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1. This document contains the summary records of the ninth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, held in UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, from 24 to 28 November 2014.
2. More than 1000 participants attended the session among which delegations from all the twenty four States Members of the Committee, one hundred and eight States Parties not Members of the Committee, seven States non party to the Convention, two Intergovernmental organizations, five Category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, sixty four accredited non-governmental organizations to the Committee and fifty press/media entities.
3. The full list of participants is available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=739).
4. The session was conducted in three languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee) and Arabic.
5. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.
6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the ninth session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: H. E. Mr José Manuel Rodríguez Cuadros (Peru)

Vice-Chairpersons: Belgium, Latvia, Kyrgyzstan, Namibia and Egypt

Rapporteur: Ms Anita Vaivade (Latvia)

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

DRAFT DECISION 10.COM 4

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/15/10.COM/4,

2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee’s ninth session contained in this document.

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

*[Monday, 24 November, morning session]*

## ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The **Chairperson** of the ninth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, **H. E. Mr José Manuel Rodríguez Cuadros**, officially opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to UNESCO’s Headquarters. Before going into the substance of the work, the Chairperson invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO, Mr Alfredo Pérez Armiñán, to make few remarks.
2. The Assistant Director-General for Culture, **Mr Alfredo Pérez Armiñán**, was pleased to participate in the opening of the ninth Committee session in his new role, and was particularly interested in seeing how cultural conventions, which is at the heart of UNESCO’s activities in the field of culture, were accompanied by States Parties at statutory meetings. This session promised to be demanding and important, like the eight previous sessions since the adoption of the Convention in 2003. This session could, however, be unusual in that it occurred during an unprecedented financial crisis that can no longer be considered transitory. It was a situation that called for awareness and responsibility in order to change the way of future work, to collectively reflect on how best to serve the objectives of the Convention, while focusing on the essentials. The Convention was said to be ambitious, generous, and in many ways pioneering. It recognized communities as key stakeholders in identifying and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and called on all States Parties to implement a veritable cultural democracy for the future of societies, their cohesion and their sustainable development: which is an essential part of UNESCO’s work in the field of culture. The question was not whether UNESCO would continue to carry out this mandate in the future but in what manner UNESCO would fulfil it. The statutory obligations of a Convention were multifaceted, and it would seem natural to expect that all aspects are taken into account, as well as supporting States Parties in implementation, capacity-building, monitoring, communication, and so on. However, the budgets available, particularly for human resources, could no longer fulfil these tasks in the same way, despite the support offered by various donors through extrabudgetary funds to whom the Assistant Director-General expresses his gratitude. The Assistant Director-General reiterated the findings of the audit of the cultural conventions conducted in 2013, which concluded that the current system was not sustainable. A review of the practices thus required lucid, creative and responsible choices in the interest of all in order to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The financial crisis should not be feared. On the contrary, it was often a crucial step that led to something else. It was this ‘something else’ that States Parties should keep in mind during the Committee’s discussions in the coming days in order to effectively achieve the important goals of the Convention. The Assistant Director-General was confident of the future and the actions to be embodied by the international community in this regard. He would be accompagnying the work of the Commiteee during present session and in the months and years to come to ensure the Convention’s success.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for his wise words, which would certainly remain in the Committee’s mind during the discussions. The Chairperson spoke of the great honour bestowed on him and his country, Peru, in chairing this ninth session of the Committee. He noted the unprecedented attendance with more than 950 participants registered, which demonstrated the importance of the Convention at the national and international level, and the presence of a number of ministers and deputy ministers attested to this. He thanked them for their presence and the importance they attach to the Convention. The Chairperson was confident that the Committee would successfully tackle the important agenda items over the next five working days even though the timetable is extreamly heavy. He spoke of the current international situation characterized by a fragmentation of society and the emergence of new conflicts such that dialogue and shared values carried particular importance as essential elements of culture and peace. He added that people demand decisions from their governments and non-state actors that open dialogue and understanding, and that highlight a humanist vision of politics and the universal value of dialogue. UNESCO thus had a duty to build peace in the minds of men, and its multidimensional approach to world culture was essential in this regard. By understanding cultural diversity and respect for others, we ensured dialogue and understanding between peoples. The Chairperson further added that culture was increasingly a variable of source for ensuring sustainable development, and was key to building peace. The 46 nominations included various expressions of knowledge, spiritual representations, oral traditions, dances and other intangible cultural expressions that represented the spirituality of millions of people who sought to share these cultural traditions with humanity. Faced with the trend towards conflict, the global community was united in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage so that everyone could live in freedom and in peace. The Chairperson thus officially opened the ninth session of the Committee, inviting the Secretary to make some practical announcements, before moving on to the agenda.
4. The **Secretary** of the Convention, Ms Cecile Duvelle, informed the Committee that the debates would be interpreted in French, English as well as Arabic, thanks to the generous support of Saudi Arabia, and broadcast in audio only on the Convention website that could be followed anywhere around the world. A special room had been attributed to the media, accessible day and night. The meeting room was connected to the wireless network, which facilitated the access to online documents and thus rendering the meeting as paperless as possible, though paper versions were provided for Committee members who had made the request. The latest updated 2014 edition of the basic texts of the Convention, which included the Operational Directives adopted in June by the General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention, had also been distributed. The printed version of the basic texts are available in French and English, with the four other official language versions soon available in print, though the Operational Directives were available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00026&key=136) in Arabic, Chinese, Spanish and Russian. The Secretary reminded the Committee that the list of participants was available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-Participants.docx) in draft form, with 974 people registered so far from 129 countries. She also reminded the Committee that the Bureau of the ninth session consisted of the Chairperson, H.E. Mr José Manuel Rodríguez Cuadros, the Rapporteur, Ms Anita Vaivade from Latvia, and the Vice-Chairs from Belgium, Latvia, Egypt, Kyrgyzstan and Namibia. Finally, the 50 delegates among the Committee members, States Parties or NGOs who received financial assistance were asked to request reimbursements for their travel costs. There would be no breaks during the sessions, but the vending machine would be available outside the hall and there were two bars in the building.

## ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/2*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-2-EN.doc)

[*ITH/14/9.COM/INF.2.1 Rev.*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.-EN.doc)

[*ITH/14/9.COM/INF.2.2 Rev.3*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-INF.2.2_Rev.3-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 2*

1. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** turned to item 2 and invited the Secretary to introduce the agenda items.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the provisional agenda included 19 items, some of which contained sub-items therefore there were in reality 30 items for discussion on the relatively rich agenda. It was recalled that the items were either related to the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, such as the ‘Adoption of the agenda’, or a Committee decision to address a particular issue discussed at a previous session, or they responded to the Operational Directives, such as the items on Lists and the inscriptions. All working documents had been published within the statutory deadline of 27 October 2014, four weeks before the opening of the session. The latest version of the list of documents could be found in document [INF.2.2 Rev.3](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-INF.2.2_Rev.3-EN.doc), which was only published recently due to addendums resulting from the withdrawal of nominations for example. The Secretary then explained the coding system of the documents, i.e. all documents began with ITH (for intangible cultural heritage), 14 referred to 2014, 9.COM referred to the ninth Committee Session, and the final number corresponded to the item on the agenda. Documents ending with ‘INF’ referred to information documents and ‘Rev’ implied that revisions had been made to the documents. For example document 7 on ‘Voluntary supplementary contributions to the ICH Fund’ was revised following an additional contribution made after the date of publication to allow the Committee to accept both donations and not just the one originally planned. It was recalled that the session would last for five days, and that the Bureau had adopted the provisional timetable ([INF.2.2 Rev.3](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.3-EN.doc)) when it met on 13 October 2014. It was also noted that the timetable would be revised according to the advancement of the debates, though no changes would be made if the Committee stayed on schedule. The sessions would begin daily at 9.30 am and end at 1 pm, and resume at 3 pm and end at 7 pm. The Secretary then outlined the schedule, beginning with the adoption of the agenda, the admission of observers, the adoption of the summary report of the Committee’s previous session, followed by two interventions that were not strictly speaking items on the agenda: the Chairperson’s report on the activities of the Bureau and the Report of the NGO Forum. This would be followed by agenda items 5.a (Examination of the reports of States Parties on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List) and item 5.b (Examination of the reports of States Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List). The day’s session would end with the agenda item 5.c (Reports of States Parties on the use of international assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund); agenda item 6 (Report by the Secretariat on its activities); and agenda item 7 (Voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund), with two additional voluntary contributions to the fund; and lastly agenda item 8 (Report on the audit of the governance of UNESCO and dependent funds, programmes and entities).
3. The **Secretary** further explained that Tuesday would be dedicated to the inscriptions, preceded by agenda item 13.d ‘Evaluation of the implementation of previous decisions of the Committee in connection with the inscription of elements, selection of proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and approval of requests for International Assistance’, as requested by the Committee in Baku. This would be followed by agenda item 9 and the report of the Consultative Body on its work in 2014 and the recommendations by the Consultative Body on the inscriptions to the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and International Assistance. This would be followed by agenda item 10 and the examination of inscriptions to the Representative List, which would likely involve significant media interest and take up the whole day, if not more, depending on the length of the discussions. Thursday morning would thus be dedicated to agenda item 11 and the establishment of the new Evaluation Body for the 2015 cycle, with agenda item 12 ‘Number of files submitted for the 2015 cycle and number of files that can be treated in the 2016 and 2017 cycles’, for which the Secretariat would provide an overview of the current status. Thursday afternoon would begin with agenda item 13.a and the draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting, on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development in agenda item 13.b, and the reflection on the referral option, the subject of item 13.c. Friday morning would be dedicated to a number of agenda items, which were not expected to require much discussion since they were rather updates and points of information. Agenda item 14 would be dedicated not to the accreditation of non-governmental organizations, as none would be proposed in the present session, but rather on the evaluation of accredited NGOs in light of the evaluation of their contribution to the Committee’s work. Finally, on Friday afternoon, the Committee would be asked to decide on the date and venue of the tenth Session of the Committee (agenda item 15), as well as the new members of the Bureau (agenda item 16). Other issues might also be discussed (agenda item 17), if required, and the Committee would end the session by adopting the list of decisions (agenda item 18). The Secretary concluded by reminding the Bureau that it would meet every day before the day’s sessions, which was also open to observers.
4. Thanking the Secretary for the introduction, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the agenda and document 2, with the provisional timetable (document INF.2.1)**,** and the provisional list of documents (document INF 2.2 Rev.), adding that the timetable was susceptible to be altered by the Bureau, as explained. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 2 adopted**.

## ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:

ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/3*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-3-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 3*

1. The **Chairperson** called on the Committee Members to respect the length of their interventions, and avoid speaking more than twice during the same debate, adding that a timer would be introduced if considered necessary. If time permitted, observers would be invited to speak during a general discussion. Observers would nevertheless not be permitted to intervene during discussions on the draft decisions.
2. The **Secretary** explained that in its Decision 6.COM 3, the Committee at its sixth session decided to authorize the participation of four entities as observers at its seventh, eighth and ninth sessions. Recalling that the sessions were open to the public, it was noted that no other entity or person had made a request to participate in future sessions as an observer; an observer differs from the public in that an observer can participate in the debates. Thus, among the entities and persons authorized to participate as observers in accordance with Decision 6.COM 3, two had registered to participate in the present session and their names had been introduced in the draft decision. It was also noted that the document did not mention the participation of accredited NGOs as they were automatically registered as observers to Committee sessions, in accordance with Art. 6 of the Rules of Procedure, as well as all States Parties to the Convention and Member States of UNESCO.
3. The Chairperson moved to the draft decision, and **declared Decision 9.COM 3 adopted**.

## ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA:

ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE EIGHTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/4 Rev.*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-4_Rev.-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 4*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the draft summary records of the eighth session of the Committee, as presented in document 4.
2. The **Secretary** explained that document 4 Rev. recalled the important discussions by the Committee at its eighth session on issues that would affect its work in the present session. The Secretary was aware that this was the longest document of the session, though it was not intended to be read in its entirety, but rather to serve as a reference document. The detailed account did in some respect record the history of the Convention, whose evolution and trends could be observed through the various reports, and which led to certain decisions. Thus, the report attempted to accurately synthesize the interventions of all the Committee Members and observers at the Committee’s last session in Baku, Azerbaijan. The Secretary also wished to remind the Committee that the audio recordings of the debates (or video in the case of the Baku session) were also available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00681). In this way, anyone could verify the accuracy of the account provided.
3. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the draft decision, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, **declared Decision 9.COM 4 adopted**.
4. Before moving to the next agenda item, the **Chairperson** wished to inform the Committee of the results of the Bureau meetings that had been convened four times, adding that all the working documents of the Bureau and its decisions were available on the Convention [website](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=570). There had been two electronic consultations since the last meeting of the Committee, and two face-to-face meetings. In April 2014, the Bureau discussed and electronically approved the Committee's final report to the General Assembly on its activities between June 2012 and June 2014. In June 2014, the Bureau met to adopt a specific proposal concerning the Secretariat on the use of funds for ‘other functions of the Committee’ for the period from 1 January 2014 to 30 June 2016. The Bureau also met on 13 October and approved the provisional timetable of the current session of the Committee. Finally, it was with great pleasure that the Chairperson informed the Committee that just before the present session, three requests for International Assistance and one preparatory assistance request had been examined electronically. The Bureau thus approved the request by Mongolia for the capacity-building of NGOs working in the field of intangible cultural heritage in Mongolia for the amount of US$25,000; the request by Viet Nam to safeguard the oral traditions of its ethnic minorities for the amount of US$24,310; and the request by Morocco for the preparation of a nomination file to the Urgent Safeguarding List for the amount of US$14,100. However, the Bureau’s work was not finished, and it would meet every morning to effectively coordinate the work of the present sessions. The Chairperson remarked that Observers were welcome, and that he counted on the Vice-Chairs to assist him if necessary, while the Rapporteur would verify the accuracy of the final decisions as they were adopted. Finally, he wished to remind the Vice-Chairs that he also counted on their collaboration to lead consultations within their Electoral Groups, particularly in the establishment of the Bureau of the next Committee session. He concluded by thanking the members of the Bureau for their cooperation over the last twelve months, and invited the representative of the NGOs, Ms Jorijn Neyrinck [from the NGO Tapis Plein, Belgium] to introduce her report on the NGO Forum that was held the day before. The Chairperson was happy to inaugurate this practice, recalling that the Committee had decided at its eighth session in 2013 to include this report in the agenda in all future Committee sessions.
5. On behalf of the NGO Forum, **Ms Neyrinck** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to present a report of the annual symposium of the Forum that had taken place the previous day, directly following up on Decision 8.COM 5.c.1, encouraging States Parties to ‘promote increased NGO and community involvement in the development of policy, legislation, safeguarding plans and sustainable development plans’, as recommended by the Internal Oversight Service in its [report](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-13-8.COM-INF.5.c-EN.doc) (Recommendation 2). It was noted that 95 participants attended the Forum, comprising NGOs, communities, researchers, State Parties, and members of UNESCO National Commissions from over 38 countries worldwide. The idea of the symposium was to revisit the accomplishments of NGOs in four important and mutually interlinked domains of safeguarding intangible heritage: in public policies, legislation, safeguarding measures and sustainable development, which all required a close collaboration between NGOs and States Parties. The event was comprised of presentations with an interactive format so as to facilitate the exchange of ideas and the sharing of experiences, producing a day of diversity, inclusivity and positive energy. The Forum had taken another step in fostering mutual collaboration of public policy, decision-makers and civil society organizations with the shared purpose of safeguarding intangible heritage in the world. It also demonstrated the growing, active and dynamic relationships between NGOs and States Parties. It brought together a range of stakeholders that fostered awareness of their diversity and the wide range of roles they enact to benefit communities. The diversity of the NGO communities was enriching and meant that the Convention was implemented on many different levels with the challenges of NGOs working at different scales. The inclusivity of the Forum enabled even the smallest NGO to have the opportunity to make valuable contributions to the Convention. The Forum would meet throughout the week to discuss important topics, including ways of sharing best practices, responses to the report of the accredited NGOs and their four-year reports, the new Evaluation Body and the enhanced role of NGOs, and the periodic reports in which a greater NGO role was envisaged. The activities of the Forum could be followed through the dedicated [website](http://www.ichngoforum.org), including the online journal [#*Heritage Alive*](http://www.ichngoforum.org/category/heritage-alive/)*,* an on-going platform for exchanges and experiences from several working groups, and the newly established newsletter. Another significant event was the Conference ‘Towards Efficient Roles of NGOs for Safeguarding ICH’[[1]](#footnote-1) in the Asia-Pacific Region held in Korea in June 2014 and organized by ICHCAP and the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation, with support from the Korean government. Finally, the delegates of the NGO Forum wished to express their gratitude to Indonesia, which had recently announced that it would support ICH NGO Forum activities in order to build infrastructure and capacity, and hoped that other States Parties would follow Indonesia's initiative. Ms Neyrinck concluded by offering a publication *Brokers, Facilitators and Mediation* that addressed the critical success factors for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, with researchers and many of the accredited NGOs active in the Forum recounting their experiences.
6. The **Chairperson** was happy to hear of the fruitful discussions and thanked Ms Neyrinck for her participation towards the future work of the Committee.
7. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Secretary for organizing the present session and congratulated the Chairperson for his chairmanship. The delegation also wished to thank the NGO for its reports, adding that giving NGOs the opportunity to have the NGO Forum at the beginning of the Committee meeting was a good tradition that it hoped would continue.
8. The delegation of **Latvia** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and thanked the Secretariat for the substantial work accomplished in the present session to prepare the debates. It also welcomed the NGO Forum’s continued reflection on the implementation of the Convention at the local, national and international levels, and for contributing to the debates of the Committee. The agenda of the present session drew the Committee’s attention to the role of NGOs, as described and analysed in the reports of States Parties to be examined during the next few days, but also to be incorporated within the proposed amendments to the Operational Directives with regard to periodic reporting. The delegation acknowledged the contribution of NGOs to the broad spectrum of transversal issues in implementing the Convention in general, and it encouraged the exchange of experiences and opinions within the NGO Forum and its continuous involvement within the Committee debates of the Committee.

## ITEM 5.a OF THE AGENDA:

EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS INSCRIBED ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY

**Document** [*ITH/14/9**.COM/5.a*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-5.a-EN_.doc)

[*27 Re**ports*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00707)

**Decision** *9.COM 5.a*

1. The Chairpersonturned to point 5.a, inviting Mr Frank Proschan from the Secretariat to present this item.
2. **Mr Proschan** explained that the task of the Committee was to examine 27 periodic reports submitted by States Parties during the 2014 reporting cycle, and to provide its own synthetic report on those reports to the General Assembly. The Annex to document 5.a constituted a proposed synthetic text of the Committee’s report to the General Assembly, and provided a general overview of the 2014 periodic reports, as well as the measures taken by the various reporting States to implement the Convention. The table in paragraph 7 of the Annex showed the status of the 56 States that were expected to report in 2014, the year in which the State was intended to report, the cycle in which they did report if they submitted a draft, and finally if the document was completed in the present cycle. Mr Proschan further explained that in many cases, the States submitted a report, the Secretariat provided feedback to improve the report, but in a certain number of cases the State was unable to make the necessary revisions before the deadline. For example, Albania’s report – one of the 27 reports under examination in the present session – had been originally submitted in 2013, but in view of the amendments suggested by the Secretariat, the State Party preferred to present its report in 2014. It was noted that 11 States were one year overdue, 14 States were two years overdue, 3 States were three years overdue, and one State was now four years overdue with its report. As this was the fourth reporting cycle, and in order to avoid the very repetitive annual overviews, the Secretariat had provided in Part III of the Annex an in-depth and cumulative analysis of inventorying-making. The Secretariat had chosen to focus the bulk of the synthetic report this year on this topic rather than trying to treat the range of topics that were covered by the States in their reports. This kind of in-depth focus on a specific topic would also be proposed for each future reporting cycle, while the overview would cover all the topics in the reports.
3. **Mr Proschan** remarked that in reading the periodic reports it was clear that the establishment of ICH inventories remained the top priority in many countries, and was one of the most visible results of the implementation of the Convention. The synthetic report thus devoted paragraphs 40–82 to providing a detailed survey of the practices of States in this respect. It was also clear that while each State was responsible for elaborating one or more inventories in a manner befitting its own situation, there was nevertheless much to be learnt from comparing the experience of these 58 States since the beginning of the periodic reporting cycle. The Annex also included an overview of the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List, and it was interesting to note the diversity of forms and domains in these 66 elements covered by the reports. The draft decision proposed by the Secretariat thus emphasized certain general trends, and addressed certain topics raised in the final section of the Annex, which could perhaps receive greater attention from submitting States and from the Committee in future reporting cycles. Particularly noteworthy was the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in development strategies, especially in rural development programmes and funds, which the Committee might wish to give greater attention to in subsequent cycles. The results of the in-depth analysis on inventorying-making were also reflected in paragraph 10 of the draft decision, which took note of the substantial progress achieved by States in meeting their inventory obligations. Paragraph 8 of the draft decision reiterated the Committee’s encouragement to States to actively involve the communities when preparing their reports, as well as to include information provided by NGOs: the consequence of Decision 8.COM 5.c.1 in 2013. Finally, paragraph 12 proposed that the specific thematic focus in the overview, to be prepared by the Secretariat in the 2015 cycle, should be on transmission and education.
4. Thanking Mr Proschan, the **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
5. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its sincere appreciation of the work of the Secretariat for providing an informative overview and specific analysis of different experiences of States Parties, as well as the in-depth study on inventory-making. It also welcomed the proposal of the Secretariat to decide on particular themes, and thus supported the proposed decision to report on transmission and education in the next cycle. It further welcomed greater reflection on the possible themes to be chosen for further cycles, as States Parties might be expected to take these into account when drafting their reports, as mentioned in paragraph 4. Keeping in mind that the reports were significant sources of information for various stakeholders worldwide, and also knowing that these reports were only expected every six years, the delegation believed that the choice of themes would only serve as an orientation for the Secretariat’s work, while the reports of the States Parties were expected to equally cover the various aspects in the implementation of the Convention. It also wished to highlight the conclusion in paragraph 97 that sought the General Assembly’s attention in its statement that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage was not only an issue of rural development programmes, but could also contribute to the development of disadvantaged urban communities. Respecting that intangible cultural heritage may be of importance for various urban communities, whatever their characteristics, the delegation felt that unless there was a particular clarification in this respect, the conclusion should be broader and more inclusive, while discussing urban communities in general. The delegation’s final observation concerned paragraph 98 on the weakening of informal modes of transmission, including within families, adding that this conclusion was very important and should be taken into account in the Committee’s further work, while encouraging various forms of transmission and safeguarding plans.
6. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** [observer]wished to comment on the periodic report submitted by the Republic of Armenia, considered to contain a number of highly sensitive issues concerning the communities and the government of Azerbaijan. It was said to contain provocative elements of a political nature that contradicted the spirit of the Convention and the principles of mutual respect and understanding among communities. Namely, there were references to internationally recognized territories of the Republic of Azerbaijan, which had been occupied by Armenia for more than 20 years and is *de facto* controlled by separatist regimes. There were also provocative references to other territories of Azerbaijan in the report, which referred to safeguarding measures of the element in Nakhchivan and Julfa, both Azerbaijani territories, and thus a violation of Article 11 of the Convention, as well as Decision 8.COM 6.a adopted in 2013. The delegation felt that this was an attempt to push the political agenda through the culture mechanisms of UNESCO, adding that this provocation would ultimately fail. It strongly believed that the Convention could neither be used for political purposes nor serve as an instrument of international disputes or territorial claims. On the contrary, the Convention promoted dialogue, social cohesion and mutual respect, and it united communities rather than creating dividing lines. It therefore regretted that instead of using the Convention as a tool to promote a culture of peace and intercultural dialogue, Armenia instigated inter-ethnic tension. Moreover, it was unfortunate that this was not the first time Azerbaijan had faced this situation. In 2010, there were identical provocative references in the nomination submitted by Armenia, but thanks to the mediation of the Secretary of the Convention, a consensus had been reached and the controversial elements in question were removed from the nomination. Unfortunately, this consensus was not respected by Armenia and was made clear in the letter by the Minister of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Azerbaijan sent to the Director-General of UNESCO on 30 October 2014. In this letter, the Minister clearly expressed the government’s position and asked that the Bureau of the Director-General and the Secretariat to negotiate with Armenia to delete the references from the report. The delegation thus sought a response from the Secretariat about the outcome of these negotiations. In any case, it urged the Committee to take a principled stance on this very important issue, which – in its opinion – discredited the Convention.
7. The delegation of the **Congo** thanked the Chairperson for his chairmanship, congratulating the Secretariat, and the Secretary in particular, for the good preparatory work and good documentation. The delegation remarked that Congo unfortunately still had no elements inscribed despite two unsuccessful attempts. Nevertheless, it commended the States for their reports, as it provided instruction to those still learning. For this reason, it insisted on paragraph 95 of the document and the ‘training in intangible cultural heritage management’, which was deemed very important, as it would lead to more nominations. Training was key and the fact that the delegation had failed twice was due to not having had the necessary training. However, the document provided the necessary elements to allow it to submit nominations, which would soon come.
8. The delegation of **Armenia** [observer]congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the wonderful preparations of the meeting. It regretted the much politicized statement by Azerbaijan with regard to its national report, insisting that it did not contain any political statements. On the contrary, the letter sent by the Minister of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Azerbaijan was itself politicized and referred to political issues that were unrelated to Armenia’s report. The delegation drew the Committee’s attention to the mention of duduk festivals in the letter that were organized in Artsakh in Armenia, as well as Amsterdam, Venice, London, the United States, the Russian Federation, and in other parts of the world, adding that no other country had issues with the organization of these festivals of duduk music organized by Armenia. For this reason, it did not see a problem in organizing and reporting on the duduk music festival in its national report, nor did it see any link between the political issues cited in the Ministry’s letter and raising these same political issues here at UNESCO, while at the same time calling upon UNESCO to ensure a culture of unity and not to politicize an agenda. With regard to the issue of Khachkars being exclusively a phenomenon of the Armenian culture, and also the issue of the destruction of Armenian cross-stones in the cemetery in Baku, the delegation explained that the film referred to in the national report was produced by a reputable French scientist, historian and art critic who supported the film-making process with professional accounts. The film also contained episodes calling for the preservation of cross-stones, while referring to the damage of Armenian cross-stones and cemeteries by Baku in Nakhchivan. The delegation had nothing to add if the Minister of Culture and Tourism of Azerbaijan was against the protection by its government of the Khachkars in Nakhchivan, only that it wished to remind the Committee of Resolution 5 adopted at the 16th session of the General Assembly of ICOMOS in 2008 on ‘The destruction of the historic cemetery of Jugha (Autonomous Republic of Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan)’. This referred to the documented destruction of the Armenian cross-stones in the cemetery of Jugha. The delegation therefore failed to understand why Azerbaijan raised politically sensitive issues about a report that did not contain anything political nor sensitive, but was simply a report of the work organized and carried out on Armenian elements of which it is the bearer, adding that duduk and the cross-stone art was not limited to its national borders, and that it therefore had the right to advocate the art of duduk and the art of cross-stones all over the world.
9. The delegation of **Uganda** congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the wonderful organization and its support to States Parties participating in this important meeting. It remarked on the role of community involvement in the drafting of the reports, and appreciated that the issues they raised should be included in the reports, adding that Uganda was expected to submit its report in the coming year. The delegation also believed that the role of communities and the issues emerging from this report would guide Uganda in improving its report. With regard to the issue of States failing to submit their reports, it asked that UNESCO find creative ways to help States in this challenging exercise.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** expressed its full confidence in the Chairperson’s able guidance that would lead to fruitful, harmonious and results-oriented discussions. It congratulated the States Parties on presenting their reports, and especially those that had made a special effort to submit their reports for the first time. This exercise provided a valuable opportunity for States Parties to assess their own progress in implementing the Convention, and to familiarize themselves with its terminology and practical methods. It also commended the Secretariat, the Secretary, and the new Assistant Director-General for Culture for their efforts, as well as the comprehensive overview of the submitted reports. The report indicated that 26 States Parties have yet to submit reports, which reflected the need for capacity-building in the States concerned, as well as the need among certain States for information and practical advice in drafting their reports, which could be provided by exchanging experiences with other States. As a Member of the Committee, the delegation reiterated its commitment to sharing experiences and to providing guidance, even training, to countries in need whenever possible. It therefore encouraged those States Parties in need to make contact through their delegations or National Commissions, and it welcomed States Parties to continue developing the legislative context required for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. It was noted that several countries had identified the potential of intangible cultural heritage as a tool for ensuring sustainable development, and that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage was increasingly integrated into planning and development programmes of these States Parties, a welcome development. The delegation further remarked that education was an important tool to promote intangible cultural heritage so as to balance the informal modes of learning and practical issues. It was also pleased to note that identifying and documenting the various aspects of intangible cultural heritage remained a top priority for many countries, including its own. However, it was apparent that the work was far from complete as many countries lacked the experience or linguistic proficiency to deal with the issues of the Convention. The delegation therefore encouraged the Secretariat to provide guidance in this regard to States in using language in their reporting mechanisms that was in conformity with the Convention and the other organs of the United Nations. It also encouraged States Parties to refrain from reporting, including in their national reports, on issues, concepts and areas beyond their national territories, which would be counter-productive in terms of the implementation of the Convention. Having carefully listened to the statements by Azerbaijan and Armenia, it believed that the Secretariat’s drafting skills would be able to provide a compromise that would remove controversial and contradictory language from the report.
11. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship, commending him on his valuable contribution. It also extended its deep gratitude to the Secretariat and the Secretary for the successful preparation of the meeting. It spoke of how transmission and education provided the core of safeguarding intangible heritage, and was thus in full agreement with the proposal of these themes in the coming cycle. With regard to the periodic reporting, the delegation thanked the States Parties that had submitted their reports this year, and appreciated the Secretariat’s hard work in preparing its own report, as well its examination of the reports by the States. Taking note of the fact that the periodic reports were an obligation shared by all States Parties, as they served as an effective tool for sharing best practices of safeguarding intangible heritage, the delegation was concerned that some reports were overdue. In this regard, it encouraged those States Parties with overdue reports to submit them as early as possible. It was also noted that State Parties with overdue reports were geographically scattered across the world, adding that this issue had to be addressed globally and in a holistic manner. It therefore requested that the Secretariat consider ways to improve the current situation by taking advantage of field offices and other relevant organizations.
12. Thanking the Chairperson for the opportunity to take the floor, the delegation of **Belize** [observer] spoke of the UNESCO Cluster Office for the Caribbean that introduced an initiative in 2012 to support the implement the Convention at the national level in three Caribbean States: Belize, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. In this regard, it wished to thank the government of Japan for funding this initiative, and UNESCO’s Cluster Office for taking the initiative to support the State’s efforts to implement the Convention. With respect to this exercise in Belize, the delegation reiterated the importance for future UNESCO efforts and for other countries to consider the importance of capacity-building so that it was fully integrated into any national effort in the implementation of the Convention and the inventorying of elements within those particular States. This was especially true for small States where there was always a lack of human resources, though it might also be true for bigger States. It was noted that the report had cited this problem across the board, whether capacity was available within academic institutions, NGOs or governmental levels, and not at the community level for example or vice versa. Hence the importance of integrating capacity-building into national efforts. It also wished to emphasize, and this was found to be very effective, the important role played by the media in the implementation of the Convention at national level, and as such they should proactively involved in highlighting elements within their territory and region. This had been true for Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago, contributing to the great strides made since 2012. The delegation concluded by looking forward to collaborating with other States within the region.
13. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the Chairperson on his election, as well as the Secretariat for its very important work. It spoke of the usefulness of the reporting mechanism from the Brazilian perspective, whose work in elaborating the report helped to better organize its internal policies, as well as verify the work being carried out in implementing the Convention. The delegation suggested that the category 2 centres could possibly be more involved in the capacity-building exercise. For instance, in the exchange of best practices, especially as States still appeared to be working in an isolated manner. Their involvement would therefore consolidate efforts and improve this useful work.
14. The delegation of **Switzerland** [observer] wished the Committee success in its work, commending the Secretariat for the high quality of its work. It spoke of the periodic reporting exercise as an important mechanism to monitor the implementation of the Convention, while serving to share good practices, as well as a means of taking stock of the measures taken by States Parties on their territory and in international cooperation. It was noted that Switzerland had ratified the Convention in 2008, and as such would present to UNESCO its first periodic report on 15 December 2014. It wished to emphasize two specific traits that marked the writing of its report. First, it would include an annex to reflect the views of the tradition bearers from civil society on the implementation of the Convention; the result of directly associating the communities, groups and individuals concerned with the realization of the first report. However, it was difficult to directly integrate the comments of civil society in the form given the technical nature of the document. For this reason, the annex contained general comments on the implementation of the Convention in Switzerland. Thus, it considered it worthwhile to reflect on how to adapt the forms with the need to dialogue with civil society. The second notable aspect of the first Swiss report was the lack of elements inscribed on the various Lists of the Convention. Indeed, during this first implementation phase, efforts were focused on achieving a documented first national inventory, a List of Living Traditions in Switzerland. Conducted between 2008 and 2012, this work required several years of research and analysis in consultation with the regions and civil society. Switzerland therefore has the intention to present future nominations and it informed the Committee that it had adopted a proposal comprising a list of eight nominations to be submitted in the coming years. The use of an indicative list of nominations reflected many opinions. Firstly, to continue the path of implementation of the Convention by involving the many different regions of the country, civil society, and the bearers in drafting the nomination, as was the case throughout the inventorying process. Followed by the desire to reflect the intrinsic diversity of the different nominations concerned. The delegation spoke of its desire to make known its nomination intentions to other States Parties, especially for the sake of communities, groups and individuals, some of whom were already associated with the project. Finally, a booklet in French and English was available in the entrance hall with more details on this approach.
15. The **Chairperson** noted that Azerbaijan wished to take the floor again, but instead proposed to suspend item 5.a so that consultations between Azerbaijan and Armenia could take place and thus reach a solution, assisted by Turkey as proposed. With no objections, the Chairperson turned to item 5.b.

