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Executive Summary

The main objective of this evaluation is to assess the Centre’s performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the agreement between UNESCO and the People’s Republic of China (The Agreement), and its contribution to UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives. The findings of the evaluation will inform the recommendations for the Sector Review Committee’s recommendations to the Director-General on whether to renew the Agreement. This evaluation has been commissioned and managed by the UNESCO Culture Sector in Paris.

The evaluation sought to assess alignment, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Centre since its inception through the triangulation of diverse sources of data used to validate findings and to avoid error and/or bias. The main sources of data used were secondary data through a desk study, as well as primary data collection in the form of semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and direct observation. A series of evaluation questions were developed and findings were plotted into an evaluation matrix as a tool to investigate each of the areas of interest in a consistent and systematic manner.

Overall the evaluation concludes that CRIHAP has been able to expand UNESCO’s reach in the area of capacity building fully in line with UNESCO’s capacity building strategy, fulfilling the key objective of CRIHAP as Category 2 Training Center. Strong commitment of both CRIHAP staff and the Chinese Government, couple with clarity as the center’s objectives are seen as key factors for this success.

CRIHAP is almost perfectly aligned with UNESCO’s Strategic objective (SO) #7: Protecting, promoting and transmitting heritage, in particular Intangible cultural heritage. However, the center is also able to address various other strategic objectives including SO 1: Supporting Member States to develop education systems to foster high-quality and inclusive lifelong learning for all by strengthening country’s capabilities to educate on ICH safeguarding (for example, through the TOT training of university professors); SO 6: Supporting inclusive social development, fostering intercultural dialogue for the rapprochement of cultures and promoting ethical principles through the organization of regional events on ICH and; SO 9: Promoting freedom of expression, media development and access to information and knowledge was addressed through the workshop for the media.

Since its inception CRIHAP has undertaken twenty different training activities in seven different countries reaching an estimated 650 participants (person/times) from twenty-seven different nationalities, covering diverse areas of focus such as inventorying, ratification and implementation of the 2003 Convention or community based inventorying. In addition, it has organized several regional meetings, created a website and reached out to stakeholders with their regular newsletter as means to increase awareness and understanding of UNESCO’s mandate.
CRIHAPs **relevance** stems from the region’s needs for greater understanding of the 2003 Convention and the importance of safeguarding ICH and UNESCO’s limited resources to do this. As such, CRIHAP is responding to a demand from the beneficiary countries and UNESCO. CRIHAP’s practice of requesting surveys from key stakeholders to understand their needs constitutes a creative way to promote inclusiveness as well as the ability to be demand driven. Some activities undertaken cannot be considered strictly within its mandate, however, they remain relevant to the mandate, provide opportunities for CRIHAP to raise its profile and reach while responding to priorities of the donor Government. The evaluation recommends that a percentage of resources that can be used for this type of activity be agreed between UNESCO and CRIHAP.

CRIHAP has undergone an important learning curve in its ability to deliver and communicate effectively with UNESCO. Overall, alignment, efficiency and relevance with UNESCO priorities and country needs has been confirmed, however CRIHAP would benefit from greater focus on countries afflicted by conflict and natural disasters, fragile states would strengthen CRIHAP’s alignment with UNESCO’s Overarching objective of peace building, while ensuring emphasis on gender would help align it with UNESCO’s global priority of gender equality.

There is also a need to continue to expand the regional nature of the center, ensuring greater participation of all the sub regions, including ideally within the governance structures, the Governing Board and the Advisory Committee, as a means to ensure the challenges, needs and potential of the different sub regions are fully incorporated into CRIHAP’s strategy.

In terms of **efficiency**, trainings are designed in line with UNESCO protocols, with a clear set of objectives and expected results. There has also been progress from a short-term approach to a more long-term approach, in line with the initial objectives set out in the mid-term plan and with UNESCO’s strategy, with various countries benefitting from repeat training. At the time of this evaluation an evaluation of CRIHAP’s work in Cambodia had begun to measure the center’s impact, and a pilot to measure use and impact of training was also planned for Nepal. These constitute good practices and should continue. However, overall data management needs to be improved, with CRIHAP defining and monitoring their beneficiary type, and increasing post-facto collection of feedback, in line with their pilot in Nepal.

The **Governing Board and the Advisory Committee** have been set up and function regularly. Overall they function well and provide an important accountability mechanism for CRIHAP, as well as a source for technical advice, however, there was a sense that meetings could be used for more substantive discussion. The evaluation observed clear benefits from geographical representation, and as such would recommend that this is further expanded for the Advisory Committee, ideally securing representation from all sub regions. In addition, timing of the Advisory Committee meeting needs to be carefully thought out to ensure recommendations are incorporated into the plans before they are sent out to the Governing Board.

The center is run by a **Secretariat** which consists of a Director and Deputy-Director charged with overseeing the center. Feedback obtained on CRIHAPs management was very positive, with
many highlighting the management’s increased leadership over time. There were however concerns regarding the high turnover of the Director post which can have negative effects on the stability, leadership and efficiency of the center. A new Director was appointed in February 2017. A letter from the Chairperson of the CRIHAP Governing Board to the Director General of UNESCO was sent on March 30th, 2017 informing of this appointment and requesting validation from UNESCO.

Since the inception of the Center, the Government of China has invested a total of 26,561,404 Yuan (RMB) in the running of the center. This excludes costs associated with the rental of the 50 m² office which are paid directly by the Chinese National Academy of Arts. Overall the budget is perceived as adequate to the needs of the center. It has grown together with need, and every indication was given that there was further room for expansion. The stability and predictability of the budget helps strengthen the center’s structure and planning. With a stable and reliable budget, the center has not made a specific effort to secure extra budgetary resources.

Since its inception, the center has grown from six staff initially to eighteen staff currently. There evaluation concludes that the staff is committed, capable and dedicated, but could benefit from increased exposure to how UNESCO operates and generally on how to manage a regional center, this could be achieved through internships at UNESCO HQ or field offices as well as through UNESCO staff come to CRIHAP for short stints. While this would be a significant investment for UNESCO, the evaluation sees great potential for UNESCO’s partnership with CRIHAP, as such, these investments would help to in the promotion of UNESCO’s capacity building strategy in the region.

On a more structural basis, the organizational structure seems to have shifted away from a more outreach/liaison oriented role towards research. This move may have had a negative impact on the center’s ability to reach out to Member States and secure their formal membership. Research is seen as a means to enhance effectiveness and pertinence of the training while helping to raise visibility of CRIHAP. There has been limited progress in regard to obtaining official membership of CRIHAP, with only 7 of the 48 member countries having submitted the notification. Current procedures seem lengthy and require involvement of various departments that do not necessarily normally interact. More importantly, it seems unclear what the benefits of becoming a member are. The evaluation suggests a discussion between UNESCO and CRIHAP to discuss the merits of this notification procedure and decide going forward if membership will be required or not. If required, benefits and implications of membership should be made clear. It should also become necessary to benefit from the center’s services, and might require a structural move back towards outreach in the center’s structure. However, from these discussions the parties may conclude that membership to UNESCO is sufficient, especially considering the center’s role in reaching out to countries that have not yet ratified the Convention who are unlikely to formally enter into an agreement for a Convention they are not yet a party to.
Communication and coordination between with UNESCO and the center has strengthened over time with good flow of communication and cooperation at present. This cooperation builds on CRIHAP’s acknowledgement that UNESCO field offices have better knowledge of the countries, and as such an important partner when implementing training. CRIHAP has a very close relationship with national institutions, including the Chinese Natcom, and in particular with the Chinese National Academy of Arts where it is hosted, and who provides the salaries for CRIHAP staff.

There has been progress in the cooperation between CRIHAP and the other two Category 2 Centers in the region covering ICH, in particular with ICHCAP with new joint activities. However, limitations due to their different mandates and administrations should be acknowledged. UNESCO is uniquely positioned to promote and coordinate the development of work plans identifying synergies, ensuring alignment while avoiding overlap of the three centers.

The overall impression of the center is very positive, as such, the recommendations put forward in this report are not so much requirements for CRIHAP’s renewal, but rather in line with the formative nature of the evaluation, as means to strengthen the center. Key recommendations include:

**Specific recommendations to the Centre for improving the effectiveness of its operations;**

- Strengthen geographic representation of the Advisory Committee and ensure timing of meetings allows for recommendations to feed into the work plans and strategic documents sent to the Governing Board.

- Invest in capacity building of staff

- Develop clear and adequate functioning procedures such as contractual modalities and systematic reporting for facilitators

- Strengthen monitoring and data management

- Strengthen focus on gender, disaster risk management and natural disasters in training to better align itself with UNESCO’s C4 strategy.

- Make better use of the press and new media.

- Consider establish trainers’ networks

- Consider strengthening the liaison/outreach role of the center.

**Specific recommendations to UNESCO for improving the effectiveness of its coordination and interaction with the Centre;**

- Strengthen role in the oversight and coordination of the three C2 centers in the Asia-Pacific region ensuring synergies are maximized and overlap is avoided.
- Consider investing into strengthening the capacity of CRIHAP staff providing greater exposure to UNESCO’s operating mechanisms.

