



unesco

Diversity of
Cultural Expressions

16 IGC

DCE/23/16.IGC/3
Paris, 10 January 2023
Original: French

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

**Sixteenth Session
UNESCO Headquarters, Room I
7 – 10 February 2023**

Item 3 of the provisional agenda: Adoption of the detailed summary record of the fifteenth session of the Committee*

This document contains in Annex the draft detailed summary record of the fifteenth session of the Committee (8-11 February 2022) for adoption by the Committee.

Decision required: paragraph 3

* The presentation of information in the summary record of the fifteenth session of the Committee (document DCE/23/16.IGC/3) does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the indication of any geographical name.

1. In accordance with Article 43 of the Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter “the Committee”), the Secretariat prepared a draft detailed summary record of the fifteenth session of the Committee (8 – 11 February 2022) in its two working languages, English and French. The draft, contained in Annex, is presented to the Committee for adoption.
2. To date, the Secretariat has received no comments.
3. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 16.IGC 3

The Committee,

1. *Having examined document DCE/23/16.IGC/3 and its Annex,*
2. *Adopts the detailed summary record of its fifteenth session included in the above-mentioned document.*

ANNEX

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

Opening of the session

1. The fifteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as "the Committee") was held online from 8 to 11 February 2022.
2. The meeting was attended by 104 representatives of States Members of the Committee, 235 representatives of 97 Parties to the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (hereinafter referred to as "the Convention") that are not members of the Committee, 20 representatives of 12 UNESCO Member States that are not Parties to the Convention, 9 representatives of 5 intergovernmental organisations, 80 representatives of 68 civil society organisations (hereinafter referred to as "CSOs"), 11 representatives of 6 UNESCO Chairs, 3 representatives of 3 Category 2 Centres under the auspices of UNESCO and 3 other observers.
3. The **Chairperson**, H.E. Mr. Nasser Hamad Hinzab, Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Qatar to UNESCO, welcomed all participants and thanked them for attending. He recalled the technical modalities for holding the Committee online, before introducing the members of the Bureau of the fifteenth session of the Committee. He then gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture.
4. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** and **representative of the Director-General** of UNESCO, Mr. Ernesto Ottone R., recalled once again the extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the cultural sector, which was already weakened before the crisis. He stated that this context only increases the relevance and importance of the objectives promoted by the Convention and emphasised that creativity and diversity are essential for overcoming contemporary challenges.

He explained that UNESCO has worked tirelessly to document and assess the damage caused by the pandemic on the creative sector, in order to empower policy makers and civil society to adequately support the recovery. He emphasised that this crisis has exposed flaws in the sector and that the focus must now shift from papering over the cracks to fundamentally transforming the cultural ecosystem to make it more resilient, inclusive and sustainable. He went on to mention two events committed to this end: the Abu Dhabi Culture Summit in the fall of 2022 - during which a partnership with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the United Arab Emirates will be presented - and the UNESCO World Conference on Cultural Policies and Sustainable Development MONDIACULT 2022 in September 2022 in Mexico.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture then listed the main challenges for the fifteenth session of the Committee: considering new ways to include civil society, creative enterprises and cultural institutions in the work of the Convention; further strengthening the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (IFCD); and establishing the 2022-2023 work plan that translates the strategic priorities identified by the Conference of Parties into concrete actions. He concluded his speech by mentioning the publication of the third edition of the Global Report entitled [*Reshaping policies for creativity: addressing culture as a global public good*](#) and by encouraging the Parties to place the diversity of cultural expressions at the heart of public policies and to defend culture as a global public good at the service of sustainable development.

5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO and opened the fifteenth session of the Committee, the quorum being reached.

Item 1 – Adoption of the agenda

Documents [DCE/22/15.IGC/1](#) and [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.1](#)

6. The **Secretary of the Convention**, Mr Toussaint Tiendrebeogo, read out the items on the agenda, proposing to deal with items 6 to 8 in the following order: 6, 8, 7. He then presented the different working and information documents. He concluded by asking for the Committee's understanding in advance for any technical difficulties and asked the Parties to limit the length of their interventions so that the Committee could complete its work within the allotted time.
7. The delegation of **Cuba** supported the proposed agenda and expressed its understanding of the challenges related to the Committee's schedule, but also stressed that time constraints should not be an obstacle to the depth of the discussions.
8. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 1 was adopted.

Item 2 – Approval of the list of observers

Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.2 REV](#)

9. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to admit observers to the session and asked the Secretary of the Convention to read out the names and functions of the observers. He then explained that observers would be given the floor in the following order: Parties to the Convention; Member States of UNESCO not Parties to the Convention; Associate Members and Permanent Observer Missions; and intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations.
10. The delegation of **Armenia** suggested that in the future the provisional list of observers be transferred in writing to the Committee members, rather than being read out.
11. The **Secretary** explained that it was customary to read this list orally, in particular to compensate for possible inattention on the part of the Parties and took note of this remark, indicating that the provisional list of participants, available online, contained the list of registered observers.
12. The delegation of **Cuba** added that it had received this list that very morning, asking that, in the future, it is made available further in advance, if possible.
13. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 2 was adopted.

Item 3 – Adoption of the detailed summary record of the fourteenth session of the Committee

Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/3REV](#)

14. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received amendments from the delegation of Canada, which had been taken into account. He asked the Committee if the draft decision was acceptable to them and, seeing no objections, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 3 was adopted as amended.

Item 4 - Report of the Secretariat on its activities and the implementation of the Committee's decisions (2021)

Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/4](#)

15. The **Chairperson** congratulated the entire Secretariat for its work: it has implemented all the decisions taken at the previous session of the Committee; continued its awareness-raising efforts; published the third edition of the Global Report on the implementation of the Convention; and opened up new and exciting areas of work, notably concerning gender

equality in the cultural and creative industries and the film industry in Africa. He also welcomed the two new Parties to the Convention, Cabo Verde and Turkmenistan, before giving the floor to the Secretary to present the Secretariat's report in greater detail.

16. The **Secretary** also welcomed these two new ratifications which bring the number of State Parties to 151 (including the European Union), representing a ratification rate of approximately 80% of UNESCO's Member States. He then outlined the four main areas of focus for the Secretariat's activities in 2021: support to the governing bodies of the Convention and implementation of their decisions; monitoring of the implementation of the Convention by the Parties; implementation of cooperation and international assistance programmes; and finally awareness raising and stakeholder engagement. He then presented some key results achieved by the Secretariat during the year 2021.

First, concerning support provided to the governing bodies of the Convention and the implementation of their decisions, he mentioned the increased contribution of civil society to the work of these bodies, particularly through the formalisation of requests for admission to statutory meetings, which has enabled the Secretariat to strengthen its ties with civil society organisations (CSOs); and the organisation of the third edition of the Civil Society Forum on 31 May last year.

Regarding the monitoring of the implementation of the Convention by the Parties, he recalled that 2021 marks the end of the second phase of the project supported by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), which has allowed the Secretariat to accompany 16 Parties in the elaboration of their quadrennial periodic reports in a participatory and inclusive manner. Moreover, 2021 corresponds to the end of a four-year monitoring cycle and the transmission by the Secretariat of a report on the monitoring of the implementation of the Convention at the international level. This culminated in the publication in 2022 of the third edition of the Global Report [Reshaping policies for creativity: addressing culture as a global public good](#). This report, which is notably based on the analysis of 96 periodic reports, provides an overview of the challenges and opportunities faced by the different stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention. The Secretary also mentioned three other publications: [Gender & Creativity: Progress on the Precipice](#), [The African film industry: trends, challenges and opportunities for growth](#), as well as [Cultural and creative industries in the face of COVID-19: an economic impact outlook](#). The Secretary then reported on the collaboration initiated with the UNESCO Chair on the diversity of cultural expressions of Laval University in Quebec (Canada), aimed at creating a database of cultural clauses in trade agreements. Finally, the Secretariat has continued its efforts to identify synergies between the 1980 Recommendation and the 2005 Convention, notably in the framework of the UNESCO-Aschberg Programme for artists and cultural professionals.

Thirdly, the Secretariat has implemented capacity building programmes to the benefit of 73 States during 2021, despite the constraints of the pandemic. He mentioned in particular an eight-week online training course on the creative economy. The Secretary therefore warmly thanked all the Parties and organizations that had provided the necessary voluntary contributions to these essential support operations.

Finally, the Secretariat deployed a wide range of communication and advocacy initiatives on the occasion of the International Year of the Creative Economy for Sustainable Development. As an example, he cited the awarding of the first UNESCO-Bangladesh Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman International Prize for the Creative Economy at the 41st session of the General Conference.

The Secretary concluded by calling on the Parties to sustain the achievements of the Secretariat, by providing it with human or financial resources. He noted that some of the programmes funded by voluntary contributions expire in 2021 and 2022.

17. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to comment on the Secretariat's report.
18. The Committee members who took the floor all thanked the Chairperson and the Parties that had provided voluntary contributions, and congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work.

19. The delegation of **Viet Nam** encouraged the Parties to provide voluntary contributions and then shared its action plan for the implementation of the Convention between 2021 and 2025. In particular, it referred to the national cultural conference held in 2021, which proposed strategic actions to revive national cultures, to include culture in sustainable development programmes, to create a healthy cultural environment and to reduce the cultural consumption gap between urban and rural areas. It added that priority was given to minorities and disadvantaged groups. It spoke about the country's investments in cultural industries and their digitisation, and concluded by announcing that Viet Nam is pursuing a government plan to develop a network of creative cities to be integrated with UNESCO's network.
20. The delegation of **Armenia** welcomed the two new ratifications and commended the Secretariat's efforts to mitigate the impact of the pandemic on the cultural sector, notably through the discussions conducted within the framework of the ResiliArt movement. However, it insisted that the precariousness of artists and the obstacles to creative freedom were not only caused by the health crisis, but could also be aggravated by conflict situations. It mentioned the difficult situation of the people of Artsakh. The delegation of Armenia concluded its statement by supporting the draft decision 15.IGC 4 regarding the report of the Secretariat on its activities.
21. The delegation of **Bangladesh** thanked all those who had contributed to the award of the UNESCO-Bangladesh Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman International Prize for the Creative Economy, and expressed its pleasure at being able to support the work of the Secretariat in this way.
22. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** said that the impact of the IFCD was very visible in the Secretariat's report, particularly in the development of cultural statistics to strengthen public policy and support for civil society. It expressed its gratitude to the countries that provided voluntary contributions, and thanked Sweden for financing the preparation of its last two periodic reports. It then congratulated the Secretariat for the preparation of the report on the film industry in Africa, which it hopes to use for the future development of the Pan-African Film and Television Festival of Ouagadougou (FESPACO). It mentioned the ambition of African cinema to become a veritable industry for the benefit of the African continent and its diaspora. Finally, Burkina Faso invited the Secretariat to address the security crisis in the Sahel. Indeed, the numerous internal displacements that it causes endanger artistic freedom and the diversity of cultural expressions on the concerned territories.
23. The delegation of **Palestine** reaffirmed its commitment to the Convention, despite all the difficulties the country faces. It reported on the work carried out in partnership with the UNESCO office in Ramallah to bring its legislation into line with the Convention. It stressed that Palestinian artists are working tirelessly to promote their cultural diversity despite the measures imposed by the occupying authorities. It concluded by suggesting that the section dedicated to preferential treatment and Article 16 be a little more substantial in the future, and requested that future reports be elaborated on this subject, in response to the requests of the Conference of Parties, be transmitted to the Committee.
24. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** stated that COVID-19 had not only caused great damage to the cultural sector, including its economic balance, but also showed its significance in everyone's lives. Azerbaijan has therefore placed the creative economy at the heart of its recovery strategy. It reported on the establishment in 2021 of the Azeri Federation of Creative Industries, which aims to support the development of the sector. It welcomed the entry of Lankaran, the gastronomic capital of the country, into the UNESCO Network of Creative Cities. It then mentioned several cultural events organised in 2021: notably the Khari Bulbul music festival in Shusha, and the exhibition "Restoration, reconstruction and development of Karabakh" held in Baku. It also expressed the ambition to develop *smart-cities* on its territory, before concluding by reminding that 2022 marked the 30th anniversary of Azerbaijan's UNESCO membership.
25. The delegation of **Austria** looked forward to the launch of the Global Report and announced that it would provide a translation of its executive summary into German. It welcomed the

success of the ResiliArt movement and the Civil Society Forum. However, it also expressed concern about the sustainability of funding and stressed its critical importance, particularly for the IFCD. It stated that the activities of the Convention should be based on the [41 C/4](#) and the [41 C/5](#), that is to say around themes such as preferential treatment, the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment, and cooperation with civil society.