## ITEM 5.b OF THE AGENDA:

EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/5.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-5.b-EN.doc)

[*8 Reports*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00708)

**Decision** *9.COM 5.b*

1. In the temporary absence of the Chairperson, the **Vice-Chair,** Mr Philippe Potjes from Belgium, introduced the next item on the agenda, inviting Mr Proschan to present item 5.b.
2. **Mr Proschan** explained that the Committee’s task was to examine the eight reports submitted by States Parties during the first cycle of ordinary reporting, covering the elements that were inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2009; the summary of which would be presented to the General Assembly. The document was composed of a brief introduction in Part A. The table in paragraph 3 showed the list of the 8 reports for examination, while the table in paragraph 4 showed four reports that were expected but had not been submitted during the current cycle by France and China, and would therefore be examined by the Committee at its next session. In the case of China, the message from the Secretariat to China concerning its periodic report had been received in the wrong mailbox and therefore had not been transmitted to the right national channels. Thus, there were many factors that could contribute to a State not submitting a report in a timely manner.In Part B of the report, the Secretariat had provided the Committee with general observations on the reports submitted, particularly, on the effectiveness of safeguarding measures and on the challenges encountered by States during their implementation. It was noted that the Committee should expect to examine 10 reports in the 2015 cycle. As previously done by the Secretariat, it provided the reporting States with an *aide-mémoire* of the experiences accumulated by other States in previous cycles so that those reports could be as informative and useful as possible. Several of the reports indicated encouraging progress in safeguarding, and in paragraph 13 of the document, the Secretariat signalled the possible need in the near future to discuss a procedure to implement what was already provided in paragraph 38 of the Operational Directives, i.e. the possible transfer of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. Although that possibility was created in the Operational Directives, the specific procedure had not been elaborated, as a case had yet to be presented. Nevertheless, the Committee was made aware that this issue was expected in a future cycle owing to safeguarding efforts that had been sufficiently strong that an element was no longer in need of urgent safeguarding and could be transferred to the Representative List.In Part C of the document, an assessment of each of the eight reports, and a corresponding draft decision, was provided. The reports themselves had been made available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00708) in English and French since July 2014. The Secretariat had summarized the effectiveness of the safeguarding activities, the participation of communities in implementing the safeguarding plan and in the reporting process, and the viability and current risks for the inscribed element.An overall draft decision was also proposed by the Secretariat, which could perhaps be considered once the individual reports had first been examined. In paragraph 4, States were invited to strengthen their engagement in the safeguarding of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
3. Thanking Mr Proschan for the introduction, the **Vice-Chair** suggested commencing with a general debate on the reports before moving to the examination of each report and the corresponding draft decision. He encouraged the six submitting States: Belarus, Kenya, Latvia, Mali, Mongolia and Viet Nam to take the floor if they so wished.
4. The delegation of **Latvia** wished to provide some general observations on the elements under examination inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, adding that the information provided was a very valuable source for reflection on various aspects. In the cases currently examined, there were numerous examples where awareness on safeguarding the intangibleaspects of cultural heritage had a very valuable impact on the preservation of other domains of heritage. Regarding the proposed assessments of the reports, it wished to invite the Secretariat to maintain the very welcome practice of summarizing community participation in the preparation of the reports, presenting it as a separate paragraph within the assessment, adding that the practice deserved to be a general principle in the future. With regard to its element on the Suiti cultural space, the delegation explained that it was initiated and driven by the strong willingness of the community to safeguard existing cultural traditions and re-utilize elements that had been lost during previous decades. The nomination process encouraged the recognition of the diversity of its traditions, while the inscriptions raised the confidence of the community. Since its inscription, the community had demonstrated its strong commitment to the implementation of the safeguarding activities, fostering various cooperation modes, strengthening the capacity of NGOs, raising awareness among children, and developing international exchange of experiences on common projects with other communities in neighbouring countries. In addition, the safeguarding of solid cultural traditions had significantly impacted on the preservation of other fields of heritage, such as renovating church buildings, liturgical objects and preserving textiles. The community had also demonstrated its involvement in research projects that had led to publications on their traditional costumes and the Suiti cultural space. Although the safeguarding plans developed within the nomination had met with certain difficulties regarding cultural policy at national and local level, but also educational, regional development and other fields of policy-making in achieving a concise approach for sustainable development, the community had a strong conviction that the inscription of the nomination had been, and continued to be, a strong driver for developing safeguarding activities. For example, on 28 November 2014, the community presented in its village, Alsunga, and also in Basi and Jūrkalne, two newly elaborated school books for raising awareness among children on the Suiti traditions, whose activities had lead to future strengthening of the cultural identity of the Suiti community and the transmission of their cultural traditions.
5. Noting that the Committee was already discussing item 5.b, the delegation of **Congo** sought clarification as to whether the Committee would return later to unfinished item 5.a.
6. The **Vice-Chair** confirmed that this was indeed the case. With no other forthcoming comments, the Vice-Chair turned to the individual reports, beginning with the report submitted by **Belarus** on the status of the **Rite of the Kalyady Tsars (Christmas Tsars)**.
7. **Mr Proschan** explained that he would not summarize the brief notes provided by the Secretariat for each of the reports, but instead proceed directly to the draft decisions, as projected on the screen. It was noted that all the draft decisions for each report had a few standard paragraphs, typically the first few, as well as specific ones addressing the needs and challenges in each inscribed element. In the case of Belarus, it was noted that the reporting State was unable to submit a revised report, as had been advised by the Secretariat (in paragraph 3), such that the Committee would be examining the report as it had been originally submitted. Mr Proschan recalled that Belarus had previously submitted an extraordinary report in 2011, and in paragraph 4 of the draft decision, it was therefore proposed to take note of its continued efforts in safeguarding this element. Paragraphs 5 and 6 highlighted two means by which the reporting State might strengthen its efforts, suggested by the Secretariat’s reading of the report. The Committee might wish to invite the submitting State to decentralize the management of the budget and the implementation of safeguarding measures to local authorities, and to establish and provide support for a long-term safeguarding strategy that would extend beyond 2015.
8. **The Vice-Chair** presented the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.1 adopted**.
9. **Mr Proschan** turned to the second report submitted by **Kenya** on the status of **Traditions and practices associated to the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda**. In this draft decision, it was noted that paragraph 5 proposed that the Committee took note that the safeguarding activities were undertaken with support from an International Assistance grant from the ICH Fund; information that was reported in document 5.c. In paragraph 6, the reporting State was invited to continue its safeguarding efforts by supporting the local communities, not only to continue their traditions and practices, but also to conserve their natural environment, a crucial element in this practice. In paragraph 7, the Committee might wish to encourage Kenya to extend its safeguarding strategy to three Kaya communities that had not yet benefitted from it.
10. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.2 adopted**.
11. **Mr Proschan** turned to the third report submitted by **Latvia** on the status of the **Suiti cultural space**. This draft decision proposed that the Committee take note of the progress realized so far by Latvia, particularly in response to the specific concerns raised by the Committee in 2009 at the time of the element’s inscription (in paragraph 4). Furthermore, the Committee might wish (in paragraph 5) to invite the reporting State to further develop its safeguarding strategy and to secure the funds needed for its implementation, and to encourage the State (in paragraph 6) to ensure an active involvement of the Suiti community in the planning of the long-term strategy and its subsequent implementation. It was noted that the Secretariat had received a small correction (in paragraph 25 of the report itself), which would subsequently be reflected in the report to be submitted to the General Assembly, but that it did not figure in the language of the decision.
12. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.3 adopted**.
13. **Mr Proschan** turned to the fourth report submitted by **Mali** on the status of the **Sanké mon, collective fishing rite of the Sanké**. This draft decision proposed that the Committee encourage the reporting State to make every effort to involve local communities at each stage of safeguarding, whether in the planning and implementation of safeguarding measures, or the preparation of technical and financial reports. The Committee might also wish (in paragraph 6) to encourage Mali to take further action in the field of environmental conservation, particularly regarding water resources management, as this element was intimately linked to its natural environment, and to build upon the local management capacities for the safeguarding of this rite (in paragraph 7). Finally, taking into account the on-going emergency international assistance granted in 2013 for an inventory of intangible cultural heritage, proposed that Mali be encouraged (in paragraph 8) to coordinate those larger national actions with the specific safeguarding measures being taken for Sanké mon.
14. The **Vice-Chair** turned to draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.4 adopted**.
15. **Mr Proschan** turned to the fifth report: the first of three reports submitted by **Mongolia** on the status of **Mongol Biyelgee, Mongolian traditional folk dance**. It was noted that the numbering of the paragraphs of the draft decision was incorrect in the working document, though now corrected, as projected on-screen. In the first draft decision addressed to Mongolia, related to the Mongol Biyelgee, the Committee might wish to take note of the progress achieved so far (in paragraph 4), while encouraging the reporting State to further develop its safeguarding strategy, paying particular attention to the risks of potential distortion and de-contextualization of this folk dance (paragraphs 5 and 6). It also proposed (in paragraph 7) that the reporting State be encouraged to fully involve the community concerned in its safeguarding efforts, and to explore the possibility of cooperation with the newly established civil society groups in charge of safeguarding this element.
16. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Mr Proschan for highlighting the correction, and turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.5 adopted**.
17. **Mr Proschan** then turned to the sixth report: the second of three reports submitted by **Mongolia** on the status of **Mongol Tuuli, Mongolian epic**.The Committee might wish to commend the reporting State for the implementation of its safeguarding plan, while underlining that safeguarding efforts should maintain the diversity of Mongolian epic rather than standardizing it (concerns outlined in paragraph 4). Paragraph 5 also proposed that the Committee encourage the State Party to find ways of addressing the decreasing number of practitioners, and of maintaining the wealth and diversity of the epic repertoire in their performances. Finally, the reporting State might be invited to secure appropriate funds for the future viability of the element and the sustainability of the safeguarding strategy (in paragraph 6).
18. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.6 adopted**.
19. **Mr Proschan** then turned to the seventh report and the last of three reports submitted by **Mongolia** on the status of **Traditional music of the Tsuur**.In the last draft decision addressed to Mongolia, the Committee might wish to take note (in paragraph 4) of the recent adoption in 2014 of a three-year national safeguarding plan, and request the State to report on its results in its next report. Paragraph 5 invited the State to take action in establishing spaces for the workshop and the making of musical instruments, while encouraging Mongolia to make every effort to strengthen the necessary human resources for the safeguarding of this element, in particular within the communities concerned and NGOs (in paragraph 6). The State could also be invited to secure a sufficient budget for the full implementation of present and future safeguarding activities (in paragraph 7).
20. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.7 adopted**.
21. **Mr Proschan** turned to the eighth and final report, submitted by **Viet Nam** on the status of **Ca trù singing**. For this last report, aware of the innovative work carried out by Viet Nam to integrate intangible cultural heritage into education, the Committee might wish (in paragraph 5) to invite the reporting State to include the teaching of Ca trù singing in formal education programmes. Viet Nam could also be encouraged (in paragraph 6) to fully involve the communities concerned, particularly the Ca trù clubs in the planning and implementation of the safeguarding plan, and to support their own existing efforts to transmit the element. Finally, the Committee might encourage the reporting State to find systematic ways to finance its safeguarding activities so as to ensure a secure source of future income (in paragraph 7).
22. The **Vice-Chair** turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections to paragraphs 1 to 3, they were duly adopted. He noted an amendment by Latvia to be added to the current paragraph 4, which read, ‘and in ensuring that safeguarding measures encourage the diversity of traditional local styles’. There were no objections, and it was duly adopted. With no further amendments or comments to paragraphs 5 to 8 of the draft decision, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b.8 adopted**.
23. Following the completion of the eight draft decisions, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the overall draft decision 9.COM 5.b on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections or comments, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.b adopted**.

