



8 CP

United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

• Diversity of
• Cultural Expressions

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

• Diversité
• des expressions
• culturelles

Organización
de las Naciones Unidas
para la Educación,
la Ciencia y la Cultura

• Diversidad
• de las expresiones
• culturales

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

• Разнообразие форм
• культурного
• самовыражения

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

• تنوع أشكال التعبير
• الثقافي

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

• 文化表现形式
• 多样性

DCE/21/8.CP/INF.12a
Paris, 3 May 2021
Original: French

**CONFERENCE OF PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION AND PROMOTION OF THE
DIVERSITY OF CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS**

**Eighth session
Online
1- 4 June 2021**

**Update on the implementation of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of
the International Fund for Cultural Diversity**

In accordance with Decision 14.IGC 9, this document presents a comprehensive report on the implementation and monitoring of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, adopted by the Committee at its twelfth session in December 2018 (Decision 12.IGC 6), as submitted to the 14th session of the Committee (DCE/21/14.IGC/9). It complements the report on the implementation of the Fund included in Document DCE/21/8.CP/12.

I. Background

1. At its thirteenth session in February 2020, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Committee”) requested the Secretariat to continue the implementation of the recommendations resulting from the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (hereinafter “the IFCD”) and present to it at its fourteenth session an update on its progress, including on: its actions related to capacity-building; the review of the monitoring framework; the project assessment report; and the development of a new fundraising and communication strategy ([Decision 13.IGC 5b](#)).
2. This document provides an update on the progress made in the implementation of the 17 recommendations adopted by the Committee at its twelfth session in December 2018 ([Decision 12.IGC 6](#)). It also presents the main conclusions of a series of reviews and assessments undertaken by the Secretariat as part of the actions recommended by the Committee to implement some of the recommendations: (i) a human resource analysis in the Secretariat for the implementation of the IFCD (Recommendation 8); (ii) a rapid review of practices of other organizations with strong learning cultures funding culture or social change (Recommendation 12); and (iii) independent evaluations of IFCD-supported projects (Recommendation 13). In accordance with [Decision 13.IGC 5b](#), these conclusions have also been taken into account in the analysis of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD, presented in document DCE/21/14.IGC/10. The following documents complement this report:
 - Narrative report of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (2020) (DCE/21/14.IGC/7)
 - Recommended projects from the International Fund for Cultural Diversity’s eleventh call for funding applications (DCE/21/14.IGC/8)
 - Draft of the new fundraising strategy for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (2021-2032) (DCE/21/14.IGC/11)
 - Evaluation report of the previous communication and fundraising strategy of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (2013-2018) and design of a new IFCD fundraising strategy (2021-2023)

II. Implementation of the recommendations of the second external evaluation

3. Since the twelfth session of the Committee in 2018, the actions it recommended in relation to the 17 adopted recommendations have been implemented by the Secretariat. A detailed overview of these actions is provided in Annex I. These include, among others, the implementation of capacity-building activities for the various stakeholders and the involvement of beneficiaries in promoting the Convention and the IFCD. The Secretariat also commissioned the various studies deemed necessary by the second external evaluation of the IFCD for the implementation of certain recommendations. Their conclusions offer interesting avenues to strengthen the activities of the IFCD.
4. The Committee also decided to address, as a matter of urgency, the implementation of eight of the 17 recommendations it adopted as a result of the second external evaluation of the IFCD:
 - **Recommendation 8:** conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat’s capacity (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;
 - **Recommendation 12:** 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 reflection at that centre of the IFCD strategy,

including hiring of dedicated staff at the Secretariat responsible for project monitoring and evaluation;

- **Recommendation 13:** conduct random, independent IFCD project evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and draw lessons from the different experiences;
 - **Recommendation 16:** review the Committee's current 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;
 - **Recommendation 17:** 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;
 - **Recommendation 18:** strengthen the 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);
 - **Recommendation 19:** 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);
 - **Recommendation 20:** 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.
5. This document is focused on **Recommendations 8, 12 and 13** out of these eight priority recommendations, as the results of the implementation of recommendations 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are covered in document DCE/21/14.IGC/11 on the draft new fundraising strategy for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (2021-2023).