- Ensure relevant information for the ICH centers is updated regularly and accessible online.

- Work with CRIHAP to adapt training materials to the relevant context, including through the inclusion of context specific examples, and the simplification of the material depending on the beneficiaries’ background and knowledge of ICH.

The evaluation concludes the center is fulfilling its objectives and obligations as intended in the Agreement in an effective and efficient manner, with existing limitations mainly due to necessary learning rather than contradictions or differences with UNESCO. Further, the evaluation points towards great potential for growth coupled with commitment, meaning that CRIHAP has the potential to become a very significant partner for UNESCO in the region. As such, the evaluation recommends the renewal of the Agreement.
Introduction

Background

Category 2 centers (C2Cs) are created under the auspices of UNESCO as a partnership model between UNESCO and a member country to further UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and programme priorities (as per the Main Lines of Action (MLA) level of the UNESCO programme and budget (C/5)). As such, Category 2 centers have the potential to play a significant role in achieving UNESCO’s objectives. These partnerships can be particularly meaningful when expertise or funding may be lacking.

Category 2 Centers are funded directly by Member States where they are located, but their scope goes beyond the boundaries of their country. While these Centers are not legally part of UNESCO, they are associated through formal Agreements.

Each center has a specialized field of activity and set of functions set out to achieve those objectives. There are currently seven centers devoted exclusively to intangible cultural heritage, and an eighth, whose mandate also includes the World Heritage\(^1\). All share a series of key objectives:

- to promote the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and contribute to its implementation;
- to reinforce capacities in the Region for actively implementing the 2003 Convention on the regional and international level;
- to increase the participation of communities, groups and individuals in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Region; and
- to foster regional and international cooperation for safeguarding ICH.

UNESCO developed a revised Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 institutes and centers under the Auspices of UNESCO\(^2\) to help guide and strengthen their effectiveness, as well as their networks. This policy provides guidelines for the establishment, assessment and renewal procedures of category 2 institutes and centers as an important mechanism to ensure alignment of the center with UNESCO’s objectives.

There are three Category 2 Centers for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region. Each of the Centers is differentiated by area of responsibility as follows:

- The Centre which is the subject of this review is based in the People's Republic of China, known as the 'International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific


\(^2\) 37 C/Resolution 93 (November 2013)
Region (CRIHAP), is responsible for the development and delivery of training on the safeguarding of ICH in the Asia-Pacific Region.

- The International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI) based in Japan is responsible for the instigation and development of research into practices and methodologies of safeguarding endangered ICH in the region.
- The 'International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHAP) is based in the Republic of Korea and is responsible for Information and Networking in the framework of the 2003 UNESCO Convention.

The 35th session of the General Conference, in its 35 C/Resolution 50, approved the establishment in the People's Republic of China of the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP) (hereafter, 'the Centre'). The objectives of the Centre, as set out in Article 7 of the Agreement, are:

a) promote the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and contribute to its implementation in the Asia-Pacific Region;
b) increase the participation of communities, groups and individuals in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region,
c) enhance the capacity of the Asia-Pacific Member States of UNESCO in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage (ICH), particularly by strengthening the capacities of concerned personnel,
d) foster regional and international cooperation for safeguarding ICH.

These objectives are directly in line with the Medium-term strategy 2014-2021 (37 C/4), and in particular with Strategic Objective 7: protecting, promoting and transmitting heritage (see figure 1).

In order to achieve the above objectives, the specific functions of the Centre, as defined in the agreement3, are to:

1. The center shall specialize in training and its objectives shall be to:
   a. Promote UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and contribute to its implementation in the Asia-Pacific Region;
   b. Increase the participation of the communities, groups and individuals in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Region
   c. Enhance the capacity of Member States of UNESCO in safeguarding ICH, particularly in strengthening the capacities of concerned personnel
   d. Foster regional cooperation for safeguarding ICH

---

3 Article 7- Objectives and functions
2. In order to achieve the above objectives, specific functions of the center are to:
   a. Organize long-term and short-term training courses including classroom training and field-based training on the following:
      i. The 2003 Convention and its Operational Directives
      ii. Different examples of policies including legal, administrative, technical and financial measures fostering the safeguarding of ICH
      iii. Introduction to UNESCO publications on identification and documentation of ICH and their application in field work
      iv. Teaching ICH in formal and informal education, including courses of theory and practice training
   b. Mobilize international and Chinese experts as well as scientific NGOs specialized in the different domains of ICH to work as instructors and advisors of the above-mentioned training activities
   c. Enhance international and regional cooperation with the institutions active in the domain of ICH, notably those established under auspices of UNESCO (category 2)
3. The center’s activities and programme shall be carried out in conformity with the 2003 Convention and its purposes, objectives and definitions.

**Purpose**

The guidelines developed by UNESCO to guide the work of the Category 2 Centers stipulate the establishment of a category 2 center for a set amount of time up to six years, which may be renewed by the Director-General, with the approval of the Executive Board, based on the results of an independent evaluation of the activities of the center and an assessment of its contribution to the strategic programme objectives of the Organization and UNESCO’s Comprehensive Strategy for category 2 centers. This is in line with the sunset clause according to which programmes will be terminated unless the General Conference explicitly decides to extend them, highlighting the need for UNESCO to demonstrate that a programme is contributing to its objectives.

This evaluation has been commissioned and managed by the UNESCO Culture Sector in Paris. The main objectives of this evaluation, as expressed in the Terms of Reference (TORs) is to assess the Centre’s performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the agreement between UNESCO and the People’s Republic of China (The Agreement), and its contribution to UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives.

The findings of the evaluation will inform the recommendations for the Sector Review Committee’s recommendations to the Director-General on whether to renew the Agreement. The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Centre, and presented to the Executive Board, as specified in the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy. They will also be made available on the website of the Culture Sector.

**Scope**

The evaluation scope narrows the focus of the evaluation by setting the boundaries for what the evaluation will and will not cover in meeting the evaluation, aligning the evaluation goals with the available time and resources.

The Agreement between the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (The Agreement) establishing the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP) was signed between UNESCO and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on May of 2010 and has a fixed six-year validity from its entry into force on January 2, 2012. A subsequent amendment was drafted on November of 2011. This agreement sets out the terms and conditions governing said Centre. The evaluation sought to assess alignment, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Centre since its inception, as described in the Agreement. Specifically, the evaluation looked at:
1. **Alignment**, Whether the activities effectively pursued by the Centre are in conformity with its functions and as specified in the aide-memoire and agreement signed between UNESCO and the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

2. **Relevance**, the relevance of the Centre’s programmes and activities to achieving UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes, as defined in the Organization’s Medium-Term Strategy (C/4), and to attaining programme results at the Main Lines of Action (MLA) level, as defined in the Organization’s Approved Programme and Budget (C/5); and

3. **Effectiveness**, both performance (achievements) and management (efficiency) since its inception.

4. **Efficiency**, including looking at the quality of organizational arrangements, (management, governance and accountability mechanisms); quality of coordination and interaction with UNESCO, both at Headquarters and in the field, as well as with other thematically-related category 2 institutes or centers; with regard to planning and implementation of programmes; quality of relations with CRIHAP Member States, including its focal points, government agencies and UNESCO National Commissions, and with public or private partners and donors; adequacy of resource base (human and financial) as well as context opportunities and risks, to ensure sustainable of the center.

**Methodology**

The key methodology proposed builds on triangulation of diverse sources of data to secure validation of findings as well as to avoid error and/or bias.

Sources of data used during the evaluation are in line with those set out in the TORs and include:

- **Desk study** of relevant documents provided by both the Centre and UNESCO. This document review includes progress reports, Board Meeting minutes as well as financial reports, brochures, as well as UNESCO’s strategic and policy related documentation (see bibliography for full list of documents).

- Semi structured remote and in person interviews were held with key stakeholders including UNESCO staff in Paris and other relevant regional offices in Asia; CRIHAP management and staff; beneficiaries of training; facilitators; national counterparts, representatives of the People’s Republic of China Government; members of the governing board, of the advisory committee and Directors of the other 2 Category 2 centers in the region.
• When relevant and feasible focus group discussions were held to provide wider participation.

• Observation of the fourth meeting of the Advisory Committee of CRIHAP was held in Beijing on Feb 22, 2017, and the sixth session of the governing board.

Evaluation questions were developed based on the four evaluation criteria put forward in the TORs (mainly alignment, relevance, efficiency and effectiveness). Building on these evaluation questions, Interview guidelines were developed for the various types of stakeholders, and lastly, an evaluation matrix was created to ensure systematic and consistent collection and analysis of the data.