26. The **Chairperson** announced that the Bureau of the Committee had agreed that the discussions on Agenda items 9, 10 and 11 would be considered together to take into account the synergies between these items.
27. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** welcomed the two new Parties to the Convention. It recalled that it hosted the 2021 World Conference on the Creative Economy and welcomed the collaboration between its country and UNESCO to conduct a study on the impacts of the pandemic on the creative economy: [Culture in times of COVID-19: resilience, recovery and revival](#).
28. The delegation of **Mongolia** welcomed the launch of the third edition of the Global Report and announced that it would translate the executive summary into Mongolian. It particularly welcomed the Secretariat's publication regarding the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on cultural and creative industries, as well as the collaboration with the UNESCO Chair of Laval University, for the elaboration of a database on cultural clauses in trade agreements.
29. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that it would like the in-depth discussions on Article 16 on preferential treatment to be brought to the Conference of Parties. It emphasised that the IFCD is the pillar of the Convention, and said it is crucial to mobilise more funds – especially from the private sector – to finance more projects.
30. The delegation of **Norway** welcomed its first participation in the Committee. It stressed the importance of a human rights-based approach to the implementation of the Convention. It welcomed the efforts made within the framework of UNESCO's global priorities of Africa and gender equality. It concluded by announcing that it was chairing this year's Nordic Council of Ministers, and that it would support diversity and cultural exchange within this framework, notably through the Nordic Bridges initiative.
31. The delegation of **France** stressed the importance of contributing regularly to the IFCD and pledged to do so again in 2022. It then announced the publication of its roadmap for the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment, structured around three axes: support for the creation and protection of creators, promotion of the diversity of cultural offerings and development of audiences and access to culture.
32. The delegation of **Georgia** said it was very honoured that its capital, Tbilisi, was awarded the title of World Book Capital in 2021. It expressed the great usefulness of the funds received within the framework of the IFCD to stimulate the cultural and creative industries.
33. The delegation of **Brazil** stated that the pandemic has affected the world, especially the cultural world, in a permanent way. It believes that small and medium-sized enterprises have a fundamental role to play in the future of the cultural and creative industries, and it is therefore necessary to better include them in the work of the Convention. It also stressed the importance of developing people's digital skills. Finally, it wished MONDIACULT 2022 to be a success, and announced that it was organising the UNESCO Creative Cities meeting in Sao Paulo in July.
34. The delegation of **Cuba** stated that the Convention was, more than ever, the cornerstone for the protection of cultural diversity, especially for the small island states of the Caribbean. It welcomed the actions carried out within the framework of the Creative Cities Network, and hoped that relations between this network and the Convention could be developed.
35. The delegation of **Qatar** stated that the implementation of the Convention should be done in an integrated manner. It cited some of the events it had organised, like the International Book Fair in Doha in 2021. It stated that Doha was awarded the title of Capital of Culture of the Muslim World in 2021 by the Islamic World Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

(ICESCO). It mentioned several Qatari cultural centres, including the Katara Center for Public Diplomacy, which aims to improve intercultural dialogue.

36. The delegation of **Jamaica** welcomed the cooperation between UNESCO and the European Union which allowed it to establish new regulatory frameworks that strengthen cultural industries and promote South-South cooperation. It stated the programme allows it to link culture and resilience, and to better integrate culture into its sustainable development plan, especially to address challenges such as the COVID-19 pandemic and climate change. It emphasised that it is essential to work on expanding access to digital resources and concluded by also thanking Sweden for its support.
37. The delegation of **Senegal** thanked all the Parties that had provided voluntary contributions, particularly Sweden and Japan. It welcomed the report on the film industry in Africa. It continued by echoing Burkina Faso on the need to take into account the security situation in the Sahel, as conflicts greatly affect cultural diversity in the concerned areas. It stressed the need to support displaced populations in this context. It thanked Sweden and UNESCO for their support in the preparation of its periodic report. It returned to the main objectives that emerged: a better structuring of cultural enterprises abroad; a facilitated circulation of artists and works at the national level; the professionalisation of actors in the creative sector; and the development of cultural statistics. It reported that several actions were already being implemented to achieve these goals, such as the construction of regional cultural centres. It concluded by mentioning the law on the status of the artist and cultural professionals, enacted at the end of 2020. The latter will allow the establishment of a social security system for artists, a better professionalisation, and the creation of the National Council for the Arts and Letters.
38. The delegation of **Ethiopia** welcomed the various programmes from which it has benefited, including the EU/UNESCO Expert Facility, and stressed their importance. It then asked for clarification on how the Ethiopian government was represented on page 268 of the Global Report, in terms of artistic freedom. It deplored the fate of the murdered musician, Hachalu Hundessa, adding that the case was still being investigated by the judiciary.
39. The **Secretary** thanked the Committee members for their positive feedback. He again thanked all the Parties that had made voluntary contributions or provided staff. Regarding Article 16 and preferential treatment, he explained that only the Secretariat's initiatives were mentioned in document [DCE/22/15.IGC/4](#) these included advocacy, capacity building and the launch of the database on cultural clauses in trade agreements in partnership with the UNESCO Chair on the diversity of cultural expressions of Laval University. As for the measures implemented by the Parties, they can be found in the periodic reports, the dedicated chapter of the Global Report, the policy monitoring platform and the Secretariat's report that will be submitted to the Conference of Parties. It added that unfortunately, in the last four years, no preferential treatment measures for artists from developing countries have been identified, with the exception of a few initiatives that have had an indirect and unintended impact.

Furthermore, he recalled that the Secretariat had developed an assistance programme to support the Parties in the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment, as requested by the Committee. However, in the absence of a voluntary contribution, the latter has not yet been operationalised.

40. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.
41. The observers all thanked the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their work.
42. The delegation of **Colombia** reported on the success of the Great World Forum of Arts, Culture, Creativity and Technology, which was held in Medellín in 2021 and which will be repeated in 2022. It said that events would be organised to provide visibility to the Global Report.
43. The delegation of **Lithuania** thanked Mexico for the organisation of MONDIACULT 2022, and announced that it would actively participate in this conference. It emphasised the importance of the initiative "Reviving the Spirit of Mosul" and announced that it had made a substantial contribution to it. It expressed that it would like funding to be found to enable the Secretariat to

operationalise the programme on digital transition, which is one of the priorities of the Ministry of Culture of Lithuania. It also welcomed the upcoming launch of the fifth global consultation on the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist. It also suggested that the survey on the status of the artist be included in the quadrennial periodic reports of the 2005 Convention, given the synergies with the 1980 Recommendation.

44. The delegation of **Germany** welcomed the launch of the third edition of the Global Report and thanked Austria for its decision to translate the Executive Summary into German. It then presented the concept of "fair culture", on which a [study](#) has been published. It concluded by asking that the debate on the difference between "public good" and "common good" be examined.
45. The delegation of **Nigeria** called on Parties in a position to do so to make contributions to further the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment.
46. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** was pleased that the resources it had provided had been put to good use. It echoed Nigeria's call and concluded by reiterating its strong commitment to the Convention.
47. The delegation of **Mauritius** welcomed the two new Parties. It thanked UNESCO for helping Mauritius create a statistics unit dedicated to culture, enabling informed decision-making. It concluded by emphasising the essential role of the Convention during this period that continues to be disrupted by the health crisis.
48. The delegation of **Mauritania** stated that cultural and environmental diversity was at the heart of its social policy, as it was the only way to ensure the stability and cohesion of the country. It echoed the remarks of Burkina Faso and Senegal on the need to take into account the crisis situation in the Sahel.
49. The delegation of the **Syrian Arab Republic** stated that the crises highlight both the vulnerability and the resilience of culture. It then reported on several actions to implement the Convention. As an example, it cited the recent performance, by more than a hundred musicians, of the Syrian rhapsody at the Dubai World Expo. Finally, it insisted on the very strong synergies between the different conventions of the UNESCO culture sector.
50. The delegation of **Canada** welcomed the forthcoming launch of the fifth global consultation on the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist. It reaffirmed the importance of cultural diversity in the digital environment, and recalled that it was part of a working group on the subject, with France, Germany, Finland and Australia, as well as representatives of civil society and the private sector. The results that emerge from the work of this group will be made available online.

The representative of the Government of **Quebec** in the Canadian delegation welcomed the rate of ratification of the Convention, the increase in contributions to the IFCD, as well as the rate of submission of periodic reports, which was also increasing. It concluded by recalling that Quebec is continuing its efforts to promote the discoverability of French-language cultural content online.

51. The delegation of **Ecuador** emphasised that the cultural sector represented a major opportunity for employment and inclusion, and stated that its country was seeking to diversify its economy in this way.
52. The delegation of the **Czechia** asked why the list of Parties that had contributed to the IFCD was not included in the Secretariat's report.
53. The **Secretary** thanked the Parties to the Convention that are not members of the Committee for their encouraging remarks and stated that he had taken good note of all their comments. It replied to Czechia that this list was included in Information Document 6.
54. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** thanked all the parties that spoke. It then responded to Ethiopia, explaining that it was necessary to include examples in the reports. It added that the Ethiopian government was mentioned in a positive way, as it had clearly

denounced the case and brought it to court. With regard to the distinction between "common good" and "public good" raised by Germany, it stated that this distinction was in progress. Based on the texts of the United Nations, it explained that the common good was what benefited humanity as a whole, and therefore could not be managed by a single player. It concluded by insisting on the need to include culture as a pillar of sustainable development.

55. The representative of the **Organisation internationale de la francophonie** (OIF) stated that culture, a fundamental and transversal component of sustainable development, has always been at the centre of its Organization. It then detailed the different ways in which the OIF supports the diversity of cultural and creative industries: advocacy and mobilisation; support to the audiovisual industry with production funds; and finally the commitment to the discoverability of cultural content online.
56. The representative of the **Centre régional pour les arts vivants en Afrique** (CERAV) welcomed the publication of the report on the film industry in Africa, which highlights the challenges and opportunities of the sector, while making relevant strategic recommendations. On this matter, it recalled that CERAV had organised roundtables on the contribution of festivals to the development of the film industry and the resilience of culture. It reaffirmed CERAV's dedicated commitment to the renewal of its status as a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO. It then mentioned the mobility and diversity prize awarded by CERAV to facilitate the mobility of young African creators. It concluded its address by calling on the Parties to make voluntary contributions.
57. The **Chairperson** thanked the observers. In the absence of proposed amendments or objections, he declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 4 was adopted.

Item 5 - Transmission of new quadrennial periodic reports **Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/5](#)**

58. The **Chairperson** stated that the importance of the quadrennial periodic reports was highlighted at the launch of the third edition of the Convention's Global Report, which is based on reports submitted over the last five years.
59. The **Secretary** explained that 15 periodic reports had been received in 2021 and therefore should be reviewed by the Committee for transmission to the Conference of Parties. He reiterated the difficult conditions of the past two years, which affected both the participatory nature of the reporting process and the Secretariat's ability to provide face-to-face technical assistance and peer-to-peer learning activities. He then gave the floor to one of the members of the Secretariat, Ms Gabrielle Thiboutot, to share additional details.
60. She explained that out of the 15 reports received in 2021, 10 were due in 2020 and 1 in 2017. She added that only 4 of the 19 reports due in 2021 had been submitted, i.e., 21%. She congratulated Ghana and Türkiye, which submitted their first periodic reports this year. She deplored the uneven geographical distribution of the reports that have been submitted: no reports from Group V(b) and Group III, due in 2021, have yet been received. In addition, 6 of the 15 Parties that have not submitted their reports due in 2021 are small island developing states (SIDS). She therefore noted that it was essential to adapt the Secretariat's support to this priority group.

She then highlighted the improvements due to the alignment of the periodic reporting framework with the Convention's monitoring framework in 2019: the flexibility of the form allows for reporting on emerging issues, such as the impact of the pandemic; and the introduction of a dedicated form for civil society organizations has enhanced their participation. In addition, she announced that the policy monitoring platform now contains more than 4,310 measures, including about 500 civil society-led initiatives.

She cited the 12 Parties whose reports were due in 2022, and then suggested that it might be appropriate for the Secretariat to present to the next Committee a proposal to streamline the

four-year reporting cycles, for example by asking Parties to clearly indicate the period covered by their report and setting the next submission date four years after the period covered by their last report. She also stated that it is essential to continue to develop the knowledge management system of the Convention. Finally, she indicated that it would be appropriate for the Secretariat to present proposals at the next session of the Committee to strengthen the support offered to SIDS in the preparation and submission of their periodic reports. She concluded by highlighting the efforts to strengthen synergies between the Convention and the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist and called on Parties to respond to the global consultation to be launched in the spring of 2022 on the subject.

61. The delegation of **Denmark** stressed the fundamental importance of periodic reporting and emphasised the need for civil society to participate in this process.
62. The delegation of **Bangladesh** recalled that it had submitted its periodic report in 2020. It supported the proposal to streamline the four-year reporting cycles. It suggested that the Secretariat could draw on other conventions to do this. It concluded by stressing the importance of capacity building for the Parties in the preparation of periodic reports.
63. The delegation of **Austria** congratulated all Parties that had submitted their reports despite the health context and noted their quality. It also expressed support for the proposal to streamline the periodic reporting cycles.
64. The delegation of **Norway** welcomed the increase in the number of reports submitted. It stressed the importance of technical support and capacity building. It agreed with the proposal to streamline the reporting cycles; and generally speaking, it favoured an approach aimed at cost efficiency and synergies between the different UNESCO cultural conventions.
65. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stressed that information sharing was essential to the Convention and expressed its agreement with streamlining the reporting cycles.
66. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that some countries, such as their own, had received technical support from the Secretariat, but had not been able to submit their reports. It explained that, in their case, it was due to a volcanic eruption. It then asked what the modalities and cost of specific assistance to SIDS would be; and whether it was possible to decide on this additional assistance at the present Committee session.
67. The delegation of **Palestine** stated that there was a consensus on the importance of the reports. It noted that the support it received from the UNESCO Ramallah office in preparing its periodic report had been very effective.
68. The delegation of **Cuba** emphasised the important role played by the regional offices. It echoed the comments of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines on the need to provide specific support to SIDS in the preparation of their reports. It then asked whether the Secretariat thought it would be appropriate to organise the submission of reports in a regional manner, as had been done in the 1972 and 2003 Conventions.
69. The delegation of **Jamaica** wished to express its support for Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, as this country has gone through a very difficult period recently. It supported all the proposals made by the other members of the Committee.
70. The **Secretary** thanked the members of the Committee. He stated that there was a clear correlation between the technical assistance provided by the Secretariat and the number and quality of reports received. He recalled that the main source of funding for the capacity building programme, for the participatory policy monitoring and the elaboration of periodic reports, came from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, regarding which he reiterated his warm thanks. He said the direct financial investment for capacity building in accordance with the implemented methodology was about US\$60,000 per country. If the Committee decides to extend this support this year, the only funding mechanism identified is the IFCD, which will require a budget amendment. On the subject of streamlining the reporting cycles, he expressed his satisfaction that the Secretariat's proposal was met with enthusiasm from the Committee, and took it upon himself to consult with his colleagues responsible for the

other UNESCO conventions for which a similar mechanism exists. Regarding the participation of civil society in the elaboration of reports, he welcomed the progress made, and recalled that CSOs can share their observations on the status of implementation of the Convention directly with the Secretariat.

71. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked why the financial cost of support per country was so high, and if it was possible to reduce it a little, for example by using video conferencing. It stated that it felt it was important that the IFCD resources be allocated to projects, and therefore suggested that other sources of funding be sought.
72. The **Secretary** explained that in the framework of the partnership with the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the assistance provided went beyond the simple preparation of the periodic report. Indeed, activities are carried out before and after the preparation of the report. For example, it is an opportunity to reflect on improving the country's cultural policies. If a purely technical support for the preparation of the report is envisaged, using video conferencing, initial cost estimates are around US\$30,000.
73. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** agreed with Saint Vincent and the Grenadines that consideration should be given to lowering the cost of technical assistance. He also stated that capacity building should not be about producing one report, but about building expertise on the ground, so that improvement is continuous over time.
74. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.
75. The delegation of **Belgium** announced that it submitted its periodic report in 2021. It stressed the importance of this process and invited all Parties to participate.
76. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** announced that it would submit its report in June 2022, and that it would organise - in collaboration with the Secretariat - a forum for the World Day for Cultural Diversity for Dialogue and Development on 21 May. It also announced its intention to translate the Global Report into Korean.
77. The delegation of **Türkiye** explained that the preparation of its periodic report had been coordinated by the Ministry of Culture, in collaboration with the Türkiye National Commission and civil society. It announced that a specific platform had been created to facilitate the active participation of all relevant stakeholders. It added that measures to reduce the impact of COVID-19 on cultural industries had been added. It concluded by recalling the importance of the digital transition in its opinion.
78. The **Secretary** added that three reports were expected in 2022 from SIDS: the Bahamas, Haiti and Trinidad and Tobago. He explained that if the Committee decided to provide technical support, this would be possible, but that the timeline was extremely short, as these reports would be due by 30 June 2022.
79. The **Chairperson** thanked the participants for their remarks and read the draft decision.
80. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed to write in paragraph 5 "is delighted about the reports submitted" rather than "is delighted about the number of reports submitted", as 15 reports due in 2021 have not yet been submitted.
81. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to add the words "effective and sustainable" in paragraph 8, to reflect the discussions of the Committee.
82. The delegation of **Cuba** supported the proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, adding that this also allowed - in its opinion - to strengthen the regional dimension of the quadrennial cycles.
83. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed its wish to remove the reference to the sixteenth session of the Committee in paragraph 9, as it felt that it would be better to find a way to support SIDS without delay.

84. The delegation of **Austria** supported the proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and asked the Secretariat for clarification on the financing of this technical support: are there any unused extra-budgetary funds left, or should the IFCD be used?
85. The delegations of **Jamaica, Palestine** and **Azerbaijan** also expressed their support for the proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.
86. The **Secretary** noted that there appeared to be a consensus on the need to accompany SIDS presently. He said this assistance would apply to SIDS whose reports are due in 2022, or are already overdue. On the subject of funding, he stated that the only source of funding available to the Committee was the IFCD.
87. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** wished to add the following phrase to paragraph 9: "within the framework of the IFCD and programmes supported by voluntary contributions".
88. The delegation of **Austria** asked whether it was possible to wait until the IFCD budget was examined before voting on such an amendment.
89. The delegation of **Palestine** stated that if the Committee members agreed in principle to allocate part of the IFCD funds to such technical support, it was not a problem to vote on the amendment now.
90. The delegations of **Armenia, Ethiopia** and **Bangladesh** supported the declaration of Palestine and the amendment of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.
91. The **Chairperson**, seeing no further objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 5 was adopted as amended.

Item 6 – Report on the Implementation of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity (2021) and Recommended Projects from the Twelfth Call for Funding Requests
Documents [DCE/22/15.IGC/6](#), [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.6](#) and [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.6Add](#)

92. The **Secretary** first briefly mentioned the 19 projects whose implementation is being monitored by the Secretariat. This includes four projects approved in 2018, nine in 2020 and six in 2021. He shared the considerable effort that has been made in 2021 to monitor projects more closely and better analyse their impacts. Regular meetings have been held with project leaders, and a database has been developed to better record the IFCD's contribution to the implementation of the Convention in developing countries.

He then conducted a review of the IFCD communication and fundraising strategy. He was pleased that by 2021, 55 Parties had made voluntary contributions to the IFCD, for a total amount of US\$1,098,651.40, or 95.5% of the target. He then thanked each of the contributors to the IFCD. He stated that this success was due to the Parties that maintained their support; those that contributed to the IFCD for the first time in 2021; and those that contributed above the recommended 1%. He also thanked the Parties that have provided voluntary contributions to the IFCD, in addition to their extra-budgetary contributions to other programmes, notably the Republic of Korea, Sweden and Germany. He went on to mention the activities carried out by the Secretariat to implement the strategy, including: recruiting a resource mobilisation officer; establishing a communication flow mechanism for the IFCD; revising the web page; developing the "Your 1%" initiative; and finally, organising next May a networking and loyalty event.

Thirdly, the Secretary reviewed the use of the IFCD's financial resources in 2020-2021. He explained that almost the entire budget had been spent or committed, with the exception of the cost of participation of experts from the least developed countries that are members of the Committee, due to the fact that the previous statutory meetings were held online.

He then announced the renewal of half of the members of the IFCD Panel of Experts and thanked the outgoing experts, Ms. Fatin Farhat, Ms. Sarah Gardner and Ms. Ojoma Ochai. He announced that nine projects have been recommended by the Panel of Experts for the twelfth

call for funding requests in 2021. He concluded by emphasising the encouraging results achieved in 2021. On the one hand, there were more projects submitted by Parties that had never benefited from the IFCD - five of the nine recommended projects came from such countries, namely, Chile, Guinea, Nigeria, Seychelles, and Timor-Leste. On the other hand, the increase in contributions to the IFCD has allowed for the financing of 30% more projects than last year.

93. **IFCD Panel of Experts Coordinator** Sarah Gardner announced that the IFCD's twelfth call for funding requests registered 615 projects, of which 592 were submitted by 85 eligible countries. Of these, the National Commissions have pre-selected 137. Following the Secretariat's technical assessment, 78 projects from 51 countries were presented to the Panel. She emphasised the thoroughness and transparency of the evaluation process, which takes into account, among other things, the project's relevance to IFCD's objectives; its feasibility; its financial management; its expected results; and its sustainability. She was pleased that the funding rate doubled from last year to reach 1.5%. She noted, however, that this rate remains low and that she hopes it can increase further. Ms. Gardner revealed that 15 projects scored 30 or more points, but only the top 9 were recommended. The total amount requested by the 9 best projects was US\$ 855,964 and the available budget was US\$ 741,683. She therefore explained that the experts recommend that the grants for all successful projects be reduced by a flat rate of 14%, and that applicants would then be required to decide whether to continue their project with this reduced grant.

She then presented the nine selected projects, of which six are from NGOs, one from an INGO and two from Parties:

- [Establishing a community-driven alliance for sustainable cultural development planning in Lautem](#) (Timor-Leste),
- [Fostering cultural diversity through youth empowerment](#) (Chile),
- [Reinvigorating and re-establishing culture at the heart of Seychelles' economic and social development](#) (Seychelles),
- [WE ARE DIVERSE: Empowering female audiovisual professionals from vulnerable groups in seven countries of Latin America](#) (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico),
- [Promoting and monitoring artistic freedom in Indonesia](#) (Indonesia),
- [Improving market access for artists with disabilities](#) (Nigeria),
- [Ramallah city of music- a strategy for sustainable city development through music](#) (Palestine),
- [Promoting cultural and creative industries in the city of La Paz, Bolivia](#) (Bolivia),
- [Reinforcing entrepreneurship in Guinea's audiovisual, fashion and design sectors](#) (Guinea).

She concluded her speech by emphasising the central role of the IFCD in the implementation of the Convention. She also stated that the experts thought it would be premature to conduct an external evaluation of the IFCD within the next year, as originally planned, and therefore recommended postponing the third external evaluation until 2024. The Panel also believes that more resources should be allocated to monitoring IFCD grants. In addition, experts believe that the percentage that can be allocated to overheads should be reduced to 10% from the current 30%. Finally, she stressed the importance of requiring the inclusion in project budgets resources for financial audit and evaluation. She concluded by thanking the Secretariat, the National Commissions, her colleagues and all the project leaders.

94. The **Secretary** replied to a Party that mentioned in the chat a voluntary contribution to the IFCD that was not mentioned, explaining that he would check with the financial services of UNESCO that the sum paid had been credited and that he would get back to the Party concerned.

95. The Committee members who spoke all thanked the Panel of Experts for its excellent work.
96. The delegation of **Palestine** indicated that its only concern was the availability of funds, which were insufficient to finance all deserving projects.
97. The **Cuban** delegation reiterated the importance of the IFCD for developing countries. It expressed regret that no SIDS were included in this year's list of selected projects, while acknowledging that this had been the case in the past. It then remarked that the IFCD was undoubtedly one of UNESCO's most complex funds, and asked whether it would be possible to strengthen capacity-building mechanisms in developing countries, in particular to help with the technical formulation of projects. It concluded by highlighting the possible synergies between the UNESCO Creative Cities Network and the IFCD, explaining that the Fund could support the development of cultural policies at the local level.
98. The delegation of **Mongolia** recalled that it had benefited greatly from the Fund, particularly through the project entitled [Promoting Mongolia's cultural industries by strengthening cultural policymaking](#) which ended in March 2021. It emphasised the success of this project, and reiterated its gratitude towards the IFCD contributors.
99. The delegation of **Brazil** welcomed the increase in contributions to the IFCD. However, it expressed regret that only nine projects could be recommended. It noted that efforts for the communication and fundraising strategy should be continued.
100. The delegation of **Austria** welcomed the progress made, but stated that the budgetary situation of the IFCD remained a challenge, as only 9 of the 15 projects that meet the quality criteria could be recommended; and the overall rate of access to funding remained very low. It concluded by expressing its interest in the impact assessment of IFCD-funded projects, which is currently being conducted by the Secretariat.
101. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed its agreement with the previous statements. In particular, it emphasised the resources allocated by project leaders to submit their applications, and the frustration caused by the low success rate. It therefore asked whether it would not be more appropriate to lower the funding ceiling to, for example, US\$75,000, in order to fund more projects. It also proposed that there be no call for funding requests in 2022, which would allow the focus to be on fundraising. It concluded by stating that it was in favour of postponing the third external evaluation.
102. The delegation of **France** encouraged the Parties to the Convention to contribute to the IFCD on a more regular basis, and the Committee members to relay this commitment to their electoral group. It encouraged the Secretariat to continue to promote the projects financed by the IFCD and their results in order to attract new funding.
103. The delegation of **Armenia** also echoed the previous statements. It expressed its support for exploring the avenues suggested by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, so that more projects could be supported. It concluded by welcoming the progress made and emphasising the quality of the selection work carried out jointly by the Secretariat and the Panel of Experts.
104. The **Secretary** expressed the Secretariat's full agreement with what the various members of the Committee had said: although significant progress had been made in 2021, the IFCD was still only at half of its funding potential; if all the Parties contributed 1% of their total contribution to UNESCO's regular budget, the IFCD would reach its full potential.
105. The **Chairperson** invited observers to speak.
106. The delegation of **Switzerland** insisted on the need to improve the ratio of funded projects to submitted projects, mentioning avenues such as the introduction of an annual thematic criterion or capacity building. It was opposed to the use of the IFCD for purposes other than project financing. It concluded by inviting Parties to make regular and predictable voluntary contributions and recalled that Switzerland has committed to contribute 50,000 Swiss francs from 2020 to 2030.

