a focus on the diversity of relevant actors and their contributions. An overall results framework for the Convention can help in aligning these multiple planning and reporting exercises by different actors.

#### slide 3

#### Stages of developing the overall results framework

There is no need to go into the details of how the overall results framework was developed. However, for those interested, the participant’s text to this unit describes in detail the different stages through which the overall results framework, a results-based monitoring framework for monitoring and evaluating implementation of the 2003 Convention, was developed. It also provides detailed information on the nature and use of indicators within such a framework, how baselines and targets are set, how the assessment factors for measurement in the overall results framework were identified, a glossary of terms for results-based monitoring and the overall results framework (in a summary form and in its full version). This is a lot of information for the participants to digest, and not all of them will wish to have so much information on how the overall results framework was developed. However, some of these sections in the participant’s text are referred to in the sessions under this and later units.

The facilitator may wish at this stage to draw participants’ attention to the summary version of the overall results framework (participant’s text at 6). They can explain that developing a results framework for monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Convention had to be situated within the terms of the treaty itself, i.e. its purposes, its national level safeguarding measures, its international rights and obligations, and other considerations such as the central role accorded to non-state actors and requirements of human rights and sustainable development.

Hence, the *long-term outcomes* generally correspond to the four main purposes of the Convention set out in Article 1. The *medium- and short-term outcomes* generally relate to the development of necessary capacities and, later, infrastructure for supporting these long-term outcomes over the longer term. The *short-term outcomes* can be understood to be results of implementing the measures that relate to the Core Indicators and which are expressed in terms of assessment factors. The *Impacts* (the highest level shown in this High Level Framework overall results framework) represent the aspirations that underlie the drafting of the Convention, some of which are expressed in the Preamble to the Convention, in particular the phrase “contributing to sustainable development for human well-being, dignity and creativity in peaceful and inclusive societies”.

The *thematic areas* are essentially a means for organizing the *core indicators* (derived mainly from Articles 11-18 and 23 of the Convention) in a meaningful way.

It should also be noted that, in the full version of the overall results framework (given in the PT at 6), the language of the core indicators is consistently “Extent to which …”. For example, indicator 1 is expressed as “Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of ICH”. This operates at both national and global levels, in rather different ways.

#### slide 4

#### Applying results-based monitoring to the Convention

As mentioned above, the four purposes of Article 1 are expressed in a different form in the overall results framework as long-term outcomes.

There are few strict obligations placed on States Parties in the Convention text, and these mostly address periodic reporting, drawing up inventories, some administrative and financial obligations and the general duty to safeguard ICH.

A number of strong and clear recommendations are made in Articles 13-15 to fulfil the general duty to safeguard set out in Article 11(a). In these, States Parties are strongly encouraged to take various courses of action, including policy-making, education and capacity building. In addition to these, the Operational Directives and any other principles adopted by the Committee, such as the Ethical Principles for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage ([Decision 10.COM 15.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/15.a)) also make recommendations and may impose some obligations on States Parties within the framework of the Convention, even though their status is legally subordinate to the Convention text.

The principle of sustainable development is also present in the text of the Convention: ICH is described in the Preamble as a ‘guarantee of sustainable development’ and as a ‘factor in bringing human beings closer together and ensuring exchange and understanding among them’. ICH elements cannot be taken into consideration at the international level if they are ‘not compatible with the requirements […] of sustainable development’ (Article 2(1)). However, it is not clear from the Convention itself how ICH safeguarding can support sustainable development and Chapter VI was added to the ODs in 2016 to clarify this. It sets out in detail the measures States Parties can take to strengthen the linkages between safeguarding ICH and sustainable development. It also calls on States Parties to ‘direct their safeguarding efforts solely on such intangible cultural heritage that is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development’ (OD 170).

#### slide 5

#### Involving non-state actors in a results-based periodic reporting process:

Articles 11b and 15 require that safeguarding measures are carried out with as high a level of involvement of communities, groups and individuals (and NGOs) as possible. This, however, presents a challenge when implementing the overall results framework and associated periodic reporting.