**Evaluation questions**

To meet the purpose of the evaluation described above, the evaluation specialist has broken down the parameters put forward in the TORs in order to develop evaluation questions that are able to guide the process. The evaluation questions are:

1. **Alignment:** Whether the activities effectively pursued by the Centre are in conformity with its functions and as specified in the aide-memoire and agreement signed between UNESCO and the Government of the People's Republic of China

2. **Relevance:** The relevance of the Centre’s programmes and activities to achieving UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes, as defined in the Organization’s Medium-Term Strategy (C/4), and to attaining programme results at the Main Lines of Action (MLA) level, as defined in the Organization’s Approved Programme and Budget (C/5);

3. **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness (performance) of the Centre’s programmes and activities to achieving its stated objectives, as defined in the Agreement;

4. **Efficiency- Management:**
   
   a. The nature and quality of organizational arrangements, including management, governance and accountability mechanisms;
   
   b. The quality of coordination and interaction with UNESCO, both at Headquarters and in the field, as well as with other thematically-related category 2 institutes or centers;
   
   c. The quality of relations with CRIHAP Member States, including its focal points, government agencies and UNESCO National Commissions, and with public or private partners and donors;
d. **Finance** - The human and financial resource base and the quality of mechanisms and resources, as well as context-specific opportunities and risks for ensuring sustainable institutional capacity and viability;

e. The process of mobilizing extra budgetary resources and to what extent such extra budgetary funding is aligned to the strategic programme objectives of UNESCO.

These questions informed the four types of recommendations to be provided by the recommendation, mainly:

- A general recommendation as to whether renewal of the Centre’s status as a category 2 institute is warranted and would conform to the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy;
- Specific recommendations for possible amendments to the Agreement, in the event it is renewed.
- Specific recommendations to the Centre for improving the effectiveness of its operations;
- Specific recommendations to UNESCO for improving the effectiveness of its coordination and interaction with the Centre;

**Evaluation Deliverables and timeline**

The proposed work plan for the evaluation is as follows:

- Desk study and preparation of mission, including some remote interviews: 16 January- 6 February
- In Country mission: 13-24 February
- Analysis, triangulation of data. Final remote interviews and report draft: 6-17 March
- UNESCO revision of draft and feedback comments: 20-31 March
- Incorporation of comments and final report draft: 17-28 April

**Key Dates and Deliverables include:**

- An in-country mission is scheduled to take place 13 to 24 of February 24 to coincide. with the Governing Board Meeting (Feb. 22) and Advisory Committee Meeting (Feb. 23).
- Draft report March 17
- UNESCO feedback to the draft report March 31st
- Final Report April 30

**Limitations**

There were no significant limitations encountered.
Findings

1. Alignment

CRIHAP is almost perfectly aligned with Strategic objective (SO) #7: Protecting, promoting and transmitting heritage, in particular Intangible cultural heritage. However, the center is also able to address various other strategic objectives such as:

- Strategic objective 1: Supporting Member States to develop education systems to foster high-quality and inclusive lifelong learning for all by strengthening country’s capabilities to educate on ICH safeguarding (for example, through the TOT training of university professors)
- Strategic objective 6: Supporting inclusive social development, fostering intercultural dialogue for the rapprochement of cultures and promoting ethical principles through the organization of regional events on ICH
- Strategic objective 9: Promoting freedom of expression, media development and access to information and knowledge was addressed through the workshop for the media.

Greater focus on conflict countries and fragile states would help CRIHAP better align itself to UNESCO’s Overarching objective of peace building, for example looking at how to preserve ICH in Syria, or after earthquakes (Nepal). A greater emphasis on gender would help to align the center with UNESCO’s global priority to achieve gender equality.

Table 1: Summary of activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIHAP Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organize long-term and short-term training courses including classroom training</td>
<td>18 training activities were organized in 7 different countries reaching participants of 27 different countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and field-based training on the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilize international and Chinese experts as well as scientific NGOs specialized in the different domains of ICH to work as instructors and advisors of the above-mentioned training activities</td>
<td>All trainings were organized with UNESCO facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance international and regional cooperation with the institutions active in the domain of ICH, notably those established under auspices of UNESCO (category 2)</td>
<td>5 international and regional cooperative programmes were organized, in addition to various activities with the other two ICH C2C centers, including meetings, cooperation on the Report of Information on the current Status of ICH Safeguarding Efforts in the Asia-Pacific region, a joint workshop in 2015 for awareness raising of the media training in Mongolia on ICH, a joint seminar in Korea and mutual participation of governing boards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Careful revision of documentary data provided confirms that since its inception the center has undertaken 18 capacity building training and two training of trainers (TOT) workshops, with another scheduled for June 2017 in Kyrgyzstan to train Russian speaking facilitators (see Annex 8 for full list of activities). It has also organized a series of international and regional cooperative programmes, including the Chengdu International Conference on ICH in Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of the Convention, which was highlighted by many of the participants as a particularly relevant and successful event, as well as participated of various international meetings (see annex 8 for full list). Overall, CRIHAP has reached an estimated 650 person/times beneficiaries from 27 different countries from the Asia-Pacific region. In addition, CRIHAP has created and regularly updates a bilingual website (Chinese/English), although no data was provided as to its reach (hits). CRIHAP also publishes a regular newsletter (Chinese and English). At the time of the evaluation 11 issues in Chinese and 8 in English had been made available to stakeholders.

Interviews with key stakeholders confirm that CRIHAP carefully follows UNESCO’s protocols and methodology of training. Plans are discussed closely with UNESCO guaranteeing alignment. Workshops are often developed in coordination with UNESCO field offices, who the center looks to for guidance in identifying participants as well as the most appropriate facilitators. There is significant consensus that CRIHAP is a ‘good practice’ model of how a C2C is intended to function in support and promotion of UNESCO’s goals. Strong commitment of both CRIHAP staff and the Chinese Government, couple with clarity as the center’s objectives, are seen as key factors for this success.

However, a closer examination highlights that out of the 18 trainings, eight took place in China, as did both TOTs undertaken and all international and regional cooperative programmes organized. This was at least partially because due to national legislation initially CRIHAP had limitations transferring funds outside China. This does not align well with the international nature of the center. However, this hurdle has now been resolved, and as a result more activities are beginning to take place outside China, however, limitations for staff to travel outside the country continues to be a hurdle, with one activity being funded by CRIHAP without physical attendance of CRIHAP staff (Workshop for Inventorying, funded by CRIHAP and implemented by UNESCO Beijing Office in Pyongyang, DPRK.)

There is a general sense that in regards to training CRIHAP has done a good job of adhering to UNESCO protocol and methodology, there is also a general sense that the center is used for promotion of Chinese culture and practices. While this falls outside the mandate of the center, there is also widespread acknowledgement that it is unrealistic for UNESCO to expect a donor not to seek some benefit from cooperation. As such, perhaps the most effective approach is to acknowledge this and consider some degree of agreement on the parameters for this type of work that falls outside of the core mandate, for example, percentage of
time/resources that the center can use for activities outside the core mandate, and ensuring that there are no conflict of interest or potential negative impact to the center’s brand.

There was consistent agreement between all those interviewed that the center has been promoting UNESCO’s, and to have shown clear commitment to its goals and objectives.

2. Relevance
CRIHAP’s relevance stems from the region’s needs for greater understanding of the 2003 Convention and the importance of safeguarding ICH. It also responds to UNESCO’s need to increase capacity in the region with an insufficient amount of resources. As such, CRIHAP is responding to a demand from the beneficiary countries and UNESCO. Another element that helps ensure CRIHAP’s relevance is their practice of requesting surveys from key stakeholders in order to understand their gaps and needs. This constitutes a creative way to promote inclusiveness as well as the ability to be demand driven, as an example the addition of the TOT training not initially envisioned was sighted.

Beneficiaries interviewed were quick to highlight the relevance of the contents of the trainings to ensure practitioners and educators adequate understanding of the 2003 Convention, as well as of key concepts for safeguarding such as “community” or “capacity building”. Procedures for nomination and necessary tools for documentation

One of the key findings is that CRIHAP has been able to successfully train relevant stakeholders in the Asia-Pacific region that UNESCO would not have had the resources to reach. Fulfilling the key objective of C2C. Overall, the center is widely credited with being able to expand UNESCO’s reach in the area of capacity building completely in line with UNESCO’s capacity building strategy. “when they do support activities (they do it) completely according to(UNESCO's) capacity building strategy, they don’t try to impose context that are not relevant, they hire our trainers and it is our content. Not different from ours. Really efficient and doing exactly what we expect”. With CRIHAP being the sole C2C exclusively focused on training in the Asia-Pacific region, perhaps a lesson to be learned is that with a more limited mandate, the center’s objectives can be more easily defined leaving little room for interpretation as well as for misunderstanding.

3. Effectiveness
Most key stakeholder interviewed agreed that CRIHAP had undergone an important learning curve, and that its ability to deliver, as well as to communicate and negotiate with UNESCO effectively, had increased significantly since inception.

All the workshops are designed with a clear set of objectives and expected results, this allows for clarity of purpose to guide the planning stage. An important development has been that
in line with the initial objectives set out in the mid-term plan and with UNESCO, CRIHAP has begun taking a longer-term approach to training. The team aims to continue this approach in some of the countries, principally Nepal and Pakistan.