Recommendation 8: conduct a human resource analysis in the Secretariat with a view to meeting the needs of the IFCD and strengthening the Secretariat's capacity

6. In order to implement this recommendation, the Secretariat commissioned a human resource analysis for the IFCD from a consultant recommended by UNESCO's Bureau of Human Resources Management (ADM/HRM).
7. The consultant assessed the human resources available to the Secretariat to manage the IFCD. Staffing needs were also identified with a view to improving the following activities: (i) the annual call for funding applications; (ii) the administrative management of funded projects; (iii) the monitoring and evaluation of funded projects; and (iv) the implementation of the fundraising and communication strategy. Lastly, recommendations were made to strengthen the staff and structure of the Secretariat in order to manage the IFCD more effectively.
8. For the purpose of the analysis, the consultant reviewed background documents on the Convention and the IFCD, and conducted Skype and telephone interviews with staff members and also non-staff members familiar with the activities of the Fund. Job and role descriptions in the various units involved in the management of the IFCD were also examined.

9. The analysis highlighted the following observations:
- The **current staffing level is clearly insufficient** to ensure the effective management of the Fund's resources and adequate monitoring and evaluation of approved funding applications¹.
 - Successful action to **mobilize resources for the IFCD requires the deployment of specialized professional staff** and should be accompanied by continuous monitoring and evaluation.
 - The IFCD does not currently have a **regular, ongoing and systematic monitoring and evaluation mechanism**.
 - A high-quality monitoring and evaluation system must cover all the activities to implement the IFCD, namely: resource mobilization, the selection and evaluation process for funding applications, the monitoring of the implementation of approved requests and their results, and the evaluation of their impact. The deployment of at least one full-time P-3 or P-2 post is required to devise and coordinate this mechanism.
 - The lack of staff continuity is a persistent problem, particularly with regard to professional posts within the Secretariat.
10. In order to strengthen the Secretariat with minimal changes and at a low cost, the analysis recommends that the team responsible for the IFCD be composed of the following staff members:
- **1 P-4** Head of the unit responsible for the management of the IFCD;
 - **1 P-3 and 1 P-2** responsible for resource mobilization and the monitoring and evaluation mechanism;
 - **1 P-3, 1 P-2 and 1 G-4/G-5** responsible for the call for funding applications, coordination of the selection and evaluation processes, the administrative management of funded projects and the monitoring of voluntary contributions to the IFCD.

Recommendation 12: make resources available so that the Secretariat can take bold steps for the IFCD to become a “learning-driven” fund

11. In order to implement this recommendation, practices prevailing in other organizations that fund culture or social change and have a strong learning culture were reviewed. This review was carried out by Evalua, the company deemed most suitable to carry out this mission following a call for proposals by the Secretariat.
12. Evalua reviewed the practices of the following intergovernmental and private agencies:
- The thematic window on “Culture and Development” of the Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund (MDG-F) implemented by UNESCO;
 - The ACP Cultures+ programme of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP);
 - The programmes of the Cultural Diversity and Development Department of the International Organisation of La Francophonie (OIF);
 - The Prince Claus Fund (PCF) Network Partnership Grant programme.
13. The review methodology included a desk study and remote or face-to-face interviews with contact persons within these organizations (persons responsible for cultural programmes and monitoring and evaluation systems). A set of best practices, identified as a source of reflection to strengthen the action of the IFCD, are presented below.

1. While some posts were vacant at the time of the analysis – including that of the head of the unit responsible for the management of the Fund – the total number of staff (staff and non-staff members) remains the same.

