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| **Topic 1: Improving the access to and increasing the visibility of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices** |
| The following key points were put up for discussion to guide and propose solutions for accessibility, including changes to the nomination form:   * What may be quick wins and fixes, flanking measures or additional tools? How important equitable representation is in the Register? * How may mechanisms be put in place to monitor and select good practices? * Possible adjustments of the form * Measures for better access to the Register * **What are some of the quick fixes, flanking measures or additional tools to increase the visibility of the Register?** * A dedicated campaign by UNESCO should be carried out in collaboration with the States Parties to raise importance of or promote the Register such as through a year in dedication of the Register. This campaign should also encourage States Parties and the relevant organisations and communities to share their experiences and learn from one another. * An information campaign or something similar, should be done to raise awareness of the funding resources available to the States Parties to prepare proposals to the Register; currently there seems to be little awareness of such an avenue, although it is stated in Operational Directives 42 – 46. This seeks to address one of the key considerations on the amount of resources needed to prepare a file or a proposal and the sustaining of such a proposal. The intentional promotion of the awareness of funding could also help to address the lack of geographic representation, in that the Committee could encourage programmes to solicit South-South collaborations. * To further reinforce the credibility of the Register, it would be worthwhile gathering information from States Parties on the usefulness of the Register to convey the impact. Such a survey should take on a more qualitative nature such as recording testimonials or perceptions of the Register from general users of the website. * Another way is to encourage States Parties to share if they have their own registers and measures to promote good safeguarding measures. Linking with or harvesting such systems, information and data could further strengthen the use of the Register. Such Registers do not need to be complex, the programmes or measures on such lists in each States Parties demonstrate that the practices can be found in everyday life and holds space for a diversity of practices such as communities can learn from one another (as from the case of Sweden’s national Register of Safeguarding Practices) * To address the perennial issue that the Evaluation body has too much to do – it is possible to consider two options – firstly, to create two separate bodies – the current Evaluation Body to continue evaluating files nominated to the RL and USL, and another to evaluate the Register and proposals to seek international assistance; the second option is for a lighter mechanism where there be an observatory like the Wiki, to host good safeguarding practices * Tailored funding/capacity programmes for countries to build capacity for creation, sustenance and dissemination of programmes, should be considered. * Provide communities, groups and if applicable individuals, with the space to share and learn through active channeling or resources, including funds. * **What exactly about the Register should we communicate and what considerations have hindered or limited the number of submissions? How may we potentially address them?** * It should be reinforced that the concept of or intention of the Register reinforces the participation of the communities, groups and other actors, as the listed safeguarding programmes recognise and create a source of inspiration and pride for the communities, given that they have transmitted their ICH through these successful programmes over generations. * The communities involved in the preparation of the proposals for the Register should considered agents of capacity building, not just as a form of promoting the communities and groups, as well as recognizing their efficiency. Such a measure could also support other communities in preparing proposals for the Register. * From the perspective of developing countries, the innate motivation would be to nominate elements to the Urgent Safeguarding List as a priority, given that the Convention raised awareness of their ICH that was facing extinction. As such, the mechanism in that context was to respond to save what was disappearing. Once elements have been listed on the USL, countries will then move on to the RL, given that there could be nationalistic or prestige implications for the RL. As such, the Committee should find ways to strengthen the link between the Register and USL. * While there is assistance not only to write proposals but also to coordinate programmes, there is less clarity in the sustaining of such proposals and the dissemination of information. The amount of resources available to begin and sustain any proposal considered, should not be taken lightly. * Remove the bottleneck that the Evaluation Body is facing. For example, create a separate body to evaluate the files submitted for the Register and elements referred from the Urgent Safeguarding List. * While indeed it is implied that groups and communities would remain open to being consulted or to collaborations, the reality of being able to cope with the demand of such requests may not be equal across all communities or States Parties. It should be clear that we do not create a scenario where only projects that are large scale or for