It was also observed that there is currently limited monitoring and data management taking place. For example, while CRIHAP knows the total number of participants, currently there is no record of the type of participant (gender / age breakdown. Significant categories such as ICH provider, academic, government...). This could indicate a gap in the strategy. Different types of beneficiaries will carry a different benefit and impact: academics are able to teach and influence research; practitioners are able to document and safeguard; government officials are able to influence policy... for example, one of the TOT trainings included university professors from over 57 different universities and colleges in China. The potential multiplier effect of this approach should not be underestimated. CRIHAP needs to determine what their objective is and who are the best beneficiaries to achieve this. This is likely to change from country to country, and imply a mixed bag, but it is an important element that needs to be thought out so that targets can be set and reached.

One recommendation voiced various stakeholders highlighted the need to collect more feedback after the trainings and other activities. This would allow CRIHAP to show their impact and success. It would also help to highlight gaps and weaknesses, allowing CRIHAP to address these and further grow as a C2 center. The center is currently piloting a new mechanism in Cambodia with a study that is going back to the beneficiaries to see how they have applied what they learned during the training. At the time of the evaluation an evaluation of the work undertaken in Cambodia was taking place. CRIHAP expressed their intent to continue evaluating after three trainings in one country. This is an important development that could provide important information for both CRIHAP and UNESCO. This kind of information could be made available on the website for other C2 centers to be able to learn from their experiences and shared with IRCI. Some of the beneficiaries interviewed shared that they had maintained contact with other trainees who they used as a network for to ask questions and share information. Networks of ICH beneficiaries is another area that CRIHAP could look at expanding together with ICHCAP.

Participants interviewed had different perceptions as to training’s degree of focus on gender, with some training beneficiaries dismissing the need for a gender differentiated approach and stating it was not part of the training, while others felt the training had opened their awareness to the need for a differentiated approach “it opened my mind and focused my research”. Given the trainings are developed by UNESCO, the content was not part of the scope of this evaluation, the evaluator assumes that this is at least partly due to the different facilitators, and would encourage that future training design ensure strong focus on women and children in line with the 2003 Convention. In regard to minorities, while the methodology focuses on working with communities, some of those interviewed felt there was a need to
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4 Training beneficiary
better adapt the content of the trainings to the local context, including through the simplification of terminology when dealing with communities as opposed to academics who already have significant knowledge on the matter.

4. Efficiency

4.1. Governance

The Center’s governance structure is set out in the Agreement, The Centre guided and supervised by a **Governing Board** which is renewed every four years\(^5\) and includes a representative of the Government of China, a representative of the Director-General of UNESCO; up to three representatives of member states (currently there are two from Japan and South Korea); one representative of the Chinese Academy of Arts and one representative of the Minzu University. There are also non-voting members and observers invited to participate, in the case of CRIHAP the directors from the other two C2C centers in the region have regularly been invited to participate, as have the members of the Advisory Committee on occasion. The Governing Board has met annually since 2012 (see annex 4 for details).

The Governing Board is in charge of approving the center’s long and medium term programmes, work plans, regulation and budget, for this reason, they play an important role ensuring alignment and as well as providing strategic guidance as well as accountability. Representation of both the Government of China and UNESCO guarantees that both have oversight and ability to input. Although it is understood that there is extensive communication with UNESCO in order to agree on the work plan and other matters, the degree of involvement or feedback from the Governing Board on a more substantive level remains unclear. The plans are shared and discussed in advance, with the actual Governing Board Session being a brief (half-day) mostly ceremonial undertaking. Many interviewed felt this was a missed opportunity, and that CRIHAP should take advantage of the presence of the Governing Board members to promote a more substantive discussion. Even sharing the discussions that have taken place to arrive to the current plan would open an avenue to better understand the center’s objectives and strategic goals. It is also important to ensure there is room for making amendments after the Session takes place, with Governing Board members being able to approve the final version over email.

As part of the governance there is also an **Advisory Committee** (Article 10), whose objectives according to the Agreement are determined by the Governing Board, and in the case of CRIHAP have been set out in the through an agreed set of rules and procedures. The Advisory Committee was set out in 2012 and currently counts with nine members from four different countries\(^6\). It is used on an ad-hoc basis by the center in order to obtain feedback and technical support. The Advisory Committee has met four times since its inception in 2012, they revise the documentation presented to the GB and provide feedback and recommendations. Because of

---

\(^5\) Article 8 of the Agreement

\(^6\) China, Fiji, Thailand and India
the timing of the meetings, (see annex 4) it is unclear how the advice provided by the Advisory Committee feeds into the work plans. For example, in the case of the sessions observed for the purposes of this evaluation, the Advisory Committee met the day before the Governing Board session and provided a series of recommendations, which were then summarized and read out during the session, but only after all the documents had been discussed and approved. This also had the strange consequence that newly appointed Advisory Committee members participated of the session before they were confirmed by the Governing Board.

The evaluator was informed of an amendment proposed for other C2C centers that are currently renewing their Agreements. This amendment sets out a clear time table for when information needs to reach UNESCO and the Governing Board before the meetings. This amendment seeks to ensure there is sufficient time for consultation between UNESCO and the C2Cs. The proposed amendment is: ‘The Director shall propose all the working documents of the Governing Board, including the draft work plan and budget, to UNESCO at least six weeks before the Governing Board meeting. UNESCO will provide feedback within two weeks of receiving them. Finally, the Centre will submit to the Governing Board a final version of those documents at least two weeks before the meeting’. CRIHAP is already complying with this timetable, but formal inclusion into the Agreement would be good for consistency.

The evaluator notes that 2017 was the first time that someone from the Pacific was part of the Advisory Committee. The evaluator could observe there was a direct impact with the member ensuring discussion and focus on the specific challenges for that region. It may be interesting to consider the possibility of extending geographic representation as a way to ensure substantive discussions of the Advisory Committee take into consideration the specific challenges, gaps and potential of the various sub regions.

The evaluation concludes the timing of the GB and AC need to be considered ensuring there is sufficient time for substantive feedback from the AC is incorporated into the final plans before approval by the GB. The evaluation also recommends that the Center seek to identify ways to promote more strategic discussions during the GB sessions. Reflection on the center’s principles, achievements, changes in the landscape and other concerns were some of the issues suggested by stakeholders as possible themes for discussion in during the GB sessions.

There is no Executive Committee, an optional additional structure set out under Article 9.

4.2. Management
The management structure is detailed under Article 11. The center is run by a Secretariat which consists of a Director and Deputy-Director charged with overseeing the center. Feedback obtained on CRIHAPs management was very positive, with many highlighting the management’s increased leadership over time. There were however concerns regarding the relatively frequent turnover of the Director post (see table 2) which can have negative effects on the stability and leadership of the center, as well as on its efficiency due to the necessary learning curve. UNESCO was not consulted before the latest change (February 2017).
In terms of the dynamics, some stakeholders felt there was a certain degree of internal focus towards China over and above other regional countries, with limited outreach activity for raising the profile of the center outside the Chinese border, and a lot of the interactions being left to the more junior staff. This coupled with the limitations for travel, and the intrinsic link between CRIHAP management staff and the government of China, limit’s the centers dynamic nature and ability to take advantage of opportunities outside China’s borders.

### Table 2: CRIHAP Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date of taking office(\text{Date approved by DG of UNESCO})</th>
<th>Date of leaving the post</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. YANG Zhi</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Jan. 2, 2012</td>
<td>May 7, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. LIANG Bin</td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Jan. 17, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be approved by DG of UNESCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On more pragmatic managerial issues, concerns were raised in regards to the lack of standardized procedures, for example, facilitators did not have signed contracts. At the time of the evaluation some of the facilitators were still pending payments for fees and even for costs incurred, such as travel tickets. This is due to the fact that sometimes CRIHAP will transfer the funds to a third party. The evaluator was informed that this issue has been identified and is now being addressed, as such, the last two workshops in 2016 (Nepal, November 2016 and Pakistan December 2016), an agreement was signed between CRIHAP and facilitators. CRIHAP has now decided to issue contract to facilitators and starting in 2017 and pay fees and costs directly. It will be important for CRIHAP to develop clear and adequate administrative procedures.

Another concern raised by some of the stakeholders was the need to better adapt and simplify terminology to the context and the type of participant as a means to ensure better impact of the training. This is likely to have to translate into closer collaboration with UNESCO and its field offices, but may require stronger input of ICH experts. Given CRIHAP’s close relationship with the Chinese National Academy of the Arts, this may be an area where they could provide technical support to the center. Ensure that content relates to “the space and the people.” Lastly, some stakeholders felt it was important for UNESCO to increase the information available to C2Cs, ensuring that list of facilitators, for example, are updated online regularly.

### 4.3 Accountability mechanisms

In terms of accountability, there seems to be clarity regarding the center’s independence under the Auspices of UNESCO. While CRIHAP needs to respect Chinese rules and regulations, from a substance perspective it is led by UNESCO and the objectives set out in the agreement.