107. The delegation of **Barbados** noted the difficulty of the application process, particularly for SIDS with very limited resources. It expressed some concerns about the IFCD selection process. It took as an example the application of its own country, which had received 31.5 points in 2020 and then only 30 points in 2021, while the application had not changed. It asked for an explanation for this.
108. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stressed the importance of the IFCD for the implementation of the Convention and international cooperation. It then congratulated the Secretariat and the Panel of Experts for their work, and concluded by encouraging the Parties to provide voluntary contributions to the IFCD.
109. The delegation of **Sweden** supported the proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. It believes that it would be beneficial not to issue a call for funding requests this year.
110. The delegation of **Belgium** recalled the importance of the Fund. It also announced that its annual contribution was more than double the recommended contribution, for a total of more than half a million euros since the creation of the IFCD. It encouraged Parties to the Convention to contribute 1% of their total contribution to UNESCO's regular budget to the Fund. It concluded by welcoming the strengthening of project impact assessment.
111. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** supported the proposal of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to lower the IFCD funding ceiling to US\$75,000.
112. The representative of **Creatividad y Cultura Global A.C.** thanked all the contributors to the Fund and congratulated the leaders of the nine recommended projects. She stated that the problem of too much discrepancy between proposed and selected projects also exists at the national level. It therefore asked the National Commissions to be clearer about the type of projects they would select.
113. The **Secretary** stated that he noted the remarks and observations that had been made. For example, regarding capacity building for the formulation of nominations, he explained that the Secretariat was already doing this, upon request from some Parties. Regarding the possible decrease in the funding cap, he stated that this decision was up to the Committee members, and that the topic could be discussed under item 7. Regarding the possible suspension of the call for funding requests for 2022, he explained that the Secretariat was concerned that the Parties would also suspend their contributions during this blank year. Regarding the resubmission of projects that were not selected the previous year, he noted that the context and environment can change rapidly, which explains why a project that is very relevant for one specific year may not be as relevant the following year.
114. The **IFCD Panel of Experts Coordinator** responded more specifically to the Barbados delegate, reiterating that the integrity of the selection process was essential to ensure the confidence of donors and applicants. She said she was very aware of the difficulty of the situation for applicants whose projects are not accepted. She recalled that each project was evaluated separately by two different experts, before the Panel met to agree on a common evaluation. She noted that there was little variation between the scores given by each of the experts, but that the same project could have scores that differed by three or four points. She also recalled that each project was evaluated according to five criteria, each with four sub-criteria. She emphasised that, although the diversity of criteria taken into account can sometimes lead to a certain variability in scores, this allows the evaluation process to be both thorough, rigorous and adaptable to the context.
115. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objections, declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 6 was adopted.

Item 7 – Revised Draft Guidelines on the Use of the Resources of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity
Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/7](#)

116. The **Secretary** recalled that the working document [DCE/22/15.IGC/7](#) had been prepared in accordance with the request made by the Committee at its fourteenth session. He explained that this document first presented the proposed revisions and updates to the Guidelines on the Use of IFCD Resources. He recalled that the purpose of these proposed revisions was to: reflect the changes that have taken place in recent years; clarify the role of the IFCD as a mechanism for implementing the Convention; align the work of the IFCD with UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy ([41 C/4](#)) and its Programme and Budget for 2022-2023 ([41 C/5](#)); and to ensure the mobilisation of the resources necessary for fundraising, as well as for the evaluation and monitoring of funded projects.

In addition, the document also presents, in a second step, elements of reflection for possible revisions that could have a major impact on the implementation of the Fund. These notably include: the need to strengthen project impact assessment and monitoring; the need to ensure that the majority of allocated resources are invested in the implementation of activities necessary to achieve project results and objectives; and the establishment of a technical assistance mechanism for the preparation of periodic reports from small island developing states (SIDS). He added that these elements were only avenues of reflection, and that the Committee was invited to examine, discuss and amend the proposed draft Operational Guidelines, to be presented to the Conference of Parties in June 2023.

117. The delegation of **Armenia** welcomed the inclusion of youth and SIDS in the IFCD's strategic priorities, in addition to gender. It expressed its support for this draft decision.
118. The delegation of **France** asked what exactly the decrease in project overhead costs covered.
119. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** welcomed the fact that the proposed revisions take into account the recommendations of the second external evaluation of the IFCD, particularly the inclusion of UNESCO's strategic priorities in the evaluation criteria. It added that it would be beneficial to make the application process less time-consuming and burdensome to encourage the participation of priority groups such as SIDS.
120. The delegation of **Ecuador** asked whether projects concerning cultural flows between countries could be adopted by the IFCD. It clarified its question by citing the example of a project that would aim to develop a digital platform that would distribute cultural content from countries that are under-represented on the international cultural goods and services market.
121. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the same question as France regarding overhead costs. It also proposed to register the decrease of the funding cap to US\$75,000, in order to be able to fund more projects.
122. The **Secretary** stated that he was pleased that the proposed strategic alignments were met with the approval of the Committee. Regarding the reduction of overheads, he explained that this was just a line of thought on which it was up to the Committee to take a position. He recalled that today, project overhead is limited to 30% of a project's budget. However, the Panel of experts found that many project leaders set their overhead at this threshold. He added, however, that this was more of a preventive measure, as the Secretariat already ensures that the overhead costs of funded projects never reach that level. Therefore, of all the projects financed to date, less than ten have exceeded 12% after budget execution. He then replied to Ecuador that the type of project mentioned could be perfectly financed, and that this had already been the case, for example with the [Retina Latina](#) project. Finally, regarding the suggestion to lower the funding cap, he recalled that the Committee had sometimes had divergent opinions, recalling the need to avoid "sprinkling". On the other hand, he said that a portfolio of more projects with small amounts would be more difficult for the Secretariat to manage.
123. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.

124. The delegation of **Sweden** stressed that, in order for the projects to have structural impacts, according to the objectives of the Fund, it was essential that contributions to the IFCD increase. Raising the idea of allowing earmarked contributions to the IFCD, for example to a sector or geographic area, it shared its concern that this practice could lead the Fund away from the objectives of the Convention. It also reiterated the importance of gender parity and equality in the projects. It supported limiting overhead costs to 10% of project budgets. Finally, it stressed the importance of monitoring and evaluation of projects, and commended the Secretariat's efforts in this regard. Learning and defining good practices are essential given the financial limitations of the Fund.
125. The delegation of **Grenada** supported the proposal to lower the funding ceiling to US\$75,000, arguing that the difference of US\$25,000 was not so great and that this change would allow more projects to be funded. It added that she understands Barbados' frustration, and that special attention must be given to projects that relate to UNESCO's global priorities.
126. The representative of the **International Music Council** announced that she was speaking on behalf of various CSOs, including Creatividad y Cultura Glocal A.C., Cultural Contra Conflict, Asociacion Cultural Baizara, the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions and the IFCCD. She welcomed the proposal to clarify the role of the IFCD as a mechanism for implementing the Convention. She welcomed the inclusion of the priorities of youth and SIDS, and expressed the hope that minorities and indigenous peoples would also receive special attention. She also welcomed the increasing evaluation and monitoring of projects. She regretted that the document did not include the civil society proposal to allow the IFCD to also support the participation of civil society representatives in the work of the Convention's statutory bodies. She also regretted that some National Commissions do not clearly communicate the criteria by which they pre-select projects. She added that, despite the progress made, capacity building programmes are still relevant for some National Commissions. Finally, she raised the issue of vetoes at the pre-selection level when NGOs are conducting work that may be considered critical of the present government. She concluded her speech by reiterating a recommendation from the third Civil Society Forum: the implementation of programmes to support CSO applications to the IFCD, in consultation with National Commissions.
127. The **Secretary** thanked the observers for their remarks and suggestions. He confirmed that the pre-selection process could be improved, but that possible changes were the responsibility of the Committee. He also stated that the IFCD was not expected to accept earmarked contributions, nor was this mentioned in the document.
128. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked for clarification of what was meant by "stakeholder engagement" in section 7.4.
129. The **Secretary** responded that these were communication and advocacy activities aimed at mobilizing stakeholders, for example to raise funds or strengthen the knowledge sharing system related to the Fund. Stakeholders are all actors involved in the implementation of the Convention, such as Parties or CSOs.
130. The **Chairperson** read out the Annex to Decision 15.IGC 7 point by point. Seeing no objection, he declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 7 was adopted.

131. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked the Secretariat to present, at the next session of the Committee, the criteria adopted for the selection of projects; ways of improving applications; and proposals for reducing IFCD overheads. In addition, it reiterated its proposal to lower the funding cap to US\$75,000.
132. The delegation of **France** supported the request of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

133. The **Secretary** replied that the Secretariat had taken note of this request and would respond at the next session. Furthermore, he added that the document presenting the project selection criteria already existed and was available [online](#).

Item 8 – Provisional budget (2022-2023) of the International Fund for Cultural Diversity Documents [DCE/22/15.IGC/8](#), [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.6](#) and [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.6 Add](#)

134. The **Secretary** recalled that this was the second time that a two-year IFCD budget was presented, in accordance with the revision of the IFCD Financial Regulations adopted in 2019. He indicated that this second provisional budget incorporated the lessons learned from the first exercise, as well as the priorities established by the Committee and the Conference of Parties. He also recalled that if all Parties contributed to the IFCD at a rate of 1% of their total contribution to the regular budget of UNESCO, total yearly contributions to the Fund could exceed US\$2 million. He then gave the floor to one of the members of the Secretariat, Ms Reiko Yoshida, to share additional details.
135. She explained that the working document first presented an overview of the current situation; then a proposed budget forecast for 2022-2023; and finally the future prospects. For 2022, she explained that the Secretariat used the actual amount available at the end of 2021, which is US\$1,993,411. For 2023, the Secretariat envisages the 2022 fundraising target to be US\$1,375,000. She went on to detail the various items in the provisional budget: the funding of projects for a proposed amount of US\$900,000 in 2023; the fixed cost of the annual call for projects; the fixed cost required to implement the communication and fundraising strategy; and finally, the new fixed costs intended to reinforce the monitoring and evaluation of IFCD-funded projects, in accordance with recommendation 12 of the second external evaluation, adopted at the twelfth session of the Committee.

She then gave an overview of the management of the Fund, which includes three main areas of work: management of the annual call for projects; implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IFCD-funded projects; and lastly, communication and fundraising. She insisted that these three fields should be implemented continuously and simultaneously. In 2021, for example, the Secretariat had to oversee the evaluation of 615 requests, while ensuring the monitoring of 19 ongoing projects and conducting communications and fundraising activities. She concluded by explaining that while innovative ways of monitoring the implementation of IFCD-funded projects were being sought, notably by creating synergies with other UNESCO projects, there was a need to strengthen the Secretariat's monitoring and evaluation capacity in order to improve the impact of the projects, and thus make communication more convincing and effective in raising funds.

136. The **Secretary** explained that the provisional budget had been amended to take into account the Committee's decision to fund capacity building programmes for the preparation of the periodic reports of SIDS. He added, however, that this budget would only be used in the absence of other sources of funding, such as dedicated voluntary contributions from the Parties. He justified the amount of this budget (US\$100,000 per year) by explaining that to date, 13 SIDS had never submitted a periodic report. The Secretariat is therefore proposing to organise online training sessions for national and CSO experts from the countries concerned, the cost of which is estimated at approximately US\$30,000. In addition, the cost of developing the educational tools is estimated at US\$10,000. In addition, the Secretariat will provide US\$40,000 to accompany SIDS that request it in order to elaborate periodic reports following the capacity building session they have received, and US\$20,000 to hire consultants to support the Secretariat in this work.
137. The **Chairperson** invited the members of the Committee who wished to speak to do so.
138. The delegation from **Bangladesh** asked if online training could be opened to other countries, and if this would increase the cost.
139. The **Secretary** replied that the only constraint was time zones. In addition, the cost of training would be increased by the cost of translation and interpretation.

140. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** supported the suggestion of Bangladesh by proposing that if training for Pacific SIDS was organised, the entire region could benefit. In addition, it asked if the decision on item 7 could be postponed, as the Committee members needed time to reflect.
141. The delegation of **Palestine** supported the two previous interventions, suggesting that the trainings be organised by region. It then thanked the Secretariat for its responsiveness and asked that the revised document be forwarded to the Committee.
142. The delegation of **Austria** also echoed other Committee members who had spoken, stating that time for reflection was needed. In addition, it requested that the technical assistance budget be broken down according to the various expenditure items. Finally, it recalled that this technical assistance should not be limited to the production of a quadrennial report, but should ensure the sustainability of the implementation of the Convention.
143. The delegation of **Ecuador** supported the statements made by its colleagues and in particular the suggestions that would make it possible to increase the number of beneficiaries of training.
144. The **Secretary** agreed to share the revised document, as requested by the Committee. He proposed that the adoption of the decision be postponed to the afternoon, so that all the members of the Committee would have time to study the document in depth.
145. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.
146. The representative of **Creatividad y Cultura Glocal A.C.** wished to add that the role of CSOs in such capacity building operations was essential.
147. The delegation of **Canada** stated that it was maintaining its contribution to the IFCD of CAD 375,000 over 5 years. It expressed strong support for the strategy of engaging private sector contributors, as it believes that society as a whole must be committed to the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. It also announced that Canada will submit to its parliament a bill on online content distribution, which would subject streaming platforms to the same rules as Canadian broadcasters.