## ITEM 5.c OF THE AGENDA:

REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE USE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/5.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-5.c-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 5.c*

1. The **Vice-Chair** movedto the next item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that Article 24.3 of the Convention provided that the beneficiary State Party provide the Committee with a report on the use of International Assistance for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Last year was the first year in which the Committee received such reports, and the Secretariat sought to better institutionalize this process by providing a template of a report, which the States could use as a guide, thus simplifying the reporting process for the Committee from a comparative point of view. In the draft decision, the Committee therefore took note of its proper use, according to the decision taken at the time it was granted, and specifically invited States Parties to use form [ICH-04-Report](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-04-Report-EN-20140310.doc) that was specifically developed by the Secretariat as the reporting framework.
3. The **Vice-Chair** opened the floor for comments. With none forthcoming, he turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 5.c adopted**.

## ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA:

REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/6*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-6-EN_.doc)

[*ITH/14/9.COM/INF.6*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-INF.6-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 6*

1. The **Vice-Chair** moved to agenda item 6, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** was happy to note the Committee’s efficiency, assuming that it was perhaps due to a new working method that was hoped for by the Assistant Director-General in his introduction. The Secretary referred to the two documents related to the item: document 6 (Report of the Secretariat on its activities) and INF.6 (Financial statement for the period 1 January 2014 – 30 September 2014 for the ICH Fund), as it was the Committee that decided on its use. It was noted that the Secretariat's report focused on activities undertaken since the Committee’s eighth session, covering a period of 12 months, and including, in particular, an update on the progress regarding national capacity-building, which remained a major priority, as requested by the General Conference of UNESCO. Moreover, the programme and budget of the section in the C/5 was entitled ‘National capacities strengthened […] to safeguard intangible cultural heritage’, and was thus a high priority for States Parties to the Convention. The Secretary drew attention to the efforts made this year to integrate the principle of results-based rather than activity-based reporting, adding that UNESCO was moving towards results-based programming and budgeting. The report’s introduction presented the reorganization of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section as a result of changes throughout the Organization. The former ‘Governing Bodies and Processing Unit’ and ‘Information and Communication Unit’ were eliminated, with some of the work absorbed by a new unit, the Conventions Common Services Team (CCS), which was created in July 2014 and was responsible for communication, publications, and the logistics of statutory meetings. Other aspects of the work of this common platform included a coordinated strategy for fundraising. Thus, two new units now absorbed some of the work of the eliminated units, comprising: the Capacity Building and Heritage Policy Unit, a central unit that continued to work on the development of training materials and the implementation of capacity-building activities in close cooperation with the field offices; and the Programme Implementation Unit, a catch-all unit in charge of the processing of nominations, periodic reports, expert meetings, and everything else outside the Capacity-Building Unit. The Secretariat’s main activities, since the eighth session of the Committee, were organized around four main themes that followed the expected results of the 37 C/5 programme and budget for 2014–2015, as adopted by the General Conference. It also followed the results framework adopted by the Bureau of the Committee concerning ‘the other functions of the Committee’, which concerned 18% of the Fund that the Bureau granted to the Secretariat, as delegated by the Committee, to carry out activities related to capacity-building and other activities.
3. The **Secretary** outlined the different parts of the report. **Part A:** ‘Governance mechanisms of 2003 Convention effectively supported.’ This covered activities supporting governance mechanisms, including the organization of statutory meetings. It was noted that since December 2013, nine statutory meetings had taken place: the General Assembly of States Parties in June 2014; the present session of the Committee; one Bureau session and two electronic session of the Bureau; three advisory body meetings; and an expert meeting held in Istanbul in September, as requested by the Committee. **Part B:** ‘Knowledge management services optimized and utilized for effective implementation and information-sharing*.*’This covered the vital work of managing the bulk of information related to the work of the governing bodies, but it also provided easy access to information on the projects undertaken by the Convention, whether safeguarding projects, capacity-building workshops, a forum for the facilitators in capacity-building, or the dedicated webpage for the network of category 2 centres where all necessary documents could be found. Thus, the work involved more than just a website, it served as a genuine knowledge management tool. The Secretary remarked how much the advisory bodies appreciated being able to work on the nominations from home, using this system to work effectively with summary information across the system, and at the same time avoiding countless e-mails. It was noted that this essential information system was only made possible through extra-budgetary support from the Fund, as it received no resources from UNESCO’s Regular Programme, as probably it should. **Part C:** ‘International cooperation mechanisms of the 2003 Convention and decisions of its Governing Bodies effectively implemented and cooperation with external partners promoted.’This covered a multitude of different of activities, which included the support provided to category 2 centres, especially last year with the second coordination meeting of the eight category 2 centres. The Secretariat provided continuous exchange and support to guide the centres in the development of their programmes, including participating in their respective boards. During the last year, it also helped coordinate the first evaluation conducted on a category 2 centre, CRESPIAL in Peru, to propose to the Executive Board its renewal. The same work was currently being conducted on a second centre in Japan.
4. The **Secretary** also mentioned the work carried out on an experimental basis in which the Secretariat provided technical assistance for the preparation of International Assistance. It was recalled that there was a paradox in that the ICH Fund had 60% of its budget dedicated to International Assistance but few States requested this assistance, and even fewer States obtained it. The Committee had thus invited the Secretariat to provide technical support to those States requesting International Assistance in order to increase their chances of obtaining financial assistance. This technical assistance benefitted three States, and was comprised of either extensive correspondence until the project appeared to be satisfactory, or the provision of experts who made country visits to discuss the project with the partners. For example, collaboration with Côte d'Ivoire was underway and even resulted in the submission of a request for International Assistance. The Secretary hoped that this process would continue so that more countries could benefit from International Assistance. Finally, in this part of her presentation, the Secretary made a comment on visibility and awareness activities, which, as the Secretary admitted, suffered most in terms of declining resources and staff. The reason for reducing here was simple; intangible cultural heritage needed little work on visibility from the Secretariat since States already provided good visibility, and thus less human and financial resources were attributed to it. Nevertheless, the Secretariat continued to publish the Lists on the Convention website. Brochures on Best Safeguarding Practices and the Urgent Safeguarding List were also produced but as online publications, since paper publications required a lot of work and funds. Finally, **Part D: ‘**Capacity-building programme strengthened to effectively support countries in developing their national policies and human and institutional resources for intangible cultural heritage.’This was considered as probably the most important part of the report, as it provided updates on the capacity-building programme. The Secretary spoke about the logic of long-term actions at national level that begin with needs assessments, and the deployment of multi-year activities for each country, rather than a regional approach. She explained that the national approach appeared to be the sole approach that could accurately respond to the specific multiple needs of a State. Therefore, the national approach was priviledged and considered more durable in terms of results than the regional approach, even if the latter may sometimes be less costly.
5. The **Secretary** noted that the Secretariat had made progress regarding two aspects that had been specifically requested by the Committee. First, to give more support to countries to develop their policies and legislation relating to intangible cultural heritage. It was recalled that this was a recommendation of the evaluation of the Convention conducted in 2013, which was taken on board by the Committee, which recommended that the programme focused on this issue. The Secretariat therefore implemented initiatives in this regard, as outlined in the accompanying document, and actions had already been implemented on the ground. The Secretary was delighted to learn that the NGOs had talked about the same issue yesterday, i.e. on how they could participate in this process, which was obviously extremely important at the macro level of a State in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The second axis concerned adapting the content and format of the capacity-building strategy to address the key challenges at national level. It was noted that the training materials were already being revised, on such aspects as sustainable development and the relationship between gender and intangible cultural heritage, and other specific aspects. The Secretary informed the Committee that during the year, the strategy had been implemented in 38 countries worldwide, and that preparatory work, essentially needs assessments, were underway in eight countries. It was noted that these activities were the result of close collaboration between the ICH Section, all the regional field offices, and the network of nearly 80 [facilitators](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00397) around the world that had been trained in the use of the training materials, delivering the capacity-building services. In this regard, the Secretary informed the Committee that during the Committee meeting, information sessions on the capacity-building programme would take place at lunchtime throughout the week. The sessions had been grouped around the Electoral Groups, starting with Electoral Groups V(a) and V(b) on Tuesday, Group III on Wednesday, Group IV on Thursday, and Groups I and II on Friday. The Secretary wished to stress that capacity-building was not only for developing countries, with many developed countries asking to benefit from the capacity-building programme, which they were asked to finance themselves. The Secretary took the opportunity to thank all the donors and partners who supported the Secretariat in its efforts to build capacity because even if it was considered the most important priority for the Convention, as recognized by the evaluation, it also received least funds from the Regular Programme. Thus, the programme of this magnitude was solely possible with the support of the many donors whose combined efforts allowed the programme to continue.
6. The **Secretary** also took the opportunity to recall the remarks made by the Assistant Director-General for Culture in his introduction, in which he understood the expectations of the Committee, but that there was also a need to adjust to the actual capacity of the Secretariat. It was noted that the workload of the Secretariat was greater than its capacity in terms of human and financial resources. The Secretary thus invited those who wished to support the Convention through extrabudgetary contributions to also support the Secretariat’s human resources through the dedicated sub-fund. The Secretary greatly appreciated the support of States that wished to strengthen the Secretariat in the form of secondments of associate experts. However, these missions, for two, three or four years, required substantial investment in terms of training, which was quickly lost when the experts had to cease collaboration. The Secretary understood that the State would later benefit from the expert, and that it was easier to contribute in this way than paying funds directly, but this was the only means for the Secretariat to keep people in place for a much longer period. For example, the Secretariat had lost two experts between July and September from Japan and Spain. The Secretary thus reiterated the need to raise funds to enable the Secretariat to have more stable staff, and to calibrate the expectations of the Committee. She cited the example of Latvia that spoke of the importance of producing summaries and so on, but this required personnel to carry out the work. The Secretariat was simply not numerous enough to continue to provide the service it had offered so far. For instance, many States submitting nominations to the 2015 cycle were still receiving in November 2014 additional information request letters on their nominations when they should have been sent in June 2014. The Secretary spoke of the innumerable tasks of the Secretariat, and hoped that the Committee would keep this in mind during its deliberations, adding that decisions impacted on the Secretariat’s ability to cope.
7. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Secretary for the report of the Secretariat’s activities, expressing particular gratitude to the Secretariat for its dedication and service to the Convention under such difficult circumstances, despite secondments by several countries. This was especially acute given the current situation at UNESCO. The Vice-Chair opened the floor for observations or comments.
8. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its sincere appreciation of the Secretariat’s work, adding that there were two aspects to which it wished to draw attention. Firstly, as already mentioned during the general debate, there were various UNESCO Field Offices that have a role to play with the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, it invited the Secretariat to consider this point in future reports. The second aspect concerned the network of UNESCO Chairs in various academic institutions worldwide. The delegation noted that attention had been drawn to the work of category 2 centres, and thus felt that these important networks should also be further explored in the areas of UNESCO’s work, taking into consideration the decision just taken that education is a major emphasis in the State Parties’ reports. The involvement of UNESCO Chairs might thus be considered.
9. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its sincere thanks to the Secretariat for its hard work in the implementation of the Convention since the last Committee session, despite the current financial constraints. It highly appreciated the Secretariat's efforts to promote the capacity-building programme, adding that this was one of the primary responsibilities of the Secretariat. It was important that the capacity-building programme be implemented in the context of regional and national circumstances. In this regard, it hoped the Secretariat would review and adapt the content and format of the programme in order to effectively respond to the implementation challenges at the national, regional and local level. Moreover, the delegation mentioned its interest in supporting the capacity-building efforts of developing countries, in particular in the Asia-Pacific region. With regard to the limited human resources of the Secretariat, the delegation hoped that the Secretariat would develop ways to fully utilize UNESCO’s existing resources and networks. For example, the regional offices, the category 2 centres, and the accredited NGOs, all of whom could be very helpful for an effective implementation of the global strategy for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, reflecting the regional and national contexts.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** endorsed the previous comments, commending the Secretariat for its efforts to ensure the effective implementation of the Convention, despite the human resources and budgetary restrictions. It was particularly pleased with the Secretariat's proactive approach with regard to raising awareness about the Convention, and it strongly encouraged the Secretariat’s work on much-needed capacity-building, as well as its role as coordinator for sharing best practices and experience. The delegation welcomed the Secretariat’s initiatives in the field of organizing and coordinating meetings of category 2 centres, adding that it would continue to participate actively in these centres. It was thus of utmost importance to better coordinate with the Convention's external partners in order to raise UNESCO's visibility among non-governmental institutions, particularly academic institutions. For this reason, the delegation proposed to insert a new paragraph to the draft decision to encourage the establishment of UNESCO Chairs in the universities, as well as greater cooperation in graduate studies in those universities interested in the work of UNESCO; a direction it would fully endorse.
11. The delegation of **Bulgaria** congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat, and – as a recently elected Member of the Committee – sought to have a constructive and positive impact on the Committee’s work. It spoke of the pleasure of reading the Secretariat’s report, adding that it had the same feeling when reading its report to the General Assembly in June 2014 in that it demonstrated the effectiveness and efficiency of the Secretariat despite its limited human and financial resources, a situation that should be addressed by all Member States. It spoke of the very important challenges and decisions that the Committee had to take in order to increase the efficiency of the Convention’s implementation at the national level. The delegation agreed with Latvia that greater use of the field offices and the UNESCO Chairs might help increase the efficiency of implementation, as well as increase its awareness, especially among young people. In addition, it was very important to further strengthen the work of the regional category 2 centres, such as the one in Bulgaria that collaborated with countries from South-East Europe, adding that the centre was trying to adapt its activities to the new challenges and to function more efficiently. Moreover, more countries were requesting to join the centre, and it took the opportunity to thank the Secretariat for its useful guidance in this regard, especially Mr Frank Proschan. Finally, the delegation believed that it was crucial to focus on the issue of supporting countries to elaborate their national policies and legislation, as without a good policy or legal base, it was very difficult for local communities to be efficient in implementing safeguarding measures and thus ensure the transmission of intangible cultural heritage to future generations.
12. The delegation of **Bahamas** [observer] congratulated the Secretariat on its in-depth and comprehensive report, adding that it was extremely encouraging and heart warming to see the emphasis placed on capacity building. The delegation remarked that the Bahamas had become a State Party to three of UNESCO's Conventions in May 2104, including the 2003 Convention. It was thus its first time at a Committee meeting and – as a new State Party – it realized the great need for capacity building in the Bahamas to help put together a strategy for managing this Convention so that it could work as effectively as possible. It further remarked that it had worked with the Regional Office in Jamaica in the preparation of its ratification of the Convention, and as such was willing to work with other countries in the region on joint projects in terms of capacity development. The delegation thus supported UNESCO and its work, especially within this Convention.
13. Thanking the Ambassador, the **Vice-Chair** welcomed and congratulated the Bahamas for its first attendance to a Committee meeting, adding that it was clear that the Bahamas had already developed a lot of enthusiasm for the Convention.
14. The delegation of **Namibia** thanked the Secretariat for its report, which outlined the activities of the Secretariat since the last Committee meeting. It further commended the Secretariat on the level of detail in some of the activities presented in the report, adding that the Secretariat had done considerably well despite the obvious human and financial challenges it faced under the current Regular Programme and Budget. It was noted that the implementation of the capacity-building strategy was going well, and it urged the Secretariat to continue offering assistance to Member States, especially those in developing countries, to implement good, harmonized legislation to protect intangible cultural heritage. For Namibia, the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is of great importance and a priority under the current strategic plan of the Ministry of Youth and National Sports and Culture. To that effect, Namibia – with the assistance of the Convention Secretariat – had begun an inventorying process since 2012. The delegation particularly appreciated the work carried out in the training of trainers, adding that this approach strengthened the local capacities of Member States, both at national and community level. It spoke of two training sessions that had taken place in April 2012 in Water Bay, funded by the Millennium Development Fund, and one in September to October 2012, funded by the Government of Flanders and the Republic of Namibia through a new initiative called the Southern African Intangible Cultural Heritage Strategy. The purpose of the training was to increase capacities in creating awareness of the Convention at the national level, which involved communities using local languages in promoting the goals of the Convention. The increased community involvement and participation at grassroots level was part of the training. The communities would then be involved in training others in the next exercise, which would focus on inventorying, nominations, and financial assistance requests, among others. The delegation also appreciated the approach by the Secretariat in terms of technical assistance to Member States in developing International Assistance requests. It acknowledged that the same methodology was also being tested in another Convention with varying outcomes in Namibia, and it looked forward to the outcome of the trial period of this approach. It appreciated the improvements made in the implementation of the Convention and the working methods of the Secretariat, and it sought to know more on how the introduction of the Conventions Common Services Team had impacted on the work of the Secretariat. In addition, it appreciated the initiative taken by the Secretariat in organizing the second coordination meeting of the category 2 centres and, in this regard, sought information on the reception by the centres on aligning their work plans to the expected results of UNESCO. Furthermore, it wished to know about the follow-up steps to that meeting, if any, as well as capacity-building and peer-to-peer platforms to those institutions, especially in developing countries that were not part of the category 2 centres, but were nevertheless stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention. Finally, the delegation noted with great concern the inability of the Secretariat to meet the deadlines set out in the Operational Directives in the treatment of files. It believed that this trend, if not soon reversed, would affect the Committee’s work in examining files in the future. In this regard, it wished to know about measures that the Secretariat could offer to bring this situation under control.
15. The delegation of **Hungary** warmly welcomed the Chairperson, the Secretariat, the Committee and the observers, especially the NGOs, asking that efforts be continued such as technical assistance for strengthening international assistance and for encouraging countries to conduct capacity-building. It concluded by thanking everyone for the customary excellent preparation of the meeting.
16. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** joined the other Members in thanking the Secretariat for its hard work in difficult conditions, with particular thanks for the quality of the documents, which should not be taken for granted. The delegation particularly thanked the Secretariat for the summary records, adding that they were the best it had seen in UNESCO. This allowed newcomers to the Committee to follow the Committee meetings, allowing them to feel as if they had attended with the same shared level of information. It asked the Secretary to explain the percentage of the Secretariat’s time spent on implementing other activities, such as policy advice and capacity-building, compared to nominations process.
17. The delegation of **Uruguay** agreed with the previous speakers, voicing its strong support of the Secretariat for its hard and high-quality work. It stressed the importance of capacity-building and the transmission of the Convention’s objectives through education at various levels within the States Parties’ national legislation. It thanked the Secretary for its guidance and cooperation in its work in various aspects relating to the Convention, and it looked forward to the possibility of receiving specific training in Uruguay.
18. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** thanked the Chairperson for his exemplary conduct of the proceedings, congratulating the Secretariat for the report and the quality and quantity of its work, as well as for the capacity-building activities. The delegation congratulated the Secretary for her availability and reliability exercised in the elaboration of its International Assistance request, adding that it remained open to suggestions and criticisms.
19. The delegation of **Myanmar** [observer] felt honoured to participate at its first session as an Observer, taking the opportunity to express its appreciation of the UNESCO Bangkok Office, UNESCO, and the Norwegian Government for supporting activities such as its successive workshops since 2013. The delegation added that strengthening the capacities of its country in implementing the Convention was very much a priority concern. The government was currently taking into account the Convention, and it acknowledged the support of UNESCO's capacity-building workshops, which had been effective in the country’s ratification of the Convention and its inventory-making. The financial support provided by the Norwegian Government to safeguard its intangible cultural heritage was also very much appreciated. In this vein, it called upon all parties to continue supporting the country in its implementation of the Convention at the national level, as well as the community-based inventorying of its elements of intangible cultural heritage.
20. As a newly elected Member of the Committee, the delegation of **Mongolia** commended the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the work accomplished this year, adding that it was an active member of the Convention and that it supported the Committee and the Secretariat. This year, Mongolia had organized the Asian regional seminar on documentation of intangible cultural heritage, and it had submitted its report on its inscribed intangible cultural heritage. It hoped that the Secretariat and the Member States would continue its cooperation in the field of capacity-building and in the development of human resources in the field of intangible cultural heritage.
21. The delegation of **Niger** [observer] offered encouragement to the Chairperson in his forthcoming work, adding that it had followed the Secretariat’s report with keen interest. It spoke of the pertinent work presented in the report, noting three key points: the capacity-building programme; the legal framework; and the technical assistance afforded to States Parties by the Secretariat. In this regard, the delegation strongly encouraged the Secretariat to continue its efforts, particularly its focus on capacity-building and the strengthening of the legal framework, especially for developing States, as this significantly contributed to the implementation of the Convention. It congratulated once again the Secretariat for all the efforts deployed in support of the Convention.
22. The delegation of **Portugal** [observer] thanked the Chairperson for his chairmanship, adding that – as an Observer – it was learning from the Secretariat and the Committee on how it could contribute to the implementation of this important Convention. It thanked the Secretariat for its work and for the quality of its documents, which allowed it to follow the specific work of the Convention and to contribute to it more fully in the future. It also commended the Secretariat for assisting States in their submission of files, despite the current difficulties, which helps to improve the submissions as much as possible so as to achieve a positive result.
23. The delegation of **India** extended its appreciation of the work carried out by the Secretariat, adding that its intangible cultural heritage agency, the Sangeet Natak Akademi, had this year placed huge emphasis on the capacity-building programme. In October 2014, the agency hosted a seminar and workshop for the SAARC countries[[2]](#footnote-2) on capacity-building and several other issues of intangible cultural heritage. It was noted that between the 3rd and 5th of December, the Sangeet Natak Akademi was also holding a capacity-building workshop with the UNESCO Office in Delhi calling on all NGOs and other State representatives across India to raise awareness and build capacity among government officials working with intangible cultural heritage and its implementation.
24. The delegation of **Eritrea** [observer] commended the Secretariat, under the leadership of Ms Duvelle, for its wonderful job in promoting the Convention. As a signatory of the Convention since October 2010, Eritrea had recently embarked on implementing the Convention through support offered by the Secretariat thanks to a contribution from Norway. It added that it had yet to sign the agreement, through the UNESCO Regional Office in Nairobi, but that the technicalities had been finalised. It spoke of the importance of attending the meeting in order to learn about the implementation process, as well as other important points, including capacity-building and the elaboration of heritage-related legislation for which it required technical assistance. It was thankful for the assistance it had received thus far.
25. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Eritrea for its update on the implementation process.
26. The delegation of **Mauritania** [observer] congratulated the Chairperson for his exemplary chairmanship, and thanked the Secretariat for its continued support of its work in the implementation of the Convention. Mauritania was aware that the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was both a vector for safeguarding, but also a vector for development. In this regard, it thanked the Secretariat and Norway for supporting the capacity-building programme, adding that its work was in line with the Convention in that it was currently reviewing the composition of the Intangible Heritage National Committee to include several departments concerned with development. It thus believed it was time to reform some national laws on intangible heritage because they are tied to a number of laws that managed other aspects of national development and economics. The delegation relied on the support of the Secretariat in the revision of these national laws, adding that it also relied on in its regional category 2 centre based in Algiers.
27. Noting the time, the **Vice-Chair** proposed to suspend the discussion, inviting the Secretary to make some announcements.
28. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates of the NGO meeting during the lunch break, and the need to obtain an entry badge. Also, delegates that had received financial assistance to participate in the present session were asked to request reimbursements.

