



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

12 IGC

DCE/18/12.IGC/3
Paris, 12 November 2018
Original : English

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

Twelfth session
Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
11-14 December 2018

Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda: Adoption of the detailed summary record of the eleventh session of the Committee

This document contains in Annex the draft detailed summary record of the eleventh session of the Committee (12-15 December 2017) for adoption by the Committee.

Decision required: paragraph 4

1. In accordance with Article 43 of the Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”), the Secretariat prepared a draft detailed summary record of the eleventh session of the Committee (12 - 15 December 2017) in its two working languages, English and French. The draft, contained in Annex, was published electronically on the Convention website (<http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/diversity/convention/>), and is submitted to the Committee for adoption.
2. To date, the Secretariat has received no comments.
3. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 12.IGC 3

The Committee,

1. *Having examined Document DCE/18/12.IGC/3 and its Annex;*
2. *Adopts the detailed summary record of the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions included in the above-mentioned document.*

ANNEX

Draft detailed summary record of the eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The eleventh session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Committee”) was held from 12 to 15 December 2017.
2. It was attended by a total of 345 participants: 100 from the 24 States Members of the Committee, by 93 participants from 50 Parties to the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Convention”) that were not Members of the Committee, 13 participants from 5 UNESCO Member States not Party to the Convention, 10 participants from 7 intergovernmental organizations, 78 participants from 49 civil society organizations, 4 participants from 2 UNESCO Chairs, 1 participant from 1 Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO, 21 members of the Secretariat and 25 other participants.
3. Panel discussions were held to address the following questions “*Cultural and Creative Industries: A New Agenda for the Development Community?*” and “*Towards Support Policies for Independent Cinema?*”. Summary of discussions can be found in Annex.
4. The **Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity**, Mrs. Jyoti Hosagrahar, welcomed all participants. She announced that the Chairperson, Mr. Mohammed Lofti M’Rini, was unable to participate in the session. She explained that the Bureau had met on 7 December 2017 and had unanimously recommended that H.E. Fernando Griffith, Minister of Culture of Paraguay, exercise the functions of Chairperson for the session. Mrs. Jyoti Hosagrahar asked whether the Committee supported this recommendation. Seeing no objection, she declared the Chairperson elected.
5. The **Chairperson**, H.E. Fernando Griffith, Minister of Culture of Paraguay, thanked the Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity and the Committee Members.
6. The **Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity** and **representative of the Director-General of UNESCO**, Mrs. Jyoti Hosagrahar, opened the session. She noted that the Convention kept growing stronger and congratulated Turkey on ratifying the Convention in 2017. She recalled that the adoption of draft operational guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment had been a major highlight of the Committee in 2016. She noted that this session was an opportunity to collectively discuss the implementation of the guidelines.

She highlighted that the 2018 [Global Report](#) monitoring the implementation of the Convention (hereinafter the “Global Report”) would be launched during the session. She explained that the Global Report was designed to guide the future implementation of the Convention, in light of emerging issues such as the digital environment, trade policies or artistic freedom. She underlined that the report also provided a solid framework to contribute to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (hereinafter the “2030 Agenda”). She noted that the Global Report, as the only existing monitoring and analytical tool for any of UNESCO’s cultural conventions, allowed Parties and civil society to measure, share and learn from the results achieved by all actors.

She mentioned other important issues to be reviewed by the Committee, such as the 37 new quadrennial periodic reports, the future revision of the framework for quadrennial periodic reporting, the approval of 7 new projects recommended for funding by the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereinafter “IFCD”), and the adoption of recommendations for the management of the Fund based on the results of its second external evaluation. She announced that the Secretariat had signed its first strategic partnership agreement with Mrs. Sabrina Ho, a cultural entrepreneur and philanthropist, to support young creative entrepreneurs of the Global South over the next three years. She reported that the global capacity-building strategy adopted in 2013 had resulted in many useful operational tools, in particular a training module on artistic freedom being developed with the support of the Government of Denmark, a future training module on culture and trade, and a new policy monitoring platform on the Convention’s knowledge management system (hereinafter “KMS”).

The Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity noted that important work remained to be done, especially in areas such as digital issues, preferential treatment, and policy monitoring, and that increased data collection, awareness raising, and knowledge sharing were essential to achieve these goals. In this context, she underlined that civil society engagement was crucial, and that the Committee would be examining reports by civil society organizations (hereinafter “CSOs”) from various regions of the world for the first time. She expressed her hope that partnerships with civil society could continue to grow and remain a unique feature of the Convention.

The Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity concluded by thanking Italy, the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Quebec (Canada) for their extrabudgetary support and recalled the Secretariat’s ongoing efforts to mobilize further financial support. She highlighted that Denmark and Norway had agreed to support the Secretariat’s capacity-development program in the field of artistic freedom, and expressed the hope that a new project to support the Expert Facility and the establishment of regulatory frameworks for the cultural and creative industries in developing countries would be signed with the European Union (hereinafter “EU”) in the near future.

Item 1 – Adoption of the agenda (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/1](#))

7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Director of UNESCO’s Division for Creativity and declared that in conformity with Article 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, a quorum was present.
8. The **Secretary of the Convention**, Mrs. Danielle Cliche, read out the list of proposed items.
9. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the decision, seeing no objections.

Decision 11.IGC 1 was adopted.

Item 2 – Approval of the list of observers (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/INF.2](#))

10. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to admit the observers to the session and asked the Secretary of the Convention to read out the names and functions of the observers. He then asked whether any other observers in the room wished to register.
11. The Delegations of **Australia, Austria, Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Haiti, India, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mexico, Romania, Serbia, South Africa, Spain,**

Switzerland, and **Uruguay** and civil society organization **Conarte Internacional** asked to be admitted as observers.

12. The **Chairperson** explained that observers would be given the floor in the following order: Parties to the Convention; Member States of UNESCO not Party to the Convention; Associate Members and Permanent Observer Missions; and international governmental and non-governmental organizations. Seeing no objections, he declared the decision adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 2 was adopted.

Item 3 – Adoption of the detailed summary record of the tenth session of the Committee (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/3](#))

13. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received amendments from the Delegations of Canada and Nigeria, which would be taken into account. Draft decision 11.IGC 3 was put on the screens and, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 3 was adopted as amended.

Item 4 – Secretariat’s report on its activities for the 2016-2017 biennium (Documents [DCE/17/11.IGC/4](#) and [DCE/17/11.IGC/INF.3](#))

14. The **Chairperson** noted that in addition to the relevant working document, this item was also accompanied by Information Document DCE/17/11.IGC/INF.3, which contained the results of the satisfaction survey on the sixth session of the Conference of Parties.
15. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the purpose of the Secretariat’s report was to provide an overview of the progress made by the Secretariat to implement the decisions taken by the Convention’s governing bodies. The Secretariat made sure all working documents include a summary of conclusions based on the Committee’s debates.

The Secretary of the Convention then presented the conclusions of the tenth session of the Committee. She underlined that many delegations had raised the digital environment, preferential treatment, artistic freedom, the mobility of artists and gender equality as priorities. She noted that [Decision 10.IGC 4](#) invited Parties to provide extrabudgetary funds to support the implementation of the Convention at the country level as well as associate experts to support the work of the Secretariat.

Regarding the Secretariat’s report for 2016-2017, this period marked the beginning of a new context, due to the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the new monitoring framework.

She highlighted that Part 1 of the report corresponded to Goal 1 of the Convention’s monitoring framework, namely to support sustainable systems of governance for culture. The Secretariat has worked to reinforce the Parties’ capacities by providing policy implementation support and new evidence to inform policy-making.

With regard to Goal 2, which seeks to achieve a balanced flow of cultural goods and services and increase the mobility of artists and cultural professionals, the past biennium has been an important preparatory period. As an example, she mentioned that the Secretariat had worked with UNESCO Institute for Statistics to produce new evidence on the flow of cultural goods and inform programs and policies for the promotion of preferential treatment.

As for Goal 3, which focuses on the integration of culture in sustainable development frameworks, the Secretariat has collected new evidence showing substantial changes in the way that countries invest in creativity for development. The exchange session that had taken place the day before had presented various means through which development agencies and banks were investing in the cultural and creative industries as a strategic entry point to promote other development issues such as gender equality, youth, empowerment, human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

Finally, concerning Goal 4, which focuses on the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms she cited as a major result the definition of artistic freedom as a priority in UNESCO's 39 C/5 Program and Budget. She mentioned that several Parties had made requests for technical assistance on this matter, indicating a renewed awareness about the social and economic rights of artists and creators, including their fair remuneration in the digital age.

The Secretary of the Convention underscored that, despite the Secretariat's limited resources, all the relevant targets in the 38 C/5 Program and Budget had been met. However, she noted that the target of eight new ratifications during the biennium had yet to be achieved. She explained that as the visibility and the credibility of the Convention increased, the Secretariat was receiving a growing number of requests for support and needed the Parties' help to meet them. She concluded by thanking Germany for the new funds-in-trust concluded to support the development of the music sector in Morocco. She also thanked Norway for its contribution to the UNESCO-Aschberg Program to support artistic freedom. She informed the Committee other extrabudgetary funds were under negotiation with the Republic of Korea, Sweden, and the EU.

16. The **Chairperson** asked whether any Committee Members wished to comment on the report.
17. All Committee Members that took the floor thanked the Chairperson, the countries that provided extrabudgetary funds and congratulated the Secretariat on its work.
18. The Delegation of **Nigeria** noted a steady improvement in the Secretariat's efficiency. It urged it, despite its limited resources, to heighten its efforts to achieve eight new ratifications of the Convention and to accelerate the implementation of the SDGs. Besides, it suggested to integrate other SDGs not mentioned in Annex 3 of the report, citing Nigeria's successful integration of SDGs 2 and 3 on hunger and health in its implementation of the Convention as an example.
19. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** commended the structure of the report. Concerning Goal 2, it cited Paragraph 11(a) of the report, which described that new evidence had been produced on the flow of cultural goods to promote preferential treatment, and asked how this new evidence would be communicated to the Parties. Concerning Goal 3, it asked whether it would be more useful to focus on only two of the SDGs to achieve greater impact. For instance, the link between SDG 4 on education and the Convention is particularly important. It also mentioned that the report did not include SDG 11 on sustainable cities, which was directly linked with the Convention through the Creative Cities Network. Finally, the Delegation asked which link existed between the 2015 Analytic Report that followed the 2014 Survey on the Status of the Artist and the survey on the status of the artist that would be launched in 2018.
20. The Delegation of **Canada** welcomed the Secretariat's efforts to improve its knowledge-sharing practices and to encourage increased civil society involvement. It also expressed its

appreciation for the Secretariat's support of the Operational Guidelines in the digital environment, noting that the digital environment was a major focus for Canada, which had recently presented its "Creative Canada" policy framework on this matter. Moreover, the Delegation highlighted the commitment of the National Film Board of Canada to allocate 50% of its production budget to films directed by women and to achieve gender parity for key creative positions by 2020.

The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the Delegation of Canada underscored Quebec's satisfaction with the increased visibility of the Convention and noted that the Secretariat was facing a growing number of requests. To this end, he announced that Quebec would once again provide the Secretariat with a young professional through its Internship Program in International Governmental Organizations in 2018. He also expressed Quebec's appreciation for the Secretariat's work on the Operational Guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment and brought the Parties' attention to the impact of digital issues on the diversity of cultural expressions. In the wake of the publication of studies focusing on Southeast Asia, Latin America and Spain, he informed the Committee of the upcoming publication of a study on cooperation towards digital cultural development in Africa, conducted by the UNESCO Chair on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions of Laval University (Québec, Canada).

21. The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the periodic reporting exercise required Parties to evaluate their own policies and actions and was fundamental for self and peer learning. It welcomed the empowerment of civil society. It also acknowledged the work on artistic freedom and gender equality, though much remains to be done. The Delegation commended the Secretariat's governance and working methods. It recalled that the recommendations on governance reform had been discussed during the 39th session of the General Conference, including the production of a guidebook of good practices, and encouraged the Secretariat to participate in this process.
22. The Delegation of **Paraguay** noted the Secretariat's improvements in preparing concise and clear documents, and requested more information on the initiatives described in Paragraph 11(a).
23. The Delegation of **Latvia** praised the Secretariat's efforts to raise awareness on the challenges of the digital environment. Noting that digital content was no longer distributed in a linear fashion and instead circulated through intertwined networks, it expressed the belief that sharing of knowledge and best practices concerning innovative digital approaches was necessary to further reinforce culture's relevance in society. It appreciated the Secretariat's development of training materials for media professionals on freedom of expression and mentioned that press and media freedom was one of Latvia's working priorities. The Delegation expressed its support for the Secretariat's work on the status of artists and announced that the Parliament of Latvia had recently adopted a law on the status of artists and professional artistic organizations. It also supported the Delegation of Finland's suggestion about the Secretariat's contribution to the guidebook of good practices on governance reform.
24. The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that this session of the Committee was the first to follow the election of the new Director General of UNESCO, Mrs. Audrey Azoulay, and that this was an opportunity to strike a new balance between cultural heritage and creativity. It highlighted that the Convention was of special importance to Colombia, as illustrated in its first quadrennial periodic report, presented in 2017 with the cooperation of its 70 organizations and representatives of cultural industries as well as with the cooperation of Sweden.

25. The Delegation of **France** expressed its appreciation for the report's structure and precision. It noted France's particular interest in the implementation of the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment, and explained that cultural policies should be designed to ensure that the digital age provided opportunities for all.
26. The Delegation of the **People's Republic of China** appreciated the Secretariat's promotion of knowledge management and capacity-building. It highlighted that it actively participated in various activities organized by UNESCO to promote the visibility and implementation of the Convention. The Delegation suggested that full use should be made of the Creative Cities Network and other entities to promote the free flow of cultural goods and services in the digital era. It announced that the People's Republic of China would host the Third UNESCO Creative Cities Beijing Summit and two international youth forums on heritage and creativity in 2018-2019.
27. The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its appreciation for the Secretariat's reading of Agenda 2030 as an overarching framework. It identified seven SDGs as being of particular interest, including SDG 11 on sustainable cities. The Delegation mentioned that the exchange session with development agencies that had taken place the previous day was proof of UNESCO's convening power and of its ability to involve important players. It expressed its interest in hearing from other Parties about how they capitalized on the recently adopted Operational Guidelines on the digital environment. It finally highlighted the crucial role of capacity-building and expressed its interest in hearing from artists and professionals in the field on how this work could be made visible to larger audiences.
28. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted its satisfaction with the achievement of all but one target of the 38 C/5 Program and Budget. It welcomed the Secretariat's efforts to relate the Convention with the 2030 Agenda and asked whether it was planning on focusing more particularly on certain SDGs listed in the report. It finally recalled that it had supported other Parties in strengthening their cultural and creative industries, in line with the principles of the Convention and with UNESCO's capacity-building strategy, through multiple funds-in-trust projects.
29. The Delegation of **Croatia** reminded that cultural diversity constituted a prominent dialogical concept. It observed that the report showed how this concept could form positive practices promoting diversity, encouraging pluralism and equal access to as many diverse cultures as possible, ultimately leading to better social cohesion and tolerance. It underlined the Secretariat's work to sustain a positive dialogue with civil society and to promote gender equality.
30. The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked all Parties that provided extrabudgetary financial resources, in particular Sweden for its support to Morocco and 11 other countries in the preparation of their quadrennial periodic reports. It endorsed the Secretariat's report, especially Goal 3, and thanked Germany for its financial support for an innovative project focusing on female musicians.
31. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** expressed that the Secretariat's initiative to bring together development agencies and private partners had been greatly helpful in securing funding for cultural industries. It explained that Côte d'Ivoire had recently adopted a cultural policy, including a particularly important decree on the status of artists and artistic mobility. The Delegation also announced that measures were currently being taken to guarantee increased accessibility to digital technologies, access to cultural platforms and the production of local content.

32. The Delegation of **Brazil** commended the Secretariat's efforts to mainstream cultural diversity. It reaffirmed its commitment to the Convention and its strong belief in the positively disruptive power of the creative economy and cultural industries, especially in the context of the 2030 Agenda.
33. The Delegation of **Kenya** announced it had engaged civil society in the reform of its cultural policies, was preparing a new register on culture, and had enacted a policy on increasing local media content. It invited the Secretariat to focus on cultural statistics, as the lack of data was an obstacle to decision-making in East Africa and often resulted in the marginalization of culture. Furthermore, the Delegation highlighted that Kenya had undertaken a reform of its education system and that arts and creativity would be included in the new curriculum.
34. The Delegation of **Argentina** endorsed the main goals set out in the Convention's monitoring framework. Regarding the mobility of artists and cultural professionals, it announced that Argentina had created a program named "Beca Cultura" to promote exchanges and training for artists through financial support.
35. The **Secretary of the Convention** thanked the Committee Members for their comments. Regarding the electronic guidebook of best practices on governance reform, she noted that the Sub-Group on Governance had recognized the decisions taken by the Convention's governing bodies to be good practices, and she indicated that the Secretariat would continue to provide input on this matter. Regarding the new data mentioned in Paragraph 11(a) of the report, she explained that it would be presented the following day during the launch of the 2018 Global Report. Furthermore, she announced that as part of the Secretariat's efforts to monitor the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist, a new survey would be launched in 2018. Concerning the SDGs, she underscored that the Secretariat would continue to seek partnerships with development agencies and banks. She agreed that many, if not all SDGs were related to the Convention, and explained that the Global Report aimed to provide hard evidence to demonstrate how implementing the Convention implements the SDGs. She thanked the Delegations that offered their support to the Secretariat. She remarked that many Parties prioritized informed policy-making, and noted that this required both quantitative data and qualitative information to evaluate the effectiveness of policies.
36. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to take the floor.

[Observers]

37. All observers thanked the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their work.
38. The Delegation of **Italy** noted that the implementation of the Convention showed the significance of cultural policies in the context of the 2030 Agenda and for the recognition of artistic freedom. It explained that it placed great value in the enhancement of creativity, the increased involvement of civil society, and the dissemination of cultural content, including in the digital environment.
39. The Delegation of **Turkey** recalled that its ratification process to become a Party to the Convention would be completed on 2 February 2018. It noted that its National Commission had been instrumental in the recognition of the Convention in Turkey's agenda. For instance, it highlighted the organization of a conference for the tenth anniversary of the Convention in Istanbul.

40. The Delegation of **Denmark** expressed its satisfaction with the constructive progress achieved in many areas. It stressed the importance of the follow-up to the recommendations on governance reform mentioned by the Delegation of Finland.
41. The Delegation of **Uruguay** welcomed the exchange session with development banks.
42. The representative of an **informal network of civil society organizations** stressed that the Secretariat was a key resource for CSOs, and that its capacity to sustain dialogue with all stakeholders was a clear condition for the effective implementation of the Convention. She welcomed the reference to Article 13 on the integration of culture in sustainable development as a reminder for Parties to integrate culture in development plans, and explained that CSOs regretted that culture was not included in a meaningful way in the 2030 Agenda. The representative noted that the exchange session with development agencies had been a significant platform for discussion. She also drew attention to Recommendation 11 of the Civil Society Report, which called for a review of development agency strategies to identify best practices and gaps, in order to identify new initiatives such as cultural and social entrepreneurship strategies, capacity-building in emerging creative sectors, and a shared knowledge management system. She suggested to present the results to the Committee at its twelfth session in December 2018.
43. The representative of the **Asia-Europe Foundation**, Mr Amareswar Galla, recalled UNESCO's strong commitment to the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. As such, he expressed the belief that the disaggregation of the data collected should include a focus on the impact and changes brought by the Convention to the creativity and cultural expressions of indigenous peoples in the Asia-Pacific region, and that references to this matter should be included in future documents, much like in the 2030 Agenda.
44. The Chairholder of the **UNESCO Chair on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions at Laval University**, Ms Véronique Guèvremont, announced that the Chair had been granted financial support from the Government of Quebec in 2017 for the realization of a study on digital cultural development in French-speaking Africa, which will be published in 2018. She explained that based on the preliminary results collected, interviews had been conducted with around 40 experts from Africa and other regions, and that recommendations were being formulated to enrich international cultural cooperation in the digital environment.
45. The **Chairperson** thanked the observers. Seeing no remarks of the members of the Committee on the draft decision, he declared it adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 4 was adopted.

