



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization



Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

12 IGC

DCE/18/12.IGC/6
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 6 of the Provisional Agenda: Report on the impact of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD)

This document presents the conclusions of the report on the impact of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD).

The full report is available in Information Document DCE/18/12.IGC/INF.5.

Decision required: paragraph 15

1. Article 22 of the Guidelines on the use of the resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity states that an evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) shall be carried out every five years. The Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Committee”) is to consider the results of said evaluation with a view to adopting, or not, the proposed recommendations (Resolution [6.CP 12](#)).
2. The first evaluation was conducted by UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS) in 2012 and the Committee adopted 30 out of 35 proposed recommendations at its sixth session. A report of the status of the adopted recommendations has been presented to the Committee at each of its sessions during the 2013-2017 period. These annual status reports show that the majority of the adopted recommendations have been fully implemented by the Secretariat and proved valuable in improving the management of the IFCD, streamlining its processes and demonstrating its impact at the national and international levels.
3. The second evaluation was carried out in 2017 and its results were presented to the eleventh session of the Committee in 2017 (See Document [DCE/17/11.IGC/7b](#)). Following a review of the proposed recommendations, the Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare, in consultation with the Parties and the IFCD Panel of Experts, a report on the impact of the proposed recommendations (hereinafter “impact report”) for its consideration at its twelfth session.
4. At this session, the Committee is to consider the results of the impact report that is presented in Information Document DCE/18/12.IGC/INF.5. The Committee shall also review and adopt the proposed recommendations that it considers pertinent for implementation. The full list of proposed recommendations and recommended implementation actions is presented in Annex to this document.
5. The second evaluation, the impact report, the debates and decisions of this twelfth session of the Committee will be transmitted to the seventh session of the Conference of Parties to be held in June 2019.

Methodology

6. The Secretariat commissioned an external expert, Yarri Kamara¹, to analyse the 21 recommendations presented in the second external evaluation of the IFCD and to prepare an impact report to be presented to the twelfth session of the Committee. Ms Kamara is a member of the Expert Facility, was a member of the IFCD Panel of Experts (2014-2017) and Coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts (2016 to 2017). Her analysis is based on document reviews, data analysis and interviews conducted with key stakeholders including National Commissions, the Secretariat and other cultural funding institutions.
7. Her final report reviews each proposed recommendation, assesses their implications and makes a proposal to implement it or not. It identifies the underlying problem that the proposed recommendation aims to address and, where relevant, presents various implementation options. An assessment of the level of urgency or strategic importance for the future of the IFCD is made along with an assessment of the risk posed by implementing the

¹ Yarri Kamara (Sierra Leone) is an international development specialist with extensive experience in cultural enterprise development. She has worked as a consultant for a number of international organizations, including UNESCO and the World Bank, and public authorities in West Africa. She currently lives in Burkina Faso where she works as a programme manager for the consultancy firm Initiatives Conseil International in the field of private sector development. Ms Kamara holds a MA in Development Studies from Sciences Po, Paris and a BA in Economics from the University of Virginia.

recommendation or not. Relevant facts and data related to the recommendation support the final assessment.

8. The draft impact report was presented to the IFCD Panel of Experts by Ms Kamara at their meeting on 19 July 2018 at UNESCO Headquarters. The panel reviewed all proposed recommendations and discussed the various implementation options presented in the draft report. They agreed that 17 of the 21 proposed recommendations are fully relevant for the future of the IFCD and arrived at a consensus on the actions related to capacity building, fundraising, communication, project monitoring and evaluation.

Proposed recommendations to be implemented

9. Among the 17 proposed recommendations, the impact report identifies seven that should be implemented as a matter of priority due to their strategic importance for the future success of the IFCD. They are:
 - Recommendation 8: To conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat;
 - Recommendation 12: To make resources available so that the Secretariat can take bold steps for the IFCD to become a “learning-driven” fund;
 - Recommendation 13: To conduct random IFCD project independent evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences;
 - Recommendation 16: To review the current Committee’s fundraising strategy to ensure that it dedicates more attention to the contributions of Parties;
 - Recommendation 17: To work towards meeting the target contribution of 1% (Articles 18.3 and 18.7) to strengthen the sustainability of the Fund and overturn the static trend of the last 5 years;
 - Recommendations 18 and 20: To strengthen IFCD’s fundraising strategy by incorporating an analytical dimension that ensures an explicit connection between communication products and concrete fundraising targets as well as to strengthen the use of communication materials on the IFCD.