*[Monday, 24 November, afternoon session]*

## ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA (Cont.):

REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES

1. Resuming his role, the **Chairperson** continued with the unfinished agenda item 6, adding that four countries: Tunisia, Morocco [later withdrew], Nepal and Algeria still wished to speak, after which the Secretary would answer questions.
2. The delegation of **Tunisia** endorsed the comments made by previous delegations in expressing its appreciation of the information in the report on the activities of the Secretariat. In this respect, it commended the efforts made to promote capacities and competences for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Tunisia – as a beneficiary – wished to thank Norway for its significant help in its programme in Tunisia. The delegation emphasized the need for coordination of activities between the different regional centres to establish synergies and to submit reports periodically that so that centres could benefit from the experience of other centres.
3. The delegation of **Nepal** [observer] thanked the Secretariat for the meeting, adding that Nepal was a State Party to the Convention since 2010. Since then it had completed three capacity-building workshops in close cooperation with the UNESCO Kathmandu office, with Japan providing the financial support. It thus wished to offer sincere thanks to Japan, hoping for long lasting results in its activities. The delegation informed the Committee that 25 districts had completed their inventory out of 75 districts, whose inventorying processes would be continued into the future. This would be carried out with the concerned authority in which intangible cultural heritage activities in Nepal had been consolidated. Nepal was planning to submit elements to the Representative List in 2016, and another important initative included the bilateral agreement with the SAARC countries. For example, the government of Nepal was going to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the government of India, together with Nakti Sangeetha Akademi, as well as with other countries. Nepal thus took intangible cultural heritage activities seriously.
4. The delegation of **Algeria** joined the other delegations in congratulating the Chairperson and the Bureau for the excellent conduct of the proceedings. It also wished to congratulate the Secretariat for the skill and flair shown in the documentation of the different sessions. With regard to the important issue of category 2 centres, the delegation spoke of the honour for Algeria to host a centre dedicated to the intangible cultural heritage in Africa. It was currently implementing the national mechanisms necessary for its operation, but it was already able to host a meeting of African experts in Algiers in 2015 to discuss inventories and all other matters that UNESCO considered pertinent.
5. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond to the questions.
6. The **Secretary** began by thanking all those who expressed encouragement to the Secretariat and to the continuation of the capacity-building programme. The Committee’s appreciation of the quality of the documents was also appreciated, especially as they took a lot of time to write, and contributed to ‘the workload of the Secretariat’. The Secretary considered that the documents were tools for the good governance of the Convention, enabling the Committee to work in complete transparency with all the relevant information required for its decision-making, and hence the care and attention afforded to the treatment of all the documents. The Secretary was particularly pleased to note that the capacity-building programme had the support not only of the recipient countries but also the donor countries, and she hoped that this would compel donors to continue supporting the programme. She also confirmed that the Secretariat fully understood the issues and importance of continuing its efforts on providing technical assistance in policy and legislation, and that it placed special emphasis in this regard in all new programmes launched in various countries. Responding to the questions raised, the Secretary referred to the suggestion by Latvia and the Republic of Korea that wished to see the work of the field offices reflected in the Secretariat’s report, as well as greater involvement of the field offices in the implementation of capacity-building. The Secretary explained that UNESCO was indivisible in that the Secretariat also included the UNESCO Field Offices. Moreover, the field offices implemented ninety-nine per cent of the capacity-building activities that were reflected in the report. Furthermore, it was difficult to implicate them even more given that they were already fully involved in the work of the Convention. For example, Mr Tim Curtis from the Bangkok Field Office coordinated all the capacity-building activities in the Asia-Pacific region, so much so that colleagues from other conventions may have found the time disproportionate compared to time spent on their activities. With regard to the question of the involvement of other stakeholders and other partners, in particular the UNESCO Chairs and academia, as mentioned by Latvia and Turkey, the Secretary concurred that this was indeed one of the fields worth exploring. However, the attribution of a status of UNESCO Chair alone was not enough. Unfortunately, the Secretariat did not have enough time to invest in the dialogue required with the academic world, even though UNESCO Chairs, and other academic Chairs, could effectively contribute. The Secretary conceded that there were many basic tasks that the Secretariat failed to do owing to a lack of time, having to concentrate its efforts to tackle the essential. Thus, the constellation of additional partners was considered a little less important than, for example, the organization of annual meetings of the Committee. Moreover, the Committee was reminded that the Executive Board continued to caution the use of UNESCO’s name, as there was a reputation risk, such that there was a need for an important process of control for extending the constellation of partners, which involved a lot of work.
7. The **Secretary** then turned to the question of category 2 centres, which she recalled was a very generous expression of the will of a State to make resources available in the country to serve a region in line with UNESCO’s objectives. It was noted that there were eight countries that had committed human and institutional resources to help UNESCO fulfil its mission in the field of intangible cultural heritage. The reality was that considerable work had already been undertaken, as mentioned by Bulgaria, to precisely align the work of these centres so as to help UNESCO achieve its results. However, the work produced by the centres was not yet fully aligned with the expected results of UNESCO in the area of intangible cultural heritage as approved by the General Conference. The Secretary recognized that it was a big challenge, but that it was an investment for the future because it was obvious that the centres at full functional capacity would be able to help achieve the expected results. But for now, there was a phase of adaptation, although some centres were more advanced than others. As a way of an example, the Secretary explained that Mr Tim Curtis spent much of his time working with the four centres in Asia-Pacific, and it was calculated that the time spent by the UNESCO Secretariat to support the category 2 centres amounted to approximately US$45,000 per centre per biennium, or US$315,000 per biennium, only in the field of intangible cultural heritage, though this was acknowledged to be an important investment. The goal however was to inverse the trend, with the centres supporting the Secretariat in its work.
8. The **Secretary** then turned to a question posed by Namibia regarding the added value of the Conventions Common Services Team, explaining that for the moment it had a putative value, as the platform was only set up in July 2014. Moreover, some of the staff had no proven experience in the Convention mechanisms and therefore there was a period of on-the-spot training at a time when the Secretariat’s workload should have been reduced. In the organization of the present session, the newly appointed staff to the CCS team was not necessarily accustomed to the working methods of the Convention. Thus, the evaluation could only come later once the system was comfortably in place, only then could it be seen whether the process improved the work situation. In response to the question by Saint Lucia on the time spent by the Secretariat at Headquarters on capacity-building compared to the time spent on nominations, the Secretary replied that about 20 per cent of the time was spent on capacity-building and 80 per cent on statutory processes such as the Lists, the organization of meetings, the statutory meeting documents, NGO reports, and so on. This did not take into account the work carried out by colleagues in the field, who work on the culture programme as a whole, and not just the 2003 Convention, and therefore were not considered full-time members of the team. It was clear that a lot of time, about 50 per cent, was spent on the Lists. Moreover, the Members of the Subsidiary Body acknowledged the amount of work invested by the Secretariat in the Representative List, not only in the provision of documents but also in terms of facilitating the work of the Subsidiary Body, i.e. writing summaries, reports, and so on.
9. The **Secretary** then turned to another question by Namibia that expressed a concern in the fact that the Secretariat was already late in processing the nominations in 2015 (around 60 per cent treated), when they should have been dealt with by late June. So, what was the solution? And what were the risks? The Secretary was clear that the risk was a general collapse of the system, as currently it was not sustainable, adding that it would likely happen soon. What were the solutions? The Secretary replied that they were numerous, but the problem lay in the fact that choices had to be made, and that so far, despite considering possible solutions, it was eventually decided that everything should remain, and that was the problem. The problem was not due to a single element, but the sum of all the elements that rendered the system unsustainable. The Secretariat continued its work but, under the present circumstances, it would eventually work less well or not at all. One hypothetical solution would be an increase in human resources, however, given the current situation, this was unlikely because the Secretariat would have to double in number to cope with the current workload. Other solutions include: i) to skip a cycle of nominations, and decide to inscribe every two years so that the backlog could be absorbed; ii) cancel activities such as capacity-building, which would alleviate 20 per cent of the Secretariat’s workload at Headquarters; iii) do away with periodic reports should States Parties not attach much importance to the way other States conducted their activities, as this required a lot of work in terms of providing feedback and the analysis of the reports; iv) NGO accreditation was also said to be time-consuming, with 180 accredited NGOs expected to draft a report every four years on their work, which would need to be analysed; v) decide to conduct advisory body meetings by e-mail in place of face-to-face meetings twice or three times a year; vi) cease expert meetings; vii) reduce the number of nominations, which had decreased from 60 to 50, but could drop further to 30 nominations. In short, there were a multitude of solutions that were in the hands of the Committee, and which could alleviate the current situation, which was clearly untenable.
10. The delegation of **Samoa** [observer] thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to speak and echo the other States Parties in thanking UNESCO, particularly the Secretariat for its excellent efforts in safeguarding the world’s intangible cultural heritage. The delegation spoke of Samoa’s recent ratification of the Convention in 2013, since then a few workshops had taken place to build capacities among people at the different levels, from grassroots to executive. It thanked Japan for the financial assistance that enabled the capacity-building workshops to take place, as well as UNESCO, and other donors and partners that had assisted Samoa in its request for capacity-building, adding that it looked forward to collaborating further with the Secretariat in this regard.
11. The delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their excellent work so far, which would enable the Committee to lead fruitful deliberations in the coming days. As a new Member to the Committee, it understood the privilege, adding that it would commit to the implementation of the Convention. Having ratified the Convention in 2006, Ethiopia had taken note of the spirit of the Convention, and had adopted aspects of the Convention into its cultural heritage legislation to conserve and promote its diverse cultural heritage across the Federal Regional States of Ethiopia. In fact, over the last few years, it had taken advantage of the support provided by the Secretariat and UNESCO to work on its intangible cultural heritage inventory, and had already succeeded with 95 per cent of its target. The delegation appreciated the Committee’s decision in 2013 to inscribe its element[[3]](#footnote-3), which it considered as a pioneer inscription that had clearly inspired its people and helped it to better understand the need to promote the Convention nationwide. It concurred with many of the interventions regarding the need for category 2 centres and the boosted efforts of the Secretariat to engage in capacity-building efforts. As development and globalization put pressure on indigenous intangible cultural heritage, it commended the remarks that referred to the practice of the spirit of the Convention, and thus the support of the Secretariat and UNESCO on capacity-building deserved to be underlined.
12. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Secretary for having clearly set out the very real problems faced by the Committee that deserved to be examined closely so as to find the most viable solutions and thus fulfil the goals of the Convention. The delegation remarked that Egypt was one of the first 18 States to ratify the Convention, and now there were more than 150[[4]](#footnote-4) States Parties aiming to achieve the goals of the Convention, namely, the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. It believed that the Committee could not discontinue any of the activities mentioned by the Secretary, as this would have a very negative impact on the safeguarding mechanisms. It further believed that the possible solution lay in increasing the staff numbers. The increased human resources would enable the Secretariat to deal with these changes and the growing number of States Parties, which was currently very high, as well as in the evaluation and examination of the nominations. Furthermore, there was a need to increase resources without depending on donations. The donors were of course supporting some projects, but at some point there might be fewer donors, which would clearly be a problem. It suggested that the financial contributions of Member States be increased, which would provide the Committee with the material resources it needed to fulfil its mission in the best possible way. Thus, it was important to calculate the difference between what was currently available versus what was actually required, with the difference to be shared fairly among the various Member States so that there was no reliance on donors. Of course, the delegation was very grateful to the donors and hoped that donations would continue, but at the same time, additional resources should be divided among the States Parties so that the Committee could deliver the expected results.
13. The delegation of **Ecuador** [observer] congratulated the Chairperson on the organization of this very important meeting, with special thanks to the Secretary for her frank approach regarding the financial problems faced by the Secretariat; a general problem throughout the Organization. Nevertheless, it was important to speak openly and clearly to all Member States and the Committee so as to find possible solutions, such as searching for new partners that could assist the Secretariat in its work. The delegation spoke about maintaining the current activities, but reducing the percentage of each activity, for example, reducing each of the activities by 50 per cent. It believed that the Committee should take into account the concerns of the Secretary so as to lead to a decision in this regard.
14. The delegation of **Uganda** appreciated the work of UNESCO, especially the Secretariat, for having compiled the report despite the challenges it faced, such as limited staff and a reduction in the Regular Programme funds. With regard to the investment in the training of trainers, and despite the fact that States had provided experts to assist UNESCO, the delegation felt that it was too expensive to invest in training when the Committee could explore the possibility of using the current trainers who had already benefitted from the capacity-building programmes, and which were greater in number than the seconded experts. It agreed with the previous speakers that had suggested that States Parties contribute a minimum amount of funds to the activities of the Convention for an amount they could afford, so as to bridge the gap in funds as a result of budget reductions. Finally, the delegation extended its appreciation of the support it had received from UNESCO, namely, in building the capacity of a number of experts in Uganda, which had helped the country in implementing the activities of the Convention.
15. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and with no comments or objections pronounced paragraphs 1–3 adopted.
16. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to propose a new paragraph 5, **‘**Further encourages the Secretariat to cooperate more with universities, in order to facilitate the establishment of UNESCO Chairs, and to promote graduate studies in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’.
17. The **Chairperson** noted that the proposed amendment by Turkey would become a new paragraph 5.
18. Referring to the amendment, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed to replace ‘to cooperate more’ with ‘increase cooperation’ or ‘enhance cooperation’.
19. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 4 and, noting that there were no objections, pronounced it adopted. He then turned to paragraph 5 and the amendment by Turkey, amended by Saint Lucia.
20. Referring to Turkey’s proposal, the delegation of **Latvia** reflected on the wording concerning the UNESCO Chairs, adding that there were already established UNESCO Chairs working in the field of intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the paragraph should probably say, ‘enhance cooperation with universities and UNESCO Chairs’. Moreover, the delegation felt that the first necessity was not necessarily to establish more Chairs, especially as there were already partners to develop cooperation within the existing network, without excluding new Chairs that might likely be established.
21. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed to enlarge the scope of the reference to promoting studies in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage so the word ‘safeguarding’ should be chairs and not only UNESCO Chairs. It would be a good idea generally that universities set up Chairs in safeguarding intangible heritage.
22. Having listened to the proposals, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of paragraph 5, inviting the Secretary to read the proposed paragraph, as amended.
23. The **Secretary** understood from the interventions that the idea was not necessarily to create new Chairs but to work with existing Chairs, and not solely UNESCO Chairs who work in the field of intangible cultural heritage but also on its safeguarding. The amendment would thus read, ‘Further encourages the Secretariat to enhance cooperation with universities and UNESCO Chairs, and to promote graduate studies in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’.
24. The delegation of **Turkey** had no objections to the new formulation, but it also sought to establish more UNESCO Chairs in academia, both to cooperate with universities as well as with existing Chairs.
25. The delegation of **Latvia** supported the proposal by Belgium to incorporate the word ‘safeguarding’ and thus ‘graduate studies in the safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’. With regard to the first part of the paragraph, it suggested that in order to maintain the reference to UNESCO Chairs, which is a specific network under UNESCO, it might read, ‘enhanced cooperation with universities, including UNESCO Chairs’. It was thus unnecessary to refer to ‘universities and chairs’, as chairs were part of the universities, adding that it would probably better read as ‘including UNESCO Chairs’, which would refer to existing or newly established Chairs.
26. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the Belgium’s suggestion to include ‘safeguarding’ because it was not simply the case of ‘intangible cultural heritage’ when ‘safeguarding’ was key.
27. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to read out the proposed paragraph, as amended.
28. Taking note of the proposals, the **Secretary** presented the amended paragraph, which read, ‘Further encourages the Secretariat to enhance cooperation with universities, including UNESCO Chairs, and to promote graduate studies in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.’
29. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 5 adopted and then turned to paragraphs 6 and 7, which were duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 6 adopted**.

## ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA:

VOLUNTARY SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/7 Rev*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-7_Rev.-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 7*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to agenda item 7, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** remarked that document 7 had been revised in order to include a second generous contribution to the Fund from the Netherlands, which arrived on October 23; just four days before the statutory deadline for publication of the document. The Committee was therefore invited to approve the two additional voluntary contributions, in accordance with Article 25.5 of the Convention, which allowed contributions to the Fund to be assigned to specific projects, provided the Committee approved those projects. It was noted that the first contribution from Azerbaijan, and the second from the Netherlands, would support the capacity-building programme. The Secretary reminded the Committee that the report on the use of the funds by the donors was presented annually to the Committee and biennially to the General Assembly, which also outlined other expenses of the Fund that were not dedicated to capacity-building. Narrative reports of these activities were available online on a dedicated [web page](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00176) with the details of all the projects implemented with these funds, as well as from other financial sources such as Funds-in-Trust. The financial reports on these activities could be found in Annex II and III of the document INF.6, attached to the previous item, but which also affected certain activities implemented within this framework. The Secretary recalled Decision 7.COM 20.1 that recognized other ways to support the Convention, which should be reported to the Committee at each session. Financial or in-kind support was also noted in the report in Annex I of document 7.REV covering the period from the eighth session of the Committee to September 2014, or slightly less than 12 months reporting. The Secretary spoke of a new feature (in Annex IV of the document) that was introduced for the sake of both transparency and efficiency. Annex IV included the concept note for the Complementary Additional Programme (CAP) 2014–2017 entitled ‘Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development’.The CAP projects were developed to complement the resources of UNESCO’s Regular Programme, which must be perfectly aligned with its objectives. It thus seemed logical that the Committee, as the receiver of funds, should endorse the CAP, which would ensure that the Committee did not have a different vision from the ICH Programme as approved by the UNESCO General Conference. The Annex therefore provided an overview of the programme so that the Committee could approve it and allow the Secretariat to receive any contribution during the year in full knowledge, and thus not have to wait several months to use the money that had been put forward. In this way, the Secretariat would not have to wait for the Committee to simply accept the contributions and it could enter the CAP programme and the capacity-building framework, so that it could be paid into the Fund and support the intangible cultural heritage projects within its scope. Evidently, the Committee would always remain informed. The Secretary gave the example of the contribution by Azerbaijan, which was offered in May or June 2014, but which could not be utilized without the formal acceptance of the Committee during the current session. Thus, by adopting the general framework of the CAP, which was the sole project conducted in line with the C/5 and its priority on capacity-building, the work of the Committee, the Executive Board and the General Conference would be more logical and aligned with the only reference document that guided its work, namely, the 37 C/5, and soon to be 38 C/5, as approved by the UNESCO General Conference. The explanation thus outlined this minor innovations, and the Committee was now called upon to accept the generous offer by Azerbaijan and the Netherlands in support of the capacity-building programme.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clear explication, and was happy to note that Azerbaijan and the Netherlands had placed their trust in the Convention and the Committee. The Chairperson then invited Azerbaijan and the Netherlands to take the floor.
4. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** spoke of its pleasure on the occasion of its first contribution to the ICH Fund aimed at increasing capacity in Bangladesh and Guatemala to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development. It was noted that this contribution was part of the multi-layer framework agreement on cooperation that was signed in 2013 between the government of Azerbaijan and UNESCO, and was thus a logical consequence of the priorities established under this agreement. It also explained that Azerbaijan had provided continuous support to the Convention by enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat for four years, only this time its contribution would go to fieldwork activities and thus help the two countries revise their policies and legislation, and readapt their institutional infrastructure with a view to safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage. It believed that both projects would raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage among communities at local and national level and – crucially – enable institutions in Bangladesh and Guatemala to respond more effectively to specifically safeguard their intangible cultural heritage. Azerbaijan was particularly committed to supporting challenges of social and environmental sustainability, and transmitting intangible cultural heritage, particularly in view of the post-2015 Development Agenda. It also believed that capacity-building, which addressed the specific needs of beneficiary countries, should remain the highest priority in the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, it commended the Secretariat for its work in advancing the global capacity-building strategy. It also thanked the Secretariat for its careful attention in identifying the needs and challenges of Bangladesh and Guatemala. Moreover, It was noted in the report that the capacity-building project would first be implemented in Bangladesh with funds provided to build their capacities, while in the case of Guatemala in-kind support would assist the follow-up activities that had already been initiated by the Secretariat. The delegation thus believed that it was important to provide continuity in UNESCO’s capacity-building efforts, adding that it remained committed to supporting the implementation of the Convention. Finally, it congratulated Bangladesh and Guatemala, expressing its confidence that its contribution would bring substantial results in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.
5. The **Chairperson** invited the Netherlands to speak, if it so wished, remarking that this was its second such contribution.
6. The delegation of **Netherlands** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship, hoping for fruitful discussions in the coming days, and gave thanks to the Secretariat for its work. The delegation was of the opinion that UNESCO’s global capacity-building programme was very important for the Convention, as all States Parties required the capacity to fully implement the Convention. This meant integrating safeguarding measures in cultural and other policies to create an infrastructure for safeguarding, as well as in the design of inventory methods in cooperation with the communities. Governments, in cooperation with NGOs, were said to be key players in this process: a topic that had been discussed in the previous day’s NGO Forum. The delegation fully agreed with the evaluation report that the success of the Convention depended on its implementation at all levels. It also noted that this was a time-consuming process, and why the continuation of the capacity-building programme was crucial so as to involve all stakeholders, and thus obtain lasting results. This was also the case for capacity-building projects in the Caribbean islands and Suriname, which were now on-going. The delegation also hoped to remain regularly informed of the progress of the projects so as to learn from the results.
7. The **Chairperson** supposed that the Committee would be enthusiastic about the new prospects opened up by these generous contributions, expressing his gratitude to the States for their support of the Convention and to the Secretariat, since the last meeting of the Committee, including Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, China, Spain, Georgia, Japan, Monaco, Norway, Turkey and the Norwegian Centre for Traditional Music and Dance. The Chairperson pointed out that eight of the contributors had chosen to support a funding mechanism that was important for the proper functioning of the Convention, its governance, and implementation at the national level. This sub-fund was created by the General Assembly in 2010 in response to the modest human resources available to the Secretariat at that time. The Chairperson expressed gratitude to those donors, particularly as – since its creation – the sub-fund had only received a quarter of what was required, as identified by the General Assembly. This left a significant shortfall to complete, with the Chairperson recalling that in March 2014, the Director-General had addressed a circular letter (CL/4053) to all Member States calling for their support, explicitly mentioning the sub-fund. The Chairperson gave the floor to the delegation of Congo and then to the delegation of Suriname.
8. The delegation of **Congo** congratulated the Netherlands and Azerbaijan for their generosity, which would go to help the two countries in safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage. Nevertheless, it noted that many delegations had spoken about the urgent need for capacity-building and suggested that future donors remain neutral, i.e. that they did not designate beneficiary States as there were many countries in perhaps even greater need. The delegation believed that the best way to safeguard intangible cultural heritage was to provide the funds to those countries in need based on their requirements. Concluding, It reiterated that donors should provide funds anonymously without specifying beneficiaries.
9. The delegation of **Suriname** thanked the Netherlands for its voluntary and supplementary contribution towards reinforcing capacity-building in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Suriname and the Dutch Caribbean islands. Suriname had not yet ratified the Convention yet it recognized its importance and had already started internal processes for future ratification. Moreover, Suriname would actively participate in developing international cooperation for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the future.
10. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 merely quoted the document just examined, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 recalled the article of the Convention on which the Committee relied to accept both voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 commended Azerbaijan for its support. Paragraph 4 accepted this contribution, and at the same time asked the Secretariat to take charge in implementing this project in close cooperation with national counterparts in Bangladesh and Guatemala, both paragraphs were duly adopted. Paragraph 5 commended the Netherlands, and paragraph 6 accepted this second contribution, asking the Secretariat to take charge in implementing this project in close cooperation with national counterparts of the Dutch Caribbean islands and Surinam, both paragraphs were duly adopted. Paragraph 7 recognized that many countries still required capacity-building to implement the Convention. Paragraph 8 was important because it would approve the Concept Note for the 2014–2017 Complementary Additional Programme, which defined the basic principles of the strategy to strengthen capacities. It accepted any voluntary contributions that would be made between two Committee sessions, provided it fell within the programme framework. The paragraphs were duly adopted. As voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund can now be accepted between two sessions, paragraph 9 requested the Secretariat to report to the Committee at its next session on new contributions that might have been received. Paragraph 10 took note that other forms of support exist and are used by other States. Paragraph 11 thanked the contributors. Finally, paragraph 12 encouraged States to offer support. All the paragraphs were duly adopted. The **Chairperson thus declared Decision 9.COM 7 adopted.**
11. The delegation of **Brazil** noted that the delegations had already applauded the approval of the decision, but wished to suggest that the Committee and the States Parties express gratitude to all the countries that had provided supplementary voluntary contributions to the Fund to foster cooperation for intangible cultural heritage with a round of applause.

[Round of applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil for its proposal andinvited the beneficiary countries to say a few words.
2. The delegation of **Guatemala** expressed special gratitude for the important and effective work carried out by the Secretariat over many years in promoting and safeguarding the world’s intangible cultural heritage. Guatemala was deeply involved in this work and fully identified itself as a multicultural, multi-ethnic and multilingual country. The delegation explained that the government authorities continued to work actively in the development and safeguarding of the different cultural expressions at the sub-regional level, as well as within the regional, continental and global agendas. It welcomed the decision of the Committee on the capacity-building programme in Guatemala, and was honoured and grateful to Azerbaijan that had – through these voluntary contributions – enabled the implementation of its training programmes. In this way, the country would be able to support efforts to achieve the Convention’s goals and to rise to the challenge of safeguarding intangible heritage in Guatemala. The delegation also thanked the Spanish government that had contributed significantly to the training of officials responsible for intangible cultural heritage. Finally, it reiterated its commitment to the Convention, adding that it would continue to contribute to the Convention for its continual improvement.
3. The delegation of **Bangladesh** congratulated the chairmanship and expressed appreciation of the Secretariat for its sincere efforts in organizing this meeting in an efficient manner despite existing financial restraints. It also expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee for approving the decision on the voluntary supplementary contribution of Azerbaijan, further expressing its sincere appreciation and profound gratitude to the government of Azerbaijan for its generous offer to support programmes in Bangladesh for strengthening national capacities for the sustainable safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Bangladesh as a new State in an ancient land was fortunate to have diverse elements of intangible cultural heritage, but it also had dire need of expertise to safeguard intangible heritage for sustainable development. Hence, international assistance for capacity-building was greatly needed. It firmly believed that this programme with its integrated approach would be able to fulfil specific needs in addressing the issues related to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and would thus enhance expertise in Bangladesh to submit nominations to the Representative List. It hoped that the generous offer from Azerbaijan could help bring change in this regard. It also hoped that the capacity-building programme involving developing countries would prove to be an important mechanism to support the implementation of the Convention.
4. The **Chairperson** called upon all States Parties to consider the possibility of following in the footsteps of those to whom the Committee had expressed its gratitude, but given the unprecedented financial constraints faced by UNESCO’s Regular Programme, to also support the human capacity of the Secretariat through the sub-fund that had been specifically established for this purpose.

## ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA:

REPORT ON THE AUDIT OF THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDENT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES AND ENTITIES

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/8*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-8-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 8*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the next agenda item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that document 8 was not an audit but a status report of the current year, recalling that the General Conference had requested a governance audit of UNESCO’s funds, programmes and related entities: the Convention was identified as such an entity. The document submitted to the Committee only specified the various approaches undertaken by the two Chairpersons of the governing bodies of the Convention, namely, the Chairperson of the General Assembly and the Chairperson of the Committee, for the self-assessment of governance by the bodies themselves. Thus, the exercise was launched for both the Committee and the General Assembly and had benefitted from many contributions by States Parties. The final audit would not only based on the self-assessment exercise but had a much broader scope and was conducted by the external auditors. The report would be presented to the Executive Board at its 197th session in the spring of 2015, as well as to the General Conference at its 38th session in the autumn of 2015. The Secretary further explained that the conclusions were not yet known, so the draft decision proposed that the Committee take note of this information, while thanking the Chairpersons of the respective bodies for their work in this regard.
3. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** noted that the exercise was still incomplete, adding that he was looking forward to seeing the results of the audit. He then turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and with no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 8 adopted**.