There are two key accountability mechanisms:
• yearly revision of the center’s work and planned work by the Governing Board, with participation and oversight of both signatories to the Agreement, and
• a UNESCO led independent evaluation the results of which will guide the Director-General’s decision to renew the center

Given the composition and dynamic of the existing Governance mechanisms, coupled with the commitment from both CRIHAP and the Government of China to the agreed objectives of the center, the current accountability mechanisms seem adequate to ensure good use of the center and its resources.

4.4 Coordination
The center discusses yearly plans and other documents to be presented to the Governing Board with UNESCO beforehand, this way guaranteeing that it is in full alignment with UNESCO’s objectives. In addition, CRIHAP works closely with the UNESCO field offices seeking their feedback before planning through yearly questionnaires (see Annex 7, in this manner, taking into account their needs and priorities. Once a training is agreed, CRIHAP looks to UNESCO’s field office for guidance to identify participants and facilitators. Communication with the center seems to have improved over time.

Coordination between the center and UNESCO has been benefitted from the move of UNESCO’s Director-General representative to the CRIHAP Governing Board from Bangkok to Beijing, facilitating regular dialogue and meetings.

There was widespread agreement that the quality of coordination with UNESCO was good and based on CRIHAP’s acknowledgement that field offices have better knowledge of the countries, and as such an important partner when implementing training. There is continued flow of information between the center, UNESCO Beijing and UNESCO HQ.

There are three Category 2 centers covering ICH in the Asia-Pacific region. Each has a clear mandate as described above. CRIHAP is in charge of training, The International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI) based in Japan is responsible for research; the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP) based in Korea is responsible for Information and Networking. All three centers signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2008 to:

• Strengthen cooperation
• Promote sharing of information
• Coordinate the formulation of their action plans through mutual consultation to achieve greater synergies

In the MOU the centers also agree to support each other when conducting projects.
All centers participate of each other’s Governing Boards as observers and of the UNESCO Global Joint Meeting of Category 2 Centers of ICH (Bulgaria 2013), and the 3rd Annual Coordination Meeting of C2C active in the field of ICH (China 2015) organized by the center and the 4th Meeting of Category 2 Centers in the Field of Intangible Cultural Heritage (France 2016). In addition, the Sub-Regional Meeting for Intangible Cultural Heritage Safeguarding in Northeast Asia was organized between the three centers, as well as some activities, mainly with ICHCAP in Mongolia (The Role of the Media in Raising Awareness about Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Mongolia in October 2016) with more activities planned for 2017 to take place in Korea, as well as extended invitations to the centers to participate or send experts of various events such as the workshop on capacity building for transmission and sustainable development of traditional craftsmanship (Shenzhen, China, 2016).

While cooperation between the three centers has been limited, there is a clear progression with more activities taking place now. This may be a reasonable evolution with centers needing to settle themselves before they can understand where their common areas of interest lie. There seems to be limited agreement as to what level of collaboration that is feasible given their very different mandates, with some believing they should be acting as different parts of one same UNESCO center, other feeling there is little room for interaction. The main concern seems to be to avoid duplication and overlap, and the fact that the three centers are approaching sometimes the same countries in an uncoordinated manner. There is agreement that coordination of the centers would benefit from guidance from UNESCO.

4.5 Relations with Member States, government and Natcom

China has 14 UNESCO Category 2 centers, highlighting their very strong commitment to UNESCO. CRIHAP maintains a good relationship with the Natcom, the Secretary General forms part of the CRIHAP Governing Board. CRIHAP also maintains good relationships with national government agencies, especially with the Ministry of Culture and in particular with the Chinese National Academy of Arts where it is hosted, and who provides the salaries for CRIHAP staff. Relationship between CRIHAP and members states seem to be limited to activities, and mostly through UNESCO Field offices, with a recent visit to New Zealand as a scoping mission, which seems to be the first instance of this type of activity.

The Agreement sets out a procedure to become a member of the center and participate of its activities. Invitation letters to become a formal member of CRIHAP were sent by the Chinese government in 2012 and again in 2014. In spite of this, at the time of the evaluation out of the 48 UNESCO members in the Asia–Pacific region only 7 had submitted consent letters with CRIHAP (Cambodia, Samoa, China, Tonga, Fiji, Pakistan, Sri Lanka). Stakeholders interviewed highlighted that the system to obtain this approval is complex and involves sections that do not normally interact, and very much outside the scope of work of the center. Under the new model agreement, the burden of membership/notification shift from UNESCO to the Centre, and notifications will from now on be addressed to the Director of the Centre (as opposed to the UNESCO DG). While this notification is required to participate (and presumable benefit) from the
work of the Center (Article 3 para 2) and should lead to the possibility to form part of the center’s Governing Board (Article 8 para 1.b) it does not appear to have any impact in practice, which could be further acting as disincentive for the member States to ensure this notification is in place.

From reading the Agreement one could infer that the objective of this notification is related to the fact that the center is autonomous of UNESCO (Article 3 para 1) as such, membership to UNESCO would not suffice, however, CRIHAP seems to be able to function without this additional requirement, having recently signed an MOU with Pakistan as a pilot alternative mechanism.

The evaluation suggests a discussion between UNESCO and CRIHAP to discuss the merits of this notification procedure and decide going forward if membership will be required or not. If required, benefits and implications of membership should be made clear. It should also become necessary in order to benefit from the center’s services. However, from these discussions the parties may conclude that membership to UNESCO is sufficient, this may be a better option for countries that have not yet ratified the Convention who are unlikely to formally enter into an agreement for a Convention they are not yet a party to, and who should be a target of CRIHAP’s work.

4.6 Human and financial Resource Base, including extra budgetary resources
In line with the regular functioning of all UNESCO Category 2 Centers, the Agreement sets out the financing of the center, its staff and its activities under the responsibility of the host Government. Since its inception, the Government of China has invested a total of 26,561,404 Yuan (RMB) in the running of the center. This is excluding the costs associated with the rental of the 500㎡ office which are paid directly by the Chinese National Academy of Arts. Investment is distributed as follows:

![Figure 2: CRIHAP Financial Resources](image)

Source: CRIHAP Annual workplan and budget presented to the Governing Board
With a stable and reliable budget, the center has not made a specific effort to secure extra budgetary resources, however, the center has supported cultural initiatives which some felt might fall outside its mandate. For example, in 2015, the National Art Foundation for the promotion of the training practices for Fujian Puppetry received 1.8 million RMB. CRIHAP supported this Program by showcasing it alongside its trainings workshops in Indonesia, Australia and Cambodia. CRIHAP worked as a coordinator and received no additional fund for, as such, at least some of CRIHAP’s resources were diverted to support this activity. Showcasing of cultural activities can help raise the profile of CRIHAP and provide opportunities to further advocate for ICH, however, care should be taken to safeguard CRIHAP’s profile as a regional center, perhaps providing the same opportunity to other members to showcase their ICH alongside training workshops.

Overall the budget is perceived as adequate to the needs of the center. It has grown together with need, and every indication was given that there was further room for expansion. The stability and predictability of the budget helps strengthen the center’s structure and planning.

### Table 3: Total Annual Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Annual Budget (RMB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agreement does not identify a specific organizational structure, although the initial medium-term development strategy did, (see graph).
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*This does not include costs related to the 500m2 offices space and expenditures associated which are provided by the Chinese National Academy of Arts*

**salaries are not included in the budget because they are paid directly by the Chinese National Academy of Arts. For 2012 and 2013 these numbers have been taken from the 2012-2016 CRIHAP Report prepared for the Governing Board, the remainder have been taken from the annual reports presented to the Governing Board*
A quick read of this graph shows that the liaison, promotion and finance divisions are no longer present, and a research division has been added. This move may have had a negative impact on the center's ability to interact with member states and secure their formal membership. The objective of the research division (as explained by CRIHAP) is “to implement one of the objectives of CRIHAP: promote the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and contribute to its implementation in the Asia-Pacific Region”. This is done by seeking to identify good practices, case studies and policies that could enrich UNESCO’s training materials as a means to enhance effectiveness and pertinence of the training, and make it more context appropriate. This is often done through cooperation with Chinese Universities (see figure 4). This cooperation is also seen as a good way to raise visibility of CRIHAP and provides a wide platform for CRIHAP and research institutes to exchange experiences. This is an interesting proposal and is a potential area for cooperation with the C2C in Japan, which would allow the center to provide experiences beyond the Chinese borders, as well as share the Chinese experiences with IRCI.