10. As indicated in Annex, the immediate implementation of these proposed recommendations would have cost implications and would require the Committee to allocate resources, for a total amount of USD 117,000, from the IFCD unassigned funds as follows:
 - USD 4,000 to commission a human resources analysis and present the results to the Committee at its thirteenth session;
 - USD 30,000 for the re-design and testing of the project monitoring and evaluation system that can help the IFCD become a “learning-driven” fund;
 - USD 18,000 to conduct independent project evaluations and prepare a report on lessons learned that can strengthen the IFCD;
 - USD 65,000 to renew and update the fundraising and communication strategy and collect feedback on existing communication tools.

11. If adopted by the Committee, there are several additional recommendations that will require the Secretariat to take action in the short term. They are to:

- continue to reinforce the capacities of the National Commissions in the pre-selection process. Pending extra-budgetary resources are found to develop an extensive programme, the Secretariat could organize a training workshop for National Commissions during their annual meeting that takes place at UNESCO Headquarters (Recommendation 9);
- review communication processes with Field Offices and continue to work with them to provide assistance to potential applicants in the design of their projects, especially in countries with low application rates (Recommendations 10 and 11);
- add a one day module on the IFCD to the Convention's capacity building programme and produce new learning materials such as a training video explaining the application process (Recommendation 11);
- undertake a rapid review of the working methods of other organizations that provide funding for culture projects in order to identify good practices that could potentially strengthen the IFCD (Recommendation 12);
- pending available resources, organize events at the regional or international level every 2 or 4 years to facilitate peer to peer learning and networking among IFCD project beneficiaries (Recommendation 14);
- upscale gender transformative actions including introducing gender disaggregated indicators in monitoring and evaluation tools, developing a gender knowledge pack for applicants and the Panel of Experts and including a session on gender in the induction meeting with new members of the Panel of Experts (Recommendation 15);
- conduct a survey with Parties on their motivation and challenges to contribute to the IFCD and present the results to the Committee at its thirteenth session (Recommendation 16);
- review the project application forms to include indicators on the experience and capacity of applicants in project implementation (Recommendation 21).

Proposed recommendations not to be implemented at this point in time

12. The impact report concludes that 4 out of the 21 proposed recommendations should not be implemented at this point in time. They are:

- Recommendation 1: to focus the IFCD support on low/middle income countries that have less funding opportunities in the realm of culture at their disposal by using the Human Development Index (HDI) or Development Assistance Committee (DAC) lists of countries;
- Recommendation 2: to prioritize funding for regional initiatives
- Recommendation 3: to introduce an IFCD endorsement scheme
- Recommendation 4: to introduce a call for concept notes that would complement the current call for proposals.

13. In each case, the impact report provides evidence as to why these proposed recommendations should not be adopted at this time (see Annex). It presents options that could be considered by the Committee as alternative actions that would nevertheless address the rationale for why they were recommended in the first place. For example, the impact report does not recommend changing the current list of eligible countries. Should the Committee decide to accept this proposed recommendation to use either the Human Development Index (HDI) or Development Assistance Committee (DAC) to compile the list of IFCD eligible countries, a large number of currently eligible countries would be excluded: 25 out of 32 currently eligible

countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, and 8 of 10 currently eligible countries in East Europe. The impact report concludes that implementation of this proposed recommendation is unlikely to improve the IFCD as the inclusiveness of the IFCD is a rallying element to garner support for the fund from the maximum number of Parties to the Convention. Moving to a more restrictive list of eligible countries may discourage voluntary contributions from Parties and create frustration for middle income countries. As an implementation alternative option, the impact report recommends to track the proportion of projects going to richer developing countries, and if these countries start to consistently (over 3 or more years) receive a disproportionate number of projects, the Committee may decide to instruct the IFCD Panel of Experts to implement positive discrimination measures for low Human Development Index (HDI) countries.

Proposed recommendations requiring decisions by the Committee

14. If the 17 proposed recommendations are adopted, the Committee will be required to take specific decisions to:

- instruct the Secretariat to engage the National Contact Points in the pre-selection process if the National Commission is unable to undertake its responsibilities within the allocated deadlines (Recommendation 5);
- instruct the coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts to attribute 1 bonus point to projects from countries that have never received funding (Recommendation 6);
- instruct the IFCD Panel of Experts to recommend for its approval, the highest-scoring projects that have attained at least 30 points and within the limit of funds available (Recommendation 6);
- allocate USD 117,000 from the unassigned funds as indicated in paragraph 10.

15. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 12.IGC 6

The Committee,

1. *Having examined Document DCE/18/12.IGC/6 and its Annex as well Information Document DCE/18/12.IGC/INF.5;*
2. *Takes note of the report on the impact of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) and its recommended implementation actions, as set out in Annex;*
3. *Adopts xx out of 21 of the proposed recommendations resulting from the second external evaluation on the IFCD;*
4. *Requests the Secretariat to implement the recommendations adopted by the Committee as Annexed to this Decision;*

5. Decides that the seven recommendations deemed urgent priority by the impact report are to be implemented and authorises the Secretariat to use resources from the unassigned funds in the IFCD Special Account for that purpose;
6. Requests the Secretariat to engage the National Contact Points in the pre-selection application process in the event that the National Commission is not in a position to undertake its responsibilities within the allocated deadlines;
7. Requests the coordinator of the IFCD Panel of Experts to attribute 1 bonus point to projects from countries that have never received funding;
8. Requests the IFCD Panel of Experts to recommend for its approval, the highest-scoring projects that have attained at least 30 points and within the limit of funds available;
9. Encourages the Parties to provide extrabudgetary funding for capacity building activities on IFCD application process at the country level;
10. Invites the Secretariat to submit the second external evaluation report and the report on the impact of the proposed recommendations as information documents to the seventh session of the Conference of Parties, together with a summary of the Committee's deliberations.

ANNEX

Assessment of the impact of the proposed recommendations presented in the second IFCD external evaluation (2017) and recommended implementation actions

Legend: ✓ Approved ; ✗ Not approved

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 1 To consider focusing IFCD support on low/middle income countries that have less funding opportunities in the realm of culture at their disposal by using other reference lists such as the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) or using the OECD DAC list.</p>	low	high	<p>a) Do not implement. Maintain the status quo for now and track the proportion of projects going to richer developing countries, according to the HDI definition. Should richer countries start to consistently (over 3 or more years) receive a <u>disproportionate</u> number of projects, implement positive discrimination for low HDI countries.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 2 To consider actively promoting and/or prioritising regional initiatives through the IFCD in order to promote greater international cooperation (in line with article 12 of the Convention) and to also impact more countries, thereby meeting the needs and expectations of more Parties and potential project holders.</p>	low	low	<p>a) Do not implement active promotion or prioritisation. Maintain the status quo and in the announcement of the call for proposals encourage regional projects.</p> <p>b) Await evaluations of a body of regional projects to assess whether the current USD100,000 funding envelope is too restrictive for regional projects.</p>	None	

² Risk posed by implementation of the recommendation presented in the impact analysis.