#### slide 6

#### How performance indicators work

Since indicators *mark progress along a route towards the agreed-upon expected results*, an expected result in the context of the Convention would be the ‘desired’ change which is expected to be induced by the implementation of measures, programmes or projects. They should be able to convey how a specific situation in future is expected to be different from the current situation (OD 170).

Indicators have both a temporal and a progress (extent) aspect to them:

* Temporal aspect: have the expected changes been finished, are they partially or fully underway, or have they not yet begun?
* Progress (extent) aspect: have the expected changes been fully achieved, achieved to a greater or lesser degree, or not achieved?

Indicators are most often expressed in quantitative terms, but qualitative indicators are also possible and may often be preferable for measuring performance under the Convention. For more on quantitative versus qualitative indicators, please refer the participants to their participant’s text at 2.

It is worth mentioning here that there are a number of *risks* associated with defining and using indicators and associated information. The most frequent of these are:

* Lack of a data source preventing easy and cost-effective collection of the necessary information
* Oversimplification and misunderstanding of how outcomes occur
* Overemphasis on outcomes that are easy to quantify at the expense of less tangible, but no less important outcomes
* Overly mechanical use of indicators in ways that fail to feed into strategic thinking and organizational practices.
* An awareness of this is important when responding to performance indicators and, in the case of online periodic reporting, their associated assessment factors used for measuring them.

#### slide 7

#### Baselines and targets:

The *baseline*provides the starting point or the status of the performance indicator at the beginning of a programme or project that acts as a reference point against which progress or achievements of results can be assessed.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The *target*is a measure associated to a performance indicator to be attained during a specific period with available resources.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Within the overall results framework for the Convention, baselines and targets will need to be established at both the global and country levels. This will require two parallel processes, whereby the *global targets* would be established through international consensus (most likely through a decision of the Committee), while the *country level targets* would be established by each State Party. Similarly, the relevant baselines at the global level will not be the same as those at the country level. For example:

A *target at the global level* might call for a given indicator, within a specific time period, to be fully satisfied in X% of States Parties, partially satisfied in Y% of States Parties, and not satisfied in Z% of States Parties. In a subsequent period, for instance, the target would be revised to call for the percentage of fully satisfied to grow, and for the percentage of not satisfied to shrink.

A State Party itself might set a *target at the country level* to satisfy the indicator fully within a given time period, based upon its own priorities, resources and capacities; or its target might be to satisfy the indicator to a certain degree or not at all. Here too, in subsequent periods the State Party would expect to see more indicators fully satisfied and fewer indicators not satisfied.

#### slide 8

#### Baselines and targets (2):

The facilitators should at this point **open the online reporting tool** to show that it includes weightings for each assessment factor that then allow for the form to generate automatically the degree to which an indicator is satisfied. The online tool includes a sliding scale that automatically indicates the extent to which each indicator is met based on the information provided. It constitutes a baseline for future reporting. The second scale allows the user, on a voluntary basis, to define a target for the next reporting exercise, in six-year time, and a text box allows you to explain how they intend to achieve this target. This, then, provides a valuable tool for States Parties to identify their current baseline for that indicator (if they do not already know this) and to set their target for the future.

**Session 2: Introducing the thematic areas of the overall results framework

***Estimated time: 90 minutes***

This session begins with a detailed examination of the core indicators developed for each of the thematic areas. The aim is to familiarize participants with the thematic areas and how they relate to the core indicators developed for evaluating and monitoring them. Participants should be reminded that the core indicators are not designed for measuring the thematic areas themselves, which are simply category titles. Rather, the role of the indicators is to allow us to measure the *outputs* and *outcomes* that have been organized under each of these thematic areas.