Since its inception, the center has grown from 14 staff initially to 18 staff currently. There is widespread agreement that current staff are committed and dedicated, but there is also some concern in regards to their experience, with most referring to them as “young” and somewhat inexperienced. Analysis provided by the center however highlights that nearly half of the staff (47%) are in the 30-40 age bracket and only 35% are below 30 years of age. Another concern raised by stakeholders is the staff’s limited international exposure, again, analysis provided by CRIHAP shows that 61% of the staff have studied or worked overseas, and 92% have either a Masters or a Doctorate.
One possible explanation for this difference between perception and reality may be due to cultural differences, with some staff having limited English, but also given the diversity of languages in the region, this is in general more of a challenge. The fact remains that many stakeholders feel the staff would benefit from increased exposure to international experience, which would also strengthen their technical base on ICH and the Convention. UNESCO could seek to provide a temporary support or opportunities for internships either at HQ or their field offices. This would be directly in line with UNESCO’s objectives in that through this they would be increasing capacity at national level (mainly in China), but also ensuring multiplying effect as this would strengthen the center. The center could consider the possibility of reinstating the liaison role potentially in the form of an international (or UNESCO staff), and international relations coordinator that could help reach out to member countries (especially if membership will be a requirement) but also to strengthen the dialogue between the center and member countries in general.
Recommendations

The TORs allow for broad recommendations to be made but specifically asked that the evaluation address the following:

- A general recommendation whether renewal of the Centre’s status as a category 2 institute is warranted and would conform to the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy;
- Specific recommendations to the Centre for improving the effectiveness of its operations;
- Specific recommendations to UNESCO for improving the effectiveness of its coordination and interaction with the Centre;
- Specific recommendations for possible amendments to the Agreement, in the event it is to be renewed.

1) Recommendation 1:
A general recommendation whether renewal of the Centre’s status as a category 2 institute is warranted and would conform to the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy;

The evaluation concludes the center is fulfilling its objectives and obligations as intended in the Agreement in an effective and efficient manner, with existing limitations mainly due to learning rather than contradictions or differences with UNESCO. Further, the evaluation points towards great potential for growth, coupled with commitment, meaning that CRIHAP has the potential to become a very significant partner for UNESCO in the region. As such, the evaluation recommends the renewal of the Agreement.

2) Recommendation 2
Specific recommendations to the Centre for improving the effectiveness of its operations;
- Advisory Committee: ensure that the meetings take place sufficiently in advance of the Governing Board so that recommendations can be introduced into the plans sent for approval to the Governing Board. The Advisory Committee would also benefit from greater regional representation, perhaps ensuring representation from each sub region.

- CRIHAP should identify weaknesses and invest in capacity building of staff as part of their objective to increase knowledge and understanding of the Convention, but also to strengthen the center and its ability to deliver in an international environment

- It will be important for CRIHAP to develop clear and systematic administrative procedures such as contractual modalities, reporting mechanisms, templates for training reports, clear payment schedules, etc.

- CRIHAP needs to strengthen its monitoring function including keeping track of types of beneficiaries, as well as other relevant beneficiary data such as gender, age, etc.... this will require an analysis of what type of beneficiary (or mix of beneficiary) is best suited
to fulfill its objectives. This may vary from country to country. Monitoring of beneficiary type should be done to better understand organize future workshop for officials not just for trainers or trainees to understand the importance (chair) of the 2003 Convention and how to implement it, and provide financial support. CRIHAP is beginning to collect data from trainers and beneficiaries, it will be important to manage this data and ensure a good database as well as access.

- Ensure clear inclusion of gender in trainings as well as increase focus on disaster risk management and peacebuilding to align itself better with UNESCO’s C4 strategy.

- CRIHAP should try to make better use of the press and new media, as a way to raise its profile, to raise awareness of ICH but also to reach the youth.

- CRIHAP should consider helping establish a network amongst trainees where they can continue to support each other. This could be done, for example, through a Facebook page, and in coordination with ICHCAP.

- The center may want to consider focusing on training’s potential multiplying effect, (TOTs, professors and government officials who are decision makers) as a way to increase their reach given the widespread geographic coverage.

- CRIHAP should consider strengthening the liaison role of the center, either via the management or through a specific liaison type officer. Ideally this person would have extensive international experience and be able to strengthen this identified weakness.

3) Recommendation 3

Specific recommendations to UNESCO for improving the effectiveness of its coordination and interaction with the Centre;

- UNESCO should have a more proactive role in the oversight and coordination of the three C2 centers in the Asia-Pacific region ensuring synergies are maximized and overlap is avoided.

- CRIHAP has proven a strategic partner for UNESCO. Given its ability and willingness to grow, UNESCO should consider investing into strengthening the capacity of CRIHAP staff and greater exposure to UNESCO’s operating mechanisms, so that they are better able to move UNESCO’s objectives forward. This could take the form of providing temporary UNESCO staff for the center, especially to develop and strengthen the liaison role, or through internships of CRIHAP’s staff to UNESCO’s field offices and/or HQ.

- UNESCO should ensure all relevant information for the ICH centers is updated regularly and accessible online, this would free up UNESCO resources and CRIHAP (and presumable
other C2 centers) would be able to access it directly instead of having to contact UNESCO staff for support.

- UNESCO should work closely with CRIHAP to help adapt training materials to the relevant context, including through the inclusion of context specific examples, and the simplification of the material depending on the beneficiaries’ background and knowledge of ICH.

_As the first and sole C2 exclusively dedicated to training in the Asia-Pacific region, it might benefit UNESCO to undertake a case study of the center to understand if this is a model that could be replicated elsewhere._

4) **Recommendation 4**

*Specific recommendations for possible amendments to the Agreement, in the event it is to be renewed.*

- If there is a joint decision to make membership to CRIHAP a requirement in order to benefit from it, this should be reflected in the Agreement.

- For consistency purposes, the amendment that sets out a timeframe for sharing information with UNESCO before the Governing Board proposed for other C2C centers renewing the Agreement should also be incorporated into CRIHAP’s new agreement.

- UNESCO and CRIHAP should agree a maximum percentage of resources (time and money) that can be used outside the strict mandate of CRIHAP, while ensuring it is always in support of CRIHAP’s objectives and does not conflict with them.
### Annex 1: Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Name and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Feb 1       | Ms. Chihiro Nishikawa  
Outreach & Partnerships Specialist  
Focal Point for Category 2 Centers and UNESCO Chairs  
Conventions Common Services Unit Culture Sector |
| Feb 1       | Mr. Giovanni SCEPI  
Regional Officer for Asia and the Pacific, in charge of CRIHAP within the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section,  
Culture Sector, UNESCO |
| Feb 8       | Ms. Susanne SCHNUETTGEN KOESTER  
Chief of the Capacity Building and Heritage Policy Unit, Intangible Cultural Heritage Section,  
Culture Sector, UNESCO |
| Feb 8       | Mr. Timothy CURTIS  
Chief, Intangible Cultural Heritage Section, UNESCO  
Former Representative of the Director-General of UNESCO in CRIHAP’s Governing Board (till January 2016) |
| Feb 7       | Ms. Cécile DUVELLE  
Former Chief of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section (till December 2015) |
| Feb 7       | Mr. Frank PROSCHAN  
UNESCO Facilitator for ICH  
Former Chief of Programme and Implementation Unit of UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Section and Sectoral Focal point for category 2 centers (till April 2015) |
| Feb 16      | CRIHAP management  
Ms. XU Rong & Mr. ZHANG Jing  
Director-General, CRIHAP & Deputy Director-General CRIHAP |
| Feb 16      | CRIHAP Staff Focus group |
| Feb 16      | Ms. Vanessa ACHILLES  
UNESCO Office in Bangkok and Regional Bureau for Education  
Programme Specialist – Culture  
Project manager of many capacity-building activities in the Asia-Pacific region |
<p>| Feb 17      | Mr. DU Yue |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member, Governing Board of CRIHAP. Secretary General, Chinese National Commission for UNESCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mr. Makara HONG**  
National Programme Officer, Culture Unit, UNESCO Phnom Penh Office  
Representative of Collaborators and Beneficiaries in South-eastern Asia (unable to take the call and send a report via mail/beneficiary) |
## MONDAY 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. WANG Xin</td>
<td>Associate Researcher, Research Institute of Anthropology of Arts, Chinese National Academy of Arts, Beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. WANG Peng</td>
<td>Founder of Juntianfang Guqin Art Centre, ICH community beneficiary and collaborator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Beatrice KALDUN</td>
<td>Head of UNESCO Office in Dhaka, Former Programme Specialist for Culture in Beijing Office (till August 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. FANG Yun</td>
<td>Lecturer, School of Social Development, East China Normal University, Representative of Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mounir BOUCHENAKI</td>
<td>Member, Governing Board of CRIHAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TUESDAY 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Noriko AIKAWA-FAURE</td>
<td>UNESCO Facilitator for ICH, Representative of Collaborators of CRIHAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Himalchuli GURUNG</td>
<td>Member, Governing Board of CRIHAP, Programme Specialist for Culture, UNESCO Office in Beijing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. XIE Jinying</td>
<td>Director-General, Bureau for External Cultural Relations, Ministry of Culture, P.R. of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. ZHANG Ling</td>
<td>Director, Division of Multilateral Affairs, Bureau for External Cultural Relations, Ministry of Culture, P.R. of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. LIAN Ji</td>
<td>President of Chinese National Academy of Arts, Director of China National Center for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. WANG Xuexian</td>
<td>Chairperson, Advisory Committee of CRIHAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sipiriano Dominiko Nemani RANUKU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>UNesco Facilitator for ICH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Policy &amp; Conventions Officer, Department of National Heritage, Culture &amp; Arts, Fiji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Collaborators and Beneficiaries of CRIHAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday 22**

