



LIETUVOS NUOLATINĖ ATSTOVYBĖ PRIE UNESCO
DELEGATION PERMANENTE DE LITUANIE AUPRES DE L'UNESCO
PERMANENT DELEGATION OF LITHUANIA TO UNESCO

Mr. Riëks Smeets
Chief of Section for Intangible Heritage

2007-01-30 Nr. 25/2007
I Nr.

Comments on the Criteria for Inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity

Dear Sir,

Lithuania as the State Party to the 2003 Convention wishes to contribute to the debate concerning the Criteria for Inscription.

First of all we would like to underline the need to define clear differences between *cultural spaces* of 2003 Convention and *cultural landscapes* of 1972 Convention. We would like to propose that both secretariats of both Conventions would meet and make clear "job division" between themselves, as for a time being the difference is quite ambiguous.

(i) we agree that one day the need might arise to identify more than five domains for inscription.

(iv)- (v) we would also support "*shared experience*" or "*rooted in the community*" to "*tradition*" or "*traditional*"

(x) we would strongly advocate for an inscription only of those ICH for which a realistic safeguarding plan was elaborated.

We would agree that in a need of an international assistance for safeguarding of ITC the State Party should within the limits of its resources to share the costs.

Related issues

Inscription of Masterpieces

To our mind the items from the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity have to be automatically incorporated to the Representative list. We agree that the same regime as to new items has to be applied to them as well.

Lithuania does not think that only the items of the States –Parties to the Convention from one list have to be incorporated to another one. It might undermine the entire concept of the List of Masterpieces and would not make any good to the 2003 Convention.

**Comments solicited by the 1st Intangible Heritage Committee:
LITHUANIA**

We are not in favour of establishing a time-frame of existence in the List for inscribed items, as we do not think it is feasible, but we would support the idea that every 5, 10 years or so it is important to undertake their viability assessment or some kind of a monitoring exercise.

Criteria for the Urgent List

Clear criteria for inscribing to the Urgent List have to be elaborated. Moreover, even more important is to define very clear, transparent and measurable criteria to remove the item from the Urgent List.

Communities, groups and individuals

We would agree that it is important to define communities and groups, but it might be done in a later stage as more experience is required.

A List and a Registry?

It has to be debated further. Does it mean that the List is about *Living heritage* and the Registry – about the *Disappeared one*?

Sincerely,



Ina Marčiulionytė
Ambassador, Permanent Delegate