#### SLIDE 9

#### Thematic Areas, Core Indicators and Assessment Factors:

This slide presents the eight thematic areas of the overall results framework and the number of core indicators and assessment factors associated with each one. It can be noted that the thematic areas correspond broadly to divisions found in the Convention, as follows:

* Institutional and human capacities (Article 13)
* Transmission and education (Articles 2.3, 13 & 14)
* Inventorying and research (Article 2.3, Article 13)
* Policies as well as legal and administrative measures (Preamble, Article 13)
* Awareness raising (Articles 1 and 14)
* Engagement of communities, groups and individuals as well as other stakeholders (Articles 11b and 15)
* International engagement (Articles 16-24).

#### SLIDE 10

#### Thematic Areas and their Core Indicators:

The facilitator shows this slide and asks the participants to focus on the core indicators chosen for each of the thematic areas. The facilitator should go through each of the thematic areas, discussing the choice of indicators, taking into consideration such issues as the availability of data, whether the indicators are primarily quantitative or qualitative (or if they might have qualitative assessment factors for measuring them), and if any serve as proxies for the information sought. They may wish to suggest aspects that they feel are not covered by the indicators and consider if these gaps may be filled through the use of assessment factors.

Participants can also be invited to think about how gender, diversity and sustainability might operate with regard to the indicators chosen, and how these might be monitored.

Section 4 of the PT for this unit gives some further information on the relationship between the thematic areas, core indicators and assessment factors and provisions of the Convention.

#### SLIDE 11

#### Indicators and assessment factors arranged by thematic areas (Institutional and human capacities):

This slide shows the three core indicators for thematic area 1, with their related assessment factors. The facilitator can discuss with the participants the choice of assessment factors for each of the core indicators. Some points to consider include:

* Why does indicator 1 have five factors associated with it, while indicator 3 only has two?
* Which of these factors measure purely quantitative aspects of the indicator, and which may also measure qualitative aspects too (discussing what makes an indicator more qualitative)?
* How available is data and information for these factors?
* Which actors/stakeholders are able to provide data and information?
* Can these continue to be measured over time?
* How do they inform the setting of baselines and targets for their associated indicator?
* How have these assessment factors been selected (i.e. what are their sources)?

At this stage, participants can be directed to look at section 3 of their participant’s text which presents two provisions from Part III of the Convention (Articles 13(c) and 14 (a)(iii)) alongside the assessment factors developed for each of these provisions for the overall results framework. The assessment factors are shown according to their related thematic areas and core indicators. This demonstrates the relationship between the assessment factors chosen and their source, in this case the Convention’s provisions.

After this discussion, the participants can be divided into groups for the following exercise.

#### SLIDE 12

#### Exercise (30 minutes):

![C:\Users\ae_cunningham\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.IE5\0LYUBDWZ\pencil-silhouette[1].jpg]()***Learning objective***: To familiarize participants with the thematic areas, core indicators and assessment factors, particularly the rationale for choosing the assessment factors.

The facilitator should provide the participants with Handout 1 and assign each group one of the following areas:

* Transmission and education (Thematic Area 2)
* Inventory and research (Thematic Area 3)
* Policies as well as legal and administrative measures (Thematic Area 4)
* Awareness-raising (Thematic Area 5)
* Engagement of communities, groups and individuals as well as other stakeholders (Thematic Area 6)

In addition to the assessment factors for these thematic areas, **Handout 1** provides a number of questions they may consider for the different assessment factors they have been assigned. They may wish to address other issues that they feel are relevant.

Once the groups have had sufficient time to consider their assigned thematic area, participants can return to the plenary to share their ideas and questions.

#### SLIDES 13 to 19

#### Thematic Areas:

* Transmission and education
* Inventorying and research
* Policies, legal and administrative measures (1)
* Policies, legal and administrative measures (2)
* Role of ICH and its safeguarding in society
* Awareness-raising
* Engagement of communities etc.

These slides are optional as each participant has the same information in **Handout 1**, but it may be useful to use these when participants share their findings in the plenary. The facilitator acts as moderator of this session and, as each group discusses its findings concerning the thematic area they worked on, the facilitator should ask the participants to focus on the assessment factors.