Participation in the 4th Session of the Advisory Committee of CRIHAP in observer capacity

- **Mr. Huh Kwon**  
  DG of ICHCAP (C2 centre in Korea)

- **Ms Misako Ohnuki**  
  Deputy DG of IRCI (C2 centre in Japan)

**Thursday 23**

- **Mr. Chaogejin**  
  Member, Governing Board of CRIHAP, Director & Researcher, Member of the Academy, Institute of Ethnic Literature, Chinese Academy of Social Science

- **Governning Board CRIHAP**

- **Mr. Wang Wenzhang**  
  Chairperson, Governing Board of CRIHAP
Annex 3: Key documents consulted

- Culture Sector Strategy for category 2 institutes and centres
- C2cC brochure
- UNESCO strategy papers
- Medium term strategy 2008-2013 (34 C/4)
- Medium term strategy 2014-2021 (37 C/4)
- Approved programme and budget 2010-2011 (35 C/5); 2012-2013 (36 C/5), 2014-2015 (37 C/5) and 2016-2017 (38 C/5)
- Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres - 37/C Resolution 93:
  - the Comprehensive Strategy of UNESCO’s category 2 centres of Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereinafter referred to as ICH) (draft) (C/4 and MLA C/5)
- Work report and financial statement for FY 2015: English (20 Apr 2016)
- Report on the work and final accounts of CRIHAP in 2013
- Report on the work and final accounts of CRIHAP in 2012: English (17 Jun 2013)
- Category 2 institutes and centres: fact sheets on established institutes and centres: English (16 Jan 2012)
- Workplan and budget for FY 2016: English (20 Apr 2016)
- Workplan and budget for FY 2015: English (20 May 2015)
- Annual work plan and budget for 2014: English (28 May 2014)
- Work plan and financial budget of CRIHAP for 2013: English (17 Jun 2013)
- Annual work plan and budget for 2012: English (22 Feb 2012)
- Minutes of the Fifth Governing Board of CRIHAP: English in preparation (20 Apr 2016)
- Replacement of Advisory Committee Members: English (20 Apr 2016)
- Minutes of the Fourth Governing Board of CRIHAP: English (20 May 2015)
- Minutes of the Third Governing Board of CRIHAP: English (24 Jun 2014)
- Minutes of the Second Governing Board of CRIHAP: English (17 June 2013)
- Minutes of the Inaugural meeting, February 2012
- Revision of the Rules of Procedure of the Advisory Committee
- Constitution of CRIHAP: English (27 Dec 2016)
- Amendment to the Agreement regarding the establishment in Beijing (the People’s Republic of China) of an International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO (category 2): English (3 Nov 2011)
- Agreement regarding the establishment in Beijing (the People’s Republic of China) of an International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO (category 2 (18 May 2010)
- Memorandum Reached by China, Japan and the Republic of Korea
- Proposal for the establishment in China of an International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region as a category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO: (13 Jul 2009)
- Call for proposal for the evaluation of the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP): English (10 Oct 2016)
## Annex 4: Governing Board and Advisory Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing Board Meetings</th>
<th>Advisory committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 1ST Session of the Governing Board and CRIHAP’s Official Inaugural Ceremony</td>
<td>First meeting: August 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: Feb. 22, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue: Beijing, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2nd Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengdu, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28, 2014</td>
<td>Second meeting: May 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fourth Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31, 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fifth Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2016</td>
<td>Third Meeting: 27 to 28 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sixth Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23, 2017</td>
<td>Fourth Meeting: February 22, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: CRIHAP Organigram
### Provisional Timetable of the 6th Session of the Governing Board

**Wednesday, February 22, 2017**  
Tibet Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:30-13:40</td>
<td>buffet lunch</td>
<td>Cafeteria, 2F, Building A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-20:00</td>
<td>buffet dinner</td>
<td>Cafeteria, 2F, Building A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, February 23, 2017**  
Tibet Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06:40-08:30</td>
<td>buffet breakfast</td>
<td>Cafeteria, 2F, Building A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-12:00</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Conference Hall, 10F, Building B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>1. Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Adoption of the Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Announcing the Proposed New Director-General of CRIHAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Replacement One Member of the Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Approving of New Member of Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Admission of Observers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Summary Records of the 5th Session of the Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Tea break &amp; photo-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>9. Work Plan and Budget for FY2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Date and Place of the 7th Session of the Governing Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Other Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Closure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Banquet</td>
<td>Xinzhu Hall, 2F, Building A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-17:00</td>
<td>Cultural excursion</td>
<td>China National Peking Opera Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30-20:00</td>
<td>buffet dinner</td>
<td>Cafeteria, 2F, Building A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, February 24, 2017**  
Departure
Annex 7: Questionnaire for ICH Training Program

Questionnaire for Intangible Cultural Heritage Training Program (2015)

NO.2015/QR -01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tel:</td>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICH Training Workshop in Need: (2016)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain of the Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized workshop: ● please select one topic and check the box behind it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored workshop: ● please specify desired workshop topic ● please briefly indicate reason for your proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficial Countries</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Workshop Date and Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Questionnaire for ICH Training Program (2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNESCO Field Office:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Tel:</th>
<th>E-mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICH Training Workshop in Need: (2015-2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of the Training</th>
<th>Beneficial Countries</th>
<th>Expected Time and Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Countries</td>
<td>Expected Time and Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8: Full List of Training Activities
(as provided by CRIHAP)

2.1. Training Activities

2.1.1. Capacity Building Trainings
◆ Workshop on the Implementation of the 2003 Convention at the National Level, Beijing, China
◆ Workshop on Inventorying under the 2003 Convention at the National Level, Chengdu, China
◆ Workshop on the Safeguarding and Sustainable Development of Traditional Craftsmanship in the Asia-Pacific Region, Hangzhou, China
◆ Workshop on “Happy Chinese New Year” and Safeguarding and Promotion of Traditional Festivals, Chaozhou and Foshan, China
◆ Workshop on the Community-based Documentation and Inventorying of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Siem Reap, Cambodia
◆ Workshop on the Ratification and Implementation of the 2003 Convention, Chengdu, China
◆ Workshop on Inheritance and Development of Traditional Festivals in the Modern Age, Shanghai and Suzhou, China
◆ Workshop on Revitalization of Indigenous Architecture and Sustainable Development of Building Skills in South Pacific, Apia, Samoa
◆ Workshop on Implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of ICH, Siem Reap, Cambodia
◆ Workshop on Practices of Intangible Cultural Heritage Safeguarding, Quanzhou, China
◆ Workshop on the Ratification and Implementation of the 2003 Convention, Sydney, Australia
◆ Workshop on Implementation of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage for Pakistan, Beijing, China
◆ Workshop on the Establishment of ICH Safeguarding Plan, Siem Reap, Cambodia
◆ Workshop on Capacity Building for Transmission and Sustainable Development of Traditional Craftsmanship, Shenzhen, China
◆ Workshop on the Community-based Inventorying of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Pyongyang, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea
◆ Workshop on Community-based Inventorying of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Nuku'alofa, Tonga
◆ Workshop on Developing Safeguarding Plans for Intangible Cultural Heritage, Kathmandu, Nepal
◆ Workshop on Community-based Inventorying of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Islamabad, Pakistan

2.1.2. Training of Trainers Workshops
◆ Training of Trainers Workshop on Safeguarding Plans and Policy Support for Intangible Cultural Heritage for Facilitators from Asia-Pacific Region, Shenzhen, China
◆ Training of Chinese Trainers Workshop on the Implementation of the 2003 Convention, Shanghai, China

2.2. International and Regional Cooperative Programmes

2.2.1. Organizing International and Regional Cooperative Programmes
◆ Review Meeting on UNESCO’s Global Strategy for Strengthening National Capacities for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage
◆ Seminar on Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage in ASEAN & China
◆ Chengdu International Conference on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of UNESCO’s Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage
◆ Networking on Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage
◆ 3rd Annual Coordination Meeting of Category 2 Centres Active in the Field of ICH

2.2.2. Participating in International and Regional Cooperative Programmes
2.2.3. Cooperation with other C2 Centres and Institutions
◆ Cooperation with ICHCAP on the Report of Information on the Current Status of ICH Safeguarding Efforts in the Asia-Pacific Region (China)
◆ Other Cooperative Activities
Annex 9: TORs

Call for proposal for the evaluation of the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP), in Beijing China UNESCO Category 2 Centre

Closing date (extended): 30 October 2016

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background

Call for proposal for the evaluation of the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP), in Beijing China UNESCO Category 2 Centre

Closing date (extended): 30 October 2016

Category 2 institutes and centres under the auspices of UNESCO form an important part of UNESCO’s network and as a general rule represent an effective partnership model for UNESCO’s programme delivery, significantly contributing to priority areas in UNESCO’s fields of competence. Category 2 institutes and centres are intended to contribute to the achievement of UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes and to the attainment of programme results at the Main Lines of Action (MLA) level of the UNESCO programme and budget (C/5), whether through individual action, joint action with other category 2 institutes and centres or through joint implementation with the Secretariat. Category 2 institutes and centres can also play a considerable role in helping the Organization achieve programme objectives for which sectoral expertise or resources are not sufficient.