Item 5 – Future activities of the Committee: draft work plan and resources available and required (2018-2019) (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/5](#))

46. The **Chairperson** recalled that in June 2017, the Conference of Parties had outlined a number of areas for action, and invited the Committee to review them and identify priorities, noting that the IOS audit had found that “the current situation is unsustainable as support from the regular programme budget decreases and the workload of the Convention Secretariat increases.”
47. The **Secretary of the Convention** called the Parties' attention the annex of Document DCE/17/11.IGC/5, which set out a draft work plan for the Committee's main activities for 2018-2019, as well as the actions required to implement them.

She highlighted that certain activities were already being implemented, for instance monitoring of the Convention through Global Reports. She underlined that the continued development of the global KMS would depend on data collection in priority areas, such as digital issues, or artists mobility. Concerning the capacity-building strategy, she noted that the training modules would support the work of the Expert Facility and Field Offices, and stressed the importance of expanding the Expert Facility in the Asia-Pacific and Arab regions. She noted that the Committee would have to decide whether it wished to review the operational guidelines on Articles [13](#) and [16](#); provide guidance on activities relating to the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment; and discuss how to further support civil society participation in the work of the governing bodies. She informed Committee Members that the draft work plan also contained information on the sources of secured funding and identified areas where extrabudgetary resources were required. Finally, she underlined that the draft work plan indicated that additional human resources were required to implement the priorities set out in [Resolution 6.CP 12](#), particularly for policy research, the IFCD and knowledge management to monitor and assess the impact of the Convention.

48. The **Chairperson** asked Committee Members whether this wished to make comments.
49. All Committee Members thanked the Secretariat for the quality of the draft work plan.
50. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its satisfaction with the ambitious activities proposed by the Secretariat. It reaffirmed its commitment to the Convention and its wish to ensure that its implementation remained dynamic, effective and could adapt to a constantly evolving environment, especially with regard to digital issues.

The Delegation mentioned that the **Francophone Group** had examined Document DCE/17/11.IGC/5 and wished to propose that the implementation of Resolution 6.CP 12 begin with the elaboration of a work plan that would identify priority actions. This would constitute a flexible and strategic framework featuring several priority actions, and it would rally Parties around concrete lines of action to undertake activities to implement the guidelines. It announced that it had submitted a proposed amendment to the Secretariat.

The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the Delegation of Canada underlined that this proposed work plan could include the visibility of local and diverse cultural contents in the digital environment. He noted that the discoverability of French-language cultural content was one of the seven main axes of Quebec's Digital Strategy. The representative announced that Quebec had launched a strategic project on metadata and algorithms, which led to a recent publication on the current use of metadata in the book, audiovisual and music sectors. He encouraged all stakeholders to identify and exchange on their priorities within the cultural value chain and on the different orientations of the Operational Guidelines.

51. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its support for the draft work plan, which included activities to expand and train a new network of Convention specialists in the Asia-Pacific region. As part of these efforts, the Delegation announced that the Republic of Korea was planning to host a training workshop on the Convention for 30 experts in the Asia-Pacific region in 2018. It expressed the hope that the workshop would contribute to raising awareness of the Convention in the region, and that this would help more countries apply to the IFCD and expand the pool of experts. It noted that the Korean Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism would also consider the possibility of hosting similar workshops for different groups of stakeholders, such as civil society and National Commissions. Regarding the possible revision of the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16, the Delegation asserted that sufficient discussions needed to come first. Finally, the Delegation

addressed two major actions taken in the Republic of Korea to promote cultural diversity. It explained that the new government was working to amend the Constitution to reflect the changing social and political environment, and that one suggestion of the advisory committee for constitutional amendments was to incorporate cultural diversity, in line with the new government's vision to build on inclusive cultural societies. In addition, the Delegation mentioned that the government was currently discussing new legislation on the rights of artists.

52. The Delegation of **Latvia** underlined the necessity to implement the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment. It highlighted that significant work in the field of cultural digitalization had been conducted in Latvia, for instance through the approval of the Digital Cultural Heritage Development Strategy, which foresaw activities to ensure the digitalization, long-term preservation, access, and reuse of Latvian cultural heritage. In addition, it explained that a new joint initiative called “Digital Humanities” had been launched to introduce and advance digital humanities in Latvia, provide information about current events, resources, and the main actors in the field, and enhance national and international cooperation. The Delegation expressed its full support for the collection and analysis of data on good practices, particularly those concerning gender equality and the SDGs. Furthermore, it supported linking culture with SDG 4, noting that previous studies and experiences demonstrated that arts and culture education could play a significant role in ensuring inclusive, diverse and quality education for all and promoting lifelong learning. The Delegation concluded by expressing its full support for the Committee's activities as identified in the draft work plan.
53. The **Chairperson** suggested that the supported activities could be moved from the extrabudgetary funds column to the funded activities column.
54. The Delegation of **France** supported the Delegation of Canada's comments. It called for a work plan to implement the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment. It underlined that the Operational Guidelines on Article 13 should be a priority and explained that France was already taking all necessary steps to promote the inclusion of culture in development assistance.
55. The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the draft work plan was in line with the monitoring framework of the Convention and the SDGs. It remarked that the Secretariat's resources were scarce, and thanked all delegations that provided extrabudgetary funds. It acknowledged the importance of digital technologies and noted that Finland was currently reflecting on their inclusion in its cultural policy. Regarding the Francophone Group's proposal to create a specific work plan on this issue, it wondered whether a separate action plan was truly necessary, given the Secretariat's important workload and the fact that the current draft work plan already covered the issue.
56. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** insisted on the importance of the Operational Guidelines on Article 16, especially concerning the mobility of artists. It recalled the example given by the Delegation of Finland of special measures taken to integrate foreign artists in Finland.
57. The **Chairperson** suggested that Committee Members examine the draft work plan paragraph by paragraph. In particular, he noted that Resolution 6.CP 12 had invited the Committee to review the Operational Guidelines on Articles [9](#), 13, and 16 “if necessary”, requiring the Committee to decide whether the revisions were necessary.
58. The Delegation of **Finland**, noting that the review of the Operational Guidelines on Article 9 had already been funded, suggested that this action be prioritized.

59. The Delegation of **Germany** recalled a large consensus on the focused review of the Framework for Quadrennial Periodic Reports. In addition, concerning the Operational Guidelines on Article 13, it underlined that the SDGs were still new, and that given the Secretariat's resources, the revision of the Guidelines may not be a priority. It supported the draft work plan as presented.
60. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** supported the review of the Operational Guidelines on Articles 9, 13, and 16.
61. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for the work plan on Articles 9 and 13 and answered the Delegation of Finland's question. It acknowledged the Secretariat's limited resources, but explained that the draft work plan did not adequately include digital issues, leading to its suggestion of a separate work plan to identify priority actions to implement the Guidelines.
62. The **Chairperson** noted that the draft work plan included one reference to activities designed to implement the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment.
63. The **Secretary of the Convention** clarified that the last two columns of the draft work plan indicated the activities for which funds were available and the ones for which funds were still needed. She explained that funds were available for the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Article 9, but that extrabudgetary funds would be required to implement activities related to the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13, 16 and on the digital environment. She invited the Committee Members to instruct the Secretariat on whether it should prepare the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16, or whether the Committee preferred to implement activities in relation with these articles.
64. Seeing no comments, the **Chairperson** asked whether reviews were seen as unnecessary.
65. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** asked which actions were described as possibly unnecessary.
66. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the Conference of Parties had asked the Committee to revise the Operational Guidelines on Article 9, but that it had also raised the possibility of revising the Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16 if the Committee deemed it necessary. She noted that some Committee Members had suggested that it may not be necessary to revise the Guidelines at this point, and that implementing activities could be prioritized instead.
67. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** noted that the draft work plan was already ambitious and that the Secretariat's resources were limited. For these reasons, it did not find it necessary to review the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16 as of now.
68. The Delegation of **France** mentioned that although it had stated Article 13 as a priority it would be more pragmatic to focus on the implementation of the existing guidelines at this point.
69. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared that a consensus had been reached for the first row of the table. He moved to the second row and noted that Committee Members may wish to define specific activities or instructions to implement the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13, 16, and on the digital environment, for instance round tables or research activities.

Annex

70. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** asked the Secretariat whether the activities that had not yet been funded could stay in the table and be adopted, with funding sources being identified at a later date.
71. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the Republic of Korea was planning on funding for an activity, and mentioned that the Secretariat was currently negotiating with the European Commission as well as with the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (hereinafter "SIDA") for extrabudgetary funds. She clarified that the activities could stay in the table, and that suggestions could be added to the column.
72. The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the activities proposed. It remarked that many of the activities were subject to the availability of extrabudgetary funds, and that it was difficult to imagine that even more could be planned when Parties may not be in a position to provide funding. It suggested that the table be adopted in its current state and that the draft decision be examined.
73. The **Chairperson** noted general support for this suggestion.
74. The **Secretary of the Convention** clarified that the changes that had been agreed to concerned the postponement of the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16 and the funding of the expansion of the Expert Facility in the Asia-Pacific region by the Republic of Korea.
75. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, adopted the draft work plan with the suggested amendments and moved to the examination of draft decision 11.IGC 5. He noted that the amendment proposed by the Francophone Group was shown in Paragraph 6, which read "invites the Secretariat, in collaboration with Committee Members, to develop, as soon as feasible and taking into account available resources, a work plan that identifies best practices in implementing the Operational Guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment, to be presented as part of an agenda item on digital issues at the twelfth session of the Committee." He invited the delegations that suggested the amendment to explain its spirit.
76. The Delegation of **Canada** underlined that the objective was to specifically request the Secretariat to prepare a document that would serve as a road map to identify priority actions. It would then be presented to the Committee which could decide on which actions it wished to implement over the following year. It highlighted that a wealth of information on digital issues was available, from quadrennial periodic reports, the 2018 Global Report, and the new Policy Monitoring Platform. The proposal would not involve additional surveys, but rather the elaboration of a detailed road map to facilitate collective decision-making. The Delegation suggested changing "work plan" to use the term "road map" instead, making the idea clearer.
77. The Delegation of **Mali** expressed its support for the proposal, given the important impacts of the digital divide and the necessity to bridge it.
78. The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the spirit of the proposal, but noted that the wording "road map" inferred that other countries should apply these best practices to implement the Guidelines. It proposed that the term "road map" be replaced with "collection", implying that the practices presented are not the only acceptable way to implement the Guidelines.
79. The **Secretary of the Convention** asked what the words "as soon as feasible" would entail. She also asked for details about the idea of a road map, and suggested that this could involve the preparation of a strategic document including priorities, activities, and budgets.

80. The Delegation of **Canada** answered that earlier discussions had shown that Committee Members required time to reflect and suggested that the road map could be distributed long before the next session, so that they would have reasonable time to study it and consult national stakeholders.
81. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Delegations of Brazil and Canada try to find a compromise between the terms “road map” and “collection”.
82. The Delegation of **France** recalled a discussion within the Francophone Group regarding the nuance between “as soon as feasible” and “as soon as possible”, with the conclusion that “feasible” would give the Secretariat more leeway in the preparation of the document. It also underlined that it was attached to the term “road map” and its implications, but that the term could be further clarified if needed. It asked for more explanations about the term “collection”.
83. The Delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that the term “good practices” seemed to refer to past practices, which may not correspond to the Committee Members’ intention to identify future measures. It encouraged Committee Members to better define these two concepts and to retain only one of them if they contradicted one another.
84. The Delegation of **Brazil** highlighted that the essence of the paragraph was to identify best practices. As such, it should read “to present best practices” rather than “to develop a road map”.
85. The **Secretary of the Convention** clarified that a collection of good practices would be included as one of the activities of the road map. She suggested the following wording: “to prepare a road map including a collection of good practices”. She highlighted the complexity of the digital environment and the large number of issues it entailed. She also underlined that digital issues concerned many other UNESCO bodies. She noted that the challenge was to identify priorities that were specific to the Convention, for instance the impact on the diversity of cultural expressions of including provisions on electronic commerce in trade agreements. She explained that the road map would also involve identifying these issues, some of which could then be chosen as priorities.
86. The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the Secretariat’s explanation made sense, but was concerned that its scarce resources may make the preparation of the document difficult. It highlighted that the draft work plan already included the identification of good practices regarding digital issues, subject to extrabudgetary funds, which was similar to the idea of the road map.
87. The Delegation of **Canada** asked, given that Committee Members had agreed that it was not necessary to review the Operational Guidelines on Articles 13 and 16, whether the funds that may have been allocated to these activities could go to the road map instead.
88. The **Secretary of the Convention** confirmed that the Secretariat could present a strategy as discussed, which would consist in a four or five-page document identifying activities for the implementation of the Guidelines. She highlighted that a chapter of the 2018 Global Report focused on digital issues and included many examples of good practices that could be used in the meantime. She noted that the creation of a new database would require significant resources.

Annex

89. The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed to the road map, but proposed to use the term “open road map” to ensure that new practices could be added in the future, taking into account local contexts.
90. The **Secretary of the Convention** suggested the wording could then be “an open road map including a diverse collection of good practices.” She asked what the collaboration with Committee Members would entail.
91. The Delegation of **Canada** explained that the intention was not to burden the Secretariat, but rather to provide Committee Members with an opportunity to comment on the document.
92. The **Secretary of the Convention** observed that the road map would be presented to the Committee at its next session, and that it could then be revised. She expressed her concern that the proposed phrase would create unclear obligations for the Secretariat.
93. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 11.IGC 5 was adopted as amended.

94. **Mr. Dave Ojay, a representative from the Arterial Network** speaking on behalf of the **informal network of civil society organizations**, congratulated the Committee Members for the adoption of their work plan for 2018-2019. He indicated the network’s interest in working with the Committee on issues such as fair remuneration, transnational mobility, the right to collective representation, freedom of artistic expression, and support for skills development, as covered in the Civil Society Activity Report (hereinafter “CSAR”). He invited the Parties to pay special attention to artists and cultural workers from developing countries, who mostly worked within the informal sector, where copyright regimes and the status of the artists were poorly enforced, and where political governance was characterized by democratic deficiencies. In addition, Mr. Ojay offered civil society’s expertise in identifying best practices for the implementation of the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment. He welcomed the work plan’s commitment to implementing Goal 3 of the monitoring framework, and offered to help develop measures to strengthen knowledge and initiatives to promote this objective, as outlined in Recommendation 11 of the CSAR. He also expressed civil society’s intention to participate to the quadrennial periodic reports, as promoted by the SIDA project. He underlined that additional technical assistance was needed to ensure that this participation could take place on a consistent basis in all countries. He called for the strengthening of the cultural value chain in developing countries in order to translate talents into sustainable jobs and income, as stated in Annex 2 of the CSAR. He welcomed the work plan’s commitment to encourage civil society participation in the work of the governing bodies, and noted that this support must be concrete, through the mobilization of extrabudgetary funds.

Item 6 – Reports of CSOs on their activities (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/6REV](#))

95. The **Chairperson** highlighted the important and growing contribution of CSOs and noted that an exchange session held between the Bureau and CSOs had been very enlightening.
96. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that decisions were taken at the last session of the Committee to organize a biennial civil society forum, to invite CSOs to submit reports to the Committee, to encourage Parties to support the participation of CSOs in the governing bodies, and to develop and implement indicators to measure CSOs’ involvement in the Convention. She recounted that these goals were being achieved and thanked all who have

been involved in this effort. She observed that civil society was heterogeneous, as demonstrated by the reports, which showed inequalities in the levels of support, infrastructure and capacities of CSOs to sustain themselves and thus participate in the implementation of the Convention. She noted that several recommendations had been put forward by civil society, corresponding with those presented in the 2018 Global Report as well as in the decisions taken by the governing bodies since 2008.

97. The **Chairperson** invited five civil society representatives to present the reports annexed to Document DCE/17/11.IGC/6REV to join him on the podium.
98. **Mrs. Mane Nett**, president of the **Chilean Coalition for Cultural Diversity** and of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity**, presented the first report. She expressed civil society's appreciation that the Convention's governing bodies and Parties continued to give meaning to Article 11 of the Convention, and declared that the opportunity for CSOs to produce an annual report on their activities to contribute to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions was a historic milestone. She noted that CSOs took their responsibilities of organizing a biennial Civil Society Forum in cooperation with the Secretariat, submitting an annual report and providing input on the issues examined by the governing bodies very seriously, but that ensuring that this input was fully representative required concrete support. She explained that the report contained recommendations organized around the four goals of the Convention, as well as a summary of 13 key recommendations for the Committee's consideration.
99. **Mrs. Valeria Marcolin**, codirector of **Culture et Développement**, presented several recommendations, the first one being to raise awareness of the Convention. As such, she invited the Committee to collaborate in an ambitious campaign to strengthen the outreach of the Convention, focusing on ways to encourage synergies with other intergovernmental agencies and to secure additional resources. She communicated the CSOs' commitment to do their part, and highlighted the need to strengthen the National Commissions' engagement.

Mrs. Marcolin then underlined the need to address transnational mobility due to increasingly restrictive global practices. For this reason, the CSAR recommended that UNESCO develop concrete recommendations for Parties to facilitate the movement of artists and cultural professionals. She noted that South-to-North and South-to-South movements were critical to the implementation of Articles 14 and 16. In addition, she highlighted that in a context of austerity and increasing protectionism, North-to-North mobility was also at stake. She noted that CSOs too faced mobility challenges and encouraged the development of a strategy to ensure a regional balance for civil society representation at the next session of the Committee.

Referring to the growing challenges faced by the cultural sector, Mrs. Marcolin observed that large companies were unfairly remunerating artists, and urged that the limited resources used to produce cultural expressions must be used sustainably. She noted that the Operational Guidelines on the digital environment needed to be implemented, accounting for the negative effects of the digital shift. She underlined that transparency and data were necessary to measure the impact of the control of the Internet by large companies on the diversity of cultural expressions, as well as a concrete strategy to remedy the issue and protect the public interest. She invited Parties to support local cultural content through arts education and public service media. As a good practice, she cited an initiative found in the "Creative Canada" report to organize an event with key players of the digital sector to discuss the promotion of diverse cultural contents online in 2018.

100. **Mrs. Nett** expressed civil society's willingness to work with Parties, and stressed that stronger political support was needed. She called for greater synergies between UNESCO sectors and other UN agencies and overall better coordination among actors, leading to the recommendation that the International Network on Cultural Policies, a network of Ministers of Culture, be recreated to play a key role in building political support for the Convention.

101. **Mrs. Dounia Benslimane**, representing the **African Cultural Policy Network**, presented five main challenges identified in the second annexed report, entitled "An African Perspective":

- Elaboration of cultural policies for development. She noted that the relationship between culture and development remained misunderstood, especially within the context of the SDGs. She lamented the frequent isolation of arts and culture departments and their focus on arts and heritage, often seen as luxuries unless they show an economic value. For these reasons, she recommended that cultural policy issues be discussed in a manner relevant to the African context. She also suggested to secure resources to realize studies in African countries to map the current state of their cultural capacities and infrastructures.
- Democracy. She noted that democratic deficiencies remained in certain African countries, forcing CSOs to work independently from governments. She suggested that awareness-raising campaigns involving civil society and governments be conducted, that National Commissions work more closely with CSOs, that CSO networks be granted support to collaborate with Parties on the implementation of the Convention, that a portion of the IFCD's funding be dedicated to supporting these networks, and that CSOs be given the opportunity to submit independent reports on the implementation of the Convention.
- Contribution of African civil society. Mrs. Benslimane explained that the activities of the African civil society often fit into the objectives of the Convention, but that these actors were unaware of its existence. She called for a training campaign targeting the creative sector, involving local partners and using adapted materials, to disseminate convincing arguments regarding the Convention's relevance and impact in African countries.
- Set the stage for African cultural and creative industries. She noted that the creative economy was originally designed based on conditions in the global North, which did not effectively translate to African countries. She explained that the greater part of the African creative industry's exports fell under the design category, but that most of the income of African creators were limited to the informal economy, making data collection difficult. In addition, she noted that copyright laws were unevenly applied, and that certain cultural industries were not economically viable in the informal sector.
- Professionalization of the creative sector. She highlighted that the African continent boasted important raw talents, but that a lack of capacities and infrastructure was keeping this talent from translating into sustainable income. She recommended that international cooperation should focus on the professionalization of key stakeholders, that local institutions should focus on data collection and analysis to inform cultural policies, and that African experts should be identified to support the implementation of a capacity building plan to be designed by UNESCO and partner organizations in Africa.