#### SLIDE 20

#### Quiz (45 minutes):

This quiz aims to reinforce the participants understanding about the relationship between the assessment factors and their sources (Convention text, ODs, Ethical Principles, others). At the same time, it is good method to become more familiar with the different assessment factors which provided the basis for the questions of the form.

Divided into small groups, the participants will be given a copy of **Handout 2** and asked to identify as many of the sources as possible for each of the assessment factors.

The participants should be encouraged to use the Convention text, ODs and Ethical Principles as a reference guide. The facilitator should also warn participants that some of the factors have no source, while others may have several.

Once the groups have worked through the factors, they should return to the plenary and share their results. Using the answer key, the facilitator can ‘score’ each group’s responses (this will require some discretion as it is unlikely that they will identify all the sources). The winning group is the one that managed to identify the most sources, including where the factors have no specific source.

At this stage, **Handout 3** can be shared with the participants so that they can check their results against the overall results framework.

After this exercise, the facilitator should begin a discussion around the following two issues:

* Why are some assessment factors included that do not have any specific source; does it affect their status?
* Are some assessment factors more important than others as a result of the source(s) they have?

This discussion will serve as an introduction to the topic of the next session about the weighting system.

**Session 3: Understanding the weightings

***Estimated time: 60 minutes***

This session presents the weightings assigned to each assessment factor in the online periodic reporting tool and the rationale behind them. This will demonstrate how baselines can be set and performance evaluated. In addition, there will be a discussion on how countries can use this information to their own benefit and set their own targets for future performance. It should also be explained that these weightings are presented in the final section of the Guidance Notes to the online periodic reporting tool.

The weightings assigned to the assessment factors are calculated such that, for each core indicator, they add up to 100. This total is split differently according to the importance accorded to the particular assessment factor and the number of assessment factors for that particular core indicator (some have up to five assessment factors, while others have only two). As each core indicator is phrased in terms of the “extent of satisfaction", the ideal would be to keep a five-way distinction between the assessment factor weightings (analogous to the likert scale). In the final version of the weightings, however, the “extent of satisfaction” can be a five-way, four-way, or three-way determination according to the total number of assessment factors per indicator. Hence, if there are 3, 4 or 5 assessment factors, the core indicator can be rated as Fully satisfied, Largely satisfied, Partially satisfied, Minimally satisfied, or Not satisfied. If there are only two assessment factors, then the core indicator can be rated as Fully satisfied, Largely satisfied, Partially satisfied, or Not satisfied.

The calculation applied operates as follows:

* Satisfied = ≥ 90 pts (for four or five assessment factor, one should be 10 points if “optional”).
* Largely satisfied = ≥ 65 pts.
* Partially satisfied = ≥ 35 pts.
* Minimally satisfied = ≥ 10 pts (not available if only two assessment factors).
* Not satisfied = ≥ 0 pts.

This can be compared with the method of calculation that would be used in a purely quantitative approach (e.g. when measuring the number of relevant courses and programmes that incorporate ICH subject matter as a percentage). In that method, one would convert the % given and convert that to a step on likert scale (of 1 to 5), such that: 0% = 0; 1 – 20% = 1; 21 – 40% = 2; 41 – 60% = 3; 61 – 80% = 4; and over 81% = 5. The method of calculation chosen was, to some degree, a compromise between the reality of the mixed qualitative and quantitative character of the indicators and their assessment factors and the wish to have a five-step scale. The idea, then, is that a State Party can achieve “partially satisfied” if they answer ‘yes’ to 1/2, 1/3, 2/4 or 2/5 of the assessment factors for a given indicator and can achieve “largely satisfied” even if they answer ‘no’ to one of the questions for an indicator with 2-4 assessment factors, or to two questions for an indicator with five assessment factors). “Fully satisfied” would require answering ‘yes’ to every (or almost every) question. This is a relatively positive approach that favours an optimistic view of the performance of States Parties.