The representative of the Government of **Quebec** within the Canadian delegation recalled that Quebec has supported the IFCD since its creation. He announced that it will continue to contribute CAD 30,000 per year, bringing its total contribution to CAD 460,000. Beyond this financial commitment, he recalled that Quebec has been supporting the Secretariat through the provision of a dozen young professionals for the past 10 years. The latter have benefited from almost CAD 200,000 in government assistance.
148. The representative of the **Swiss Coalition for Cultural Diversity**, who is also President of the **International Federation of Coalitions for Cultural Diversity (IFCCD)**, thanked all the contributors to the IFCD. However, he noted that for 2022 and 2023, the amounts allocated to direct project financing represented only 53% and 57% of the Fund's total budget respectively. He then shared several proposals from CSOs for a comprehensive strategy for cooperation with civil society. Firstly, he suggested that this cooperation should be more structured at the national and regional levels, for example by creating training platforms on the Convention and networking spaces. Secondly, he proposed that several areas of support be developed within the framework of the IFCD, including support for CSO efforts to promote the Convention on the ground, and support for South-South mobility for the development of cooperation projects. Lastly, he hoped that the application process would be facilitated by support programmes set up by the National Commissions; and the possibility of submitting projects in national languages.
149. The delegation of **Grenada** thanked the Committee members for supporting the proposal made the previous day by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines to provide technical support to SIDS in the preparation of their periodic reports.
150. The **Secretary** stated that the Secretariat took note of the comments made by the observers. He noted that the procedure to allocate a portion of IFCD funds to capacity building of the Parties was new, as until now, the procedure was to dedicate a maximum of funds to project

financing, while capacity building programmes were financed by extra-budgetary contributions. He added that if this procedure were to be continued, the modalities of intervention with the Parties would of course not be uniform and would have to be adapted to the local context and issues. He therefore pointed out that the current budget was designed to support the SIDS, and that any expansion of the beneficiaries of the capacity-building programmes would result in additional costs. To give an idea to the members of the Committee, he recalled that the assistance provided by SIDA over 4 years to the capacity building of 16 Parties, which had been so beneficial, as well as knowledge management and sharing and the publication of the Global Report on the monitoring of the Convention, had cost around US\$3 million.

151. The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision, point by point.
152. The delegation of **France** expressed concern about how the US\$100,000 related to technical assistance to SIDS would be funded, and asked that this be clarified. In addition, it recalled that the majority of the Parties had opposed the earmarking of contributions, and stated that this provision was akin to earmarking in its opinion.
153. The delegation of **Austria** asked what would happen if the IFCD did not manage to raise the expected funds.
154. The delegation of **Palestine** expressed its view that this was not an earmarked contribution. It added that this was a provisional budget, and that the Committee would advise later if there were any discrepancies between the amounts planned and those collected. It also noted that the annex was attached to the document, not the decision. It therefore proposed an amendment to correct this.
155. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** expressed its agreement with Palestine. It explained that this was a budget breakdown, not earmarking. It also wished to add the adjective "revised" in paragraph 4.
156. The **Secretary** confirmed that this was an allocation of IFCD resources, not an earmarked contribution. He went on to explain that the funds currently available were sufficient to cover the proposed 2022 expenditures. Regarding 2023, he confirmed that if the necessary funds were not forthcoming, then the Committee would have to decide which investments to prioritise. He added that the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines amendment was relevant.
157. The delegation of **Palestine** wished to add "voluntary" before "contributions".
158. The **Chairperson**, seeing no objection from the Committee, stated that the recommended projects would be funded. He then read the draft decision and, seeing no objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 8 was adopted as amended.

Item 9 – Report on the feasibility study for the creation of a regular consultation mechanism of the Committee with micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises
Documents [DCE/22/15.IGC/9](#) and [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.9REV](#)

159. The **Chairperson** announced that the Bureau had suggested to the Committee, in view of the synergies between items 9, 10 and 11, to consider them one after the other before turning to the decisions.
160. The delegation of **Cuba** stated that these three points were undoubtedly the most important, and that it would be important to consider them independently when making a decision and that the decisions be adopted one by one. However, it stated that it would stand behind the consensus.
161. The delegation of **Ecuador** noted that mixing the three points would, in its view, complicate the discussions. It therefore suggested that the three points be examined one by one.
162. The delegations of **Azerbaijan, Palestine, Bangladesh** and **Jamaica** expressed their agreement with Cuba and Ecuador.

163. The **Secretary** recalled that this document was a follow-up to the decision taken by the Conference of Parties at its eighth session to consider the creation of a regular consultative mechanism for micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises, taking into account possible synergies with existing participatory mechanisms. He explained that a feasibility study was launched in June 2021, taking into account the views expressed by all the stakeholders of the Convention. He then gave the floor to a representative of the European Creative Business Network, who had conducted the study.
164. The representative of the **European Network of Creative Enterprises** explained that the main objective of this study was to examine the practicalities and costs of establishing a regular consultation mechanism with micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises. She explained that the study was based primarily on qualitative material, provided by UNESCO or collected specifically. The methodology consisted of a preliminary bibliographical study, a preliminary analysis of existing similar mechanisms, and a mapping of the enterprises concerned. Semi-structured interviews were then conducted: 15 with representatives of cultural and creative enterprises; 4 with representatives of civil society and 6 interviews with members of the Secretariat. At the same time, two questionnaires were distributed: one to the members of the Committee, and another to cultural and creative enterprises.
165. The **Secretary** gave the floor to one of the members of the Secretariat, Ms Laurence Mayer-Robitaille, to detail the different scenarios proposed to the Committee members.
166. She explained that the creation of a specific consultation mechanism for micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises appeared relevant, as it fills a lack of representation of these structures. Secondly, she said it would be appropriate to work with "second-level representatives" such as professional associations or chambers of commerce to ensure better representation. She added that one of the key factors for the success of the process was the identification of themes for consultation, among which she cited climate change, sustainable development, digital and issues related to topics such as freedom of artistic expression, intellectual property rights, or preferential treatment. She noted that enterprises were particularly interested in the issues of visibility, networking and the possibility of bringing local realities to the global cultural agenda. Finally, concerning the format of the consultations, the study suggests a digital format, for example based on the model of the ResiliArt debates.
- She went on to detail the three scenarios proposed by the feasibility study. The first calls for the establishment of a Forum of micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises, which could be held online every two years, in parallel with the Civil Society Forum. The second scenario calls for the establishment of thematic focus groups, which would respect the principle of equitable geographical representation and work through regular online meetings. Finally, the third scenario is relatively similar to the second in its mode of consultation, except that the thematic focus groups would be replaced by geographic focus groups with cross-cutting topics.
167. The Committee members who spoke all thanked the Secretariat for the study.
168. The delegation of **Austria** noted that cultural and creative enterprises already have the opportunity to be represented in CSOs. For example, it said that 7,000 of them are represented in the Austrian Coalition for Cultural Diversity. It welcomed the desire to better include these enterprises in the work of the Convention, but suggested improving existing consultation mechanisms with civil society rather than creating a new one. It insisted on the importance of bringing together the artistic and economic sectors, for example by taking inspiration from the format of the ResiliArt debates. It explained that it had submitted an amendment to that effect.
169. The delegation of **Ethiopia** indicated that the private sector, and in particular micro, small and medium-sized creative and cultural enterprises, was the missing link in the work of the Convention, and expressed its strong support for the creation of this new consultation mechanism. It indicated that it preferred the third proposed scenario.

170. The delegation of **Brazil** recognised the importance of cultural enterprises, especially in the reconstruction of the cultural sector after the COVID-19 pandemic. However, it stated that for cost-related reasons it would be more appropriate, in its opinion, to include these enterprises in the existing consultation mechanisms. It supported Austria's amendment.
171. The delegation of **Palestine** supported the statements made by Austria and Brazil.
172. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed its agreement with the key themes identified in the feasibility study. It added that it thought that more frequent exchanges than once every two years with micro, small and medium-sized creative enterprises were needed. It concluded by stating its preference for the second scenario.
173. The delegation of **Denmark** stressed that micro, small and medium-sized creative and cultural enterprises wanted more than just a consultation: they hoped to have an in-depth exchange with the Committee. It also expressed support for incorporating this mechanism into existing schemes. In particular, it suggested that enterprises could produce written reports that would be sent to Committee members well in advance of the sessions.
174. The delegation of **Mongolia** explained that it had itself set up consultation mechanisms with micro, small and medium-sized creative and cultural enterprises at the national level. It reported on the success of this initiative launched by the Ministry of Culture. It concluded by stating that it was best to build on existing mechanisms.
175. The delegation of **France** expressed its agreement with the position defended by the delegations of Austria and Brazil.
176. The delegation of **Cuba** emphasised the fundamental importance of creative and cultural enterprises. It asked whether the National Commissions, UNESCO regional offices and the Creative Cities Network had been consulted in this feasibility study. It regretted that only four enterprises from Latin America and the Caribbean were interviewed in the process. As it stands, it stated that it was not in a position to decide in favour of either scenario.
177. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** supported Cuba's comments, also noting the small number of enterprises surveyed. It expressed its agreement with the amendment proposed by Austria, especially in view of the discrepancies in the responses from micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. It nevertheless stressed the importance of involving these actors in the work of the Convention, through the existing consultation mechanisms.
178. The delegation of **Ecuador** added that if such a mechanism were adopted, it would have to include a space for networking between the different enterprises in the cultural sector, to promote the integration of the creative value chain and attempt to rebalance cultural exchanges.
179. The **Secretary** noted the interest of Committee members in consulting with micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the creative and cultural sector, even though some were already represented in CSOs. He also noted the need that this consultation should not require overly large costs. He reiterated that the consultation themes were fundamental to the success of such a mechanism; and that it should not be redundant with the Civil Society Forum and the reports submitted by CSOs.
180. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.
181. The delegation of **Canada** explained that the feasibility study had not convinced them of the relevance of creating a separate consultation mechanism for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the creative sector. It noted that this would be redundant with current efforts to integrate civil society. On the other hand, it proposed that the consultation mechanisms for civil society be strengthened and updated, especially to better include enterprises. It concluded by expressing its agreement with Austria's amendment.

182. The delegation of **Argentina** emphasized the crucial importance of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the creative and cultural sector. It shared its own efforts to consult with them at the national level. It concluded by asking the Committee to continue its reflection.
183. The delegation of **Colombia** expressed strong support for the creation of a new consultation mechanism dedicated to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the cultural sector. It expressed hope that a consensus could be found within the Committee. It concluded by stating that there is a need for these enterprises to become an active and well identified stakeholder of the Convention, whether through a dedicated mechanism or through their integration into the civil society consultation process.
184. The representative of the **Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity** emphasised that cultural enterprises are already involved in CSOs. For example, the Canadian Coalition represents over 2,000 enterprises, the majority of which is constituted of micro, small or medium-sized. He noted that it would have been useful and easy to contact the IFCCD for contributions from enterprises in the cultural sector. He concluded by stating that there was no need to create a new consultation mechanism.
185. The representative of **Creatividad y Cultura Glocal A.C.** explained that she was also speaking as a member of the coordinating group of the 2021 Civil Society Forum. She emphasised that micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises are already represented in CSOs, particularly through sectoral associations. She expressed surprise that few CSOs already involved in the work of the Convention had been consulted. She expressed concern that too few enterprises responded to the survey, and that it was not geographically representative enough. She concluded by suggesting that the definition of civil society be clarified, and by stating that if new funds could be injected, then they should be injected into existing consultation mechanisms.
186. The representative of the **International Theatre Institute** explained that she too represented micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. In addition, she felt that the meaning of the terms micro, small or medium-sized enterprises in the creative and cultural sector was insufficiently defined in the study. She concluded by adding that the term "civil society" also needed to be defined.
187. The representative of the **International Music Council** read an intervention made by the **Culture and Development** organisation and other CSOs. She also insisted on the need to harmonise and deepen the definition of civil society, mentioned in particular in Articles 11 and 15 of the Convention, and the associated Operational Guidelines. She concluded by stating that existing consultation mechanisms are already relevant to the private sector, even if they have limited funding.
188. The representative of the **French Coalition for Cultural Diversity** spoke of the many enterprises she represented, and stated that she was opposed to the creation of a parallel consultation mechanism dedicated to the private sector. She expressed her fear that other CSOs would be marginalised, and her belief that such a decision would depart from the spirit of the Convention, particularly the recognition of the dual economic and symbolic nature of cultural goods. She added that market forces alone cannot guarantee the diversity of cultural expressions, and sometimes they even threaten it.
189. The **Secretary** took note of the comments made. In particular, he recognised the need to work on the definition of the terms involved, especially to integrate the private sector more explicitly into civil society. However, he also noted the desire of some Committee members to engage directly with for-profit actors.
190. The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision, point by point.
191. The delegation of **Cuba** requested that it be explicitly stated in paragraph 3 that the Committee may consult with public or private organisations.
192. The delegation of **Austria** thanked the delegations that supported its amendment.

193. The delegation of **Cuba** proposed that paragraph 6 be amended to state that the Committee requested the Secretariat to continue the consultation process.
194. The delegation of **Jamaica** supported Cuba's proposed amendment.
195. The delegation of **Palestine** stated that it would have preferred to delete this paragraph. However, it expressed its agreement with Cuba's amendment, provided that the reference to a new, more affordable mechanism was removed.
196. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that it would also like to delete paragraph 6, arguing that the concerns of Cuba and Jamaica were already contained in paragraph 7.
197. The delegation of **Cuba** agreed to delete paragraph 6. It clarified that it was the consultation itself – particularly with UNESCO networks – that was important, rather than the choice of mechanism. It amended the new paragraph 6 (former paragraph 7) to reflect this.
198. The delegation of **Ecuador** proposed to change the wording of the new paragraph 6 to leave open the possibility of implementing a specific consultation mechanism for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the creative and cultural sector.
199. The delegation of **Austria** explained that the new paragraph 6 focused on improving existing consultation mechanisms.
200. The delegation of **Palestine** replied to Ecuador that no one was considering stopping consulting the private sector. It expressed its support for the adoption of this new paragraph 6 as amended by Cuba, but without the additions of Ecuador.
201. The **Chairperson**, in the absence of objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 9 was adopted as amended.