14. First, the review showed that the organizations selected for the comparative analysis adopted a **results-based management approach** in order to facilitate the evaluation of their interventions.
15. The review also highlighted that the “**theory of change**” on which these programmes are based must be constantly challenged. The exercise showed that, by relying on assumptions, experience may show that the expected dynamics between activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts were not as expected. Accordingly, the theory of change should be viewed as a living working document that may be amended, in the same way as the criteria and conditions for selecting projects to be supported.
16. Second, the comparative analysis of the selected organizations showed that **an approach based on monitoring and evaluation and the use of results requires mobilizing human resources** (especially if the activities are carried out internally) and **financial resources** (especially if the services are outsourced). The analysis also revealed that, without adequate resources, the funding agency cannot have the information necessary for decision-making. For example, the ACP Cultures+ programme has a technical assistance team of five experts, while the PCF has a team of six staff members devoted to research and monitoring and evaluation of all its activities. The MDG-F had a three-person team devoted to knowledge management and 3 to 5% of the budget for the thematic window on “Culture and Development” had been allocated to evaluation.
17. The analysis also showed that in cases in which the funding agency did not have sufficient resources, **evaluation and use of results could be shared with the organizations responsible for implementing the funded projects**. Thus, in order to have additional information on project achievements and not depend solely on the beneficiaries' declarations, the funding agency may **ask the organizations responsible for implementing the funded projects to devote a percentage of the budget allocation to project evaluation**. This is enshrined in the ACP Secretariat's procedures, according to which beneficiaries are required to undergo a final evaluation in order to receive the last funding instalment. The same applies to OIF which, at the end of the first year of project implementation, carries out an interim evaluation. This evaluation is carried out by an independent service provider who spends two to three days on average on each project, collecting data in the field. The same service provider also carries out a final evaluation of the project at the end of the contractual period, in order to compare the results achieved with the objectives pursued.
18. The experience of the funding agencies shows that **these evaluations have highlighted the results achieved and also helped to make relevant recommendations for the operators** (highlighting risk factors that had been omitted or underestimated in the selection process, insights into programme adjustment or closure, development of new programmes, etc.).
19. In addition, the comparative analysis revealed that an effective way of learning from funded projects is through the networking of beneficiaries. Networking beneficiaries (past and present) can help not only to build their capacity but also to draw lessons that contribute to the evaluation of the projects and the programme as a whole. For example, beneficiaries of the PCF are invited to join a network for a total of six years, including three years after the grant has expired, which promotes the exchange of know-how and best practices well beyond the end of the activity funding period. The ACP Secretariat also attaches great importance to capacity-building opportunities for its beneficiaries and cultural operators by organizing meetings to share experiences. Furthermore, the ACP Cultures+ programme website also served as a platform for information exchange. These networks may be led by former beneficiaries and/or programme specialists from the funding agency.
20. Lastly, the analysis highlighted that the **added value of the use of results lies in the ability of stakeholders to learn from the funded interventions**. This activity therefore requires a significant provision of written contributions and widespread dissemination of knowledge (websites, social networks, organization of workshops, etc.).

21. With regard to project impact evaluation, the analysis revealed that this approach can be developed by establishing **partnerships with the academic world**, in particular through the UNESCO Chairs. For instance, the MDG-F has worked in partnership with the UNESCO Chair in Cultural Policies and Cooperation at the University of Girona (Spain) and the Silvia Santagata Research Centre in Torino (Italy). The PCF has also recently initiated cooperation with university researchers and other agencies to assess the overall impact of its investment in culture.
22. Regarding the duration of projects, the project evaluation initiatives implemented by the organizations reviewed in the comparative analysis showed that **a period of less than two years does not allow projects to achieve results and impacts**, thus making it difficult or even risky for the funder to make any decision concerning their future (closure, adjustment, replication).
Recommendation 13: conduct random, independent IFCD project evaluations in order to build a knowledge base on the projects and extract lessons from the different experiences.
23. In order to implement this recommendation, seven projects funded by the IFCD in Uruguay and Zimbabwe between 2011 and 2017 were evaluated. The projects evaluated are listed in Annex II of this document.
24. The evaluation, also carried out by the company Evalua, was based on a desk study, the identification of the theory of change for each project, and interviews and meetings with beneficiaries (project holders/recipients) and with the various IFCD stakeholders (culture specialists in field offices, representatives of National Commissions, etc.).
25. The evaluation found that **IFCD investments helped to structure the cultural and creative sectors in Zimbabwe**, particularly at the local level, insofar as the projects generated data and statistics, the development and adoption of policies and strategies, and the establishment of networks. It was also noted that **projects in Uruguay helped to create new sources of income, alleviate social tension** and, in some cases, promote the educational and professional reintegration of vulnerable populations. The main results and impacts of these projects were presented in the brochure produced on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the IFCD ([document DCE/20/13.IGC/INF.7](#)).
26. According to the evaluation, the main impact of the projects is measured in terms of **strengthening of the organizations implementing the projects**. This stems from the fact that **the projects were consistent with the strategic directions of the organizations that had developed them**, and also from the difficulty of promoting change among other project stakeholders, which led the organizations to refocus their efforts on building their own capacity. As a result, the projects have helped beneficiary organizations to **establish new partnerships, obtain financial contributions from other donors, join professional networks** and thus pursue their activities beyond IFCD funding.
27. However, the evaluation found that the target audiences benefited from the projects to a lesser extent, as the magnitude of their impact was closely linked to the prior relationship and geographical proximity between the organization responsible for the project and the target audiences, and to the targeting of a limited audience. In some cases, the impact of the projects proved to be weak, as **the changes they had initiated were insufficient to achieve sustainable change**.
28. Lastly, the evaluation found that **the ability of projects to change public policies was limited** where projects were not integrated into an “ecosystem” of interventions (public and private) with similar objectives or where there was no relationship between the organization responsible for project implementation and the policy makers. Accordingly, projects that sought to have an impact at the local level proved to be more successful than those that sought to have an impact at the national level.

