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| **Topic 1: Improving the access to and increasing the visibility of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices** |
| * **First point of discussion: What is the purpose of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices?**
	+ The Register perfectly illustrates the Purposes of the 2003 Convention, especially regarding the safeguarding of ICH, as stated in Article 1 (a).
	+ The Register gives examples of tangible experiences of community-based safeguarding. Community safeguarding experiences, as illustrated by the Register are models for others.
	+ The Register motivates exchange between communities, who are at the heart of the 2003 Convention and safeguarding endeavours.
	+ The Register can be a motivating factor for State Parties and Communities to engage with safeguarding practices. Governments are interested in having visibility through these listing mechanisms.
	+ The Register is good for awareness-raising and should be thought about as a hub of inspiration.
	+ Out of the three listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention, the register is most action-based, and thus serves as an activating principle. Although the subject of the 2003 Convention are the elements of ICH, its purposes are about promoting action on safeguarding the diversity of ICH.
	+ The Register is a pivotal capacity-building tool within the framework of the 2003 Convention and can help in the preparation of ICH policies at every level of implementation of the 2003 Convention.
* **Reflection on Form ICH-03 and the criteria of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.**
	+ Section 8 of ICH-03 Form, which is based on criterion P.8, regarding assessment of the results is considered a difficult section to address. Some questions that arise when analysing this section are: What is the framework of indicators that we use to assess these results? Monitoring tasks that allow for such assessment are also difficult to set up them. The group agreed that there is a tendency to favour quantitative indicators, but these are not enough to tell the stories of change that happen within community contexts during the implementation of safeguarding activities.
	+ Furthermore, Section 4 and Section 8 (regarding criteria P.4 and P.8, respectively) are difficult to differentiate and might overlap.
	+ Section 2, that deals with criterion P.2, was superfluous, as coordination efforts are part of the effectiveness of the program (Section 4) and such coordination efforts can also be expanded through the willingness to collaborate, which is addressed in Section 7.
	+ Section 5, which relates to criterion P.5, that addresses community participation was considered the most important section of Form ICH-03, specially within the framework of Article 15 of the 2003 Convention.
	+ ICH-03 Form can be simplified by merging Sections 4 and 8 (P.4 and P.8). This is because the effectiveness of a programme or project can be described in within the framework of evaluation indicators.
	+ Moreover, Sections 2 and 6 (criteria P.2 and P.6) can also be merged since coordination efforts at levels beyond the national level reflect the capacity of the programme or project to operate as model.
	+ The importance of criterion P.1 was underscored during the discussion. However, such description must be framed within the purposes and principles of the 2003 Convention.
	+ Therefore, the merging of Sections 1 and 3 was proposed, so that the description directly addresses how the programme or project addresses the purposes of the 2003 Convention.
* **How can we make the register more visible to people who are looking for inspiration on safeguarding experiences?**
	+ The issue of visibility of the Register, for it to operate as a resource for people engaging with ICH safeguarding, could be resolved by improving the capacity for agency of NGOs and communities particularly within capacity building efforts.
	+ Training programs must both be directed NGOs, communities, and grassroots networks, and must be led by accredited NGO’s and communities. This emphasis on agency of communities and NGOs would increase the visibility of the safeguarding practices in the Register because they are the main stakeholders of the inscribed programmes and projects.
	+ Formal and non-formal education are also fundamental channels for raising awareness on the Register, specially by using digital and online resources.
	+ The online observatory, enriched with tools such as podcasts and transmedia projects, was considered a positive way forward in terms of raising awareness on the Register and safeguarding experiences in general.
	+ Communication and awareness raising efforts done by the Secretariat, State Parties, and other 2003 Convention stakeholders must focus more on the safeguarding activities that are being carried out at different levels of implementation of the 2003 Convention, as well as on the programmes and projects inscribed in the Register.
* **How can we promote the presentation of more proposal for inscriptions on the Register on behalf of States parties?**
	+ The Intergovernmental Committee could make calls for specific thematic proposals for the Register, as stated in Article 18(1), inspired by reflections inspired by assessment of the results of the periodic reporting process. Safeguarding themes can be identified when analysing either gaps or opportunities that are made evident by periodic reporting.
	+ Guidelines for the preparation of proposals for the Register should be more visible and made more user friendly for State parties and stakeholders.
	+ Furthermore, the Register must be more accessible, with a better presentation within the UNESCO ICH website.
	+ Capacity-building materials must integrate examples derived from the Register to a larger extent.
* **How can we improve follow-up and monitoring of the Register?**
	+ Follow-up on inscriptions on the Register could be integrated into the periodic reporting exercise since the form currently does not address it explicitly.
	+ However, it was stated that periodic reporting is still not very visible, and it is a based on a very long cycle.
	+ A form of recognition public for States parties that engage and promote good safeguarding practices could be a way of promoting interest in monitoring or following-up on the results of Good Safeguarding Practices.
	+ However, a point was raised that sponsoring competition within the 2003 Convention is not in line with its spirit based on cooperation and exchange. Nevertheless, competitiveness could be channelled into something positive.
	+ The ICH-03 Form must have a section regarding what will happen in the future with the programme or project, and it could be related to how the programme or project promotes the SDGs.
	+ Instead of a written follow-up, a verbal presentation within a Global Forum or Conference could generate interest in the preparation of assessment reports of the programmes and projects inscribed in the Register.
	+ The presentation within the context of such Forum of Conference should be led by representatives of the communities.
	+ The concept of follow-up is considered more appropriate than monitoring when referring to the Register.
	+ Monitoring can have a negative connotation for communities.
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