#### SLIDES 21 & 22

#### Weightings for measuring indicators (Core indicator 1 and 4):

Slides 20 and 21 show the weightings available for each of the five assessment factors for core indicator 1: “Extent to which competent bodies and institutions and consultative mechanisms support the continued practice and transmission of ICH” (Slide 20) and for each of the five assessment factors for core indicator 4 “Extent to which both formal and non-formal education strengthen the transmission of ICH and promote respect for ICH” (Slide 21).

When showing these slides, ask the participants to think about the weightings assigned to each assessment factor and consider how the relative weightings were arrived at. At this stage, it is important not to guide the participants’ thinking too much, but to leave them free to make their own speculations based on their own understanding. Indeed, it is quite possible that they may disagree with some of these, and they should be provided with the opportunity to express their thoughts freely.

#### SLIDES 23 & 24

#### Weightings and sources (Core indicator 1 and 4):

Once the facilitator feels that enough time has been given to this discussion, then they can show the next two slides which add a further column showing the sources (Convention text, ODs and Ethical Principles) for each of the assessment factors. The facilitator can then point out that, although there may be some correlation between the status of the assessment factors according to its source (on a hierarchical ‘scale’ which places the Convention text as the most authoritative and the Ethical Principles as the least authoritative), but that this is by no means a strict correlation. The facilitator should ask the participants to consider why this might be and what other factors are involved in assigning the weightings.

#### SLIDE 25

#### Exercise (30 minutes):

![C:\Users\ae_cunningham\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary Internet Files\Content.IE5\0LYUBDWZ\pencil-silhouette[1].jpg]()***Learning objective***: To help participants understand the rationale behind assigning weightings to different assessment factors.

The participants should be divided into groups of 4 or 5 and given a copy of **Handout 4**. Each group is assigned one of the core indicators on this handout. In the cases of indicators with only two assessment factors, two indicators may be assigned. Using the information available in the Guidance Notes for their indicator(s), the groups can consider the weightings assigned to the assessment factors, taking into consideration the sources for each one.

Having done this, they should look at the table showing the overall results framework in their participant’s text at section 6. They should then try to (a) find a correlation between the weighting that has been assigned and the source(s) for the assessment factor cited, if one or more exists, and (b) identify any other considerations(s) that might have influenced the decision as to which assessment factor to give greater or lesser (or the same) weighting to. The participants can then return to the plenary to discuss their findings. Once they have done this, participants can practise completing their indicator in the online form to see how the weightings assigned translate into the baseline. Participants should be encouraged to give responses that match their own situation as closely as possible.

The facilitator can then provide the following explanation, with some examples, to show how some of these weightings were arrived at. Please note that while some of these are included in the handout, others are not.

The current arrangement is much more complicated than simply assigning an equal weighting to all assessment factors (25 for a four-assessment factor indicator, 20 for a three-assessment factor indicator, etc.), and this allows for a much greater degree of nuance as to the relative importance of the different assessment factors. This method for calculating the extent of satisfaction of the indicators also involves a degree of subjective judgment as to the relative importance of the assessment factors to the overall implementation of the Convention and the achievement of the core indicator, reflecting the qualitative aspect of many of the assessment factors and core indicators.

An early proposal for assigning the weightings to each assessment factor was to do this strictly according to the level of obligation it reflected, particularly according to the Convention text, ODs and Ethical Principles. It was felt that this approach, however, would skew the overall results framework evaluation (and reporting) too heavily towards purely measuring compliance and/or non-compliance. The aim behind the approach decided upon, then, was to assist States Parties in considering their implementation of the 2003 Convention at the national level and help them assess where they are at the time of reporting (establish baselines) and where they would like to be in six years’ time (establish targets).

Some examples of weightings assigned and the discussions that this involved can help to illustrate this process. It is useful for the participants to have a copy of the PT at hand when this explanation is given to consult the overall results framework.

 ***Assessment factor 4.4: “Teacher training programmes and programmes for training providers of non-formal education include approaches to integrating ICH and its safeguarding into education”:***

This was assigned a weighting of 15, even though it has no explicit authority in the Convention and its supporting texts (see ‘Citations’ column). A reason for this is that ICH and Education was the second priority of the Committee at the time of developing the overall results framework (2018-19). In addition, it is regarded as implicit in Articles 2.3 and 14 of the Convention.