29. The evaluation identified the following factors as those with the greatest impact on the achievement of objectives:
- **Shortcomings already visible in the project design.** The objectives set for some of the seven projects evaluated were too ambitious and stakeholders knew from the outset that they were unattainable. Furthermore, some projects had completely separate components, resulting in piecemeal efforts and reduced resources available for each component. The most successful projects were those that had included in their funding applications: (i) full identification of the stakeholder system in the cultural sector concerned, (ii) a detailed analysis of the challenges faced, (iii) an action strategy to address these challenges, and (iv) adequately identified risks.
 - **Shortcomings in the evaluation of funding applications** by the Panel of Experts, which sometimes underestimated the risks associated with the projects, resulting from the institutional and financial fragility of the organization responsible for project implementation or the lack of an explicit, logical connection between the proposed activities and expected results.
 - **Unforeseen challenges faced during project implementation which did not result in project adjustment.** The financial resources available for some of the seven projects evaluated were reduced as a result of project partner withdrawal or a deteriorating national economic environment. Other projects have been affected by changes in national authority priorities. The ability to adapt the projects to the local and national context has proven to be a key factor in the success of the projects.
 - **The lack of use of project results** (self-evaluation, internal evaluation, external evaluation) limits stakeholders' ability to learn from the projects and therefore has a negative impact on the achievement of the objectives set. Adequately identifying the factors that contributed to the success or failure of a project is essential for beneficiaries, in order to avoid repeating the same mistakes when preparing a new funding application. The same applies to the funding agency, to avoid supporting projects with similar issues.
 - **Project period considered too short by beneficiaries.** Before the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD were revised in 2013 ([Resolution 4.CP 9](#)), the funding period established for IFCD-funded projects was one year. As the projects evaluated had been approved before the revision, the beneficiaries stressed that they would have preferred a period of two years rather than one, in order to more effectively strengthen their results and sustainability².

III. Conclusions and next steps

30. The implementation of the 17 recommendations adopted by the Committee cannot take the form of one-off activities, but requires regular monitoring and ongoing efforts. Examples of this are capacity-building for National Commissions (Recommendation 9) and for countries with limited funding opportunities in the cultural sector and countries that have never received IFCD funding (Recommendation 11), and the conduct of random, independent project evaluations (Recommendation 13).
31. Taking into account the need for sustained monitoring over time, the provisional budget for 2020-2021 adopted by the Committee ([Decision 13.IGC 5b](#)) allocated \$88,000 for the implementation of the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the IFCD, approved by the Committee ([Decision 12.IGC 6](#)). Henceforth, the Secretariat thus proposes that the update on the implementation of the recommendations be included in the narrative report of the IFCD, which the Secretariat must submit annually to the Committee, in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the Special Account for the IFCD as revised by the Conference of Parties ([Resolution 7.CP 9](#)).

