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| **Topic 2: Towards the creation of an ‘observatory’ for sharing good safeguarding practices** |
| The structure of the discussion in Group A: a general invitation to all participants in the group to express their opinions on the proposed questions and issues having in mind the 6 questions in the document LHE/23/EXP ART 18/3 under the topic, but also other new issues that came out already in the expert meeting or that were addressed partially by the participants in the plenary sessions  The following issues, concerns and recommendations were discussed:   * **Evaluation of the impact of the online modality as opposed to the in-person communication, and the need to carefully consider the needs and expectations of bearers and practitioners in the digital environment:**   - the awareness of the various target-groups of the platform and the limitations of a relevant or a full engagement with stakeholders and recipients in an online format vs. the advantages and the need of a real-person connection on sharing information and good practices;  - a concrete case showing the lack of interest of community representatives for engaging in sharing materials on an online platform; they preferred to use alternative individual social media platforms that did not involve “moderators” and “selection”, or the participation of “external” observers/outsiders;  - the need to build the platform as an engaging participatory forum in order to create as much as possible the environment of in-person and direct communication;  - the existing asymmetry in geographical terms of the capacity of using digital tools by communities across the world; the reality that some communities are less comfortable with using digital tools or have no available technical capacity in this respect.   * **Recommendation of starting to build the online platform based on the existing resources around the Convention** (the gradual growing platform approach):   - using existing data and resources available for broader dissemination on the Convention website (nomination files, International Assistance projects, periodic reporting, calls for information at the national level in the preparation of periodic reports, capacity building materials, safeguarding living heritage during the pandemics or in emergencies, Dive into ICH, etc.), accredited NGOs materials, different countries’ projects on inventorying and awareness-raising data;  - building further and developing these databases, linking them further with new examples of safeguarding practices, that should enrich the existing information in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices;  - the problem of ethical sharing of materials and information, being aware of a swift protocol for sharing already existing resources on the Convention’s website, and the needed protocol for ensuring the rights to use, share, distribute, reproduce new information.   * **The careful consideration of the target-groups of the online platform:**   - the need to implement lighter ways of sharing information and to consider the categories of recipients of these already existing materials, taking into account that some capacity building materials or nomination files are not inclusive or available enough (in terms of language, specialized jargon) for broader audiences, and especially for members of the communities concerned;  - the targeted category of recipients should be as broadest as possible, from experts to the civil society as a whole, and especially approaching the needs and expectations of communities, groups and individuals as living heritage bearers;  - the need to consider a wide concept of “community” – not just communities of practitioners, but also the public or audience of living heritage practices, engaging and enjoying living heritage.   * **Proposals for the content, technical features and general design of the online platform:**   **- Implementing desk research and surveying existing digital tools of similar platforms for sharing living heritage data:**  - recommend to the Secretariat to ask the focal points to survey the existing digital tools in their countries;  - surveying the digital tools, programs of sharing safeguarding practices in programmes and project of Category 2 centres;  - surveying the needs and expectations of communities and accredited NGOs on the expected experience and content that should be made available on the platform;  - consulting UNESCO chairs.  **- Thematic structure:**  - not necessarily following the structure of the 5 domains of the Convention, but rather categories of safeguarding activities, or following the indicators of the ORF 8 thematic areas;  - a data gathering interface for including information for the periodic reports, especially using the experience of State Parties that used already digital tools for requesting periodic reporting information at the national level;  - ensuring as much as possible the geographical balance of the presented information.  - **Technical structure** **of the platform**:  - designing technical modalities for filtering the information: tagging the content of the platform in more than one way – not just thematic, but based on other relevant criteria that may be of interest for communities to use it as an inspirational tool; developing various keywords for improving and assisting searching  - practical data needed for building an effective platform: who are the users, how is content mapping being achieved, building user-friendly interfaces, ensuring an interactive aspect of the platform as to shape it as welcoming space for dialogue, with the possibility  to use local languages.  - **A safe space format**: the importance of ensuring the platform functions as an inclusive, “safe”, non-judgmental space for the communities, eliminate the concern of a “big brother” system, the feeling that the information shared is to be assessed, filtered by experts before being posted.   * **Active and trained users of the platform – building the participatory feature**   - creating connections with the global capacity building framework of the Convention: the capacity building programme to be utilized not just as resource for information, but also to build the online platform through providing training, awareness-raising campaigns and prepare efficient dissemination and encourage future users  - training for using the online tools and acknowledging the technical and ethical implications on participating on the platform   * **Risks**:   - third parties taking control of the platform for ends beyond the living heritage safeguarding scope  - the concern for intellectual property rights, collective rights, image rights, copyrights and the need to properly inform the communities, groups and individuals before they become active users of the platform |