 ***Assessment factor 5.3: “The diversity of learners’ ICH is reflected through mother tongue or multilingual education and/or the inclusion of ‘local content’ within the educational curriculum”:***

This was assigned a weighting of 10 (in place of an original 20) as it is a controversial requirement, especially the reference to curriculum content. Moreover, mother tongue or multilingual education is not relevant to monolingual countries. In contrast, 5.4, is explicitly referred to in Article 14(c) and is given greater weight.

 ***Assessment factor 11.3: “Public financial and/or technical support for the safeguarding of ICH elements, whether or not inscribed, is provided on an equitable basis, in relation to the overall support for culture and heritage at large, while bearing in mind the priority for those identified as in need of urgent safeguarding”:***

This assessment factor was ‘invented’ during the development of the overall results framework, and so it was proposed to give it a low weighting (at 10). However, in view of the (subjective) judgment that it is a relevant factor and would encourage States Parties to consider this, it was decided to assign a weighting of 15. It may also be seen as implied by the emphasis placed on continued viability of ICH in Article 2.3.

 ***Assessment factor 13.3: “Policies and/or legal and administrative measures to respond to situations of natural disaster or armed conflict are established or revised to include the ICH affected and to recognize its importance for the resilience of the affected populations”:***

This has no authority in the Convention and related texts (see ‘Citations’ column) and it was proposed that it might therefore be seen as ‘optional’. However, due to the increasing importance of this issue in the political discourse of UNESCO as well as for ICH, and as there are references in the ODs to such situations and possible State interventions (especially in Chapter VI), it was decided to assign a weighting of 15.

 ***Assessment factors 15.1, 15.2 and 15.3:***

Only one of these assessment factors has explicit statutory authority (15.3), and it was proposed to recognize this by weighting these three assessment factors as 15.3 (30), 15.4 (30) and 15.5 (40). However, as it was felt that States Parties have a lot to say about 15.1 (“Communities, groups and individuals use their ICH for their well-being, including in the context of sustainable development programmes”), a breakdown of 15.3 (35), 15.4 (25) and 15.5 (40) was finally settled on. This decision to assign a greater weight to 15.1 than to 15.2 is, therefore, largely subjective even if backed up by experience.

 ***Assessment factor 16.2: “Self-respect and mutual respect are fostered among communities, groups and individuals through safeguarding plans and programmes for ICH in general and/or for specific elements of ICH, whether or not inscribed“:***

To allow for four possible extents (including “Largely Satisfied”), these would have to be weighted either 65/35 or 35/65. Both were deemed s important, and so this is to some extent an arbitrary judgment. As 16.1 is seen to reflect a general principle implied by Article 15 and by the Preamble’s invocation of existing human rights instruments, the higher weighting was assigned to it.

 ***Assessment factor 24.1: “Bilateral, multilateral, regional or international cooperation is undertaken to implement safeguarding measures for ICH in general”:***

In contrast to assessment factor 24.2, 24.1 has clear authority (Article 19 and OD 86) and so it was suggested that they should not be treated as equivalent in weight. However, it was felt that the way in which multi-national files are described in the ODs would imply international cooperation for the implementation of joint safeguarding measures for specific ICH elements. As a result, both 24.1 and 24.2 were accorded 35 points. The subjectivity of this judgment can be understood by considering the 15 points assigned to 24.3, which could also be regarded as one of the main positive outcomes of international cooperation.

 ***Assessment factor 25.3: “State Party participates in the ICH-related activities of international and regional bodies other than UNESCO”:***

Although having no explicit authority, this 25.3 was originally accorded equal weight with 25.1, which is supported by OD 88. In addition, it was seen as potentially interfering in a State Party’s sovereign right to conduct its own foreign affairs. As a consequence, the balance of 25.1 (35), 25.2 (40), and 25.3 (25) was decided upon.
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