international consumption should be actively promoted; local level programmes are just as or at times, even more valuable. * **To review the monitoring mechanisms to strengthen the Register:** * Include a section in periodic reports if the actors and networks have been approached and examples of such, and include views from States Parties on their experiences of sharing the Register with interested persons/States Parties. * Option for communities, groups, and if applicable individuals, to mention how they may want the programme to progress (there is no agreement at this point by the group whether to include this in the nomination form or in the periodic report). * The overall results framework can be used as a means to map the above. In addition, this framework could seek States Parties’ inputs on how their programme had or will (depending on the status of the programme), contribute to the larger 2030 agenda for sustainable development. This kind of time-based mechanism can assist in address a future oriented outlook, without pressurising States Parties to commit (if they may not have the resources to do so), or to exclude States Parties from sharing/nominating valuable programmes to the Register. * There is a need to address the resources required to reach and maintain the desired outcome of active sharing/learning of the listed Programme. * Invite and encourage commitment from the States Parties to co-invest to sustain the programme. This could be in written into the nomination form. * **Recommended adjustments to the criteria and the nomination form to better fulfil Article 18**   The following discussions were carried out to align with the objective of the  Register as well as possible downstream efforts to allow for better access to the  Register:   * The current form seems to convey some detachment between the safeguarding measures and the ICH element that it is being nominated for. Not asking about the element could prevent the reader from fully understanding the context, and hence will impact the relevance of the programme to the communities. Making it abstract. * Language used to describe the Register that impacts the understanding of the programme to be nominated i.e. is the programme time limited? Is it completed? Etc. This impacts the understanding of the programme. * It has also been identified that there are similarities between certain criterion and those could be merged to remove the seemingly onerous process of filling up the nomination form. The following criteria on the form could be combined, given similarities in information required: * P1 can be merged with P3, given the similarities in information, with the inclusion of Ethical Principles. It is to be noted that P1 is useful to be retained, given that it allows the reader in particular the Evaluation Body, to decide the suitability of the Programme for the Register. P1 can be viewed as a tool to be kept to support in the removal of bottlenecks for the Evaluation Body. * P4 with P6 can be combined and finetuned. * Important to retain P5 given that this is crucial to express engagement with the groups and communities. However, we will need some way to include that communities will or have provided sustained consent (see Ethical principle 4). This could inform or pave the way for downstream efforts whether to assess if the programme is still working and if it should be archived afterwards. There should be a mechanism to seek their sustained consent due to a few considerations such as (i) it is not feasible to shackle communities to the promise of sharing their programme should the situation change for any reason, and they should be given the option to withdraw consent; (ii) that the programme is no longer feasible or applicable to their communities given that ICH is ever evolving. This discussion is similar to what was considered for elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List i.e. how feasible should elements listed on the USL be there for a lengthy period of time? * In P7, to consider replacing “best practices” with “good practices”. It is also to be noted that this criterion does not address the possibility of appropriation of the programme, while in favour of a lower entry point of sharing and learning. There can be proposals by different countries working on safeguarding projects – putting resources together – aligned with UNESCO. Bridging ideas somewhere? Should this be a criterion? * P2 and P8 were floated up for consideration if they are necessary criteria to be retained. * **What are some possible measures to encourage access to the Register?**   The access to listed programmes on the Register was discussed a means not just  to promote the Register but also to create a platform for communities to learn  from one another.   * There should be an option to move programmes that are no longer active into an accessible archive (such as on the website of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage). Such an option allows for wider accessibility, regardless of the level of activeness of the programme, and could still be useful for communities to refer to. Other possibilities include the “Wiki Loves Living Heritage” platform or creating a new category/page on the UNESCO website. * Regardless of the type of digital platform on which the information is held, one must consider the types of information and the way it is being presented. For example, the content must be simple and relevant contacts listed; for the latter, it should be communicated if there be any contact points willing to be contacted. * Consider a connection to the rhythm of the reporting cycles, in the framework of a theory of change. |