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 3 To introduce an IFCD endorsement scheme for projects implemented in high human development countries where IFCD funding is not as relevant as in low human development countries with fewer funding opportunities.</p>	low	medium	<p>a) Do not introduce an endorsement scheme. Increase visibility of the project application database so that applicants who wish, can use the publicly available evaluation as an endorsement.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 4 Introduce a call for concept notes that would complement the current call for proposals. The evaluation team recommends adopting a call requesting a short 2-3-page application with a simple budget based on two elements: a summary of the proposed action presented within a simple theory of change reflecting a wider contextual change process and elements proving the capacity of partners (see Recommendation 21). Concept notes should be presented online to be assessed by National Commissions. After the first screening process, a maximum of 15 to 20 applicants would be invited to develop full proposals following the same process currently in place.</p>	low – medium	medium	<p>a) Do not introduce concept notes, but limit the applicant information that National Commissions need to assess. b) Communicate statistics on chances of selection to applicants. c) Focus on ensuring simplicity of the application forms.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 5 To work with the National Commissions to strengthen their role in line with the Guidelines in concrete areas such as the responsibility of forming and coordinating the pre-selection panel (as per articles 12.2 and 12.3 of the Guidelines)</p>	medium – high	low	<p>d) Simplify the National Commission preselection form by eliminating section 5 of the form. e) Invite the IGC to consider the possibility of the Secretariat taking recourse to the 2005 Convention Focal Point if a National Commission fails to undertake preselection by the deadline.</p>	None	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 6 To allocate extra criteria in the proposal scoring system to projects promoting certain strategic themes and/or geographic regions in order to finetune project selection and reduce the challenges emerging from the 30-point decision as well as geographic imbalance.</p>	low	low	<p>a) Give the Coordinator of the Panel of Experts the responsibility of attributing 1 bonus point for projects with scores close to the recommendation range from countries that have never received funding.</p> <p>b) Revise current 30-point criteria, whereby any project scoring at least 30 points is recommended for funding, to stipulate that the highest-scoring projects attaining at least 30 points, will be recommended for funding <u>within the limit of funds available</u>.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 7 To incorporate a specific question about the IFCD in the Quadrennial Periodic Reports (QPRs) to ensure that IFCD projects systematically feature in these reports, thereby ensuring that the links between the Fund and the implementation of the 2005 Convention are made explicit.</p>	--	--	This recommendation is already implemented.	--	
<p>Rec. 8 To conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat (in line with IOS Recommendation 31). Strengthening the team's fundraising capacity is particularly key for the future of the Fund and in order to maximize efforts to date.</p>	high	low	<p>a) Commission an HR analysis for the IFCD. A senior HR consultant is to conduct individual and/or group interviews with staff, undertake a review of fundraising and monitoring & evaluation tools, present findings and conclusions in an interactive workshop.</p>	USD4000 for the HR analysis + funds for implementing the recommendations	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 9 To strengthen the capacity of the National Commissions as key actors involved in the application process in order to improve the selection process and avoid the non-selection of good quality projects. A good step forward would be ensuring that each National Commission appoints a focal person in charge of coordinating IFCD issues for at least 2 years, and that in case of changes, the same person ensures the transfer of knowledge and files.</p>	<p>medium – high</p>	<p>low</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Secretariat should regularly communicate indicators tracking screening by National Commissions. b) During the 2019 cycle, the Secretariat should review current communication processes with National Commissions. c) In 2019 or 2020, the Secretariat should take advantage of the annual meeting of National Commissions at UNESCO headquarters to present the IFCD and the preselection process. d) In the 2020 cycle the Secretariat should organize an assessment of the quality of preselection by having the Panel of Experts evaluate a random sample of applications rejected by National Commissions. e) If the assessment reveals that there are problems with quality, prepare a training program for National Commissions with lowest capacities. f) If insufficient improvement is seen in National Commission performance indicators by the next global IFCD evaluation, invite the IGC to consider transferring National Commission responsibilities to other official channels, such as the 2005 Convention Focal Point. 	<p>Cost of additional evaluations by Panel of Experts in 2020. Potential costs of training program for National Commissions after 2020.</p>	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 10 To work with Field Offices to ensure that on the one hand, UNESCO maximizes the opportunities of having an IFCD-funded project (such as increased visibility, enhanced contact with the local cultural sector and a better understanding of the context) and on the other hand, to ensure that projects know what they can (and should) expect from UNESCO Field Offices (especially in terms of support and involvement throughout the diffusion, communication and implementation processes).</p>	medium	low	<p>a) The Secretariat should review current communication processes for Field Offices.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 11 To develop tailored capacity-building actions for countries with less funding opportunities in the cultural sector and for those countries that have never received funding</p>	medium	low	<p>a) Implement in-person training on the IFCD through the 2005 Convention Capacity building program. Integrate a 1-day session on the IFCD in all 2005 Convention training programs.</p> <p>b) Encourage field offices that have the capacity to undertake capacity building.</p> <p>c) Develop online videos focusing in particular on: 1) visual presentation of the application guide, and 2) common weaknesses in project applications and elements that are well appreciated.</p> <p>d) Explore the opportunities for developing more elaborate online training in conjunction with other culture funding institutions.