Mrs. Benslimane mentioned that other challenges also existed, for instance regarding the mobility of artists and related visa costs, the lack of political spaces for freedom of expression, and uneven levels of technological expertise and infrastructure. She underlined that the implementation of these recommendations could constitute a turning point for the African creative sector, increase its contribution to the world economy, and lead to a better quality of life for citizens of Africa.

102. **Mrs. Anupama Sekhar**, representing the **Asia-Europe Foundation**, presented the annexed report entitled “Observations from the Asia-Pacific”. The report has found CSOs in the Asia-Pacific region to be very active in the areas of contemporary creativity, but raised several challenges.

First, she explained that many projects that reflect the spirit of the Convention were realized without any knowledge of this instrument. She suggested creating training materials and capacity building program for CSOs, so that cultural professionals could understand the impact of the Convention on their daily work. She also recommended using existing cooperation mechanisms in the Asia-Pacific region, in order to rely on available resources, rather than reinventing them.

As a second challenge, she observed that access to consistent data on new developments and policies in the cultural and creative sectors remained very limited. In response to this gap, she recommended strengthening existing information systems. She also recommended finding synergies with existing information systems, for instance the Compendium on Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe or the WorldCP-Asia section of the International Database of Cultural Policies, which were good examples of projects in which Ministries and CSO already collaborated.

103. **Mr. Giacomo Mazzone**, representing the **European Broadcasting Union**, presented the fourth annexed report, offering a sectorial focus on public service media in Europe. He highlighted that the Convention recognized the special role of public service media in its Article 6.2(h). Given the current changes in the digital economy and the domination of audio-visual content on global distribution platforms, he stressed that the Convention should be modernized. He raised the Convention’s technological neutrality as a positive way to make quality content accessible to all, but stressed that this legal framework needed to be strengthened to ensure that the diversity of opinions and non-discriminatory access were protected. He explained that European public service media already fell under the scope of the European Union’s Charter of Fundamental Rights, and expressed the European Broadcasting Union’s intention to encourage the creation of a binding international framework to this end, in which UNESCO could play a role.

Mr. Mazzone explained that the report provided statistics on the contribution of European public service media to the diversity of cultural expressions, and recommended that such data be collected in other regions. He mentioned that the European Broadcasting Union was cooperating with the International Federation of Trade Unions to accomplish its social objectives, as well as with copyright collectives, cultural institutions, and associations of authors, producers, artists, and creators. He noted that these organizations coexisted in a fragile ecosystem where one’s actions could impact many others. He concluded by expressing his support for the general CSAR.

104. The **Chairperson** thanked the panellists and invited other observers to add comments.
105. Mrs. Carole Poirier, a representative of the **Assemblée Parlementaire de la Francophonie (APF)**, explained that it is comprised of 83 parliaments and international organizations that aimed to promote democratic life through laws and policies. She recalled that APF members

had participated in the drafting process of the Convention and promoted its ratification, making it a requirement to join the Francophonie institutions. She highlighted that the Francophonie institutions had adopted several texts to define the actions of their parliamentarians, including the Antananarivo Declaration, in which the APF committed to promoting transparent public action and citizen participation in policy-making. She stressed the importance of raising awareness among the population regarding digital issues and highlighted that the president of the APF, Mr. Jacques Chagnon, had ensured that this was a particular focus of the APF's Strategy for 2017-2019. She noted the APF's particular interest in issues such as gender equality and North-South equality in the digital world, digital democracy in open governments, and digital culture. She stressed the importance of this legal framework dealing with cultural globalization and cultural exemption clauses in trade agreements.

106. The **Chairperson** invited Committee Members to take the floor.
107. All Committee Members thanked CSOs for their reports.
108. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** underlined civil society's crucial role in all UNESCO cultural conventions, but especially in the 2005 Convention, given its focus on autonomy, diversity, and creativity. It appreciated the CSOs' recommendations, especially Recommendations 1 and 10 of the CSAR on the education of Convention stakeholders and support for diversity in the production of local content. As an example, it introduced the Rainbow Bridge Project, which was first implemented by the Korean Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism in 2013. It explained that the program selected non-governmental partners through public contests and helped them carry out activities related to the promotion of cultural diversity, for instance co-hosting music festivals. It highlighted that between 2013 and 2016, over 457,000 individuals from 76 organizations had participated in the program, and that 25 organizations were participating in its 2017 edition. The Delegation added that it was also developing a customized curriculum for different target audiences, providing training and encouraging research on cultural diversity.
109. The Delegation of **Latvia** welcomed the growing involvement of civil society and noted that it could further contribute by bringing citizen's concern to the authorities, monitoring the implementation of policies, and encouraging greater transparency and accountability in governance. It expressed its conviction that cultural governance should not be restricted to the ministerial level, especially given the role of culture in building inclusive societies. To this end, it noted that the grassroots approach and self-organizing committees had a great potential. In addition, it pointed out the importance of culture in development policies as an enabler of sustainable development and a stimulator of economic growth. It highlighted that Latvia had launched a creativity week called "Let Us Create", which served to raise public awareness of the development of the cultural and creative industries.
110. The Delegation of **Finland** remarked that the Convention had become a vehicle to stimulate a wide range of CSOs to come together to harness recommendations on its implementation and monitoring. It underlined that because of the principle of sovereignty enshrined in its Article 2.2, much of the Convention was structured around best endeavour clauses rather than binding provisions, which may be hard to reconcile with certain of the recommendations. It noted that the responsibility of implementing of the Convention fell first and foremost to Parties, and that civil society could and should provide important contributions towards this goal. For this reason, the Delegation encouraged a bottom-up implementation approach arising from Parties and moving up to the governing bodies and the Secretariat. In this perspective, it expressed its opinion that Recommendations 6, 7 and 11 of the CSAR were particularly pertinent, and suggested that the cultural policy profiles

mentioned in Recommendation 6 should be prepared according to a standardized grid to provide comparable information and facilitate their reporting efforts.

111. The Delegation of **Germany** supported the Delegation of Finland's assessment. It encouraged interactions among CSOs and governments to facilitate local actions. It recalled that the possibility of reinstating an International Cultural Policy Network had already been discussed at the last session of the Conference of Parties in June 2017 and was an interesting avenue. The Delegation expressed its support for the draft decision and encouraged CSOs to limit their reports to a small number of main recommendations or ideas in order to reduce their workload in the future.
112. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the wealth of information in the reports evidenced how important the work and expertise of civil society were. The Delegation announced that Canada was working with international experts to hold a working meeting in March 2018 that would explore practical approaches to a range of digital policy issues, including diversity of content and voices in the digital age. It also announced that Canada would provide a contribution of 100,000 CAD to the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity, to ensure that it could continue its excellent work and that the Headquarters of the Secretariat of the International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity would remain in Montreal, Canada. The Delegation expressed that it would continue to fully consider the recommendations of civil society, such as Recommendations 6, 9, and 10 of the CSAR, and the extent to which they may be implemented with CSOs.

The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the Delegation of Canada highlighted that Quebec had provided support to the Coalition for Cultural Diversity ever since its creation. Regarding Recommendations 3 and 4 of the CSAR, he encouraged the participation of CSOs in the meetings of the governing bodies and committed to consulting with them prior to all sessions.

113. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on the draft decision. Seeing no objections, he declared paragraphs 1 to 4 adopted .
114. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** suggested that Paragraph 5 be amended to read "the increased and balanced participation of representatives from civil society organizations".
115. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared Paragraph 5 adopted as amended.
116. The Delegation of **Canada** asked the Secretary of the Convention to explain what "requesting the Secretariat to support the participation of civil society [...] at the country level" in Paragraph 6 would entail, as confusion might arise from differences between the French and English drafts.
117. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the technical assistance programs at the country level always included a process to bring together civil society and governments, which this paragraph aimed to confirm. She asked how language differences could be harmonized.
118. The Delegation of **Canada** underlined that the wording felt confusing. It explained that it may have liked to remove "at the country level" but was satisfied with the explanations provided.
119. The Delegation of **Morocco** expressed its support for civil society participation, and asked whether the Secretariat would choose which CSOs to involve or whether Parties would be consulted.

120. The **Secretary of the Convention** underlined that the Operational Guidelines on Article 11 included a definition of civil society within the context of the Convention. However, she explained that the Secretariat did not choose which organizations were involved, but rather supported countries in the elaboration of their reports and requested that CSOs be included onto the national team. She suggested that the wording of the paragraph could be improved to reflect this nuance.
121. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** suggested that the paragraph be amended to read "Requests the Secretariat to facilitate civil society participation in the work of the Convention's governing bodies and in activities at the country level, with a view to consolidating this innovative approach to governance at the international level in a stakeholder outreach strategy."
122. The Delegation of **Morocco** suggested that based on the explanations provided by the Secretary of the Convention, the paragraph could read "Requests the Secretariat to facilitate the participation of civil society in the work of the Convention's governing bodies, in coordination with Parties".
123. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested a correction to the French version, replacing "au niveau des activités des États" by "et des activités des États", to better align it with the English version.
124. The **Chairperson** underlined that decision 11.IGC 6 was redrafted to ensure that the Committee's intentions would be interpreted correctly. He read the new proposal for Paragraph 6. Seeing no objection, he proceeded with the adoption of the amended decision.

Decision 11.IGC 6 was adopted as amended.

Item 7a – Secretariat's report on the implementation of the IFCD (Documents [DCE/17/11.IGC/7a](#) and [DCE/17/11.IGC/INF.4](#))

125. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that at its last session, the Committee had approved six new projects, examined the Terms of Reference for the second evaluation of the IFCD, discussed the implementation of the communication and fundraising strategy, and noted the decreasing level of contributions to the Fund despite the increased number of contributors. She recalled that fundraising was a shared responsibility, including for beneficiaries.

She informed the Parties that regarding the IFCD's eighth call for funding requests, National Commissions had preselected 216 requests submitted by 58 eligible countries and 9 international non-governmental organizations. While the number of requests had decreased again in 2017, the percentage of eligible projects had increased. Similarly, the number of National Commissions participating in the preselection process had decreased, which suggested a priority need for capacity-building among these actors through country-level interventions. She underscored that no funding sources had yet been identified to conduct these activities. She noted that among the seven projects that were recommended, two were submitted by countries that had never benefited from the Fund, namely Albania and Ukraine.

126. The **Chairperson** invited Mrs. Yarri Kamara, Coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts, to share observations on the evaluation of funding requests and to present the recommended projects.

127. The **coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts**, Mrs. Yarri Kamara, explained that the Panel of Experts tried its best to select projects that could achieve the IFCD's vision. She then offered general observations about the selection process. First, she hoped that the rate of submitted projects that are assessed by National Commissions could increase, therefore giving all projects an equal chance. Second, she noted that the proportion of projects that were rejected at the technical assessment stage had decreased and hoped that this trend would continue.

Regarding the evaluation conducted by the Panel of Experts, she explained that all experts viewed the current system, which consisted of having two experts independently assess each funding request with subsequent mediation if necessary, very positively.

Thanks to the increased availability of funds, Mrs. Kamara announced that the Panel of Experts was able to recommend seven projects for the eighth cycle, as opposed to six in the two previous cycles. She underscored that the projects directly involved 13 countries in Africa, Europe and Latin America. Only one eligible request had been received from the Asia-Pacific region, and none from the Arab States region. Mrs. Kamara then presented the recommended projects:

- Project number 2017-159 in Senegal, entitled “Mobicine Sénégal: Proximity cinema as a tool for the promotion of cultural diversity”, was proposed by the Association Culture Waw and recommended for 89,989 USD in funds. By extending an innovative economic model of mobile cinema units across various regions of Senegal, this project presents a new avenue for revitalizing the distribution of cinema. It is hoped that it will succeed in creating a viable and sustainable force for film distribution in Senegal after the project ends.
- Project number 2017-191 in Albania, entitled “Engaging communities in public art and policy”, was proposed by Ekphrasis Studio and recommended for 86,052 USD in funds. This project is the first for Albania and the first to focus on public art. It aims to develop Tirana's first public art policy by establishing cooperation and networking with experts in the field from neighbouring countries, public institutions and CSOs. The project specifically focuses on increasing the visibility of works by women artists in the public sphere.
- Project number 2017-230 in Montenegro, entitled “Developing cultural and creative industries into viable economic sector in Montenegro”, was proposed by the Institute for Entrepreneurship and Economic Development and recommended for 86,090 USD in funds. This project will inform the design of a policy for the cultural and creative industries through a mapping study. Fifty percent of training places are specifically targeted at women, and the project applicant partners with a university and involves undergraduate students in cultural administration during the data collection exercise, which could improve the practical skills and knowledge of future cultural practitioners and policymakers.
- Project number 2017-161 in Ukraine, entitled “The business of plays: transformation of theatres”, was proposed by the National Union of Theatre Workers of Ukraine and recommended for 88,082 USD in funds. This project is the first for Ukraine and aims at transforming Ukrainian theatres into self-sustaining economic entities by modernizing theatre management, focusing on issues such as management, audience development and fundraising. The project will also facilitate networking between private and public theatres, as well as between Ukrainian and European Union theatre professionals.

- Project number 2017-135 in Brazil, entitled “Strengthening local cultural chains and networks in four Brazilian mid-sized cultural poles”, was proposed by Cebrap, the Brazilian Centre of Analysis and Planning, and recommended for 91,355 USD in funds. This project contributes to local cultural policy development and presents good complementarities with existing cultural policy frameworks. It will improve the enabling environment for cultural economies in four secondary Brazilian towns by building the capacities of cultural sector players to establish improved dialogue with government policymakers and by undertaking mapping of cultural economy needs and demands. The project could then be replicated.
- Project number 2017-130 in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay, entitled “Developing ownership, strengthening and promoting Latin American cinema through the digital platform Retina Latina”, was proposed by the Ministry of Culture of Colombia and recommended for 92,875 USD in funds. The project aims to strengthen a digital streaming platform for Latin American cinema. The project directly involves six partner countries, and the reach of the platform covers all Latin American and Caribbean countries. It will develop a mobile application to adapt to increasingly popular modes of mobile consumption, and train 30 young filmmakers from the region to develop regional and international distribution plans that incorporate digital distribution plans.
- Project number 2017-143 in Guatemala and Mexico, entitled “Entrepreneurs for diversity: Strengthening regional innovative creative micro-industries by mentoring young entrepreneurs from marginalized and indigenous cultures in Mesoamerica”, was proposed by Ventana a la Diversidad and recommended for 77,777 USD in funds. This project focuses on supporting digital-based creative ventures by marginalized youth in Mayan regions. Its strength lies in the rigor of the training and incubation activities developed in partnership with university and business support entities capable of continuing or scaling up activities after the project ends. The project also sets an ambitious target of achieving a 6:4 female-to-male ratio for training and incubator activities.

Mrs. Kamara concluded by noting that half of the Panel of Experts would be renewed for the next funding cycle, including Mrs. Ouafa Belgacem, Mrs. Helene George and herself. She wished all the best to the incoming experts and thanked the Secretariat for its support.

128. The **Chairperson** thanked the experts and asked the Committee Members for comments.
129. The Delegation of **Colombia** suggested that the Fund could promote international cooperation, including South-South cooperation, by focusing on regional initiatives. It noted that there were two selected regional projects in the eighth cycle and wished to see more in the future. It then detailed the regional nature of the Colombian project, and thanked the Committee for selecting it.
130. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** expressed its satisfaction with the increased number of eligible funding requests and with the success of the Secretariat’s measures, including technical training. It expressed its preoccupation with the IFCD’s fundraising strategy and visibility in the private sector, and insisted on the importance of securing sufficient and stable financial resources. It thanked the Panel of Experts and underlined the importance of monitoring funded projects.
131. The Delegation of **Germany** commended the Secretariat and the Panel of Experts for their thorough and transparent management of the Fund. It illustrated the gap between the need for increased contributions from Parties and the limits to the resources that Parties could

provide. It wondered whether the Fund's evaluation could serve as a quality label allowing projects that did not receive funding to be recommended to other funders. It recalled the exchange session with development agencies, noting that they could open up larger structural avenues in the future.

132. The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its satisfaction with the selection of the Brazilian project. It congratulated the other countries whose projects were selected, especially the Latin American and Caribbean countries involved in the two recommended transnational projects, as it believed that this constituted the main objective of the IFCD.
133. The Delegation of **Paraguay** congratulated the countries whose projects were recommended. It expressed its interest in regional initiatives and commended this new form of cooperation. It nevertheless underlined that projects should aim to strengthen public policies in developing countries, especially within the context of the 2030 Agenda.
134. The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Delegation of France for having been the biggest donor to the Fund since its creation.
135. The Delegation of **France** confirmed that it had contributed more than 1 million EUR to the Fund over the years, illustrating its faith in this instrument. It invited the Parties to provide sustained contributions in the future, underscoring that this would allow for strengthened capacities in essential areas such as training, assistance, information sharing and data collection. It commended the Panel of Experts and noted the high quality of the recommended projects.
136. The Delegation of **Finland** expressed the belief that the Fund may not be running as effectively as it could. Its resources have decreased and significant funds-in-trust arrangements have been concluded with certain Parties such as Sweden or the European Union. In this regard, it highlighted that the IFCD did play an important role in supporting cooperation for development, but that other instruments also existed for this purpose. It supported the ideas expressed by the Delegation of Germany regarding the creation of new avenues for the development of the IFCD. The Delegation of **Finland** wondered how to achieve more structural and systematic cooperation with development banks and agencies, after the fruitful exchange session with them. It suggested that new networking opportunities could be channelled into the Fund.
137. The **Chairperson** observed that while support was important, its continuity mattered even more. Seeing no objections, he declared that the recommended projects be funded from the IFCD.

[Observers]

138. The Delegation of **Serbia** noted that the 1972 Convention provided an interesting example of a mechanism to broaden the number of funded projects. It mentioned that Serbia had actively participated in the Fund but experienced technical issues with the preselection process. It explained that it had communicated with the Secretariat, but its efforts had not been formally acknowledged. It asked whether it would be possible for the projects to be re-evaluated for internal uses, as the institutions involved in Serbia were disheartened by the outcome of the process.
139. The Delegation of **Ecuador** congratulated the recommended projects. It supported the Delegation of Colombia's intervention suggesting an increased focus on regional and interregional projects. It also supported the idea of constituting a list of good practices, as many had been identified.

140. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary of the Convention to introduce the recommendations for new members to the Panel of Experts.
141. The **Secretary of the Convention** presented the Secretariat's recommendations to be approved by the Committee. She acknowledged the excellent work done by the three outgoing members and named the three new members proposed by the Secretariat: Mrs. Sarah Gardner from Australia, Mrs. Ojoma Ochai from Nigeria, and Mrs. Fatin Farhat from Palestine.

The Secretary of the Convention announced that she would now present its project monitoring and results-based management activities, the implementation of the communication and fundraising strategy, and the use of the financial resources of the Fund. She recalled that demonstrating the impact of funded projects had been among the recommendations made by the Internal Oversight Service (hereinafter "IOS") in its evaluation in 2012. She explained that the Secretariat had worked on implementing a results-based management framework to monitor funded projects, and on aligning this framework with the overall monitoring framework presented in the 2015 Global Report and with the SDGs. She informed the Parties that in 2017, the Secretariat had sent a questionnaire to 60 completed projects to gather information on their impact. While the response rate had only been of 25%, it showed that data collection mechanisms existed at each stage of the process. She affirmed the Secretariat's motivation to go forward with its work based on the results of the exercise, as they illustrated that the Fund's support often had an impact in the medium and long terms, well beyond the projects' implementation period.