In order to enhance the operation and effectiveness of individual UNESCO category 2 institutes and centres, as well as the effectiveness of their network, a revised Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for institutes and centres under the Auspices of UNESCO, as contained in document 37 C/18 Part I and its annex, was approved by the 37th Session of the General Conference (37 C/Resolution 93). This strategy, among other elements, provides guidelines for renewal assessment procedures of category 2 institutes and centres.

Those guidelines provide that an agreement for the establishment of an institute or centre as a category 2 institute or centre is typically concluded for a definite time period, not exceeding six years. The agreement may be renewed by the Director-General, with the approval of the Executive Board, in the light of an evaluation of the activities of the institute/centre and of its contribution to the strategic programme objectives of the Organization and the aforementioned Integrated Comprehensive Strategy for category 2 institutes and centres.

The 35th session of the General Conference, in its 35 C/Resolution 50, approved the establishment in the People’s Republic of China of the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP) (hereafter, ‘the Centre’). The objectives of the Centre are to: (a) promote the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and contribute to its implementation in the Asia-Pacific Region; (b) increase the participation of communities, groups and individuals in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region, (c) enhance the capacity of the Asia-Pacific Member States of UNESCO in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage (ICH), particularly by strengthening the capacities of concerned personnel, (d) foster regional and international cooperation for safeguarding ICH.

In order to achieve the above objectives, the specific functions of the Centre are to:

a) organize long-term and short-term training courses including classroom training and field-based training on the following subjects, and grant financial support to trainees in need of assistances:

1. The 2003 Convention and its Operational Directives;
2. Different examples of policies including legal, administrative, technical and financial measures fostering the safeguarding of ICH;
3. Introduction to UNESCO publications on identification and documentation of ICH and their application in the field work;
4. Teaching ICH in formal and non-formal education, including courses of theory
and practice training.
b) mobilize international and Chinese experts as well as scientific NGOs specialized in the different domains of ICH to work as instructors and advisors of the above mentioned training activities.
c) enhance international and regional cooperation with institutions active in the domain of ICH, notably those established under the auspices of UNESCO (category 2).

Subsequent to the approval of the General Conference, an Agreement concerning the establishment of the Centre (hereafter, ‘the Agreement’) was signed between the Government of the People’s Republic of China and UNESCO on 18 May 2010 and its Amendment on 3 November 2011. The Agreement is fixed for a period of six years as from its entry into force on 2 January 2012.

Purpose

The main objectives of this evaluation are to assess the Centre’s performance with respect to its objectives and functions, as specified in the agreement between UNESCO and the host Government, and its contribution to UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes. The findings of the evaluation will serve as the basis for the Sector Review Committee’s recommendation to the Director-General as to whether the Agreement should be renewed. The Director-General will then provide the results of these evaluations, including the endorsement or rejection to renew a specific agreement to the Executive Board. The approval of the Executive Board will be required before the Director-General can proceed with the renewal of an agreement between UNESCO and the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

The results of this evaluation will be shared with the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Centre, and presented to the Executive Board, as specified in the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy. They will also be made available on the website of the Culture Sector.

Scope

In order to meet the purpose of the evaluation described above, the following parameters shall be considered by the expert(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation and writing a report that is consistent with UNESCO’s reporting mechanisms:
a) Whether the activities effectively pursued by the Centre are in conformity with its functions and as specified in the aide-memoire and agreement signed between UNESCO and the Government of the People’s Republic of China;  
Call for proposal for the evaluation of the International October 2016 Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP) in China  
b) The relevance of the Centre’s programmes and activities to achieving UNESCO’s strategic programme objectives and sectoral or intersectoral programme priorities and themes, as defined in the Organization’s Medium-Term Strategy (C/4), and to attaining programme results at the Main Lines of Action (MLA) level, as defined in the Organization’s Approved Programme and Budget (C/5);  
c) The effectiveness of the Centre’s programmes and activities to achieving its stated objectives, as defined in the Agreement;  
d) The quality of coordination and interaction with UNESCO, both at Headquarters and in the field, with regard to planning and implementation of programmes, as well as with other thematically-related category 2 institutes or centres, with regard to planning and implementation of programmes;  
e) The quality of relations with CRIHAP Member States, including its focal points, government agencies and UNESCO National Commissions, and with public or private partners and donors;  
f) The nature and quality of organizational arrangements, including management, governance and accountability mechanisms;  
g) The human and financial resource base and the quality of mechanisms and capacities, as well as context-specific opportunities and risks for ensuring sustainable institutional capacity and viability;  
h) The process of mobilizing extrabudgetary resources and to what extent such extrabudgetary funding is aligned to the strategic programme objectives of UNESCO.

In addition to the findings on each topic, the expert(s) shall offer four types of recommendations:
1) a general recommendation whether renewal of the Centre’s status as a category 2 institute is warranted and would conform to the Integrated Comprehensive Strategy;  
2) specific recommendations to the Centre for improving the effectiveness of its operations;
Methodology

The evaluation of the Centre will include:

- A desk study of relevant documents, provided by the Centre and UNESCO Secretariat;
- A visit to the Centre, including interviews with the Centre’s management and staff;
- Interviews (telephone, online and/or via e-mail) with the Centre’s stakeholders, collaborators, and beneficiaries as well as UNESCO staff concerned;
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Preparation of the evaluation report.

Roles and responsibilities

The evaluation will be conducted by a team comprising one or more independent experts/evaluators. Local travel, materials, secretarial support and office space will be provided by the Centre during the field visit. The evaluator(s) will be responsible for telecommunications and printing of documentation.

The UNESCO Culture Sector will facilitate and oversee the evaluation process, to the extent possible, by providing any relevant information, and will be responsible for evaluating and approving the final report.

Background documents

UNESCO shall make the following documents available to the evaluation team in electronic form:

- The Executive Board and General Conference documents concerning the establishment of the Centre;
- The existing Agreement between the Government of the People’s Republic of China and UNESCO concerning the establishment of the Centre, together with its amendment;
- The Medium-term Strategy 2008-2013 (34 C/4), Medium-term Strategy 2014-2021 (37 C/4), Approved programme and budget 2010-2011 (35 C/5), 2012-2013 (36 C/5), 2014-2015 (37 C/5) and 2016-2017 (38 C/5);
- Relevant correspondence concerning the cooperation between UNESCO and the Centre. The Centre shall make the following documents available to the evaluation team in English, in electronic or paper form:
  - Annual progress reports;
  - Financial reports;
  - List of staff;
  - List of key publications;
  - List of donors and project partners;
  - Minutes, decisions and working documents of the Governing Board and Executive Committee meetings;
  - Report of support provided to or received from Member States;
  - Available audit and evaluation reports;
  - Account of networking achievements linked with other thematically related category 2 Institutes or centres and UNESCO’s programmes.
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Draft evaluation report

A draft report will present findings, conclusions and recommendations, with a draft executive summary. The UNESCO Culture Sector, the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Centre itself will have the opportunity to comment and give feedback to the evaluation team.

Final evaluation report

The final report (max. 20 pages, excluding annexes) should be structured as follows:

- Executive summary (maximum four pages);
- Introduction (background, purpose and scope);
- Methodology;
- Findings;
- Recommendations (as described above);
Annexes (including interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, Terms of Reference).
The language of the report shall be English.

Evaluation team
The evaluation team will consist of one or more independent experts/evaluators. A single proposal/expression of interest must be submitted on behalf of the team, whether it is one or several persons, and a single contract will be executed.

Qualifications:
- At least 7 years of professional experience in research and/or capacity-building in the field of cultural heritage, cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue, cultural policy or culture and development;
- At least 7 years of professional experience in policy and programme evaluation in the context of international development;
- Fluency in English (written and spoken);
- Knowledge of the role and mandate of UNESCO and its programmes.

Schedule
The evaluation shall be completed no later than 31 January 2017. The schedule for the evaluation is as follows:
- A desk study of background documents (to be completed prior to the visit to the Centre);
- A mission to visit the Centre;
- Writing and submission of the draft evaluation report no later than 15 December 2016;
- Submission of the final evaluation report (before 31 January 2017).

The date of the mission to the Centre will be defined by UNESCO in coordination with the Centre and taking into account the Evaluators’ availability.

Submission of proposals/expression of interest
Interested candidates should submit their applications in English, consisting of:
- Curriculum vitae of expert(s)/evaluator(s) and, if applicable, a company profile;
- Letter expressing interest and clearly identifying how the candidate/candidate team meets the required skills and experience;
- An approach and methodology for the assignment, a Workplan and comments on the Terms of Reference if any (in brief);
- A total cost (quoted in US dollars), distinguishing the fees for services from the travel expenses, with a breakdown of the cost and number of work hours required for each phase of the schedule.

Applications should be submitted no later than 30 October 2016, midnight (Paris time) to Conventions Common Services unit (cultureC2C@unesco.org). Please note that applications submitted through other channels will not be considered. Selection will be made on the basis of best value for money.