Item 10 – Preliminary reflections to recognise and encourage the efforts made by cultural institutions to provide access to a diversity of cultural expressions
Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/10](#)

202. The **Secretary** recalled that despite the many negative impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the cultural sector, this event also stimulated awareness of the value of culture for the collective well-being, and gave rise to innovative practices. He stated that it is now time to rebuild the foundations of the sector more solidly and emphasised the central role played by certain cultural organizations and institutions, both public and private, in this regard. He emphasised the exceptional resilience and innovation they have shown, and the major efforts they have undertaken to promote the diversity of cultural expressions. He recalled that the Conference of Parties requested the Committee to undertake a reflection with a view to recognising these efforts. This recognition would also allow UNESCO to raise awareness of the Convention's objectives around the world, while mobilising key stakeholders who have been little involved until now. He shared the success of similar initiatives, such as the recent collaborations between UNESCO and the Asia Pacific Screen Awards; the Académie des Césars or the FESPACO. He stated that it would be appropriate to expand this network of partnership, and especially to mobilise it more around specific commitments to promote equitable access to a diversity of cultural expressions. He explained that several modalities were envisaged to develop this mechanism: the formal commitment of cultural organizations through membership in a coalition; or the establishment of a network, for example. Cultural institutions and organizations wishing to join would commit to the implementation of concrete actions whose objectives would be to promote diversity not only in their artistic programming, but also in the activities they undertake. The annex to Document 10 provides a non-exhaustive list of organizations that might be interested in such an initiative. On the basis of these elements, the Committee may wish to request the Secretariat to present concrete modalities for this initiative to the sixteenth session of the Committee in the form of a project document, including a

proposed budget and a provisional timetable for implementation, taking into account the guidance that will emerge during that session.

203. All the members of the Committee thanked the Secretariat for the quality of the document.
204. The delegation of **Denmark** recognised the importance of the participation of cultural institutions and organizations, especially in the face of the pandemic. It then used the example of the film industry, stating that it was facing many challenges relevant to the work of the Convention: parity, the emergence of platforms, the dominance of digital giants, etc. It concluded by saying that it did not think there was any need to create new consultation mechanisms, but that it would be useful to be able to consult these actors through existing mechanisms, as Article 27.3 of the Convention allows.
205. The delegation of **Austria** expressed its agreement with what Denmark had said. It expressed concern about the additional burden that the creation of a network would place on the Secretariat's limited budget. It asked whether extra-budgetary contributions had been identified to fund such a scheme, and noted that it might be more effective to build on pre-existing structures, such as the Creative Cities Network.
206. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** also recognised the importance of cultural institutions and organizations in promoting cultural diversity. However, it added that new initiatives should be as focused and budget efficient as possible.
207. The delegation of **Nigeria** welcomed the efforts made by cultural organizations and institutions to ensure access to a diversity of cultural expressions, and stated that these efforts deserved to be further recognised and encouraged. It cited the example of the National Institute for Cultural Orientation (NICO), which has done much to promote cultural diversity, for example, by protecting indigenous languages, or by developing capacity building programmes for women in the cultural sector.
208. The delegation of **Armenia** welcomed the opening of this reflection aimed at recognising and encouraging the efforts of cultural organizations and institutions to promote cultural diversity. It noted that some of them have already established important links with UNESCO, particularly in the film sector. It suggested that such a collaboration be established with the Yerevan International Film Festival, nicknamed "Golden Apricot". It noted that the precise modalities of structuring an alliance or network needed to be further discussed, and suggested that the Secretariat prepare a document for the next session of the Committee that would examine in more detail the practical arrangements for such a scheme.
209. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** expressed strong support for such an initiative. It recalled the fruitful collaboration between UNESCO and FESPACO for the past twenty years.
210. The delegation of **France** welcomed the commitment to this reflection and asked the Secretariat if it could provide more details on the concrete forms that support to cultural organizations and institutions could take, as well as on the added value that would be generated in relation to existing mechanisms.
211. The delegation of **Ethiopia** welcomed this approach to recognise the efforts of cultural organizations and institutions.
212. The delegation of **Senegal** recognised the vital contribution of cultural institutions and organizations, some of which - such as the Dakar Biennale and FESPACO - already have a fruitful collaboration with the Secretariat. It welcomed the inclusion of UNESCO's priorities in this reflection and supported the Secretariat's proposal.
213. The delegation of **Jamaica** asked how the non-exhaustive list of cultural organizations and institutions promoting cultural diversity had been compiled. It wanted its JAFTA Propella festival, which it briefly presented, to be added to it.
214. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** presented some governmental initiatives aimed at helping the cultural sector to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, it mentioned the creation in 2021 of the Azeri Federation of Creative Industries.

215. The delegation of **Cuba** acknowledged the complexity of listing relevant initiatives around the world, but noted that there were few examples from SIDS. In the future, it suggested exploring the initiatives, especially in the music sector, of these countries.
216. The **Secretary** took note of the interventions of the Parties. He was pleased that this proposal met with the approval of certain Parties. He specified that it was not expected from this reflection to create any consultation mechanism, but simply to reflect on how to recognise the efforts made by these institutions for cultural diversity, and to encourage them to continue the work they already do so well. He recalled that the reflection was still at a preliminary stage, and that the Secretariat did not yet have a clear idea of the modalities of this recognition. He explained that he would be able, based on the discussions at this session, to present more concrete proposals to the next Committee. He concluded by stating that the attached list of organizations was intended to provide a non-exhaustive overview only, and was not intended to be a pre-recognition of the organizations listed. He added that the recognition process for cultural organizations should be voluntary, meaning that these institutions should take the initiative to express their interest. Finally, he reiterated that the Convention was not intended to produce lists.
217. The **Chairperson** invited the observers to speak.
218. The representative of the **Swiss Coalition for Cultural Diversity** announced with sadness the death of the President of the Chilean Coalition for Cultural Diversity, who was also Vice President for the Americas, and former President of the IFCCD, Mane Nett. He wished to pay tribute to her and said that she had been one of the most fervent defenders of cultural diversity in her country, her region, but also on a global level.
219. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr. Ernesto Ottone R., also paid tribute to Ms. Mane Nett on behalf of UNESCO. He said that she embodied the values of the Convention, and that she had defended them all her life.
220. Delegations from **Chile, Norway, Austria, Armenia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Germany, Canada** and **Ecuador** joined the tribute.
221. The **Secretary** joined in the tribute to Mane Nett, and expressed his deepest condolences.
222. The representative of the **Portuguese Coalition for Cultural Diversity**, speaking on behalf of the **IFCCD**, welcomed this initiative and offered some suggestions. First of all, she regretted that small cultural organizations – which are particularly affected by the health crisis – are not mentioned in the indicative list of institutions that could be interested in such a scheme. Furthermore, she indicated the need to re-examine mechanisms to promote preferential treatment, which is crucial for a network such as the one envisaged. She regretted that this subject is sometimes neglected by developed countries, and recalled that preferential treatment also applies to the digital environment. Finally, she suggested working in collaboration with existing internationally representative CSOs, which would reduce the costs of establishing a new network.
223. The representative of the **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions** announced that she was speaking on behalf of many CSOs, such as the Asociacion Cultural Baizara, the International Music Council, the International Theatre Institute, and Culture and Development. She stressed that before exploring new mechanisms, it was important to strengthen and improve existing ones. She also noted that it would be beneficial to define more precisely what is meant by "cultural institutions and organizations". She wanted the definition criteria to be broad enough to be inclusive of all types of organizations, especially local ones.
224. The representative of the **International Music Council** declared her support for the role of cultural organizations, which are often the mediators between creators and audiences to ensure sustainable and equitable access to the diversity of cultural expressions. She recalled that CSOs participating in the work of the Convention do so on a voluntary basis, and hoped that they too could benefit from the label that would be created, including small CSOs.

225. The delegation of the **Syrian Arab Republic** stated that further reflection was needed, but supported this initiative, which could also encourage new States to join the Convention. She also noted that there seemed to be confusion between networking, best practices and partnerships that needed to be clarified.
226. The representative of the **CERAV** declared himself very favourable to this approach and pledged to do everything possible to ensure the diversity of cultural expressions in Africa.
227. The **Secretary** took note of all the interventions. He confirmed that the reflections were still at a preliminary stage, and that it was above all a question of showing the solidarity and recognition of the Parties towards the organizations that implement the Convention on the ground.
228. The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision, point by point.
229. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** asked for clarification on the rationale of paragraph 5.
230. The delegation of **Austria**, which co-drafted this amendment, stated that in view of budgetary and human resource constraints, there were more efficient ways to achieve the objectives of the Convention by taking into account the Committee's discussions, for example by building on existing networks such as the Creative Cities Network.
231. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** thanked Austria for its intervention, but said that it remained doubtful, because at this stage, the reflections carried out had no financial impact. He noted that Austria's formulation was not conducive to further reflection.
232. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** supported the amendment of Austria.
233. The delegation of **Senegal** acknowledged that the explanations of Austria had clarified matters, but regretted that recognition and encouragement for these organizations were not included. He therefore proposed to return to the original wording, while keeping the sentence on the limited resources of the Secretariat.
234. The delegation of **Palestine** stated that it felt that the Austrian amendment reflected the feeling of the majority of the Committee members. It added that the reference to the debates held during the present session allowed the amendment not to be in contradiction with the interventions of Burkina Faso and Senegal.
235. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** noted that it understood the concerns of Burkina Faso and Senegal, but agreed with Palestine. It added that the exercise was not to establish a list of virtuous organisations. It concluded by stating that the Convention did not have to grant anything to these organizations, but simply to encourage them in their work.
236. The delegation of **Senegal** thanked its colleagues, and stated its agreement with the Austrian amendment, provided that the paragraph also specified that the Secretariat should submit a more in-depth document to the next session of the Committee.
237. The delegation of **Austria** stated that it would prefer a less precise term than "partnership", as it considered this qualification premature. It also proposed to delete the word "major", as the criteria for the selection of the organizations concerned had not yet been defined.
238. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** noted that the two strong ideas it wished to see mentioned were: the desire to see the Secretariat continue its reflection; and the need to find a mechanism to encourage organizations working for cultural diversity.
239. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed, in order to find a consensus, to keep the Austrian amendment as it was originally, and to add to it, as requested by Senegal and Burkina Faso, the wish that the Secretariat continue its reflection on this subject.
240. The delegation of **Senegal** proposed to replace "partnership" with "accompanying mechanism".

241. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** stated that it was probably too early to talk about any mechanism. It proposed replacing the phrase with "proposals to improve the engagement of cultural organizations and institutions".
242. The delegation of **Austria** supported the compromise proposed by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, if it was acceptable to Senegal and Burkina Faso.
243. The **Chairperson**, in the absence of objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 10 was adopted as amended.

Item 11 – Collaboration with civil society to implement the Convention and the conclusions of the third Civil Society Forum

Documents [DCE/22/15.IGC/11](#), [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.11a](#) and [DCE/22/15.IGC/INF.11b](#)

244. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Parties had recognised, since the entry into force of the Convention, the essential role of CSOs in the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions. He enthusiastically mentioned that the Bureau had a very productive meeting with 43 CSO representatives on 7 February 2022 prior to the present session of the Committee. This meeting focused notably on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on culture, the challenges of the digital transition, and the need to address existing inequalities. CSOs also recommended that the Committee improve existing consultation mechanisms to ensure more interaction with Parties, and expressed their desire to be more involved in awareness raising among other stakeholders of the Convention, including micro, small, and medium-sized creative enterprises and cultural institutions and organizations. Finally, CSOs also emphasised the need to better track their contributions to the work of the governing bodies.
245. The **Secretary** noted with satisfaction the increasing number and diversity of civil society representatives participating in the work of the Convention. He recalled that currently, collaboration with civil society was based on four main axes: the Civil Society Forum; the item dedicated to CSOs, its systematic inclusion in the Committee's agenda; the working session between civil society representatives and the Bureau organised before each Committee session; and finally, the section dedicated to CSOs in the quadrennial periodic reports. In addition to these four formal channels of collaboration, civil society is invited to participate in most of UNESCO's projects, as a key ally in promoting the Convention and implementing it. Therefore, CSOs are the main beneficiaries of the IFCD and the main drivers of the ResiliArt movement. In addition, they are also invited to participate in the preparations for the 2022 MONDIACULT Conference.

He welcomed the increased opportunities for dialogue between the Committee and CSOs, but noted that the diversity of collaborative mechanisms has also resulted in the fragmentation or duplication of information collected. This is why the Committee decided, at its last session, to initiate a reflection to clarify the modalities of its collaboration with civil society, with the aim of capitalising on the existing cooperation. As a first step, the Committee asked the Secretariat to facilitate the process of admitting civil society representatives to its meetings. For example, in 2021, the Secretariat contacted 281 CSOs involved in the implementation of the Convention. Of these, only 60 submitted a complete application to be admitted as observers to the present session of the Committee. This relatively low response rate underscores the need to further support the participation of civil society organizations in statutory meetings. As a second step, the Committee may wish to consider how to streamline its channels of communication with civil society, specifying the type of reports it wishes to consider at each session. For example, it might choose to review the previous year's Civil Society Forum reports in even-numbered years and individual CSO activity reports in odd-numbered years.