The Secretary of the Convention also raised several challenges that the Fund faced, including ensuring regular contributions, ensuring visibility, and attracting more donors, both public and private. She recalled the Secretariat had created a large variety of communication tools to raise awareness of the Fund since 2013. On this matter, she informed the Parties that a strategic partnership had been signed in November 2017 between UNESCO and Mrs. Sabrina Ho, a young cultural entrepreneur and philanthropist, which constituted a turning point for the Convention and the Fund.

The Secretary of the Convention remarked that since the creation of the IFCD, 69 Parties had contributed at least once, 40 of them being from developing countries. While the amounts they contributed may be lower, she noted that this illustrated their commitment. She noted that only 23% of donors were regular contributors but saw encouraging developments, with 40 Parties having contributed in 2017 and 6 of them having made two contributions.

She concluded by drawing the Parties' attention to the financial statements of income and expenditure for 1 January 2016 to 30 June 2017 and to the draft provisional budget for 2018. She remarked that the draft budget for project funding had increased due to new contributions, and explained that part of this budget was an amount estimated for cost recovery and pertained directly to the management of ongoing and approved projects. In addition, she recalled that 342,707 USD were still available from unassigned funds, and noted that if the Committee decided to continue its fundraising activities, it could choose to allocate the estimated cost of 60,000 USD from the unassigned funds, as it had done in previous years.

142. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary of the Convention and asked for comments.

143. The representative of the **APF**, Mrs. Carole Poirier, affirmed that the APF's objectives consisted in building the capacities of developing countries while protecting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions within their territory. As such, she noted that the APF was particularly interested in the IFCD, and had encouraged governments within the Francophonie to contribute to the Fund on a regular basis.
144. The **Secretary of the Convention** first raised the issue of finding other funding sources for projects that were not funded. She then asserted that it was up to the Committee to discuss regional projects and make recommendations. She addressed the Delegation of Serbia's question and encouraged the projects that could not go through the process to be resubmitted next year. She also took stock of the discussions on the wide range of funding sources that contribute to the implementation of the Convention and explained that the Fund provided direct funding to projects, while various funds-in-trust had been set up to support capacity-building activities.
145. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph. All existing paragraphs of the draft resolution were adopted as drafted.
146. The Delegation of **Finland** supported the draft decision, but proposed that a new Paragraph 12 be added, reading "Encourages the Contracting Parties and the Secretariat to engage with development agencies and banks with a view to creating synergies as appropriate."
147. The Delegation of **Colombia** suggested that the amendment read "development and international cooperation agencies and banks."
148. The **Chairperson** suggested that "Contracting" be taken out of the proposal to emphasize the status of the Parties.
149. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for the amendment proposal, and suggested the formulation "development and international cooperation agencies and development banks."
150. The **Secretary of the Convention** confirmed that the amendment would then read "Encourages the Parties and the Secretariat to engage with development and international cooperation agencies and development banks with a view to creating synergies as appropriate."
151. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, proceeded with the adoption of the decision.

Decision 11.IGC 7a was adopted as amended.

Item 7b – Report of the external evaluation of the IFCD (Document [DCE/17/6.CP/7b](#))

152. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD stipulated that the Fund should undergo an evaluation every five years.
153. The **Secretary of the Convention** recalled that the results of the first evaluation of the Fund's pilot phase had been presented to the Committee in 2012, who had examined each of the recommendations made by the IOS evaluators and decided whether it wished adopt them. She noted that the Secretariat had provided the Committee with a monitoring table on the status of the implementation of the adopted recommendations at each session since then, and that it had been reported to the Conference of Parties in June 2017 that all the recommendations had been fully implemented. She recalled that the Committee, at its tenth

session in December 2016, had adopted the proposed terms of reference for the second evaluation in 2017. After a call for tenders, Leitmotiv from Spain had been selected out of the 14 proposals received due to its experience in the monitoring and evaluation of international programs, its knowledge of UNESCO, its excellent understanding of the cultural and creative industries, and its proficiency in both English and French. She recounted that the Secretariat had worked in close cooperation with the evaluators to provide the relevant documents and had taken part in regular meetings. She noted that several recommendations, if they were adopted, would have financial implications for the Secretariat, for instance the strengthening of IFCD stakeholders' capacities, introducing measures to ensure that the IFCD becomes a learning-driven fund, or carrying out independent evaluations of projects.

154. The **Chairperson** invited Mrs. Itziar Gómez and Mrs. Eva Otero to join him on the podium to present the external evaluators' report and its recommendations.
155. **Mrs. Gómez**, an **external evaluator from Leitmotiv**, explained that the aim of the evaluation was to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the IFCD, as well as the progress made in the implementation of the 2012 recommendations of the IOS, in order to identify lessons learned and provide further recommendations. In terms of methodology, the evaluation focused on four IFCD cycles over a period of nine months, and included visits to three selected projects in different countries, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, surveys submitted to beneficiaries, National Commissions and Permanent Delegations. She recounted that 127 people had been consulted during the process, and that an extensive desk review had also been conducted.

Regarding the theme of relevance, the study found that the Fund was unique for several reasons, ranging from its foremost statutory role in the Convention to its ability to serve as a catalyst for medium to long-term structural changes. The external evaluator noted that although all the 2012 IOS recommendations had been implemented, some had not retranslated to concrete substantive changes. For instance, as concerns the results-based management framework, she described that in order to provide a real basis for effective monitoring, all key stakeholders needed to fully understand the framework and incorporate it into their practices, and observed that the current level of knowledge remained uneven across different actors. The evaluator further noted that given the IFCD limited resources, it was impossible to fully meet the needs of all the Parties. Moreover, evidence suggested that the IFCD may not be as relevant to high human development countries, which have access to other funds for the same type of cultural projects. On the issue of relevance, the evaluator listed the following recommendations included in the report:

- 1. Focus IFCD support on low and middle-income countries that have less funding opportunities in the field of culture. At present, developing countries are formally eligible, but the wider definition of this concept applied by the IFCD implies that in fact, 16 out of the 36 projects analyzed were implemented in high human development countries.
- 2. Promote regional initiatives to enhance international cooperation and impact more countries, thereby meeting the needs of more Parties and potential project holders.
- 3. Introduce an IFCD endorsement scheme or form of certification for projects promoting the Convention in high human development countries where IFCD funding is not as relevant as in countries with low human development and less funding opportunities.

156. **Mrs. Otero**, also an **external evaluator from Leitmotiv**, moved on to the second section of the report on governance and management. Though the Secretariat's management of the Fund had been found very efficient, she raised concerns about its capacities regarding some functions like fundraising. In addition, she mentioned that the step involving National Commissions was the weakest link in the application and selection process, and expressed concerns that the quality of this screening may not always be up to standard and that high quality projects may get lost in the process. She also noted uneven engagement from UNESCO Field Offices, and observed that the Field Offices' resources and expertise remained limited. The evaluator emphasized that the application and selection process had improved but that issues remained. Indeed, the Fund's objectives were long-term, and of a structural nature. Nevertheless, it required applications to cover concrete short-term initiatives, following a rigid framework, rather than focusing on how the project is framed into a broader organizational strategy. Furthermore, she observed that no independent monitoring was conducted. She then listed the recommendations under this theme:

- 4. Introduce a call for concept notes that would complement the current call for proposals. Requesting fully-fledged projects requires investing substantial time and effort, but contextual factors, for instance, make significant modifications inevitable.
- 5. Work with National Commissions to strengthen their role in areas such as forming and coordinating the selection panel.
- 6. Consider the allocation of extra criteria in the scoring system promoting strategic themes and/or geographic regions, for instance, in order to reduce the geographic imbalance.
- 7. Incorporate a specific question about the Fund in quadrennial periodic reports to ensure that IFCD projects systematically feature in this exercise.
- 8. Conduct a human resources analysis within the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD. For example, strengthening the team's fundraising capacity is particularly key.
- 9. Strengthening of the capacity of National Commissions by the Secretariat to improve the selection process and avoid the non-selection of quality projects.
- 10. Work with Field Offices to ensure that UNESCO maximizes the opportunities of having IFCD-funded projects in countries, for instance by increasing visibility, and to ensure that the projects know what they can and should expect from the Field Offices.
- 11. Consider developing tailored capacity actions for countries with less funding opportunities in the cultural sector and for the countries that have never received IFCD funding.
- 12. Make resources available so that the Secretariat can take steps for the Fund to become a learning-driven fund, including the hiring of dedicated staff responsible for monitoring and evaluation.
- 13. Consider conducting random IFCD project evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences.

- 14. Take steps to maximize the Convention’s potential as an advocacy tool among civil society actors.

The evaluator then addressed the third theme of results. She highlighted that though projects had reached their intended audiences, they generally did not reach the critical mass required to contribute to structural changes. She identified gender mainstreaming as an issue of concern, as although projects often use sex-disaggregated data, powerful gender approaches remained limited to few projects. For these reasons, she listed the following recommendations:

- 15. Consider positively discriminating project proposals that include concrete actions aimed at increasing women’s participation in key areas of cultural activities and/or that aim at challenging traditional gender roles.

157. Regarding the theme on income and budget, **Mrs. Gómez** reported the uneven trend in the contributions. Despite the efforts to widen and diversify donors, Parties remained the IFCD’s main source of funding. She commended the first private sector partnership. However, she observed that implementation of the fundraising strategy had been met with challenges, mainly due to the Secretariat’s human resource capacity. The following recommendations were formulated:

- 16. Review the current fundraising strategy to ensure that it dedicates attention to the contributions of Parties in a more tailored manner.
- 17. Work towards meeting the suggested contribution of 1% to strengthen the sustainability of the Fund.
- 18. Strengthen the IFCD’s fundraising strategy with an analytical dimension ensuring an explicit connection between the communication products and concrete fundraising targets.
- 19. Change the current success targets of 50% of contributing countries to seek regular amounts instead.
- 20. Strengthen the use of IFCD communication materials by conducting an analysis to understand what has worked and what requires improvement.

Finally, regarding sustainability, the evaluator explained that even if voluntary contributions continued, the sustainability of the Fund was not guaranteed. She raised the idea that projects were too short and activity-focused to be fully sustainable. In addition to the many previous recommendations linked with sustainability, she listed the following recommendation:

- 21. Give the capacity of project partners a greater weight in the selection process. Hence, concept notes should include elements that prove the capacity of partners such as experience, sector expertise, past performance, and participation in networks.

158. The **Chairperson** thanked the evaluators and invited Committee Members to discuss item 7b, which would allow the Secretariat to design a work plan, as well as a monitoring and evaluation table to be updated at each session of the Committee until the next evaluation in 2022.

159. All Committee Members that took the floor thanked the evaluators for their report.

160. The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the recommendation regarding National Commissions. Their privileged situation in the field should enable them to evaluate applicants' capacities.
161. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** expressed its satisfaction with the decreasing proportion of rejected proposals and wondered whether involving national contact points could improve the selection process.
162. The Delegation of the **People's Republic of China** supported the recommendations. It asked the Secretary of the Convention, whether the absence of selected funding requests from the Asia-Pacific region in 2017 was due to a low number of requests or to the quality of the requests.
163. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** supported the recommendations. It asked whether letters encouraging Parties to make voluntary contributions amounting to 1% of their annual contribution to UNESCO had been effective. Concerning fundraising, it echoed the Delegations of Germany and Serbia in wondering whether it would be possible to draw inspiration from initiatives such as the Marketplace for World Heritage to fund quality projects that were not recommended.
164. The Delegation of **Germany** endorsed the recommendations. It expressed its interest in reflecting on the definition of realistic financial objectives. As part of the German National Commission, the representative raised concerns regarding the reiterated identification of National Commissions as an important but fragile link, and offered the Delegation's collaboration on this matter.
165. The Delegation of **Canada** supported the recommendations, but asked for clarifications. Firstly, it asked whether Recommendation 3 was likely to change the functioning of the Fund. Regarding concept notes, it asked how these would provide sufficient quality information and underlined that this new step should not lengthen the selection process. It supported Recommendation 9, but stressed the importance to not overburdening National Commissions and Field Offices. Finally, it wondered whether Recommendation 13 was likely to decrease the funds allocated to projects.

The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the Delegation of Canada suggested to analyze — before the revision of the fundraising strategy — the reasons explaining why only a limited number of Parties contributed to the Fund on a regular basis.

166. The **Secretary of the Convention** hypothesized that the low number of applications from Asia-Pacific was due to the low visibility of the Fund in this region. Regarding the impact of the letter sent to Parties, she asserted that it had led to an increase in the number of Parties contributing to the Fund, especially from developing countries. Furthermore, concerning the suggestion to draw inspiration from the Marketplace for World Heritage, she replied that the Secretariat had investigated the idea and concluded that it used a different model involving a very small number of funds-in-trust projects put forward by the Secretariat, rather than projects prepared by governments or other organizations. She recalled that the Secretariat had explored other creative fundraising avenues such as a Kickstarter platform with only limited success, as professional fundraising required high capacities and extensive time.
167. **Mrs. Otero** noted that the evaluation team felt very strongly about the recommendation concerning concept notes, as it could create an additional layer of complexity. Regarding the long-term impact of the projects, she confirmed that the lack of follow-up was a major issue.

168. **Mrs. Gómez** explained that Recommendation 13 could generate better evidence about the impact of the projects. She acknowledged cost concerns and remarked that the suggested evaluations could be completed by local experts or former beneficiaries, instead of international experts.
169. The Delegation of **Morocco** asked for clarifications about the monitoring of funded projects and the recommendation to transform the IFCD into a learning-driven fund.
170. **Mrs. Gómez** explained that this concept referred to the strengthening of the monitoring process, in order to ensure that the experience acquired through the Fund served to improve its activities in an organic manner and that learning opportunities were maximized.
171. **Mrs. Otero** provided an example, citing the efforts put into the production of communication products such as case studies, in order to raise additional funds. She explained that with a learning-driven lens, such materials could double up as learning opportunities through internal evaluation processes, in addition to being used as external communication tools.

[Observers]

172. The Delegation of **Serbia** acknowledged the uniqueness of the Fund, but noted that its challenges were shared with other conventions. It noted a generalized call for the increased use of UNESCO's networks. Regarding the Marketplace for World Heritage, it recalled that the original projects had not been funds-in-trust but rather projects that had been positively evaluated.
173. The Delegation of **Italy** observed that the theme of governance and management should get particular attention. Given the different internal structure of each Party, it suggested that reflections should focus more on National Commissions rather than on Ministries or national contact points.
174. The Delegation of **Sweden** highlighted Recommendation 3 regarding the need to include a gender equality perspective when evaluating project proposals. It stressed that the gender gap in the cultural sector was worrying and encouraged the Committee to adopt this recommendation.
175. The Delegation of **Denmark** remarked that the understanding of the Fund's aims was central to the discussions. It expressed the belief that communication efforts should be as simple as possible. It suggested to align the framework of the Fund with that of the Global Report, as the Global Report's four clear objectives facilitated direct and concise communication. It also highlighted that a learning-driven fund could be beneficial allowing a broader audience to benefit from each project. For this reason, it suggested that this recommendation be prioritized.
176. Mr. Garry Neil, speaking on behalf of the **informal network of civil society organizations**, highlighted that CSOs had been beneficiaries of IFCD funding. Regarding funding, he suggested the possibility of brokering additional funding for specific projects. Allowing funding to be directed could increase opportunities to obtain private sector support. For instance, global film companies may be prepared to contribute to a project to train technicians in digital film techniques, but not to contribute to the IFCD. He suggested that funding could also be sought from development organizations and foundations, and that national round tables involving UNESCO, CSOs and the private sector, may bring closer collaboration between CSOs and National Commissions.

177. Mr. Amareswar Galla, also speaking on behalf of the **informal network of civil society organizations**, addressed the low application rate in the Asia-Pacific region. He explained that the region was particularly wide and complex, that the Convention was little known or understood and that National Commissions faced several challenges including a lack of capacities. He also raised the issue of language access and translations, which were not widely available and rarely accurate. In addition, he mentioned that many countries still used annual budgetary frames, which requires applicants to prove to the National Commissions that they have already approached the national government before applying. He underlined that many cultural projects falling under the scope of the Convention were already being conducted, but that people did not realize it.
178. Mrs. Yarri Kamara, **coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts** suggested an addition or alternative to Recommendation 3 on the gender gap. The suggestion consisted in periodically opening IFCD calls focused exclusively on projects addressing the gender imbalance. This would require all applicants to give the issue in-depth thought and reduce the superficial mentions.
179. The **Secretary of the Convention**, regarding Recommendation 1, explained that it would have the consequence of significantly reducing the number of IFCD-eligible countries.
180. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared Recommendation 1 adopted. Recommendations 2 and 3 were also adopted as drafted.
181. The Delegation of **Morocco** asked the Secretary of the Convention for her opinion on Recommendation 4, noting that the Delegation of Canada had asked for clarifications on it.
182. The Delegation of **Colombia** requested more time to reflect as a regional group, and asked to wait until the last day of the session to adopt the decision, especially Recommendation 1.
183. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** supported the two previous interventions.
184. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the concept notes could create a burden from a human resources perspective. She asked the evaluators which activities this step would require.
185. **Mrs. Otero** responded that the spirit of the recommendation was to simplify the process. It would involve assessing more concept notes at the beginning, but the selection process would be simpler due to the brief nature of the documents. 15 to 20 candidates would then be asked to develop full proposals, requiring the evaluation of fewer complex applications than in the current process.
186. The **Secretary of the Convention** remarked that the call and submission of concept notes would need to take place within a year at the end of which the Committee would decide on the preliminary selection of 15 to 20 projects. Given that the second selection phase would take place after this decision, she observed that the evaluation process would now take two years instead of one.
187. **Mrs. Otero** suggested to entrust the Secretariat with the preliminary selection.
188. The Delegation of **Finland** observed that some recommendations could have significant impacts, and might be of interest to Parties that were not Members of the Committee. It asked whether the final decision would be taken during the present session or at the next Conference of Parties.

189. The **Chairperson** responded that the decision was to be taken during the current session of the Committee. He then invited the Committee to consider Recommendation 5.
190. **Mrs. Otero** explained that the external evaluation had revealed that the pre-selection panel was subject to the uneven capacities of the National Commissions responsible for this step. As such, the recommendation suggested that the Secretariat work with the National Commissions to ensure that the quality of the panels and the effective use of the resources produced by the Secretariat.
191. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members whether they preferred to completely suspend the discussions until 15 December, or whether they wished to discuss the recommendations at this moment and only leave the most complex issues for 15 December.
192. The Delegations of **Canada, Côte d'Ivoire** and **Czech Republic** proposed to examine the recommendations in the presence of the evaluators.
193. The Delegation of **Germany** asked for clarifications about whether it was truly necessary to adopt or reject each recommendation, as draft decision 11.IGC 7b only involved “taking note” of the report and its recommendations to transmit it to the Conference of Parties.
194. The **Secretary of the Convention** pointed out that Paragraph 4 of the draft decision requested the Secretariat to prepare a plan of action for the implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Committee. She recalled that some recommendations proposed after the first evaluation of the Fund in 2012 had not been deemed relevant by the Committee. For this reason, the Secretariat did not include them in the plan of action. She encouraged the Committee Members to discuss practical questions regarding the implications of the recommendations with the evaluators.
195. The Delegation of **Finland** remarked that the draft decision requested the Secretariat to produce an action plan for the recommendations “adopted” by the Committee. Instead, it suggested that the Committee could endorse the general thrust of the recommendations and ask the Secretariat to prepare an action plan.
196. The Delegations of **Latvia, Canada, Paraguay** and **Croatia** supported the Delegation of Finland’s proposal and asked for clarifications regarding the timeline and the procedure for the implementation of the recommendations.
197. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Finland to confirm that it was proposing an endorsement rather than an adoption, and on which timeline it envisioned this proposal.
198. The Delegation of **Finland** left the choice to the Chairperson but underscored that its concern was with the Parties’ capacity to provide useful feedback on the recommendations at this moment.
199. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the discussions on this item would resume on 15 December.

[Additional discussions]

200. On 15 December 2017, the **Chairperson** suggested that Committee Members ask the Secretariat to elaborate a realistic work plan based on the recommendations instead of adopting them immediately. The Secretariat could consult with the evaluators, to ensure that the consequences of each recommendation were fully understood.