2. Paragraph 11.2 of the current Guidelines states that “the project implementation period can be between 12 and 24 months”.

32. Furthermore, the implementation of the recommendations has shown that more specific guidance is required on the ways of implementing some of the recommendations. This applies, for instance, to ways of positively discriminating in favour of funding applications that include actions to increase women's representation in the cultural and creative sectors (Recommendation 15) and ways of giving greater weight to the capacity of project partners/applicants in the selection and evaluation process (Recommendation 21). A possible revision or update of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD, which the Committee may decide (see document DCE/21/14.IGC/10), would provide an opportunity to clarify on the ways of implementing these recommendations.
33. At its fourteenth session, the Committee took note of the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations resulting from the second external evaluation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD) and of the need to pursue the implementation of the recommendations that did not require a specific action. The Committee requested the Secretariat to monitor their implementation within the limits of the financial resources made available to it in the budget of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity for the period 2020-2021 and to present a comprehensive report on the implementation and monitoring of these recommendations to the eight session of the Conference of Parties.

ANNEX I

Monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations resulting from the second external evaluation of the IFCD and adopted by the Committee

Recommendations	Implementation status
<p>Recommendation 5</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 2019, the National Commissions' pre-selection form was simplified. - Since 2019, the National Points of Contact of the Convention have been called upon when a National Commission does not participate in the pre-selection by the deadline set (Decision 12.IGC.6, paragraph 6).
<p>Recommendation 6</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since 2019, the Panel coordinator has awarded an extra point to projects submitted by countries which have never before received funding (Decision 12.IGC 6, paragraph 7).
<p>Recommendation 7</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since 2019, a specific question about the IFCD has been included in the form for the Quadrennial Periodic Reports (Resolution 7.CP 12).
<p>Recommendation 8</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An analysis of the human resources in the Secretariat was conducted.

Recommendations	Implementation status
<p>Recommendation 9</p> <p>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>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since 2018, information meetings have been organized on the occasion of all the statutory meetings of the governing bodies in order to strengthen the capacities of the National Commissions and facilitate the communication process. - In 2020, the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Field Offices in Doha, San José, Lima and Nairobi, provided training on the IFCD to the National Commissions of Comoros, Djibouti, Honduras, Jordan, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Peru, Qatar, Seychelles and the United Republic of Tanzania. - It should be noted that this recommendation requires continuous monitoring.
<p>Recommendation 10</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Field Offices (to the extent that their resources allow) participated in project implementation and the issuing of calls for funding applications. - It should be noted that this recommendation requires continuous monitoring.
<p>Recommendation 11</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information sessions are organized systematically in collaboration with the field offices when calls for funding applications are issued. - In 2020, the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Field Offices in Doha, San José, Lima and Nairobi, provided training on the IFCD to the National Commissions of Comoros, Djibouti, Honduras, Jordan, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Peru, Qatar, Seychelles and the United Republic of Tanzania. - Since 2018, an IFCD module has been included in the training programmes provided by the Secretariat on the participatory monitoring of cultural policies. - As a result of the capacity-building and awareness-raising efforts of the Secretariat, in recent years, several countries (e.g. Ethiopia, Georgia, Rwanda and Viet Nam) have benefited from the IFCD for the first time.

Recommendations	Implementation status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It should be noted that this recommendation requires continuous monitoring.
<p>Recommendation 12</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A review of the practices of other organizations with a strong learning culture in respect of culture funding was conducted and its findings have shaped the analysis of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD presented in document DCE/21/14.IGC/10. - The Committee allocated \$35,000 of the IFCD budget to project monitoring and evaluation for the period 2020-2021. This sum will be used to integrate monitoring and evaluation more effectively into the management of the IFCD. - The revision of the IFCD monitoring and evaluation framework, which takes into account the findings of the independent project evaluations and the review of the practices of other organizations funding culture. It will need to be refined in the light of the Committee's decisions concerning a possible revision or update of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD.
<p>Recommendation 13</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An assessment of the impacts of seven projects in two countries (Uruguay and Zimbabwe) has been carried out. The conclusions resulting from this evaluation have provided input to the analysis of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD presented in document DCE/21/14.IGC/10. - It should be noted that this recommendation requires continuous monitoring.
<p>Recommendation 14</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Secretariat organized “Create 2030” talks with IFCD beneficiaries in the context of the intergovernmental meetings and as part of the Pan-African Film and Television Festival of Ouagadougou (FESPACO). These talks provided an opportunity not only to show the results and impact in the field of the funded projects, but also to facilitate the exchange of information and experience among IFCD beneficiaries.