He concluded by expressing his gratitude to the 16 CSOs that supported the organisation of the third edition of the Forum last year, and to those that volunteered to write the report. He added that in light of this report, the Committee may wish to request the Secretariat to present proposals for the organisation of the next edition of the Forum at its next session. Finally, he reiterated his sincere thanks to all the CSOs present, explaining that their work not only

ensures greater transparency in the governance of culture, but also offers new perspectives and approaches that inspire the formulation of innovative programmes.

246. The **Chairperson** invited the CSOs among the observers to speak.
247. The representative of the **IFCCD**, who is also a representative of the **Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity**, highlighted the financial support of the governments of Canada and Quebec for the coalition she leads, as well as Switzerland's support for the IFCCD. She noted that few CSOs are supported in this way, and commended them for their considerable volunteer commitment. She then recalled one of the recommendations of civil society, regarding notably the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment and measures for the discoverability or enhancement of local cultural expressions that are urgently needed, given the lack of progress on regulations for online distribution platforms. Finally, she announced that the IFCCD had submitted its activity report on 11 January 2022, which had required a significant amount of work. In consideration of this work, she asked that the Committee clarify its expectations, perhaps even formulate a specific question for CSOs to answer, in addition to other recommendations deemed relevant. She concluded by hoping that some form of feedback would be provided to follow up on these progress reports.
248. The representative of **Creatividad y Cultura Glocal A.C.** recalled that the last session of the Civil Society Forum brought together more than 100 representatives from 90 CSOs. She emphasised that the members of the civil society coordinating group are high quality professionals with expertise in the implementation of the Convention at a local level. She suggested that this should be taken into account when capacity building or technical expertise is required. She then recalled the Civil Society Forum's recommendation to encourage CSO participation in the organisation of MONDIACULT 2022. She cited the power of the inclusive models adopted by UN-Habitat for the World Urban Forum, and by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for the recent Conferences of Parties as examples. She concluded by stating that the inclusion of civil society at all levels is necessary to make MONDIACULT 2022 a true success.
249. The representative of the **International Music Council** stated that the organisation of the third edition of the Civil Society Forum benefited from a horizontal approach, and from the lessons learned from the two previous editions. She thanked all the CSOs that participated in the organisation of this Forum, as well as the Secretariat for its valuable support. She also expressed the gratitude of the CSOs for the support in the translation and graphic design of the Forum's working documents. She hoped that other resources could be identified and included in the Civil Society Forum budget. She concluded by saying that she was touched by the Secretariat's appreciation for the work of CSOs.
250. The representative of the **International Affiliation of Writers' Guilds (IAWG)** stated that this was her first participation in the work of the Convention and introduced her organization. She explained that most of the 16,000 authors she represented were micro-enterprises, and wished to remain so to maintain their independence. She added that the existence of legislation on the status of the artist, as well as their gathering in guilds allowing them to benefit from a real power of collective bargaining, considerably improved their working and living conditions.
251. The representative of **Culture and Development** thanked the Secretariat for its support in the preparation of the Forum. She added that the Civil Society Forum has also helped to structure cooperation among CSOs, strengthening coordination and synergies among them. She hoped that the instruments for dialogue with civil society would be improved by ensuring greater space for debate on the recommendations of the Forum and the activity reports of CSOs. She concluded by expressing the hope that the organisation of parallel meetings with the Bureau could continue, given the limited time of the statutory meetings.
252. Following the interventions of the civil society representatives, the **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to react to the concerns expressed and the ideas proposed.
253. All committee members who spoke thanked and congratulated the CSOs and the Secretariat for their work and commitment.

254. The delegation of **Cuba** stressed that the degree of involvement of civil society in the work of the Convention was exceptional within UNESCO. It recalled the fundamental role of the Civil Society Forum, during which very important recommendations were made. It asked the Secretariat how National Commissions and UNESCO decentralised offices are involved in this process of collaboration between civil society and the Parties to the Convention, stressing that an essential part of this work must be done in the field, outside the statutory meetings.
255. The delegation of **Ethiopia** welcomed the success of the third edition of the Civil Society Forum and highlighted its efforts at the national level to strengthen cooperation with CSOs. It hoped that this strong link with civil society would lead to further ratifications of the Convention.
256. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** welcomed the increased participation of CSOs in statutory meetings, especially due to the establishment of the Civil Society Fora. It said that CSOs would be key allies in the coming years to rebuild the cultural sector after the COVID-19 pandemic. It mentioned the [Creative Azerbaijan](#) portal which is a database and knowledge sharing platform aimed at implementing the strategy of sustainable public-private partnerships in the cultural sector.
257. The delegation of **Denmark** noted the need to consult with CSOs on specific issues. It added that they have limited resources, and that they expect concrete impacts from their collaboration with the Convention. It explained that as a member of the Committee's Bureau, it was able to have a more in-depth dialogue with civil society. It stressed the importance of being able to read the CSO reports well in advance so that the different delegations can dialogue before the statutory meetings. It explained that its proposed amendment was driven by the need to be pragmatic and focused. It thanked several Parties for the improvements made to its amendment.
258. The delegation of **Norway** stated that even more needs to be done to promote civil society participation and increase transparency. In particular, it supported paragraph 14 of document DCE/22/15.IGC/11, which states that the Secretariat should present at the next session of the Committee, an analysis of the admission process for CSO representatives, including an overview of the challenges encountered. It has also supported the initiative of optimisation and streamlining of work processes with civil society. Finally, it supported the amendment proposed by Denmark.
259. The delegation of **Austria** thanked the CSOs that had submitted reports and encouraged others to do so. It stated that a follow-up process on the reports and recommendations of civil society should be put in place, as they provide interesting avenues for work. It too supported the proposal from Denmark. It encouraged the CSOs who wish to do so to participate in the survey on the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation.
260. The delegation of **Armenia** welcomed the increasing involvement of civil society in the work of the governing bodies through the Forum, an optimal framework for exchange, and the preparation of periodic reports and recognised its fundamental role. It also welcomed the active participation of Armenian civil society in the areas covered by the Convention.
261. The delegation of **Brazil** stressed that collaboration with civil society was at the heart of the Convention's purpose. It therefore expressed its support for strengthening the partnership with civil society, by having regular exchanges with CSOs, and in particular micro, small and medium-sized cultural enterprises, as well as cultural institutions. It expressed its agreement with the draft decision and the amendment proposed by Denmark.
262. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** praised the dynamic collaboration with civil society in its country, mentioning in particular the UNESCO-Aschberg programme. It recalled that as a member of the Bureau, it had participated in the meeting with the CSO representatives. It stated that it had taken note of the concerns of civil society, which included: the short meeting time with the Bureau (2 hours); their wish to add other working languages; preferential treatment; the number of projects selected for the IFCD; and capacity building of civil society with regard to the Fund.
263. The delegation of **France** expressed its support for the draft decision as amended by Denmark.

264. The delegation of **Germany** recalled that civil society has been an integral part of the UN ecosystem since its inception; and that the UN Secretary General had recently called for going beyond consultation and advocacy with CSOs, and integrating them directly into all UN bodies. It said that UNESCO in general, and the Convention in particular, can provide examples of good practice in integration with civil society. It concluded with three suggestions: draw inspiration from the partnership mechanism with civil society developed by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation's Committee on Food Security; implement the Civil Society Forum's recommendation to establish, in partnership with National Commissions, support programmes for CSOs wishing to submit projects to the IFCD; and finally, include civil society as much as possible in the preparation of the MONDIACULT 2022 conference.
265. The delegation of **Sweden** stressed the importance of taking into account the expertise of civil society in the development of cultural policies and in the work of the Committee, particularly in designing inclusive post-pandemic recovery plans. It stated that there is a need to clarify and simplify the processes for CSOs to contribute to the work of the Convention. Furthermore, it noted that it would be preferable to allow more time before the Committee for the Parties to consider civil society reports. It encouraged the Secretariat to continue its work to diversify the CSOs involved in the work of the Convention, with particular emphasis on youth and women. It concluded by expressing its agreement with the amendment proposed by Denmark.
266. The delegation of **Canada** explained that it gives a large role to civil society in the elaboration of its periodic reports, as well as in all the initiatives it implements to promote cultural diversity. In particular, it cited the event dedicated to cultural diversity online, in which civil society had been a key contributor. In addition, it announced that it has funded the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity with CAD 375,000 over 5 years in recognition of the work they have done. It expressed its support for the amendment proposed by Denmark.
- The representative of the Government of **Québec** in the Canadian delegation emphasised the major role played by the Canadian Coalition for Cultural Diversity. He said the coalition is as concerned about the economic health as it is about the creative vitality of the cultural sector; that it intervenes to protect the specificity of cultural goods in trade negotiations and that it acts for cultural diversity in the digital environment. He concluded by expressing his support for the Danish amendment, whose inclusive approach allows the numerous voices of civil society to be heard.
267. The **Secretary** welcomed the convergence of views expressed by both CSOs and Parties on the need to further strengthen civil society participation. He concluded by affirming that the Secretariat would make every effort in this regard, depending on the decisions of the Committee, and within the limits of the resources that will be allocated.
268. The **Chairperson** read out the draft decision, point by point, including the amendments received. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.
269. The delegation of **Cuba** proposed to add "in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention" at the end of paragraph 3 of the draft decision.
270. The delegation of **Jamaica** proposed to change "*between*" to "*amongst*" in the English version of paragraph 4 following the amendment proposed by Azerbaijan.
271. The delegation of **Cuba** asked Azerbaijan the rationale for the new paragraph 5 at this stage of the draft decision.
272. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** stated that it had wished to add this paragraph in order to take into account the views of all Committee members and observers by emphasising the importance of civil society actors in order to better highlight its role.
273. The delegation of **Cuba**, supported by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, stressed that the development of an inclusive post-pandemic recovery plan is different in each Member State and that some countries are already doing so. It proposed to insert a reference to this effect in paragraph 5.

274. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to add a reference to the Operational Guidelines of Article 11 in paragraph 5, which was then adopted.
275. The delegation of **Cuba**, referring to the amendments proposed by Denmark in paragraph 6, indicated that the reference to Article 23.7 of the Convention should be completed by adding the text of this provision, in order to remain consistent with the decision taken under Agenda item 9 and the references made to this provision and Article 11 of the Convention.
276. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed, in order to meet Cuba's concerns and simplify the text, to delete the legal reference to Article 23.7 and to remove the references to paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines on Article 11 of the Convention.
277. The delegation of **Cuba** replied that it was necessary to refer to the provisions of the Convention, to retain the text of Article 23.7 and paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines of Article 11, and that if these references were to be removed, it was necessary to do so for all the provisions.
278. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** proposed to keep Article 11 and the reference to Article 23.7 and its text in order to give the context of the situation in the draft decision, as this paragraph of the decision was not an operational paragraph.
279. The delegation of **Cuba** read out paragraph 6 and pointed out the inconsistency between what was said in the text of paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines, which did not refer only to written contributions from CSOs.
280. The delegation of **Denmark** provided clarification by pointing out that the text referred to the Operational Guidelines of Article 11 and that paragraph 9 referred to written contributions. Here there is no reference to Article 11 but to its Operational Guidelines.
281. The **Secretary** also pointed out that reference was made here to paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines for Article 11 of the Convention and that this may be the source of the confusion.
282. The delegation of **Cuba** reiterated that this paragraph 9 of the guidelines does not only refer to written contributions, that there are other means of cooperation for CSOs, and that it was therefore necessary to refer to all of them. It insisted on the fact that it is necessary to speak of the general framework here and not only about the written contribution.
283. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed to stop paragraph 6 after "written contributions" and to delete all references to paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines for Article 11.
284. The delegation of **Cuba** preferred to keep the reference to paragraph 9 in order not to limit civil society's contributions to the Convention's governing bodies only to written contributions.
285. The delegation of **Denmark** stressed that the phrase "in writing" should not be deleted.
286. The delegation of **Cuba** wished to see in the text "contributions in accordance with paragraph 9".
287. The **Secretary** recalled that if one wished to remain faithful to the basic texts of the Convention, paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines did indeed refer to "written contributions" from CSOs.
288. The delegation of **Cuba** pointed out that paragraph 9 was broader, that it was ready to include the full text of paragraph 9 but not only one part, the one referring to written contributions.
289. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed to write "contributions, including in writing" with the reference to paragraph 9.
290. The delegation of **Denmark** supported this proposal, which avoided repeating the entire paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines of Article 11.
291. The delegation of **Cuba** stated that this proposal did not change anything and that it did not understand why it was necessary to refer to "contributions, including in writing", and that there

were inconsistencies between the references to the articles of the Convention and what was mentioned in the draft decision. It proposed to remove the reference to written contributions.