201. The Delegation of **Germany** noted that the complexity of the recommendations made it difficult for Committee Members to evaluate their implications in different scenarios. It remarked that this process needed careful understanding and time, and that the experience of the IFCD Panel of Experts could be relevant. It expressed the idea that an information document spelling out possible impacts would be helpful. As such, the Delegation supported the Chairperson's proposal.
202. The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that it viewed Recommendation 1 as having been already adopted, and underscored that it disagreed with this recommendation. The Delegation explained that it was in favour of a special focus on low and middle income countries, especially those that had never benefited from the Fund, but that it opposed the adoption of additional criteria which could lead to the exclusion of 47 countries, most of them from the Latin American and Caribbean region. It supported the Delegation of Germany's idea of considering the report as a source of information, and added that it should be considered in this light by the next Conference of Parties.
203. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** noted a lot of confusion and disagreement among Parties. It suggested that it would be preferable to adopt the recommendations at the next session of the Committee, to ensure that all Parties were satisfied with the results.
204. The Delegations of **Paraguay, Argentina and Peru** agreed.
205. The Delegation of **France** supported the idea that Committee Members needed to further reflect on the recommendations. However, it underlined that many recommendations would immediately have a positive impact on the Fund. It stressed the importance of avoiding a long reflection process, and rather favoured a pragmatic approach to maximize the utility of the report in the short term. As such, it supported the principle of mandating the Secretariat with the elaboration of a work plan, but cautioned that the mandate should be precise and include a clear timeframe.
206. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Delegation of Brazil and objected to Recommendation 1. It stated that keeping the Fund open to all countries currently eligible was non-negotiable.
207. The Delegation of **Finland** enquired if it understood the Chairperson's proposal correctly: the recommendations would be discussed with the evaluators at the current session, but no final decision would be taken. Rather, the discussions would enable the Secretariat and the evaluators to draft a document to be discussed at the next session of the Committee in December 2018.
208. The **Chairperson** confirmed that this was the spirit of his proposal.
209. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire and Canada** supported the Chairperson's proposal.
210. The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that a work plan could not be prepared on the basis of an information document, as it was not yet known which of the recommendations the Conference of Parties would retain. It underlined that the evaluation was not limited to the recommendations and contained a total of nine annexes that should be taken into account.
211. The **Chairperson** noted the existence of two opinions within the Committee, the first one being to postpone the adoption of the recommendations until its next session, and the second one being to transmit the responsibility of adopting the recommendations to the Conference of Parties.

Annex

212. The Delegation of **Latvia** suggested a compromise: the words “adopted by the Committee” could be removed from the draft decision, and Committee Members could add “for adoption at the next session”. This would lessen worries about adopting recommendations that had not yet been studied while also ensuring further work on an action plan.
213. The Delegation of **Germany** agreed and suggested the Secretariat prepared a working document based on the knowledge of the evaluators and of the Panel of Experts. It highlighted that assessing the implications of the recommendations was crucial, as, for instance, the exclusion of the Latin American and Caribbean region would be incoherent with the recommendation to encourage regional projects. It noted that an action plan might be premature.
214. The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that Paragraph 3 of the draft decision be shortened to “Invites the Secretariat to submit the external report and its recommendations as an information document to the Conference of Parties, at its seventh session” and that the rest of the paragraph, as well as Paragraphs 4 and 5, be deleted.
215. The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the idea that more time was needed and agreed with the changes to the draft decision proposed by other Committee Members.
216. The **Chairperson** underlined that in Paragraph 4 of [Resolution 6.CP.12](#), the Conference of Parties had invited the Committee “to review the results of the second evaluation of the Fund in order to make recommendations to the seventh ordinary session of the Conference of Parties.” He noted that all Committee Members agreed that more time was needed to evaluate the recommendations.
217. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested the following amendment to Paragraph 4 as a compromise: “requests the Secretariat to prepare a commentary on the recommendations, as presented in the table annexed to this decision, for consideration at the next session of the Committee.”
218. The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Canada and the one from the Delegation of Germany.
219. The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Côte d’Ivoire** suggested to start discussing the recommendations and to let the Secretariat analyze and summarize the discussions later.
220. The **Chairperson** confirmed that a concrete proposal from the Delegation of Canada was under consideration, which would allow the Secretariat to provide an analysis in the future.
221. The Delegation of **France** supported the proposal, but noted that the Secretariat usually did not provide commentaries, but rather analyses, and suggested that this term be used instead.
222. The Delegation of **Paraguay** noted that the proposal from the Delegation of Canada well reflected the proposal from the Delegation of Brazil. It suggested that the Canadian proposal become Paragraph 3, so that the Secretariat’s analysis would be submitted to the Committee at its next session, followed by the Brazilian proposal to transmit the recommendations to the Conference of Parties.
223. The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Canada, and mentioned that it should be understood that the Secretariat would solicit Committee Members, the evaluators and the IFCD Panel of Experts to assess the implications of the recommendations.

224. The Delegations of the **People’s Republic of China, Finland** and **Brazil** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Canada, as well as that of the Delegation of Paraguay.
225. The **Secretary of the Convention** noted that the Committee was asking the Secretariat to prepare an analysis of the implications of the recommendations. She supported the suggestion that Committee Members exchange with the evaluators at the current session. She suggested the following wording: “that the Secretariat prepare an analysis on the implications of the recommendations based on the debates of the Committee, as well as consultations with former members of the IFCD Panel of Experts and the evaluators, for consideration at the next session.”
226. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed the idea that all Parties could provide comments to the Secretariat, which would then compile them. It suggested that an extraordinary session of the Committee could be held prior to the Conference of Parties to reflect on the Secretariat’s analysis.
227. The **Secretary of the Convention** highlighted that time was available at this session to consult on the recommendations, and urged Committee Members to discuss them and ensure they understood them. She underscored that it would be the Committee’s task at its next session to reflect on the Secretariat’s analysis, making an extraordinary meeting unnecessary.
228. The Delegation of **Paraguay** agreed with the Secretary of the Convention. She suggested that the proposed Paragraph 3 be further improved with the wording “requests the Secretariat to prepare an analysis on the legal, procedural, and financial implications of the recommendations” and that Parties be added to the list of actors to be consulted.
229. The **Chairperson** encouraged the Committee Members to make a decision on the proposals. He asked them to consider Paragraph 3, to see whether they could adopt it.
230. The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the proposed Paragraph 3, but suggested adding “invites the Members of the Committee to deliver additional comments to the Secretariat, and requests Secretariat” with the rest of the paragraph as proposed.
231. The Delegation of **Argentina** noted that it was up to the Committee Members to modify the text, as it was their prerogative to make a decision. For this reason, it opposed the proposal. It explained that the draft decision and the recommendations were almost 40 pages away in the document, and that Parties may not realize that issues existed until they got to the recommendations. It opposed the adoption of the recommendations as a block and encouraged the Committee to analyze the impact of each recommendation, especially since most of Group III might be excluded from the Fund. It suggested that all Parties should be consulted, not only Committee Members.
232. The **Chairperson** explained that this decision to follow the consensus by allowing for more consultation time needed to be reflected in a document.
233. The **Secretary of the Convention** remarked that the recommendation to focus the Fund on a reduced number of countries had come from the external evaluators, that the Secretariat was not recommending this avenue, and that it was the Committee Members’ prerogative to accept or reject this recommendation.
234. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members whether the proposed Paragraph 3 reflected the spirit of the consensus, so that the decision could be taken.

235. The Delegation of **Colombia**, supported by Paraguay, proposed a change in Paragraph 3, to read “requests the Secretariat, in coordination with the Parties, to prepare an analysis” and to eliminate the reference to Parties at the end of the paragraph.
236. The Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its support for the spirit of the Delegation of Colombia’s proposal, but asked how the Secretariat could coordinate its work with the Parties. It suggested that the term “consultation” be used instead.
237. The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of Colombia was showing agreement.
238. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the Secretariat would consult the Parties through written means, would engage someone to prepare an analysis of the results of the consultation, and present it to the Committee at its next session. The analysis would focus on the legal, procedural, and financial implications of the recommendations.
239. The Delegation of **Paraguay** suggested that instead of listing the legal, procedural, and financial implications, a more general wording of “the feasibility of the implications of the recommendations” could be used. It underlined that it wanted the analysis to cover all relevant aspects.
240. The **Secretary of the Convention** suggested that, in order to cover the full scope of implications, the paragraph could read “the potential impact of the recommendations.” She also underlined that this decision would have financial implications for the Secretariat. She then proposed a final version of the paragraph: “requests the Secretariat, in consultation with the Parties and the IFCD Panel of Experts, to prepare an analysis on the potential impact of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the Fund, for consideration at its next session.”
241. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared Paragraph 3 adopted. He then read Paragraph 4 current version: “invites the Secretariat to submit the external report and its recommendations as an information document to the Conference of Parties at its seventh session.”
242. The Delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** suggested that Paragraph 4 be removed.
243. The Delegation of **Egypt** suggested that wording such as “in order to confirm the Committee’s decision” could be added at the end of Paragraph 4.
244. The **Secretary of the Convention** suggested that the Committee wait until its next session, which would also take place before the Conference of Parties, to make this decision.
245. The **Chairperson** observed that a consensus had been reached on the removal of paragraph 4. He moved on to Paragraph 5 and 6 and observed that they should also be taken out. Seeing no objection, he declared the decision adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 7b was adopted as amended.

246. The **Chairperson** encouraged the Committee Members to use the presence of the evaluators to seek clarifications about the recommendations and invited Mrs. Gómez to join the podium.

247. The Delegation of **Germany** asked Mrs. Gómez about the reasons that led to Recommendation 1, and her assessment of its implications. She also asked what the IFCD endorsement scheme mentioned in Recommendation 3 would entail.
248. **Mrs. Gómez**, raised three arguments behind Recommendation 1. Firstly despite the reference to developing countries in Paragraph 1 of the Guidelines of the Fund, as defined by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (hereinafter “UNCTAD”), 16 out of the 36 projects funded during the four cycles analyzed had a high level of human development according to the HDI. Secondly, the research showed that the capacity of cultural actors varied enormously across countries. Mrs. Gómez noted that although the IFCD was created to support developing countries, its approach had been one-size-fits-all and did not account for the different capacities and needs of the Parties. Thirdly, the evidence suggested that the IFCD may not be as relevant to some high human development countries, having access to other funds. In this sense, she underlined that establishing an endorsement scheme could be a way of providing a different kind of support to countries where cultural actors have a wider range of possibilities. She suggested that, similar to the use of the emblem, certain projects from high human development countries would be authorized to use the IFCD “brand” to present their work as being in line with the Convention.
249. The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed that Recommendation 6 on the inclusion of a geographic criteria in the scoring system may contradict the first and third points raised by Mrs. Gómez.
250. **Mrs. Gómez** underlined that this could be a complement or an alternative to Recommendation 1. She explained that the evaluators had observed that certain countries had received funding for several projects, whereas other countries had not received any. Recommendation 6 could serve as a way to favour or prioritizing regions or countries that had not received funding. She noted that this could apply not only to geographic representation, but also to thematic areas such as gender.
251. The **Chairperson** invited observers to take the floor.
252. The Delegation of **Uruguay** expressed great concern with the use of per capita income as a unique indicator to measure development regarding Recommendation 1.
253. The Delegation of **Denmark** asked Mrs. Gómez to elaborate about Recommendation 16 on the review of the IFCD’s fundraising strategy, especially with regard to ensuring that the strategy dedicated attention to the Parties’ contributions in a more tailored manner.
254. The Delegation of **El Salvador** joined the Delegation of Uruguay in its concern. It asked that middle-income countries not be excluded from the Fund, and underlined that this position was shared by many UNESCO Member States, as shown in the speech delivered by the President of Group III to welcome the new Director General during the 39th session of the General Conference.
255. The **Chairperson** opened the floor back to Committee Members.
256. The Delegation of **Colombia** disagreed with the expert’s assertion that the solution to diversifying the Fund was to promote geographical or thematic priorities. It underlined that it saw a need for the Fund to promote the development of capacities as well as participation, rather than to promote criteria that would exclude countries. It supported the intervention of the Delegation of Uruguay.

257. The representative of the Delegation of **Germany** spoke in her position as a member of the German National Commission. She remarked that training 50 National Commissions to better handle the preselection process did not make economic sense if only 5 or 6 projects ended up being funded. It would be helpful to have more specific elements of information, for instance regarding whether certain regions were more successful. She noted that more information could also be useful with regard to the low number of projects from the Asia-Pacific region.
258. **Mrs. Gómez** responded that each National Commission faced very specific circumstances. She agreed that further reflection was needed to determine whether providing training across the board was relevant, and what kind of capacity-building measure could help strengthen their action in light of the three recommendations of the report.
259. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** focused on Recommendation 21 and asked whether the concept notes would be drafted by the partners themselves or by National Commissions.
260. **Mrs. Gómez** noted that the partners to be in charge of the concept notes would have to be discussed, but that the idea was to simplify the process and ensure that it became less labour-intensive.

Item 8 – Quadrennial periodic reporting: transmission of new reports and of the second edition of the Global Report (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/8](#))

261. The **Chairperson** invited Committee Members to examine the periodic reports submitted in 2017 and discuss possible revisions to the [Operational Guidelines on Article 9](#) on information sharing and transparency. He also announced that the 2018 Global Report would be launched in the presence of the Director General of UNESCO and the representative to the Minister for Culture and Democracy of Sweden.
262. The **Secretary of the Convention** underlined the crucial role of the reporting process to promote the Convention. At the global level, she highlighted that information sharing and transparency were achieved through the analysis of the Parties' periodic reports and the production of the Global Reports. At the national level, she noted that periodic reporting helped the relevant stakeholders to create new spaces for dialogue, better understand the goals of the Convention, establish a state of the art environment for policy-making and identify priority areas for future action. She invited the Parties to share their valuable experiences during the debate and to learn from one another.

She announced that the Secretariat had received 37 reports in 2017, and congratulated all Parties that submitted their reports. She stressed the importance of using the online form in order to build a comprehensive Knowledge Management System (hereinafter "KMS") as well as the new Periodic Reports Platform. The Secretary of the Convention mentioned that training materials and capacity-building activities on periodic reporting and participatory policy monitoring had helped to ensure the submission of quality reports. She noted that these efforts have led to an increase in the global submission rate by developing countries, that increased from 54% of the reports submitted in 2016 to almost 67% of the reports submitted in 2017, and thanked the Government of Sweden for its support.

She also highlighted the Secretariat's efforts to improve the KMS, with the support of the Governments of Italy and Sweden, by digitizing and restructuring the data collected, in order to make the monitoring process more collaborative. To this end, she presented the new Policy Monitoring Platform, and explained that the platform allowed for analytical searches by date, geographic region or thematic criteria, within the hundreds of policies and measures

reported as well as youth-related and preferential treatment measures. She explained that certain measures, 13 as of this moment, were identified “innovative practices” on the platform, highlighting evidence-based examples of policy interventions that demonstrate how the Convention and the SDGs were being implemented. The Secretary of the Convention stressed that the possibilities of the platform relied on the quality of the information processed, and that the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Article 9 and of the periodic reporting form could significantly contribute to its quality.

Furthermore, she explained that the Secretariat had worked with international experts and partner organizations to produce the 2018 Global Report, which assesses the impact of reported cultural policies and measures and the difficulties encountered in their implementation, in addition to providing recommendations and identifying areas for future policy interventions.

She then addressed the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Article 9. She stressed that the Committee’s recommendations were crucial to prepare preliminary draft operational guidelines on Article 9, to be presented at the twelfth session of the Committee. She highlighted four recommendations: aligning the Framework for Quadrennial Periodic Reports with the monitoring framework included in the Global Report; simplifying the Framework in order to facilitate data collection and management; elaborating more focused questions to elicit impact-related information; and reviewing the calendar for periodic reporting, deferring the due date from April to November of each year, as well as aligning the frequency of the Global Report with the quadrennial reporting cycle. She highlighted that these recommendations would limit changes to the core contents of the current Guidelines and would relate mainly to the Framework and the electronic form.

Finally, the Secretary of the Convention presented proposals for future action, noting that they would require additional extrabudgetary funding. First, she suggested that capacity-building for periodic reporting and policy monitoring be expanded and that new training tools be developed to improve the overall submission rate and the quality of the reports. Secondly, she suggested that the KMS be updated and improved to implement Articles 9 and 19 of the Convention, particularly the new Policy Monitoring Platform. Third, the Secretariat offered to continue analysing key findings, trends and challenges on the implementation of the Convention through a third Global Report to be published in 2021. Fourth, she identified a need to reinforce capacities for cultural data collection and analysis, in cooperation with UIS. Fifth and last, she explained that the dissemination of the 2018 Global Report was expected to lead to the formalization of new strategies for the implementation of the Convention, in particular in key policy areas such as the digital environment, artistic freedom, media diversity, and gender equality.

263. The **Chairperson** invited Committee Members to take the floor.
264. All Parties thanked the Secretariat for its excellent work in supporting and improving the reporting process.
265. The Delegation of the **People’s Republic of China** remarked that it had submitted its first report in 2012, and that its second report was almost ready. It observed that the preparation of the reports had shed light on the importance of mobilizing all stakeholders.
266. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** expressed its satisfaction with the growing number of reports submitted by developing countries and thanked the Government of Sweden for its support. It also acknowledged the online publication of the reports as a positive step to help Parties draw inspiration from one another. However, it observed that several countries had

not submitted their reports, and asked which obstacles remained and how they could be remedied.

267. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** noted that it had made important progress to implement the Convention but that much remained to be done. It recalled that it had submitted its first report in 2013, and its second in June 2017. It explained that the Ministry of Culture and Francophonie was responsible for the preparation of the reports and that it had established a consultative committee that brought together government representatives and civil society. However, it noted that it had experienced some challenges related to data collection and to the technical preparation of the reports, and suggested that a mechanism could be put in place to support Parties in this regard.
268. The Delegation of **Indonesia** highlighted that it had submitted its first quadrennial periodic report in 2016, that involved 22 ministries and 25 CSO. It thanked SIDA and two experts from the Convention's Expert Facility, namely Mrs. Anupama Sekhar and Mr. Charles Vallerand, for their support. It announced that Law n°5 concerning the advancement of culture had been launched in 2017, as a result of the Convention's influence. It also underlined that Indonesia had already started to work on its next report due in 2020. The Delegation expressed its appreciation for the exchange session with development banks and shared that Indonesia was preparing a World Conference on Creative Economy, to be held in Bali in 2018.
269. The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked SIDA for its support. It reaffirmed Colombia's willingness to continue working on the implementation and dissemination of the Convention, for instance through projects such as the IFCD-funded Retina Latina platform or the Cultural Industries Market of the South (hereinafter "MICSUR"), to be held in Brazil in 2018. It also noted that the report had created an opportunity to review existing cultural policies and to propose new ones to strengthen the cultural value chain. The Delegation also identified issues related to the online submission platform, such as the reduced number of characters to describe policies and the type of measures that could be included, and suggested that greater flexibility could improve the quality of reports.
270. The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the Secretariat's new Policy Monitoring Platform, noting that it would be very helpful to policy-makers, as well as the proposed revisions to harmonize the reporting framework with the Convention's monitoring framework, and to make it more relevant, focused, and flexible. It recalled that the elaboration of Finland's second report had been an important learning exercise, both due to the challenges of the reporting template and the efforts required to ensure the coordination of national actors. It encouraged the Secretariat to work with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics in order to reinforce cultural data collection and analysis.
271. The Delegation of **Canada** highlighted the quality of the reports that were submitted. It encouraged Parties that had not yet submitted their reports to do so, noting that the submission of quadrennial periodic reports constituted a binding obligation for all Parties to the Convention. It stressed that this exercise led to concrete results that benefited all Parties, for instance through the publication of the 2018 Global Report, and congratulated the Secretariat and the experts who worked on this document. The Delegation noted that it saw the efforts undertaken to improve transparency and information sharing in a positive light, and underlined the contributions of the Governments of Sweden and Italy towards the creation of the new Policy Monitoring Platform in this regard.