</p>	<p>Funds from existing capacity building activity. Funds for developing online training tools</p>	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 12 To make resources available so that the Secretariat can take bold steps for the IFCD to become a “learning-driven” fund by introducing measures that aim to extract lessons and spaces for the reflexion at that centre of the IFCD strategy, including hiring of dedicated staff at the Secretariat responsible for project monitoring and evaluation</p>	high	low	<p>a) Invite the IGC to commit to making the resources available for implementing costed options for building learning capacity resulting from the human resource analysis referred to in Rec. 8.</p> <p>b) For 2019, invite the IGC to commit up to USD30,000 for the re-design and testing of an overall M&E system from unassigned funds.</p> <p>c) Invite the IGC to commit to regularly allocating a percentage of either IFCD project funding or IFCD total income to learning (monitoring & evaluation human resources, tools and products).</p> <p>d) The Secretariat should undertake a rapid review of practices of other organizations with strong learning cultures funding culture or social change to identify practices that could potentially strengthen existing systems.</p>	<p>A benchmark figure suggests USD78,000 of M&E expenditure per year for \$600,000 of project funding</p>	
<p>Rec. 13 To conduct random IFCD project independent evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences.</p>	high	low	<p>a) Set aside a sum equivalent to 3% of project funding (roughly US\$18,000 each year assuming US\$600,000 in project funding) for IFCD-commissioned independent project evaluations.</p>	<p>Sum equivalent to 3% of project funding per year. NB. To come from overall M&E budget</p>	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 14 To take steps to maximize the Convention’s potential as an advocacy tool among civil society actors. This could be done by providing more information, training and awareness-raising on the importance of advocating on the contribution of the cultural sector to the economy as well as on the existing links between project-focused work conducted by cultural entities and their contribution to policy-related issues affecting the implementation of the Convention.</p>	low	low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Ensure that the new fundraising strategy considers how to engage past IFCD grant recipients in fundraising efforts. b) Organize events at the regional or international level every 2 or 4 years to facilitate networking among IFCD grant recipients. 	Budget for organizing regional or international events every 2 to 4 years	
<p>Rec. 15 To positively discriminate project proposals that include concrete actions aimed at increasing women’s representation in key areas of cultural activity and/or aimed at challenging traditional women’s roles.</p>	Medium - high	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Integrate a special call for gender transformative projects in IFCD calls. b) Introduce gender disaggregated indicators in monitoring and evaluation tools. c) Develop a gender knowledge pack for applicants and the Panel of Experts. d) Include a session on gender in the induction meeting of the Panel of Experts. 	None	
<p>Rec. 16 To review the current Committee’s fundraising strategy to ensure that it dedicates more attention to the contributions of Parties and their engagement in a more tailored manner, recognizing that not all Parties have the same capacities and resources.</p>	High	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Secretariat should undertake analysis of what influences contributions from Parties. b) In future, the Secretariat should regularly collect feedback on all communication materials from a sample of 6-10 Parties. 	None	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 17 To work towards meeting the target contribution of 1% (Art. 18.3 and 18.7) to strengthen the sustainability of the Fund and overturn the static trend of the last 5 years.</p>	High	low	<p>a) Re-emphasize the 1% of UNESCO contribution target in the fundraising strategy for Parties.</p> <p>b) The Secretariat should review current communication to Parties aimed at encouraging contributions to assess whether Parties are receiving reminders about their contributions at the right time.</p>	None	
<p>Rec. 18 To strengthen IFCD's fundraising strategy by incorporating an analytical dimension that ensures an explicit connection between communication products and concrete fundraising targets (especially those related to Parties' contributions).</p>	High	low	<p>a) Commission a study to draft a new fundraising and communication strategy. The study will include a review of the previous strategy.</p> <p>b) Invite the IGC to commit to making available the necessary resources for implementing the new fundraising strategy.</p>	<p>US\$65,000 for strategy development. <u>At least</u> 10% of income target for implementing the fundraising strategy</p>	
<p>Rec. 19 To modify the current success target of 50% of contributing countries so that instead of focusing on ensuring that at least half of the Parties to the Convention give to the Fund, regular amounts are sought in line with the suggested 1% (Art. 18.3 and 18.7)</p>	high	low	<p>a) Put a timeframe (e.g. 3 years) on the 50% of Parties contributing target. When communicating, emphasise which Parties have contributed within that timeframe to encourage renewed contributions.</p>	None	

Recommendations from the IFCD external evaluation	Level of urgency/ strategic importance	Risk posed by implementation ²	Recommended implementation actions	Cost implications	Decision by the 12IGC
<p>Rec. 20 To strengthen the use of communication materials on the IFCD. The first suggested step is to conduct an analysis of the implementation of the different phases of the Communication Strategy to understand what has worked and what requires improvement.</p>	high	low	<p>a) Commission a study to draft a new fundraising and communication strategy. The study will include a review of the previous strategy.</p> <p>b) Invite the IGC to commit to making available the necessary resources for implementing the new fundraising strategy.</p>	See Rec. 18	
<p>Rec. 21 To devote more attention to the capacity of project partners [applicants] and give this factor greater weight in the selection process...Include elements that prove the capacity of partners [applicants] (such as experience, sector expertise, past performance and participation in networks).</p>	medium to high	low	<p>a) In the application form introduce a table to inform on at least 2 similar experiences.</p> <p>b) In the application form introduce a structured table to collect information on applicants' partners to ensure that applicants give more complete information.</p> <p>c) Increase the weight given to applicant capacities in proposal evaluation scoring to at least 10%.</p>	None	