292. The **Secretary**, invited by the Chairperson, recalled the content of paragraph 9 and proposed to simply recall the provisions of paragraph 9, without going into detail.
293. The delegation of **Denmark** proposed to add all references to all means in paragraph 9, the four possibilities of cooperation with CSOs.
294. The delegation of **Cuba** replied that paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines for Article 11 was not limited to its last subparagraph and the written contributions, and wished the decision to refer to the entire content of that paragraph in general.
295. The **Secretary**, in order to facilitate consensus, proposed to refer only to paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines of Article 11, so as not to omit anything of the substance of the paragraph.
296. The **Chairperson** then proceeded to the adoption of paragraph 6 of the draft decision following the consensus reached, as well as paragraph 7.
297. The delegation of **Cuba** asked why paragraph 8 of the draft decision emphasised certain recommendations in particular, and explained that it preferred the original wording that did not privilege certain subjects over others.
298. The delegation of **Denmark** acknowledged the importance of all the civil society recommendations, but explained that it had focused on those aimed at improving collaboration between CSOs and governing bodies, as this was the topic at hand. It added that it was also a way to assume, as an intergovernmental body, the responsibility of sorting out the proposals of civil society and prioritising some of them today.
299. The **Chairperson** then adopted paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft decision.
300. The delegation of **Cuba** explained that it considered it somewhat premature, in view of the decision taken under Agenda item 9, to refer in paragraph 10 to regular calls for contributions from micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in the creative sector, and that it was important not to start mixing stakeholders of the Convention who did not have the same status in terms of the consultation mechanisms already established. It proposed not to establish a new mechanism.
301. The delegation of **Austria** responded that this paragraph was not intended to create a new mechanism. It said it was simply intended to focus on written contributions from CSOs, taking advantage of existing mechanisms, in order to collect reports with rich information.
302. The delegation of **Ecuador** expressed its agreement with Austria. It proposed to replace "by making regular calls" with "through existing mechanisms" to take into account Cuba's remarks.
303. The **Secretary** recalled that the practice of the Committee was to request written contributions from CSOs and warned that in 2021, only two reports had been received by the Secretariat without any feedback from the Committee, which could discourage CSOs from submitting reports. In addition, he pointed out the potential risk of increasing the number of requests for written reports without providing feedback on them.
304. The delegation of **Cuba** expressed its agreement with the proposal of Ecuador, and suggested adding "with the cooperation of National Commissions and UNESCO Field Offices" which are essential partners, as is the Creative Cities Network, thus using UNESCO's networks. It asked the Secretariat if there was any problem with mentioning enterprises in this decision dedicated to civil society.
305. The delegation of **Denmark** noted that it might be useful to remind CSOs that they have the possibility to submit written reports to the Committee, and that a call would be useful in this regard. It also noted the disappointment of CSOs in not receiving feedback on their reports and explained that another paragraph was seeking to address this issue. It recalled that it was trying to make the collaboration with civil society more simple and pragmatic, as it has already

been, and that the call for written contributions is a simple publication on the website to facilitate communication. It then asked if involving National Commissions did not add complexity. However, it was in favour of the latter relaying information on the fact that CSOs covered by paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines on Article 11 could submit written reports to the Committee.

306. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** recalled that the type of CSOs allowed to participate was indeed framed in paragraph 9 of the Operational Guidelines for Article 11, and that there was no contradiction in also referring to enterprises. He added that it was not necessary to mention the Field Offices, as the mention of UNESCO already covered all the offices.
307. The delegation of **Cuba** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture for his explanations, but wished to maintain the reference to the Field Offices, arguing that some countries might encounter difficulties with their National Commissions.
308. The delegation of **Austria** suggested a new wording for this paragraph, writing "civil society organisations, including micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises as well as cultural institutions and organizations."
309. The delegations of **Brazil** and **Denmark** supported this formulation.
310. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** noted that the exercise of formulating this decision was very complex. It expressed its support for the inclusion of micro, small and medium enterprises in the draft decision. Concerning the reference to National Commissions, it would like its participation to be optional. It explained that the National Commission in its country, for example, was made up of only one person, who would probably not have the time to work with all CSOs.
311. The delegation of **Ecuador** wished to add "and networking opportunities for micro, small and medium-sized cultural and creative enterprises" to paragraph 11.
312. The delegation of **Cuba** stated that it was not in favour of the proposal of Ecuador, which proposed a specific consultation mechanism for enterprises, although the Committee had not yet chosen one in its Decision 15.IGC 9.
313. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** suggested that it would be better to delete the reference to the 2022 call.
314. The delegation of **Brazil** noted that if the reference to "2022" was removed, perhaps this would restrict contributions related to the challenges of COVID-19, while it expressed its hope that it would cease to be a problem, if not disappear entirely after 2022.
315. The delegation of **Denmark** proposed to reword the beginning of the paragraph as follows "decides that the specific questions in the written contributions in 2022 will focus on the challenges encountered in the context of COVID-19".
316. The delegation of **Ecuador** reiterated its proposal to include the networking of micro, small and medium-sized cultural enterprises in this paragraph.
317. The delegation of **Cuba** stated that it could not approve the creation of a network of enterprises, in light of Decision 15.IGC 9. However, it suggested adding the importance of micro, small, and medium-sized cultural enterprise's participation as a second topic of the written reports produced in 2022.
318. The delegation of **Ecuador** responded that it was not a question of creating a network, but simply of facilitating the networking of micro, small and medium-sized cultural enterprises.
319. The delegation of **Brazil** stated that it was not opposed to the proposal of Ecuador, but in view of the difficulty of finding a consensus, it proposed to delete this paragraph entirely.
320. The delegation of **Cuba** asked about the financial implications of the online posting of written contributions and the online exchange with CSOs referred to in paragraph 12.

321. The delegation of **Denmark** clarified that the mechanisms referred to in this paragraph were not new, except that the Committee now requested that documents be made available online at least one month before the next session in order to be able to provide relevant feedback.
322. The delegation of **Cuba** asked if this online meeting modality would be maintained when the Committee sessions would be held in person again. It proposed to delete the mention "on the UNESCO website" arguing that all the information documents were available on the UNESCO website anyway. Finally, it proposed to delete the reference to cultural enterprises, again with regard to Decision 15.IGC 9, which states the need for further reflection and not the creation of consultation mechanisms. Regarding paragraph 13, it proposed to delete the words "in a suitable format". It proposed to also delete the reference to "specific mechanisms" in paragraph 15, which was agreed by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.
323. The **Chairperson**, in the absence of new objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 11 was adopted as amended.

Item 12 – Future activities of the Committee: draft work plan and timetable (2022-2023)
Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/12REV](#)

324. The **Secretary** explained that the preparation of this document had taken into account the priorities set by the Conference of Parties, as well as the [Medium-Term Strategy \(41 C/4\)](#) of the [Programme and Budget for 2022-2023 \(41 C/5\)](#), UNESCO's global priorities and priority groups; the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; the four main goals of the Convention's monitoring framework; and the 100 recommendations of the ResiliArt movement. He added that several activities were already at the heart of the Committee's work: implementation of the IFCD; reception and processing of periodic reports; and implementation of capacity building programmes. He noted that other activities were more forward-looking, like the further development of the knowledge management system, which will depend on the collection of data through mechanisms such as the national roadmaps for implementing the Convention in the digital environment, the global consultation on the implementation of the 1980 Recommendation, or the database on preferential treatment measures.
- He congratulated France on the submission this week of its roadmap for the implementation of the Convention in the digital environment. He encouraged other Parties to follow the example of France, Canada, including Quebec, Germany and the Republic of Korea. He explained that the decisions taken at this session of the Committee would be reflected in the work plan contained in the annex to working document 12REV. He noted that this annex also provided information on funding sources and human resource requirements.
325. The delegation of **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines** asked whether any changes were needed in light of previous decisions.
326. The **Secretary** explained that the work plan displayed on the screen had indeed been revised to take into account the decisions adopted at the present session.
327. The delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Secretariat for the preparation of this document. It stressed the critical importance of advocacy initiatives for preferential treatment. It also highlighted the need to address the digital divide, which remains a persistent challenge for many countries. It stated that the creative and cultural sector is a strategic priority of Mongolia, and supported the work plan.
328. The delegation of **Jamaica** welcomed the proposed work plan. It explained that it had received capacity building itself in 2018 for the preparation of its periodic report, and emphasised how helpful this had been, especially in the long run.
329. The **Chairperson** invited observers who wished to do so to take the floor.
330. The representative of the **Togolese Coalition for Cultural Diversity** praised the remarkable work carried out under the Convention. In particular, he mentioned the regional capacity

building workshops conducted in partnership with CERAV, which have proven to be extremely beneficial. He asked UNESCO to continue its support for CERAV. He expressed his wish to see the development of further actions on the priority of preferential treatment for developing countries.

331. The delegation of **Sweden** emphasised the need for international cooperation in the cultural sector, particularly in light of the impacts of COVID-19. It welcomed the publication of the third edition of the Global Report. It then thanked the Secretariat and the Parties for the excellent implementation of the capacity building programme, financed by its agency SIDA, and welcomed the continuation of this important activity in the coming years. It hoped that the synergies between the Convention and the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist would be strengthened. It also asked for additional data, for example on the status of women or LGBTI communities in the cultural sector. It welcomed the approach of diversifying the Convention's stakeholders, and said that cooperation with cultural institutions and enterprises, for example, should build on existing mechanisms. It concluded by stressing the need to include culture as a key component of sustainable development.
332. The representative of the **International Federation of Musicians (FIM)** joined the tribute to Mane Nett. He said that the pandemic acts as an indicator of the ills suffered by professionals in the performing arts, and in culture in general. He explained that in 2020, the British Musicians' Union conducted a survey that showed 40% of musicians were considering changing careers. He noted that inadequate funding, eligibility criteria, and complex implementation procedures in a sector that suffers largely from informal labour have limited the effectiveness of government plans to support culture. He recalled that these difficulties had not affected the major digital distribution platforms, which nevertheless live off the work of artists. He concluded by stressing the importance of the 1980 Recommendation concerning the Status of the Artist.
333. The representative of the **UNESCO Chair on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions** was pleased to note that several of the activities in the work plan were directly related to the research projects that her Chair was currently conducting. In particular, she explained that the Chair is establishing a database on cultural clauses in trade agreements, the results of which will be shared with the Committee in due course.
334. The representative of **Culture all Nippon** also stressed the need to promote the work of the Convention in other fora, such as the G7 or the G20. She stated that it is essential that culture be recognised as a pillar of sustainable development and a fundamental public good.
335. The representative of the **International Music Council** echoed the words of her FIM colleague, and also stressed the essential role of the 1980 Recommendation. She said that this tool helps governments to structure the cultural sector around a full professional status, guaranteeing real access to social protection, collective bargaining and all other labour rights; intellectual property rights that provide artists with remuneration linked to the income derived from the exploitation of their works; and measures to facilitate international mobility.
336. The delegation of **Palestine** proposed to add the word "amended" to paragraph 3 of the draft decision, to reflect the revisions made to the work plan.
337. The **Chairperson**, in the absence of objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 12 was adopted as amended.

Item 13 – Date of the sixteenth session of the Committee **Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/13](#)**

338. The **Chairperson** mentioned the proposed dates for the next session: 7 – 10 February 2023. In the absence of objections, he declared the decision adopted.

Decision 15.IGC 13 was adopted.

Item 14 – Election of the members of the Bureau of the sixteenth session of the Committee
Document [DCE/22/15.IGC/14](#)

339. The **Chairperson** explained that the Committee was invited to elect a Bureau of six members, one from each electoral group established by the General Conference of UNESCO, in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical distribution. He noted that the Bureau elected by the Committee would be composed of a Chairperson, four Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur. He noted that H.E. Mr. Christian Ter-Stepanian (Armenia) had been nominated for the role of Chairperson. He announced the candidacy of Ms. Aysha Kamali (United Arab Emirates) for the position of Rapporteur. Finally, he stated that he had been informed of the candidacies of Cuba, Ethiopia, France, and Mongolia for the positions of Vice Chairpersons.
340. The **Chairperson**, in the absence of objections, declared the decision adopted as amended.

Decision 15.IGC 14 was adopted as amended.

341. The delegation of **Armenia** explained that H.E. Mr. Christian Ter-Stepanian was unable to join the online session, and that he asked the Secretariat and the Parties to excuse him. It conveyed the Ambassador's thanks to the members of the Committee for their confidence, and his commitment to do everything possible to make the next session of the Committee a success.
342. The **Chairperson** thanked all the members of the Committee for their excellent work and their contributions to the rich debates, as well as all the observers, in particular the CSOs, for their participation.
343. The **Rapporteur** presented a summary of the deliberations and decisions taken during this session of the Committee.
344. The **Chairperson** stressed the heavy workload that had been carried out during the present session. He thanked again all the members of the Committee, and especially the members of the Bureau who helped him in his task. He also thanked the interpreters, technicians and all the colleagues who had ensured the success of the session and allowed it to take place in excellent working conditions. Finally, he expressed his gratitude to the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Secretary of the Convention and the entire Secretariat for their dedication and excellent work.
345. The **Secretary** thanked the Committee members, Parties, CSOs and other observers for their renewed confidence in the Secretariat and the quality of their collaboration. He congratulated his team for the immense quality of their work. He also expressed his appreciation to the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr. Ernesto Ottone R. He concluded by thanking the Chairperson for the successful conduct of this session, as well as all the interpreters and technicians.
346. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr. Ernesto Ottone R, also thanked the members of the Committee, the Chairperson, the Rapporteur, the Secretary, the Secretariat, the interpreters, the technicians and all the colleagues who took part in this session. He then shared two convictions, which this session had reinforced. He began by stating that the post-pandemic recovery of society would depend greatly on creativity and the diversity of cultural expressions. He then stressed that international cooperation and collaboration with civil society in its diversity are essential to meet contemporary challenges. He concluded by emphasising the growing importance and relevance of the Convention.
347. The **Chairperson** thanked all the participants again and closed the session.

Session closed