The **representative of the Government of Quebec** within the Delegation of Canada also congratulated the Secretariat and the experts for the 2018 Global Report and pledged to contribute to its distribution and promotion. He expressed Quebec's conviction that

monitoring the impact of the Convention was crucial to identify challenges and exchange good practices. He stressed the importance of conducting regular monitoring through other mechanisms and welcomed the implementation of the new Policy Monitoring Platform. Regarding the revision of the Operational Guidelines on Article 9, he supported the idea of making the reporting framework simpler and more flexible.

272. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked for clarifications on the figures presented by the Secretariat, as it remarked that while the submission for Group IV was indicated to be 100%, Afghanistan and Australia had not yet submitted their report. It expressed its belief that periodic reporting was not only a responsibility of the Parties, but also the most effective way to evaluate the implementation of the Convention. For this reason, it stressed the importance for all Parties to submit their report on time, and underscored that ongoing capacity-building needed to be provided where needed. It welcomed the launch of the 2018 Global Report, and asserted that its impact would be doubled if it was translated and disseminated more broadly. To this end, it pledged to translate the Report into Korean and to distribute it to all relevant stakeholders within its territory.
273. The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated all Parties that submitted their reports. It then provided an update on Nigeria's efforts to implement the Convention in 2017, through actions such as the launch of an e-platform for culture-related UNESCO Category 2 Institutes and Centres, Chairs and UNITWIN networks within the Culture Sector in November 2017. It explained that this platform would serve as a forum for sharing good practices in the implementation of cultural programs and projects. As another example, it highlighted that Nigeria's national Zero Hunger Committee had been made aware of the tremendous role that culture, and especially the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, could play in achieving food security, and was working together with a UNESCO Category 2 Centre to implement a new work plan integrating these two fields. The Delegation also explained that a mechanism had been established to link the implementation of SDG 3 on good health with the relevant provisions of the Convention, and that an interministerial dialogue had been instituted between the Ministries of Health and Culture in the State of Ogun. Finally, it mentioned that it had developed cooperation agreements with Burkina Faso for the implementation of the Convention in Africa, as a potential pathway for Africa.
274. The Delegation of **Croatia** stated that the reporting process had been both useful and complex. It experienced challenges regarding data gathering, especially cultural statistics, and the inclusion of all stakeholders from ministries and civil society. The exercise has been useful in identifying which areas of the implementation of the Convention required further work. It supported the proposed simplification of the reporting framework and emphasized the need for flexibility.
275. The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Government of Sweden for empowering Parties and stakeholders. The representative noted that as an expert, she had participated in the screening of many reports, and had witnessed a positive evolution in their quality as Parties gained experience. It encouraged the Secretariat's efforts to work even more closely with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics and Field Offices and stressed the importance of revising the reporting framework. It commended the Republic of Korea's initiative to translate the full Global Report in Korean and noted that Germany, in cooperation with Austria, Luxembourg and Switzerland, would have the executive summary translated into German, and presented in Berlin in February 2018. It concluded by expressing its support for the Secretariat's recommendations and for draft decision 11.IGC 8.
276. The Delegation of **Kenya** shared that Kenya had submitted its report in 2016. The main challenges had been that numerous actors were not aware they worked on topics related to

the Convention and that little electronic information was available. The limited number of characters and the difficulty to save information in the online form were additional obstacles. The Delegation supported the recommendation to simplify the form, as well as the need for capacity building.

277. The Delegation of **Brazil** recalled that Brazil had submitted its report in 2016, and announced that it was developing an atlas of Brazilian culture centred on four thematic axes, namely cultural enterprises, job market, public investment, and international market. The Delegation announced that Brazil, in partnership with the other countries of South America and with the support of the UNESCO Office in Brasilia, would organize the 2018 edition of MICSUR, bringing together entrepreneurs from 8 sectors of the creative economy and buyers from 30 countries.
278. The Delegation of **Argentina** congratulated the Parties that submitted their report, then shared certain initiatives featured in its own report. It highlighted that the Division for the Diversity of Community Culture had organized activities to raise awareness about cultural identity, that an interministerial forum had been organized to strengthen the integration of Argentina's 34 nations and that language workshops had been organized. Regarding international cooperation, it announced that the Beca Cultura program had been strengthened to support artists in their international projects, and that Argentina had supported the creation of MERCOSUR's Commission for Cultural Diversity and contributed to its Artist Residencies Plan. In the context of SDG 11, it had developed seven indicators to protect and promote cultural and natural heritage.
279. The **Secretary of the Convention** thanked the Parties. She acknowledged that the online form had been very useful for systematic data collection, but also presented technical challenges that the Secretariat would focus on fixing. Regarding the question on the submission rate for Group IV, she clarified that the 100% rate presented was accurate for the reports due in 2015, rather than those due in 2017. She then addressed the delays in the submission of reports, noting that the reporting exercise was meant to be collaborative and aimed to establish a dialogue between policy-makers and other cultural actors, which could prove challenging, in addition to data collection issues. The simplification of the reporting framework should help reduce this burden.

[Observers]

280. The Delegation of **Burkina Faso** thanked the Secretariat, the UNESCO Office in Dakar, the Government of Sweden, and two experts, Mrs. Valeria Marcolin and Mr. Francisco d'Almeida, for their support in the preparation of its report. It explained that the Minister of Culture had established a dedicated committee for the report and had organized a multi-sectoral meeting with civil society, technical and financial partners, and the media. These steps were followed by a data gathering exercise and a national validation workshop that involved a hundred actors, and the process concluded with the online submission of the report, which proved difficult. The Delegation shared Burkina Faso's experience during a regional workshop organized in August 2017 by the Centre régional pour les arts vivants en Afrique, a UNESCO Category 2 Centre. It supported the recommendations to simplify the reporting framework, to improve the online submission form, to provide capacity building and to strengthen cultural statistics.
281. The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Governments of Italy and Sweden for their contribution to the new platform, which could help countries that were not part of the Council of Europe's system of review of cultural policies.

282. The Delegation of **Denmark** appreciated the efforts made by many Parties to organize national launches of the Global Report, and suggested that these launches could be included in the Parties' national work plans as a way to promote new strategies and the importance of periodic reporting.
283. The Delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Secretariat as well as the Government of Sweden for their support. It explained that the Convention's objectives had always been clear to Cuba, especially now that it is celebrating the 70th year of Cuba's relations with UNESCO. For this occasion, it organized seminars and workshops on the cultural industries at the Latin America and Caribbean Film Festival in December 2017. It expressed its support for the simplification of the reporting framework and reaffirmed its commitment to the promotion of cultural diversity.
284. Mrs. Laure Gicquel, a representative of the **French Coalition for Cultural Diversity** and speaking on behalf of an **informal network of civil society organizations**, announced that CSOs would submit concrete proposals in the coming weeks concerning Section 5 of the Framework for Quadrennial Periodic Reports on awareness-raising and participation of civil society.
285. Mr. Michel Saba, a representative of the **Centre régional pour les arts vivants en Afrique**, a UNESCO Category 2 Centre, explained that the Centre aimed to promote cooperation in the performing arts sector and monitor the implementation of the Convention at the regional level. A first capacity building workshop focusing on the Convention had been organized in cooperation with UNESCO and Wallonie-Bruxelles International and has been attended by 20 government and civil society actors from Benin, Burkina Faso and Senegal. Mr. Saba also recounted that the Centre had supported several national teams in charge of periodic reporting, including Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Niger, and Togo. He called for the positioning of the Centre as a regional hub of expertise on the Convention and announced the Centre's intention to contribute to an improved reporting process in 2018, including through the launch of a Resource Centre for the Convention aimed at students, researchers, artists, and cultural professionals in March 2018.
286. The **Chairperson** reviewed the draft decision with the Committee members and, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 8 was adopted.

Item 9 – Date of the next session of the Committee (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/9](#))

287. The **Chairperson** noted that the proposed dates for the next session were 11 to 14 December 2018.
288. The **Secretary of the Convention** added that there would be a meeting between the Bureau and civil society before the opening of the session, and that an exchange session could also take place. She highlighted that these events were organized upon the Committee's request and served to inform its debates, and invited all Committee Members to attend them.
289. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 11.IGC 9 was adopted.

Item 10 – Election of the members of the Bureau of the twelfth session of the Committee (Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/10](#))

290. The **Chairperson** explained that it was proposed that the Committee elect a Bureau of six members, one per each electoral group established by UNESCO's General Conference, in order to respect the principle of equitable geographic distribution. He noted that the Committee would be electing a Bureau composed of a Chairperson, four Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur. He noted that informal consultations seemed to have taken place among Committee Members concerning the candidates for the election, and asked them to propose nominations.
291. The Delegation of **Paraguay** nominated **Colombia** for the position of Vice-Chairperson.
292. The Delegation of **France** nominated **Canada** for the position of Vice-Chairperson from Group I.
293. The Delegation of the **Czech Republic** nominated **Slovakia** for the position of Vice-Chairperson.
294. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** nominated the **People's Republic of China** for the position of Vice-Chairperson from Group IV.
295. The Delegation of **Nigeria** nominated **Mrs. Mélanie Afferi** from **Côte d'Ivoire** as Rapporteur.
296. The Delegation of **Côte d'Ivoire** nominated **Mr. Anwar Moghith** from **Egypt** as Chairperson.
297. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 11.IGC 10 was adopted as amended.

298. The **Chairperson** thanked all Committee Members for their excellent work and contribution to rich debates, as well all the observers, especially CSOs, for their participation.
299. The **Rapporteur** presented a report of the discussions and decisions taken during the session.
300. The **Chairperson** expressed his appreciation to the Director-General on behalf of all Committee Members, and thanked the Secretary of the Convention for her constant support and the Secretariat for their dedication and excellent work. He also thanked the interpreters, the technicians and all the colleagues who ensured that this session was a success.
301. The **Secretary of the Convention** thanked the Chairperson for his dedication and successful chairmanship.
302. The **Director of UNESCO's Division for Creativity** and **representative of the Director-General of UNESCO**, Mrs. Jyoti Hosagrahar, thanked Committee Members, the Chairperson, the Rapporteur, the Secretary of the Convention, the Secretariat, the interpreters, the technicians and all other colleagues who participated in the session.
303. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Paraguay for its support throughout the week. He then concluded the session.

CLOSING OF THE SESSION

ANNEX
Panel discussions

Cultural and Creative Industries: A New Agenda for the Development Community?
(12/12/2017)

304. **Mr. George Papagiannis, UNESCO Chief of Media Services**, moderated the debate. He welcomed all participants, including those watching the online stream of the event, and invited them to ask questions through social media during the debate. He highlighted that the global revenue of the cultural and creative industries hovered around 2.2 trillion USD, and that they employed more individuals between the ages of 15 and 29 than any other economic sector. He noted, however, that many developing countries still lacked the regulatory frameworks needed to support the emergence of dynamic cultural and creative sectors, and that the proportion of development aid spent on culture was at its lowest point in 10 years. In order to discuss this paradox, he introduced the panellists. Starting with Mrs. Helga Flores Trejo from the Inter-American Development Bank (hereinafter “IDB”), he recalled that the IDB had been one of the first institutions to notice the potential of the cultural and creative industries.
305. **Mrs. Helga Flores Trejo, Principal Specialist at the IDB and Team Leader for Cultural and Creative Industries**, acknowledged that multilateral development banks were not usually recognized as the most innovative institutions that could quickly capture and adapt to new trends. She underlined the IDB had always seen culture as an important factor for development, given that it served a region that was very creative. She recounted that this approach had not become systematic until the publication of the Orange Economy book in 2013, which allowed the cultural and creative industries to be analyzed as an economic sector. She explained that the colour orange had been chosen due to its historical association with creativity in many societies.
306. **Mrs. Flores Trejo** expressed her belief that the most pressing need was to show countries how to maximize the potential of the cultural and creative industries. She noted that the book had been effective in convincing governments of the importance of this sector, but that they now needed to focus on the modalities of its promotion. To this end, she highlighted that a coordination meeting, which brought together both multilateral and national development banks, had been organized to exchange experiences and understand which practices were most successful. She asserted that while financing mattered, effective public policies had proved to be particularly important.
307. **Mr. Papagiannis** noted that the Permanent Delegates to UNESCO in attendance could also provide information about the elaboration and implementation of their countries’ policies. Turning to Mrs. Emanuela Gregorio from the African Development Bank (hereinafter “AfDB”), he noted that she was both an economist and a gender specialist. He observed that the 2018 Global Report had found that almost half of the people involved in the creative economy were women, but that they faced economic hardships and were underrepresented in key leadership positions. He asked Mrs. Gregorio to explain how the AfDB was incorporating gender issues into its strategic thinking.
308. **Mrs. Emanuela Gregorio, Economist at the AfDB’s Department of Gender, Women and Civil Society Organizations**, highlighted that with initiatives such as Fashionomics Africa and Africa Food Cuisine, the AfBD aimed to focus on high-growth sectors that could create employment opportunities, especially for women as they are disadvantaged with regard to access to education and finance. She recalled that her Department had started viewing the fashion industry as an entry point to its focus on the cultural value chain in 2015, as women made up the majority in the workforce in the textile and clothing industry. She noted that

efforts had been needed to garner support for Fashionomics Africa, even within the AfDB itself, and to convince people of the potential of its value chain. She explained that the project targeted micro, small and medium enterprises to help them emerge in the formal economy and contribute to gross domestic product (hereinafter “GDP”) growth. She highlighted that the AfDB was working to attract foreign direct investment (hereinafter “FDI”), invested in physical infrastructure, worked with regional member countries to develop a regional integration strategy, and promoted the use of information and communication technologies. She mentioned that the AfDB had recently conducted a comparative study on the textile value chain in certain African countries, which found that focusing on value addition along the chain would generate more jobs. Mrs. Gregorio also highlighted the launch of an online platform consisting in a digital marketplace, to provide access to markets through wholesale and retail electronic commerce, as well as reliable data on the value and the industry. She expressed the AfDB’s intention to encourage skills development, not only through online tutorials but also in-person training, for instance through the Fashionomics Africa Masterclass created in October 2017, which taught participants to develop their business plans and conduct sales pitches, and allowed the AfDB to exchange with entrepreneurs on their needs and situation. She explained that the AfDB invested in financial intermediaries that would then lend to businesses, and that these actors felt that they did not have enough data to assess the risks of the industry. As such, she noted that the AfDB was working to generate such information.

309. **Mr. Papagiannis** observed that the AfDB needed to partner with local actors to organize such training events. He asked Mrs. Gregorio how these partners were chosen.
310. **Mrs. Gregorio** replied that for the masterclasses, the AfDB had tapped into fashion platforms such as Design Weeks, because they brought together buyers, retailers, and investors. For instance, she noted that the AfDB had started partnering with Google Africa’s Skills for Africa program in Nigeria, which trained stakeholders on the use of digital tools to run their businesses. She also mentioned that partnerships with CSOs were being pursued, for instance with Devos International.
311. **Mr. Papagiannis** turned to Mrs. Rima Le Coguic, from the Agence Française de Développement (hereinafter “AFD”). Noting that the AFD was elaborating a strategy for the cultural industries, he asked her to describe the challenges and steps needed to get internal buy-in on this issue.
312. **Mrs. Rima Le Coguic, Director of the Energy and Digital Transitions / Cultural and Creatives Industries Department at the AFD**, confirmed that the AFD had received a new mandate at the end of 2016 to work on cultural and creative industries. She noted that the AFD had found that many measures already indirectly contributed to this goal, with the projects mostly focusing on cultural heritage or urban development, for instance. She expressed her conviction that the cultural and creative industries could have a major impact on all SDGs, making it an important sector to invest in to improve the AFD’s interventions in other sectors, including climate change, social cohesion, or education. She explained that the objective was to mainstream the cultural sector, as well as to structure it in a governance, policy, and training perspective. She acknowledged that raising awareness about the role of culture was an important internal challenge.
313. **Mr. Papagiannis** asked whether it was difficult to internally align her Department’s objectives with those of the agency in general, and to broaden people’s minds.
314. **Mrs. Le Coguic** stressed the importance of building a common narrative on the importance of culture, as not all donors had accepted it, as well as placing this issue high up on management agendas. She observed that challenges existed regarding financial tools,

given that culture was currently mainly supported by grants, whereas the AFD mainly used loans. She explained that a business model that could be supported through loans would need to be developed.

315. **Mr. Papagiannis** asked Mrs. Friederike Kärcher, from the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (hereinafter “BMZ”), whether her organization could be considered a more traditional aid agency.
316. **Mrs. Friederike Kärcher, Head of the Culture, Creative Industries, Media and Sport Division at BMZ (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)**, explained that her organization was actually a Ministry and remarked that the panel debate was very innovative in discussing the potential of a non-traditional sector, which was relevant to all organizations. She observed that the relationship between culture and development could be seen like a union where both elements had equal importance and legitimacy. She noted that Germany’s situation was particular in that it had both a Foreign Office and the BMZ, and explained that the BMZ had active projects in 50 to 70 countries, financed by the BMZ and implemented on the ground by agencies. She explained that the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development had created a Unit for Culture and Creative Industries in 2016, as part of Germany’s Marshallplan mit Afrika initiative, a full-fledged international project to secure more private investment in Africa. She underlined that the Minister saw Africa as a continent of opportunity, and that the creative industry sector truly illustrated this image, given its involvement of youth, interconnectedness, and digitalization. She described that the BMZ’s approach to tap into this creative potential was to enable artists and cultural entrepreneurs to live from their work, and clarified that the focus was not on content, but rather on improving framework conditions. She recounted that cooperation between economists and cultural experts had not always been easy, but that the potential of the cultural sector for job creation and economic growth was now more widely recognized. She noted that the project would be implemented in different contexts in both Africa and the Middle East, and that the migration aspect would be particularly relevant to the Middle East, for instance with the integration of arts and culture in strategies for refugees.
317. **Mr. Papagiannis** observed that large bureaucracies sometimes needed more time to implement change. He asked Mrs. Kärcher whether any particular factor had been instrumental in getting the Ministry to see the relevance of the sector.
318. **Mrs. Kärcher** mentioned that the context of the Marshallplan mit Afrika as a broad international political initiative had helped to raise awareness of the cultural and creative industries as a topic that could not be left out anymore. She agreed with previous comments about the lack of reliable data and stressed the need to strengthen the arguments in favour of the economic benefits of the sector. She assessed that the process of gaining awareness was still ongoing, and that culture would be discussed like any other economic sector in future years.
319. **Mr. Papagiannis** asked Mrs. Flores Trejo which financial mechanisms had been developed at the IDB that both fit within the Bank’s regular operations but also veered away from its traditional lending mechanisms.
320. **Mrs. Flores Trejo** assessed why creative industries had become a priority at this particular moment, on the basis of four factors: the digital revolution, the 2008 economic crisis, the focus on jobs of the future and climate change. In addition, she noted that the Latin American region was creative in itself, meaning that the only need was to harness the value of already existing work. She stressed the need for a systematic economic approach to fully convince outside institutions of the potential of the sector. For this reason, she explained that the IDB was not yet implementing financial mechanisms, and that it was necessary to fully

comprehend the role of public policies, strengthen the role of Ministries of Culture within governments, and to involve other Ministries in order to increase the sector's perceived legitimacy. In addition, she noted a tension between the promotion of economic value of cultural goods and services, and the protection of their intangible value, which was difficult but not impossible to measure. In terms of financing, the IDB had realized that supporting creative industries through mechanisms such as seed funds could directly contribute to the projects' long-term success.