Recommendations	Implementation status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ResiliArt movement was promoted among IFCD beneficiaries that were involved in the debates on the needs of the cultural and creative sectors in the face of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) crisis and the search for common solutions. - The Secretariat has started to involve IFCD beneficiaries in IFCD capacity-building sessions. - It should be noted that this recommendation requires continuous monitoring.
<p>Recommendation 15</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The IFCD Panel of Experts, at its biennial meeting, held virtually in 2020, stressed the importance of focusing on projects that achieve such results. - Further details on measures to implement this recommendation could be detailed in a possible revision or update of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD (see document DCE/21/14.IGC/10).
<p>Recommendation 16</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An evaluation of the fundraising strategy for 2013-2018 and a new fundraising strategy for 2021-2023 are set out in documents DCE/21/14.IGC/11 and DCE/21/14.IGC/INF.11.
<p>Recommendation 17</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under the new fundraising strategy proposed in documents DCE/21/14.IGC/11 and DCE/21/14.IGC/INF.11, the Director-General could send customized letters to the Parties to the Convention, requesting that they pay the equivalent of 1% of their respective overall contributions to the regular budget of UNESCO. Customization of the letters is recommended in order to adapt their content according to whether or not the Parties are regular contributors to the IFCD.
<p>Recommendation 18</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An evaluation of the fundraising strategy for 2013-2018 and a new fundraising strategy for 2021-2023 are set out in documents DCE/21/14.IGC/11 and DCE/21/14.IGC/INF.11.

Recommendations	Implementation status
<p>Recommendation 19</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An evaluation of the fundraising strategy for 2013-2018 and a new fundraising strategy for 2021-2023 are set out in documents DCE/21/14.IGC/11 and DCE/21/14.IGC/INF.11.
<p>Recommendation 20</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An evaluation of the fundraising strategy for 2013-2018 and a new fundraising strategy for 2021-2023 are set out in documents DCE/21/14.IGC/11 and DCE/21/14.IGC/INF.11.
<p>Recommendation 21</p> <p>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>	<p>IMPLEMENTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At its virtual meeting in 2020, the IFCD Panel of Experts highlighted that the evaluation of funding applications should place more emphasis on project partner capacity. - Further details on measures to implement this recommendation could be detailed in a possible revision or update of the Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the IFCD (see document DCE/21/14.IGC/10).

ANNEX II

List of projects evaluated by Evalua

Approval year	Funding cycle	Country	Project title	Beneficiary	Type of project holder	Amount (in \$)
2010	1	Uruguay	Comparsa: encouraging social participation through music	Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO)	Party	65,500
2011	2	Uruguay	Fostering creativity and cultural participation for poverty alleviation in Uruguay	Montevideo Municipality	Party	95,115
2014	5	Uruguay	Fostering an active participation of vulnerable groups in the creative sector in Uruguay	Ministry of Education and Culture	Party	99,600
2011	2	Zimbabwe	Measuring the economic contribution of cultural industries in Zimbabwe	Culture Fund of Zimbabwe Trust	NGO	99,023
2012	3	Zimbabwe	Management and business training for cultural professionals and arts associations in Zimbabwe	Nhimbe Trust	NGO	97,365
2013	4	Zimbabwe	Developing a National Strategy on Copyright	ZIMCOPY - Reproduction Rights Organization of Zimbabwe	NGO	92,928
2015	6	Zimbabwe	Strengthening local cultural policy in Zimbabwe	Amagugu International Heritage Centre	NGO	99,465