321. **Mr. Papagiannis** asked whether those seed funds were a loan or a grant.
322. **Mrs. Flores Trejo** answered that many had been grants, but that they were increasingly becoming loans as governments became increasingly aware of the cultural field potential.
323. **Mr. Papagiannis** observed that the maturity of the sector probably came into play as well. He asked Mrs. Gregorio if the decision to invest in the cultural sector was primarily based on the expectation of generating a return on the investment.
324. **Mrs. Gregorio** agreed about the need of a systemic approach, but noted that the AfDB had not yet reached this stage and needed to start with grants and technical assistance before moving towards loans. She explained that since the AfDB did not invest directly into small and medium enterprises, but rather through intermediaries, its role was to strengthen the financial sectors of national economics through different mechanisms such as lines of credit and guarantee schemes. She mentioned that all regions of the world were facing the same issue, in that very little of the commercial banks' lines of credit went to small and medium enterprises, because financial institutions saw them as riskier. She stressed the importance of developing data to help these institutions understand the cultural and creative industries as economic players and provide them with a sectorial approach. She also highlighted that technical assistance was provided through the lines of credit to strengthen the supply side and conduct appropriate risk management.
325. **Mr. Papagiannis** asked whether the AfDB had recalibrated the risk component of the analysis and what its tolerance level was for this risk.
326. **Mrs. Gregorio** explained that the Bank was currently undergoing a transformation. She cited that in 2016, 70% of its investments had targeted African infrastructure development, but that did not necessarily contribute to raising the standard of living. For this reason, she noted a renewed interest in people-centred approaches, with the launch of a strategy called Feed Africa. She explained that the AfDB was considering agriculture as a business and aimed to invest along the cultural value chain through downstream activities. She stressed the need to move away from the sole production of raw consumables in the food sector and to encourage value-added processing and branded products. She explained that this illustrated the AfDB's endeavour to become more flexible, including regarding the mechanisms it used.
327. **Mr. Papagiannis** opened the floor for questions. He invited Mrs. Kärcher to respond to a Twitter question, which observed that most investments seemed to be targeting cultural industries and the economic dimension of culture, and asked whether development institutions and banks were also investing in culture as a factor of social and environmental sustainable development.
328. **Mrs. Kärcher** replied that this type of investment was taking place, but that the development and income sides had different triggers for investment. She explained that culture had a tremendous number of benefits, for instance with regard to cohesion and empowerment,

and mentioned that the BMZ was looking into projects in the film and music industries that would both contribute to job creation and stimulate social debates and change.

329. **Mrs. Papagiannis** noted that UNESCO and Germany were working on a joint project in Morocco.
330. **Mrs. Kärcher** confirmed that a project supporting the music industry in Morocco would be implemented, and that it would be innovative in considering its value chain as a whole, including music education for children, training for music teachers, and the transformation of music activities as a viable way to make a living. She highlighted that music was both a production chain and a powerful language that could serve as an integrative factor. She noted that this could constitute an excellent pilot project on culture for development for both Germany and UNESCO.
331. **Mr. Garry Neil**, a cultural policy analyst, commended the panellists' understanding of the positive contribution of cultural and creative industries. However, he expressed his concern that artists were facing an increasingly precarious situation, and that diverse cultural content was becoming marginalized due to the growing monopoly of the Internet. He remarked that most artists were experiencing income reductions, especially writers and musicians. He asked whether development banks and agencies required partners to fully recognize the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist when developing partnership agreements, to ensure that the artists involved were contracted, remunerated and received social benefits.
332. **Mrs. Le Coguic** responded that the AFD aimed to support environments that could protect artists, including from a copyright perspective, to work with artists to ensure that they were aware of their rights and help them set up associations to defend them, and to help artists access digital platforms with the same rights as international players. She expressed her conviction that the market of tomorrow would be located in the global South, and that consumers would need access to local as well as international content.
333. **Mrs. Flores Trejo** noted that the IDB had realized that it needed to help creators be more visible. As such, it started a series of signature events called Demand Solutions that showcased creators and brought them together with policy-makers to advance the issue of artists' rights.
334. **Mrs. Kärcher** added that the BMZ's focus on cultural governance aimed to support policies that benefited artists, by ensuring that they had a voice, could conduct advocacy through associations, and had access to tax incentives. She explained that while one of the main arguments for cultural development cooperation was often its economic benefits, but that artists and civil society also needed to be heard and organized.
335. **Mrs. Gregorio** noted that AfDB envisioned cultural entrepreneurs as artists and used a tailored approach to respond to their needs and encourage the development of local content.
336. **Mr. Papagiannis** noted that this issue was closely related to the freedom of cultural expression and the mobility of artists, both important challenges.
337. A participant from the **Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development** (hereinafter "OECD") noted that the OECD had also started to work on mainstreaming the role of culture as a driver for development, taking into account both its economic and intangible impacts. She explained that the OECD did not have Ministries of Culture on its Governing Board, but that it promoted this agenda with the Ministries in charge of economy, employment, social inclusion, and regional development, and saw its future role as a

provider of evidence regarding the sector's impact on growth and inclusion. She remarked that many OECD countries faced a lack of capacity at the local level, where policy-makers did not understand the needs of the creative sector and did not know how to best support it, and that the OECD endeavoured to provide capacity building to address this issue.

338. **Mr. Mike van Graan**, from the **African Cultural Policy Network**, asked Mrs. Kärcher about the Marshallplan mit Afrika, noting that this project likely stemmed from the need to respond to the flow of refugees. He noted that Africa had some of the fastest growing economies over the past decades, but that many of these countries' social development seemed to remain stagnant. For instance, he observed that South Africa had adopted a Cultural and Creative Industries Policy in 1998, but that the gap between the rich and the poor had only increased since then. He asked whether an unrealistic burden was being placed on the creative sector to achieve objectives that other robust sectors had not been able to fulfil. Regarding the involvement of youth, he recounted his experience that many were attracted to theatre and dance, which required subsidies. He also wondered whether concentrating on the cultural industries had the practical effect of empowering an elite with disposable income, with poorer people remaining excluded from accessing the arts.
339. **Mrs. Kärcher** explained that the plan aimed to bring in an additional sector as a new opportunity for cooperation, rather than shifting the burden entirely. She noted that BMZ's efforts did not focus on content, which belonged to the artists, but rather aimed to support framework conditions, if requested. For this reason, she expressed her belief that the project did not place a burden on the cultural and creative industries to produce income, but rather saw it as a possible avenue that carried potential for economic growth. She recounted that the Marshallplan had led to debates when it was initiated, especially due to its name, and explained that it related to the span of the initiative needed and the wide range of actors involved.
340. **Mrs. Gregorio** clarified that development banks did not see the cultural and creative industries as a standalone solution for all development issues, but rather that there was an untapped opportunity for this sector to contribute to economic growth in each country.
341. **H.E. Fernando Griffith, Minister of Culture of Paraguay**, stated that discussions on the legitimacy of the role of cultural industries for development remained necessary. He supported Mrs. Flores Trejo's affirmation that Latin America was creative, but noted that its awareness of this strength remained poor, and regretted that millions of opportunities to put value into artistic work had already been lost. He asked whether the lack of involvement of all stakeholders and the recognition of the role of culture in development were still challenges elsewhere.
342. **Mr. Papagiannis** gave his impression that the panellists were pioneers in this awareness raising process, and that the pace was starting to pick up.
343. **Mrs. Le Coguic** expressed her belief that most people were now aware of the role of culture as a pathway for development, and that the challenge was now to place culture at the top of the agenda of all stakeholders so that it would be allocated more efforts and resources. She also mentioned that culture had not been identified as an independent SDG, which made it challenging for development banks to follow it as a standalone sector. She called for a common narrative and indicators to demonstrate that culture was an importance factor for growth and social cohesion.
344. **Mr. Giorgio Ficarelli**, from the **European Commission**, noted that when the European Commission decided to actively participate in the Convention 12 years ago, this discussion could not have taken place, as actors from economic institutions did not view culture in a

favourable light. He highlighted that the presence of development banks, agencies, and ministries indicated their progressive recognition of the importance of the cultural dimension of development and international cooperation. He noted that after the 2008 economic crisis, the world had realized that the consequences were not only economic in nature, and that societies consisted of much more than this one aspect. He observed that the debate featured two dual elements, the first one concerning the cultural and creative industries as a driver for development, and the second one concerning the identity-building and social contribution of culture, the current refugee flows being a telling illustration of people migrating to find jobs, but also searching for an identity. He remarked the European Commission would celebrate the European Year of Cultural Heritage in 2018 and expressed the opinion that 2017 had in fact been the year of cultural and creative industries, with a growing recognition of the importance of this dimension.

345. **Mrs. Esther Kouassi**, from the **Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire**, noted that the proportion of development aid dedicated to culture remained low, and thanked all development agencies that worked towards the inclusion of the cultural and creative industries in their strategies, especially AfDB. She noted that Côte d'Ivoire's Ministry of Culture had established an interministerial committee to support the AfDB's initiative, and that a recent AfDB study conducted in another country had identified the cultural and creative industries as the second most important source of employment after the agricultural sector, with women being particularly involved.
346. **Mr. Anwar Moghith**, from the **Delegation of Egypt**, asked for clarifications about the relationship between development banks and artists. He asked whether partnerships, with the sharing of both profits and losses, or loans or grants were preferred, or whether the relationship was more indirect.
347. **Mrs. Gregorio** explained that within the context of Fashionomics Africa, a platform would be developed to connect all players along the value chain, including traditional channels such as development banks and non-traditional ones such as impact investors, ventures, and equity. She underlined that the AfDB supported entrepreneurs through intermediaries, and that the majority of financial institutions in Africa were clients of the AfDB, to which it provided financial instruments such as lines of credit and guarantee schemes.
348. As a conclusion, **Mr. Papagiannis** invited the panellists to make closing remarks and asked them to describe how they envisioned the situation in 10 years.
349. **Mrs. Kärcher** suggested an example of headline that could be seen in the future: "Unbelievable but true, African film has won the Oscar and the Berlinale." She expressed the hope that arts from Africa and developing countries would be more widely available in Europe, and that all stakeholders would cooperate to this end. She thanked the panellists and UNESCO for the debate.
350. **Mrs. Le Coguiç** expressed her conviction that the cultural and creative industries would account for a greater proportion of the economic activity in the global South, and that the global South would be a major producer of local content that would be consumed worldwide.
351. **Mrs. Gregorio** hoped that the development community would have a unified approach to support the growth of the sector, and that all AfDB countries would address the cultural and creative industries as a strategic sector in their national development strategies.
352. **Mrs. Flores Trejo** illustrated the transformative power of culture through the NASA's exploration of space and its drawing inspiration from Japanese origami to ship solar panels to space, which combined arts, culture, and technology. She noted that this combination

was very powerful, and that we are currently at an important junction in which culture and creativity were moving from being relevant to being strategic. She encouraged all stakeholders to grasp this opportunity.

353. **Mr. Papagiannis** thanked all panellists and the audience for their participation, as well as the interpreters and technicians.

LAUNCH CEREMONY OF THE 2018 GLOBAL REPORT

354. The **Chairperson** introduced the Director General of UNESCO, Mrs. Audrey Azoulay, and the Swedish Ambassador to UNESCO, H.E. Mrs. Annika Markovic. He announced that their speeches would be followed by a presentation of the key findings of the Report and two panel discussions.

355. Mrs. Audrey Azoulay, the **Director General of UNESCO** greeted all participants and underlined that the Convention, having been ratified by 146 Parties, had served as a source of support for them to defend their artists, their culture, their social links and economic development. She recalled that the Convention had resulted from a fight, diversity being a constant battle.

She highlighted that the Report shed light on the implementation of the Convention in various areas such as the role of public services, digital issues, trade agreements, artists mobility, gender equality, and artistic freedom. She observed that several new trends had emerged over the past decade, citing as an example that the average share of income from national films had increased from 14 to 18% in developed countries and from 10 to 25% in developing countries. She noted several innovative actions, such as Kenya's integration of culture in its long-term sustainable development plan; the Republic of Korea's designation of a monthly "Cultural Exploration Day" where free access is provided to public cultural institutions; New Zealand's modification of its immigration policy to facilitate the granting of visas to foreign artists; and Honduras' creation of Regional Councils for Culture. She explained that these examples were illustrative of the growing recognition of culture as a driver of social and economic development.

The Director General reaffirmed the dual nature of cultural goods and services as vehicles of values and identities. She remarked that diversity remained a battle even in 2018, as digital shifts required Parties to rethink their means of action, rather than their principles. She commended the work of experts and Parties that led to the adoption of the Operational Guidelines on the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment. She explained that the diversity of cultural expressions could not be protected online in the same way as offline, and that the digital world was transforming the ways in which creators were remunerated, as multinational companies managed to escape mandatory contributions to funding mechanisms for creation.

The Director General also brought up the necessity of preserving the Convention's strength in relation to other international legal instruments, especially as the inclusion of cultural sectors in trade agreements became increasingly frequent and required a constant reaffirmation of the distinctive nature of cultural goods and services. She further identified electronic commerce as a new threat to the legal protection of culture in trade agreements.

In addition, the Director General encouraged Parties to include cultural diversity in their development assistance strategies, observing that the proportion of public assistance dedicated to culture was at a mere 0.2%, its lowest point since 2005, and highlighted that this issue had led UNESCO to establish a dialogue with development agencies.

She painted diversity as the recognition of the history and identity of others and of oneself, thus contributing to the idea of universality, and remarked that artists, through the act of creation, sustained spaces of dialogue for peace and understanding. She concluded by thanking the Government of Sweden for its support and wished the participants fruitful debates.

356. The **Chairperson** thanked the Director General and expressed the Parties' commitment to work with her to further strengthen the Convention and better support independent and dynamic cultural sectors. He thanked the Government of Sweden for its support in making the Report possible.
357. Mrs. Annika Markovic, the **Swedish Ambassador to UNESCO**, spoke on behalf of Mrs. Alice Bah Kuhnke, the Swedish Minister of Culture and Democracy. She noted that the Global Report highlighted the strong connection between culture and democracy, and was the only global document to present an overview of cultural development worldwide and to monitor State action to protect and promote the diversity of cultural expressions at all levels. She expressed the hope that it would be used as a source of inspiration for policy-makers and cultural actors, and extended special thanks to those who participated in the Report.

Mrs. Markovic observed that the Convention was the first global instrument of its kind, embracing general cultural issues and cultural policies in particular. She recalled that Sweden had been deeply involved in the adoption of the Convention. She appreciated the Convention's interrelation between cultural diversity and the protection of human rights, in particular the right to freedom of expression and information. She underscored that the Convention invited Parties to promote cultural diversity on all levels, one international example being the project "Enhancing Fundamental Freedoms through the Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions", which was funded by Sweden and made the publication of the 2018 Global Report possible.

Mrs. Markovic offered some reflections about the issues addressed in the Report. She observed that the digital revolution was creating possibilities for exchanges, but that a balance needed to exist between the free flow of cultural expressions online and the rights of creators to be compensated for their work. She stressed the importance of robust copyright systems in the transition between the analog and digital worlds, to ensure fair remuneration to rights holders, thus constituting a driving force for innovation, artist renewal, and creativity. She also underlined that civil society participation in decision-making was crucial for the development of cultural life. As such, she affirmed that civil society must always be included, protected and promoted in a democratic and functional society, and that it also played a key part in awareness raising efforts to promote the diversity of cultural expressions.

Furthermore, Mrs. Markovic explained that as a representative of a feminist government, she wished to underline the need to support equal rights for women. She highlighted that the message of the Convention was clear in calling for policies and measures that promoted this objective, and the gender gap present in almost all cultural fields and parts of the world, as shown in the Report, must be repeatedly addressed, given that women remained underrepresented in the workforce, particularly in key creative roles and decision-making positions.

In addition, she underlined artistic freedom as a global challenge, as it was under threat worldwide due to censorship, imprisonment, threats or even killings. At the same time, she noted that the Report showed positive progress in the area, allowing for hope that the crucial role played by artistic freedom for the development and the stability of cultural sectors was

increasingly understood. However, she stressed that strong action remained necessary on all levels, and urged stakeholders to cooperate to this end. She highlighted that Sweden had adopted a concrete action plan featuring measures to safeguard freedom of expression in July 2017, the objective being to work more strategically to reduce the vulnerability of these individuals.

Mrs. Markovic concluded by remarking that UNESCO's mandate to promote the free flow of ideas was more relevant than ever and underlined that the 2018 Global Report provided the necessary knowledge base to further develop cultural policies.

358. The **Chairperson** thanked Mrs. Markovic for her inspiring words and underscored Sweden's role as a powerful advocate of the Convention and an important supporter of artistic freedom. He invited the speakers of the first panel to join the stage.

Key findings of the 2018 Global Report

359. **Mr. Yudhishtir Raj Isar, principal editor of the Global Report**, summarized the findings of the Report. Mr. Isar credited the 10 contributing authors for their work, commended the Secretariat for its role in crafting the architecture and visual aspects of the Report, and the British company BOP Consulting for its contribution to data gathering and analysis. He also thanked the Parties for providing the raw material analyzed by the authors through their quadrennial periodic reports.

Mr. Isar explained that the introduction of the Report reiterated the methodological framework to monitor the implementation of the Convention, which groups together the themes present in the Convention into four major goals. These goals are: supporting sustainable systems of governance for culture (Goal 1), achieving a balanced flow of cultural goods and services and increasing the mobility of artists and cultural professionals (Goal 2), integrating culture in sustainable development frameworks (Goal 3), and promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms (Goal 4). The report's introduction also linked these goals to the SDGs.

Mr. Isar summarized the first section of the Report, which corresponds to Goal 1. The first chapter, written by Mr. Jordi Baltà Portolés, analyzed policies and measures and found that the Convention provided increased legitimacy and inspiration for the adoption and adaptation of cultural policies. He mentioned that positive impacts on collaborative governance, and significant cultural policy innovations were resulting from the Convention implementation. However, he noted that this progress was limited by the lack of data, making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of policies.

Mr. Isar then presented the second chapter, written by Mrs. Christine Merkel and devoted to the public service media. He underlined that Mrs. Merkel had identified many improvements in the related legislative base, as governments updated their public service media goals and systems. He remarked that new policy frameworks designed in the digital context were currently applied by 90 countries to respond to the challenges of horizontal and vertical media convergence. However, he underlined that major gaps remained, including the absence of a forward-looking policy model to serve the needs of all individuals and groups and respond to changes in public thinking and processes of convergence, given the profound effects of technological changes.

Mr. Isar summarized the third chapter about digital environment, written by Mr. Octavio Kulesz. Few governments have implemented digital cultural policies going beyond the digitization of specific nodes of the value chain, and in the global South, many countries lack infrastructure and are unable to consolidate a market for digitally-produced cultural goods

and services. The chapter also identified the rise of large platforms as being responsible for market concentration, a lack of public statistics, and a monopoly on artificial intelligence. Absent a targeted approach to countering these risks, the public sector may lose its agency on the creative scene.

Mr. Isar introduced the fourth chapter about civil society, written by Mr. Andrew Firmin. It concluded that many civil society actors did not yet find policy-making processes transparent enough, and that laws and regulations did not sufficiently enable civil society participation in cultural governance. Nevertheless, the chapter has found a strong call from CSOs committed to playing this role, by convening their peers, engaging in advocacy, generating and sharing knowledge, and creating new networks. The chapter underlined that CSOs could do much more if they were afforded capacity development support and resources.

Mr. Isar then moved on to Goal 2 and presented the fifth chapter, written by Mrs. Khadija El Bennaoui. This chapter stresses the difficulty for cultural professionals from the global South to access the world's main markets, still located in the global North, in the current security climate. These regulations continue to hamper the efforts to address the persistent inequalities in mobility, and restrictions on freedom of movement have even become tools of censorship. Despite these findings, the chapter highlighted that the number of mobility opportunities provided through market access and transnational cultural cooperation had increased, and that there was a renewed interest in South-South mobility. In this regard, the author found that although institutional frameworks remained inadequate, new regional networks, exchange platforms and creative hubs have emerged across the global South, thanks to a vibrant, resilient and independent arts sector.

Mr. Isar described the sixth chapter, written by Mrs. Lydia Deloumeaux, which studies flows of cultural goods and services, finding that developing countries accounted for 45% of global trade of cultural goods in 2014, compared to just 27% in 2005. Even more progress could be made with less trade barriers, more preferential treatment measures and more human and financial capacities. In addition, the chapter noted that digital distribution platforms were helping countries from the global South to penetrate the international market, and that domestic quotas were effective in increasing national audiovisual production, eventually leading to more exports.

Mr. Isar then summarized the seventh chapter, written by Mrs. Véronique Guèvremont, which focuses on the integration of the Convention in other international forums. While large regional trade partnership agreements have left little room for the direct promotion of the Convention, all eight bilateral and regional trade agreements concluded between 2015 and 2017 included cultural clauses. While no new protocols on cultural cooperation have been signed recently, other free trade agreements have included provisions to enhance preferential treatment for the audiovisual sector. In addition, the European Union and other organizations have taken steps regarding digital issues, sustainable development, and the integration of culture into national trade frameworks.

Moving on to Goal 3, Mr. Isar introduced the eighth chapter, written by Mrs. Avril Joffe, which analyzes the positive impact of the Convention on policies for sustainable development. It observed an increased recognition of the role of culture in sustainable development, notably in the 2030 Agenda, although not as directly as UNESCO may have liked. Paradoxically, the chapter also found that although several sustainable development programs included cultural affairs as major areas of intervention, the proportion of development aid spent in this field was at its lowest point in over ten years. The chapter also concluded that municipalities were innovative in exploring ways of fostering sustainable development through the cultural and creative industries.

Concerning Goal 4, Mr. Isar summarized the ninth chapter, written by Mrs. Ammu Joseph, which sheds light on the persisting gender gap. Women are not only severely underrepresented in the workforce, particularly in key creative roles and decision-making positions, but also had less access to resources and were generally paid much less than men. It then looked at how the Convention could be implemented while actively promoting gender equality among creators and producers of cultural expressions, and found that this challenge called for specific measures as well as the fuller integration of a gender perspective into all cultural policies and measures.

Finally, Mr. Isar presented the tenth chapter, written by Mrs. Sara Whyatt. It focuses on artistic freedom, which is under increasing threats. Nonetheless, the chapter concluded that monitoring and advocacy in favour of artistic freedom had grown, as had the capacities of organizations engaged in this field, and that municipal authorities had taken valuable initiatives by providing safe havens for artists at risk.

Mr. Isar concluded by underscoring that the lack of data constituted a transversal issue across all chapters. He acknowledged the advances made regarding this issue, but stressed that these advances remained insufficient.

Panel discussion with the authors of the 2018 Global Report

360. **Mr. Isar** acted as moderator of the panel and started by raising four general questions:

1. Has the Convention induced or inspired positive policy change?
2. How effectively are better policies and measures being implemented?
3. Have these policies and measures actually improved policy-making?
4. Have these improvements generated better outcomes in terms of sustainable development?

He then asked Mr. Jordi Baltà Portolés how the Convention had helped reshape cultural policies.

361. **Mr. Jordi Baltà Portolés**, stated that the Convention had helped redefine the scope of cultural policy, to include a holistic understanding of the ecology of culture, and a strengthening of the focus on the cultural and creative industries within the realm of cultural policy. These two aspects have led to a more collaborative cultural governance, through the strengthening of multistakeholder dialogue with civil society.

362. **Mr. Isar** explained that the Convention has often been interpreted as applying to many other fields, such as cultural heritage, that did not constitute its intended main focus. He asked Mr. Baltà whether the focus of the second cycle of quadrennial periodic reports had sharpened.

363. **Mr. Baltà** noted that the understanding of the Convention's focus still need to be fostered, but an increasing integral approach to policies across the value chain had already been achieved.

364. **Mr. Isar** then noted that the chapter written by Mr. Andrew Firmin seemed to imply that space may still be lacking for civil society to make the commitment of involvement a practical reality.

365. **Mr. Andrew Firmin**, confirmed that the participation of civil society in cultural governance was still a mixed picture. A great amount of autonomous civil society activity engaged in participating in cultural governance but improvements are still needed. Civil society indeed

faces challenges such as the lack of laws enabling them to take part, lack of resources, and the insufficient transparency of policy spaces.

366. **Mr. Isar** asked Mr. Firmin and Mr. Baltà, which advice they would give to Parties.
367. **Mr. Firmin** replied that the most pressing issue was the availability of resources. He also raised that communication and awareness of the Convention, as well as the quality of networking opportunities, remained low among the broader civil society. He stressed the need to foster these connections both within civil society itself and through the Parties' action at the national level.
368. **Mr. Baltà** suggested establishing more permanent frameworks of collaborative governance, strengthening the position of cultural policies within the broader framework of national strategies, as well as larger efforts such as improving the availability of data.
369. **Mr. Isar** then asked Mrs. Khadija El Bennaoui to describe the many innovative policies being implemented for the mobility of artists in the global South.
370. **Mrs. Khadija El Bennaoui**, responded that independent cultural actors, or civil society actors were key for mobility in the global South. She noted that it had evolved from a general and multidisciplinary approach to a more specialized one, with specific networks for sectors such as music or visual arts. She noted a growing interest for South-South exchanges, illustrated by the development of several mobility programs by various institutions. She also explained that the European Commission had shifted from its traditional North-South approach to subgranting programs designed to indirectly support smaller youth initiatives. Mrs. El Bennaoui stressed, however, that these initiatives all faced the same issue of mobility, even those arising from Member States of the European Union.
371. **Mr. Isar** asked Mrs. El Bennaoui how Parties could respond to these challenges.
372. **Mrs. El Bennaoui** suggested that cultural actors come to a united position and that commissions be created at the country level to work with all relevant ministries on advancing visa-related issues, as done by Zone Franche in France. She also underlined that the issue could not be resolved until a professional and legal infrastructure for cultural workers in the global South was implemented.
373. **Mr. Isar** noted that the terms “artistic freedom” did not figure in the Convention, although it did include a reference to “fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, information, and communication.” He asked Mrs. Whyatt, why artistic freedom was so central to the Convention.
374. **Mrs. Sara Whyatt**, underlined that many civil society actors had been trying to make artistic freedom a higher priority, but had been met with a lack of recognition that artists contribute to social change and reach out to audiences that other actors may not. She asserted that artists at risk tended to be lone workers, and that performing artists in particular put themselves in danger by stepping foot on a stage. In this context, artistic freedom seemed to have become a trendy topic over the last three years, for several reasons including the role of art in the 2011 Arab democracy movement, the 2013 report on the right to freedom of artistic expression and creativity from Farida Shaheed, and the engagement of CSOs. She expressed her surprise that the role of artists as actors of social change had not been more recognized until this point. **Mrs. Whyatt** noted that many States had started acknowledging artistic freedom, and that 21 States had enshrined this principle in their Constitution. She stressed that CSOs needed to liaise with Ministries of Culture, human

rights defenders, media organizations and across other civil society sectors. She underlined that a particularly important aspect of cooperation concerned data gathering.

375. **Mr. Isar** thanked the panellists for their comments and opened the floor for questions.
376. **Mrs. Yarri Kamara, coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts**, asked how experts defined the balance of opportunities and threats presented by digitalization, and which guidance they could offer to developing countries concerned about preserving spaces for their cultural expressions.
377. **Mrs. Christine Merkel**, explained that she could see encouraging developments showing that policy-makers were ready to deal with the digital issue and ensure that the next generation of audiovisual production could survive in this new ecosystem. She stressed that dialogues needed to take place with large providers that were not yet involved in the discussions, but that promising initiatives were being implemented in the global South to design new web-based systems and to maximize new digital opportunities.
378. **Mrs. Silja Fischer**, representing the **International Music Council**, referred to the data requirements formulated in the 2018 Global Report's Report Card for Goal 1, especially regarding revenues generated by digital distribution platforms and by artists. She noted that this requirement likely referred to the value gap on the Internet and the poor remuneration of artists by digital platforms. She noted that CSOs wished to draw attention to the fact that a majority of the income of music artists came from live performances. For this reason, the data also needed to account for the relationship between income from digital and live performances.
379. **Mr. Mike van Graan**, representing the **African Cultural Policy Network**, observed that the Convention was characterized with a major contradiction, between States Parties, UNESCO and civil society. He remarked that Parties were the primary causes of problems for CSOs, with issues such as freedom of expression or the lack of resources. There is a contradiction between the necessity for civil society to obtain the support of UNESCO, and UNESCO's difficult position due to its financial dependence on and accountability to Parties with varying levels of democracy.
380. **Mr. Firmin** responded by underlining that current times were characterized by an assault on democracy. He expressed the belief that civil society needed a new partnership to defend multilateralism, as well as a new narrative regarding its global vision for the world to challenge the regressive vision coming from many sources.
381. **Mr. Amareswar Galla** asked the experts for their comments on the presence or absence of indigenous peoples' creative expressions, especially those of women.
382. **Mr. Isar** responded that several chapters included mentions of indigenous communities, but that the organization of the Report under the Convention's four goals had not led to the inclusion of a distinct chapter on this topic. He recalled that the Convention included a reference to this group.
383. The **Secretary of the Convention** explained that the Convention's monitoring framework had been elaborated as a baseline that could be further developed, and could include indigenous communities in the future. She highlighted that several IFCD projects focused on this topic, including a project in Brazil that support their participation in electronic publishing was included as a case study.

384. **Mrs. Ammu Joseph**, responded to Mr. Galla's question on indigenous peoples by underlining that they were often mentioned along with women and other minority groups. She explained that gender issues had been an important focus of the 2018 Global Report, but that less attention had been paid to other minorities, not because of the Convention's text itself but because of priority setting.
385. **Mr. Isar** thanked the four panellists and the audience for their participation.
Panel discussion: Towards Support Policies for Independent Cinema?
386. **Mr. Frédéric Bonnaud, Director General of the French Cinémathèque**, moderated the panel. He introduced the panellists, and then asked Mrs. Yoonhyung Jeon how the Republic of Korea managed to preserve its ambitious national cinema with a proactive public policy.
387. **Mrs. Yoonhyung Jeon, a distribution director within the Korean Film Council** (hereinafter "KFC"), highlighted that the KFC had been working for almost 40 years to promote domestic films in all stages of their development. She explained that the establishment of screen quota system had helped to promote local films, with each screening venue being mandated to show Korean films for a minimum of 73 days every year. She also noted that the Korean Film Development Fund had been created to support local films, and that 3% of countrywide film tickets sales were allocated to this independent budget. Mrs. Jeon also mentioned that an annual budget of 60 million USD was invested to support Korean films both within the country and internationally.
388. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked whether this situation had resulted from negotiations, which governmental parties had been involved and whether opposition existed to these policies.
389. **Mrs. Jeon** replied that the Korean government had shown a clear will to protect a stable local film economy. She mentioned that although the screen quota remained in place, it had decreased from 146 to 73 days in 2016, due to the bilateral free trade agreement with the United States of America.
390. **Mr. Bonnaud** mentioned that coproduction agreements increased the distribution of Korean cinema worldwide. He then asked Mrs. Ebba Sinzinger to describe the current situation in Austria.
391. **Mrs. Ebba Sinzinger, a film director and producer from Austria**, clarified that she was not representing a governmental institution, and asserted that cinema did not constitute a priority in Austria, unlike music and theatre. She noted that Austria comprised some funding institutions such as the Film Institute or the Vienna Film Fund, but not many other mechanisms. She explained that this situation resulted in a very creative film industry, but with a small audience. She asserted that in Austria, diversity was understood as ensuring that large and small productions could survive, but that co-productions with minority language countries or the global South were not encouraged.
392. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mrs. Sinzinger whether she felt that the Austrian's policy could be more proactive and favour of stronger Austrian film sector, if it were treated like music or theatre.
393. **Mrs. Sinzinger** agreed. She underlined that the situation was increasingly difficult, with the funding available for co-produced documentaries having dramatically decreased in recent years. She also noted that television was facing greater pressure than cinema, even though Austrian television companies are legally obligated to invest 12 million euros into Austrian cinema productions.

394. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mr. Claude-Éric Poiroux to comment on the European independent cinema situation, and on the obligations of television companies to support cinema in France.
395. **Mr. Claude-Éric Poiroux, Director General of Europa Cinemas**, highlighted that Korean films accounted for 53% of the total film market in the Republic of Korea in 2016, a much higher proportion than any European country. He explained that regulations existed in Europe to prevent certain behaviours that hurt local production, but that programming remained mostly free, resulting in a market made up of 60% of American films. He nevertheless highlighted the dense network of movie theatres across Europe, with over 30,000 theatres, as representing a strong avenue to make local films available, despite the wider success of American films. He also underlined that, although less popular, independent cinema did exist. He stressed the crucial role of movie theatres in screening independent films, thus generating revenue and getting independent films produced.
396. **Mr. Bonnaud** then asked Mr. Karim Moussaoui which support schemes were available to him, and how the mechanisms he used in France may supplement the support available in Algeria.
397. **Mr. Karim Moussaoui, a film director from Algeria**, recalled that he had used his own resources when he first started making films. He then participated in a script writing residence in Morocco to write his first short film, and became interested in co-producing the film through his encounters with various producers in France and Algeria. He highlighted that the co-production agreement allowed him to benefit from his partners' experience, and that the contacts he made led to the production of his first feature film, co-produced by Algeria, France, Germany and Qatar. The Algerian government had little success in promoting its film sector through its own efforts in the early 2000s. Therefore, following the 2008 crisis, the Ministry of Culture had been forced to turn to external partners to co-produce local films, and that this had actually resulted in increased visibility for Algerian films.
398. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mrs. Jeon and Mrs. Sinzinger to describe which options would be available to young Korean and Austrian independent filmmakers in similar situations.
399. **Mrs. Jeon** replied that strong public funding existed to support filmmakers. However, she noted that filmmakers always found this funding insufficient; especially in the changing makeup of the Korean film industry due to the evolution of the digitalized market and the saturation and slowing growth of the film sector. Nevertheless, she underlined that the Korean funding system was particularly stable. She added that other financial mechanisms existed, including subsidies, tax exemptions, educational opportunities, and funding to attend workshops or festivals.
400. **Mrs. Sinzinger** explained that up until in 2015, young filmmakers in Austria had access to many opportunities, including funding schemes providing up to 1.5 million EUR for a first film, but that the situation had changed. She noted that one of the main funding sources that had an entry limit of 1 million EUR for film budgets had raised it to 2.3 million EUR in 2015, making it very difficult for films whose budget was under around 1.8 million EUR to find funding elsewhere. She underlined that this especially hurt newcomers, who struggled to find co-production opportunities.
401. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mr. Poiroux whether the French model was working correctly. He mentioned that this model had inspired other countries, but that the strength of French cinema seemed to be the exception rather than the norm. He also asked Mr. Poiroux whether co-production agreements were still being used within Europe, for instance between France and Italy.

402. **Mr. Poiroux** recalled that cooperation between the French and Italian film sectors had made the industry profitable, even eliminating the need for public funding. He noted that such a star system did not exist in Europe anymore. He underscored that a high number of 1,700 films had been produced in Europe in 2016, and that one should ask how these films could then reach audiences, although he did not advocate for a decrease in film production. He noted that film production in Europe was fairly well supported, including through the European Union's Creative Europe program, as well as the Council of Europe's Eurimages program, which allocated 20 million EUR per year to the production of almost 100 co-productions. He expressed his optimism that public institutions in Europe saw the value of cinema, although imbalances remained regarding the distribution of films from lesser-known countries within those countries themselves. For instance, he observed that Mr. Moussaoui's film may not be widely shown in Algeria.
403. **Mr. Moussaoui** replied that the film would be shown in Algeria's 20 digitized theatres but agreed that it had not been widely distributed. He explained that Algerian theatres had closed due to the economic crisis in 1990 and that Algeria had not capitalized on digital technologies in a timely manner. New theatres have now started to open but progress remains slow.
404. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mrs. Jeon whether youth did show interest in independent Korean cinema.
405. **Mrs. Jeon** explained that the KFC was currently focusing on audience development, especially among young generations, which were less interested in going to movie theatres. Although cinema can be enjoyed through different means, including digital platforms, general interest in this sector is declining among people under 26 years old. Regarding Korean independent cinema, she described that the country was facing a market centralization. She also explained that independent films from foreign countries often performed better among Korean audiences than Korean independent films, and that the latter often were more successful abroad.
406. **Mr. Bonnaud** noted Mrs. Jeon's mention of digital platforms, and mentioned that European policy-makers would also need to reflect on how to maximize their potential while ensuring the diversity of content. He then asked Mrs. Sinzinger to describe the preferences of Austrian audiences.
407. **Mrs. Sinzinger** observed that Austrian films often garnered bigger audiences abroad. Following up on Mrs. Jeon's comment about reaching out to younger audiences, she noted that many film festivals were held in Austria, and that audiences under 26 often attended screenings if they were part of an event. Concerning digital platforms, she highlighted recent efforts to create the "Global Nomads" label that was filmed by refugees, and put on iTunes and Google among other platforms. She explained that digital platforms only complied with existing regulations, and often did not encourage local productions and avoided paying taxes.
408. **Mr. Bonnaud** asked Mr. Poiroux how large digital actors could be better regulated.
409. **Mr. Poiroux** explained that while digital platforms pretended to favour diversity, based on the thousands of films they offered, this was not truly the case, as independent films were not easily accessible on the platforms. He explained that the European Union had made good progress regarding this issue, with its MEDIA program encouraging the flow of films between countries, and recalled Europa Cinemas' similar initiative with its Mundus program. He expressed the opinion that diversity did not necessarily need to be expensive, but that it

required stakeholder engagement and political will to actually constrain large actors to sustain true diversity.

410. **Mr. Moussaoui** added that diversity was closely related to culture and education, and that the ministries in charge of national education programs should also be involved.
411. **Mr. Bonnaud** cited the 2017 movie “Petit Paysan” as an example of a film whose production was made possible thanks to French and European support, but that also performed well among the general public, showing that an audience existed for more diverse and varied films. He asked Mrs. Jeon whether an audience for such prototype films existed in the Republic of Korea.
412. **Mrs. Jeon** answered that a niche market of connoisseurs looking for sophisticated films did exist. Several independent cinema houses target these audiences and are successful, but the KFC and Korean government subsidize these films, indicating that they are not quite sustainable without public support.
413. **Mr. Bonnaud** recalled that the cinemas at Viennale were full. He asked whether, beyond such marketed events, a regular audience existed for prototype films in Austria.
414. **Mrs. Sinzinger** replied that it did exist, but that it mostly consisted of people over 45 years old.
415. **Mr. Bonnaud** wondered whether a film-maker such as Michael Haneke, if he were to return to Austria, would find favourable conditions for the production of his films.
416. **Mrs. Sinzinger** clarified that Michael Haneke always produced his films in Austria, but asserted that the budget needed for his films could not be obtained in Austria, forcing him to resort to co-productions. She noted, that after Michael Haneke won the Palme d’Or for his film “Amour”, 30,000 admissions were counted during the first round of screening, and that the second round of screening following the inclusion of the film on the short list for the Oscars led to 70,000 additional admissions. However, she remarked that this remained the exception rather than the norm.
417. **Mr. Bonnaud** observed that the Premiers Plans Festival, which Mr. Poiroux founded, gathers a particularly large and young audience. He asked Mr. Poiroux whether, despite the rise of digital platforms, the habit of going to the cinema has been passed down to younger generations.
418. **Mr. Poiroux** confirmed that large cinema events could attract younger audiences on a yearly basis. He explained that the difficulty resided in translating this interest for one-off events into a more regular habit. He indicated that audience renewal should be a priority for cinema operators.
419. **Mr. Bonnaud** opened the floor for questions.
420. A **member of the audience** explained that in the past, independent cinema used to be understood as going against the State, whereas it now depends on governments, especially regarding the safeguarding of national cinema industries in the context of globalization. He suggested that measures should be devised to ensure that cinema remained independent from governments.

421. **Mr. Moussaoui** agreed and noted that co-production was helpful in diversifying funding sources and ensuring independence, as were actors such as local communities and television channels.
422. A second **member of the audience** suggested that younger generations should be taught about the world cinematographic heritage in schools through cultural and artistic curricula.
423. **Mr. Poiroux** agreed but explained that the increased accessibility of content led some authorities to believe that education was becoming unnecessary. He underlined that the promotion of cinema was part of a larger societal concern regarding the transmission of culture and heritage.
424. **Mrs. Jeon** highlighted that the Republic of Korea was promoting education programs such as film studies or media literacy, both optional courses for high school juniors and seniors.
425. **Mrs. Sinzinger** underlined that the Austrian Film Museum was very active in offering programs for schoolchildren, and that Austrian productions could receive State support if directors participated in education programs and presented their films in schools.
426. **Mr. Bonnaud** related these discussions on possible policies to support independent cinema as well as cinematographic education programs to the Global Report's objective of reshaping policies. He thanked the panellists for their participation.