## ITEM 13.d OF THE AGENDA:

EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS OF THE COMMITTEE IN CONNECTION WITH THE INSCRIPTION OF ELEMENTS, SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO THE REGISTER OF BEST SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES, AND APPROVAL OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.d*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.d-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.d*

1. The **Chairperson** invited Mr Proschan to present the next agenda item.
2. **Mr Proschan** explained that this point was introduced in the eighth Committee session in Baku after the Committee had spent a number of days examining all the nominations to the Representative List, the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance, adding that over the course of the Committee’s life it had taken a number of transversal decisions on nominations. The first occurred during its fifth session in Nairobi, and in Baku in 2013 the question arose as to how previous decisions were being respected by the Committee, the two evaluation bodies and the Secretariat. Thus, in its Decision 8.COM 8, the Committee asked the Secretariat to evaluate the implementation of previous Committee decisions concerning these four mechanisms. The Secretariat began by first distinguishing the formal decisions of the Committee from the recommendations and advice offered by the Subsidiary Body and the Consultative Body. The recommendations were far more numerous, while the decisions of the Committee were relatively few. The Secretariat further concentrated its analysis on the public implementation of the Convention, i.e. what the Committee and the Secretary had implemented, and what the Subsidiary Body and Consultative Body reported in their annual public reports. This meant excluding the confidential deliberations of the Consultative Body and the Subsidiary Body during their proceedings, which remained private unless they chose to bring their discussions to the Committee in the form of a recommendation or draft decision, or in their written reports. The Secretariat did not want to take advantage of the confidential decisions taken in assessing the overall implementation of the Convention and document 13.d was therefore limited to the public record. Mr Proschan remarked that the Committee could corroborate the findings with previous summary records in order to determine whether a fair assessment had been made or not. Document 13.d thus presented, decision-by-decision from the most recent, the Committee’s decisions, as well as the actions carried out to implement each of those decisions.
3. **Mr Proschan** further explained the findings, in which it was found that whenever specific instructions were given to the Secretariat, i.e. on technical requirements, or what constituted a complete dossier, the Secretariat applied them as consistently as possible. There were also a number of decisions addressed to States Parties that were respected by the States, and therefore they had not presented cases to the Committee that would challenge the Committee’s implementation of those decisions. In several cases the report simply state, ‘the Committee took the decision, States have respected the decision and it has not been tested’. With the Subsidiary Body and Consultative Body, a number of examples were found in which the recommendations to the Committee on specific nominations directly referred to a previous Committee decision. Typically, this would justify a recommendation *not* to inscribe an element, *not* to select a best practice or *not* to grant international assistance. There were thus two specific instances in the public record where the Committee had applied its previous decisions to the letter. The Committee usually, but not always, endorsed the Bodies’ recommendations when those were grounded upon previous decisions; Committee decisions on specific files similarly cite one or another previous decision. Document 13.d also identified a few instances where the Committee disregarded the recommendations of the evaluation bodies and its own previous decisions, deciding to inscribe or refer an element rather than rejecting it, when the Body had recommended that the element should not be inscribed based on prior Committee decisions. For instance, paragraph 9 of the document discussed how the Committee itself had applied Decision 7.COM 11 concerning misplaced information. Moreover, in several cases, the Subsidiary Body reported to the Committee that it had not been able to rigorously apply one of the Committee’s decisions. Typically, when the Subsidiary Body or the Consultative Body reported that it was having difficulty applying one of the Committee’s decisions, it asked the Committee to take the same decision a second time, occasionally in a slightly stronger form. For instance, paragraph 11 of the document reviewed the use of the referral option by the 2013 Subsidiary Body and by the eighth session of the Committee, and that same question is addressed in the [report](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-10%2BAdd.3-EN.doc) of the 2014 Subsidiary Body. Similarly, paragraph 12 of the document looked at the instructions that the Committee had given about the minimal information required to satisfy criterion R.2, and how the 2013 Subsidiary Body had applied that requirement with a certain flexibility, as stated in its 2013 [report](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-13-8.COM-8%2BAdd.2-EN.doc). The same requirement was then reformulated in more stringent terms by the Committee in its Decision 8.COM 8, with the 2014 Subsidiary Body report again addressing its frustration in trying to apply the two previous decisions of the Committee. Mr Proschan remarked that document 13.d represented the Secretariat's best effort to review the public record of the Committee and its bodies with the hope that taking stock of its past practices would assist the Committee in its task of examining new nominations, proposals and requests. He noted that when Decision 8.COM 8 was adopted in 2013, the Secretary had explained that the Secretariat could compile the information requested but could not provide a draft decision, as the Secretariat could not propose a qualitative judgement on the Committee’s work. The document therefore only provided a minimal decision, which the Committee might wish to elaborate further following its debates.
4. The delegation of **Belgium** believed that consistency and credibility go hand-in-hand, and as seen in the report regarding Decision 7.COM 11 on information placed in appropriate sections, the Committee should try to adhere to the rules and precedence created by previous decisions. It proposed to recall and reiterate the previous decisions, Decision 7.COM 7 and Decision 7.COM 11, and to follow those rules. It also noted that a decision had yet to be taken on agenda item 5.a.
5. The **Chairperson** confirmed that item 5.a would be returned to later.
6. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked the Secretariat for the evaluation document, acknowledging the importance and usefulness of the continuously updated document on transversal issues, as well as the aide-mémoiredocuments for the completion of nomination files. It recognized the importance of the proposed decision to take note of the impact it will have in further Committee discussions, while reflecting on the way decisions were taken within the Committee.
7. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Secretariat for the interesting document, but mostly it thanked the previous Committee for its courage in having asked for this document, which was a sign of good governance. As said by Belgium, consistency and credibility go hand-in-hand. Decisions and criteria have to apply to States Parties in the same way, but as noted from this document and from previous summary records, it was clear that this had not always been the case. The delegation noted that there was a kind of subjectivity involved in the evaluation of nominations, which the Committee had to recognize. It spoke of certain issues that go deeper than simply applying decisions taken by the Committee, and that there was a real problem with criterion R.2 of the Representative List, which deserved to be debated in the future. The delegation added that the problem with criterion R.2 was more than a misunderstanding by State Parties, and that the entire criterion was not interpreted in line with the Convention, and should thus be revisited at the Committee’s next session.
8. The delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Secretariat for the evaluation document on the implementation of previous decisions by the Committee, which it considered necessary and important. It concurred with Saint Lucia that each point in the document raised many questions. It also believed that there should be a debate in the future about the Committee’s decisions taken in the past, including the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity that were automatically incorporated in the Representative List, especially with regard to the elements inscribed in 2001, 2003 and 2005, which were not in the same situation regarding inscription. A detailed study was considered necessary, as there were many elements that were better suited to the Urgent Safeguarding List, which thus demanded a more careful and detailed approach.
9. Thanking the Committee Members for their comments, the **Chairperson** moved to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to paragraph 1, it was duly adopted.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to propose the following wording as a new paragraph 2, which read, ‘Welcoming the Secretariat’s and Subsidiary Organs’ calibrated and sensitive approach regarding uplifting of principles to avoid misunderstandings and tensions among communities by encouraging dialogue and mutual respect among groups, communities and individuals’, with the current paragraph 2 becoming a new paragraph 3.
11. The **Chairperson** invited Turkey to provide the amendment in writing.
12. The delegation of **Belgium** welcomed the idea by Turkey but did not believe the amendment was in its right place and proposed to delete it.
13. While waiting for the written text, and before opening the debate on the amendment, the **Chairperson** turned to the original paragraphs 2 and 3, which were duly adopted.
14. The delegation of **Brazil** understood Turkey’s intention with the amendment, which it considered a good and important idea. However it felt that it was only emphasizing one aspect among many aspects included in the report. Thus, it was not in its proper place, as the Committee could not single out only one aspect in its decision and disregard all the other aspects. It therefore suggested its deletion.
15. Noting that there was insufficient support for Turkey’s amendment, the **Chairperson** returned to the original text, and with no further comments or objections, the Chairperson **declared Decision 9.COM 13.d adopted**.

## ITEM 9 OF THE AGENDA:

REPORT OF THE CONSULTATIVE BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2014

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/9*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-9-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 9*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced the next agenda item 9 by inviting the Chairperson of the Consultative Body, Mr Egil Sigmund Bakka (Norway), and the Rapporteur, Ms Naila Ceribašić (International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM)), to join him on the podium. The Chairperson recalled that this Consultative Body was established by the Committee at its eighth session in Baku to evaluate: i) nominations to Urgent Safeguarding List; ii) proposals for Best Safeguarding Practices; and iii) requests for International Assistance of more than US$25,000. The Chairperson outlined the examination process in which the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body, Ms Ceribašić, would first present the Body’s general observations, followed by those specific to the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Committee would then be invited to debate agenda items 9 and 9.a, without examining draft decision 9.COM 9, which would be examined once all nominations and requests for all three mechanisms had been examined. Mr Bakka would introduce each nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List, summarizing the main points and recommendations of the Consultative Body. The Committee would discuss each nomination and adopt the corresponding draft decision. The same procedure would be followed for item 9.b (Best Safeguarding Practices) and item 9.c (requests for International Assistance). The draft decisions 9.COM 9.b and 9.COM 9.c would be discussed following the examination of the files concerned, which would be followed by the examination of the overall decision 9.COM 9. Recalling the working methods adopted by the Committee, the Chairperson recalled that the debate on the draft decisions was restricted to Members of the Committee. He also recalled Article 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure in which the submitting State, whether Member or not of the Committee, could not intervene to support its file, but only to provide information in response to the questions raised. Since the Committee’s sixth session in Bali in 2011, it was agreed that the Committee would not accept new or additional information presented by the submitting State during the session. Only clarification of information already included in the file evaluated by the Consultative Body would be permitted. This would ensure fair treatment of nomination files between submitting States. It was noted that some States had already withdrawn their files for revision and submission in a subsequent cycle. Finally, the submitting State would be granted two minutes to speak following the Committee’s decision on its file. With no comments forthcoming, Ms Ceribašić was invited to present her report.
2. The **Rapporteur**, Ms Naila Ceribašić, spoke of her pleasure in introducing the overall report of the Consultative Body on its work in 2014, explaining that the written report was comprised of four parts. She began with a brief overview of the working methods and the files examined by the Consultative Body. **Part** I.A: ‘Overview of 2014 files and working methods.’ The Body was composed of 12 members; six were individual experts and six persons representing accredited NGOs. At its first meeting in March 2013, the Body elected Mr Egil Sigmund Bakka (Norway) as Chairperson and Ms Emily Drani of the Cross-cultural Foundation of Uganda as Vice-Chairperson. Ms Ceribašić (from ICTM) was elected as Rapporteur. As for the previous cycles, the Secretariat evaluated the technical completeness of the nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, without entering into the substance of the files. However, the Secretariat gave more substantial feedback on the International Assistance requests. Altogether, 15 files were processed by the Secretariat and 14 were transmitted to the Consultative Body (eight for the Urgent Safeguarding List, four for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and two for International Assistance). Before meeting for the second time in September 2014, members of the Body submitted their evaluation reports directly through the dedicated website. Based on those evaluation reports, draft recommendations were elaborated by the Secretariat. During the meeting, the Body collectively evaluated each nomination, and debated and amended the recommendations on each criterion, deciding whether or not to recommend the nomination or request. As is the custom, the Body based its evaluations entirely on the information provided in the nomination. An unfavourable recommendation meant that the submitting State had not provided convincing information in the nomination file to satisfy one or more criteria. It was noted that Body members would not be permitted to participate in the evaluation of any nomination file submitted by the country of domiciliation of his or her NGO or by his or her country, and there were two such cases in this cycle. Moreover, of the members initially elected, Ms Kris Rampersad was unable to serve the Body due to her appointment as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago on the UNESCO Executive Board. Mr Anthony Parak Krond completed the evaluation of all the files but was unable to participate in the September meeting due to a visa problem.
3. The **Rapporteur** turned to the general observations and recommendations common to all three mechanisms. **Part I.B:**‘General observations and recommendations.’ The Body was impressed with the diversity of intangible cultural heritage, and a reasonable geographical balance that had been maintained, with all electoral groups represented by at least one file. But the limited number of files submitted to these three mechanisms continued to be a subject of concern. In this regard, the Body emphasized the importance of the global capacity-building programme, whose effects were increasingly visible. The Body was also pleased to learn that two African countries were benefitting from technical support through the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to prepare International Assistance requests, and that others will follow. The Body observed that certain States expected an inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List to automatically result in International Assistance. It was noted that each mechanism in this cycle was independent with no gateway between them. However, this would change in the future, as a new joint form becomes introduced. Beginning with the 2016 cycle, a State may propose a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List and simultaneously request International Assistance to support implementation of its safeguarding plan. During the meeting the Body had a chance to comment on the new joint form, and it was confident that this new procedure would be helpful. In terms of the presentation of files, the Body regretted a number of recurring problems such as poor linguistic quality, misplaced information, and incoherency across different sections of the nomination. Furthermore, there were several files demonstrating a lack of adequate knowledge of the Convention with the use of inappropriate vocabulary or references to concepts that were more in line with the 1972 Convention or the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.
4. The **Rapporteur** further explained that the Body invited submitting States to carefully follow the instructions given in the form and to refer to advice made available in previous Committee decisions. In this regard, the newly published [*aide-mémoire*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-01-aide-m%C3%A9moire-EN.doc), which summarized lessons learned, observations and recommendations, represented a useful tool and the Body thanked the Secretariat for its efforts in preparing this document. With regard to the content of the files, the definition of a ‘community’ continued to be a major discussion theme, given that the participation of the community, group or individuals is a common criterion for all three mechanisms. When the communities were not well defined, then unsurprisingly their widest possible participation was not easily demonstrated. It was also important as a prerequisite for satisfying other related criteria for all three mechanisms. The Body also reflected on the contours of a given community, and that external audiences, such as tourists, could not be automatically considered as part of the community concerned, although the Body was also aware that intangible cultural heritage was viable thanks to the intricate social dynamics of a diverse set of actors. The Body again highlighted the importance of clearly describing the role of each actor when preparing submissions.
5. The **Rapporteur** also noted that there were several files this year in which economic considerations appeared prioritized over safeguarding objectives. While recognizing their potential value, measures such as income generation, remuneration to practitioners or expansion of audiences could not automatically be considered safeguarding measures without clear argumentation. In a similar vein, the issue of de-contextualization was discussed in connection with proposed commercialization, tourism-related activities and the institutionalization of transmission. The Body felt strongly that respect for the social and cultural context must be the priority when it comes to safeguarding measures and that intangible cultural heritage should not be maintained only for the enjoyment of or profit for those outside the communities. In conformity with the decision adopted by the General Assembly at the fifth session, the Rapporteur confirmed that this was the last cycle in which the Body would evaluate the three mechanisms. A single body, the Evaluation Body, would in the future evaluate files for the Convention’s four mechanisms, including the Representative List. Based on experience obtained over the years, document 9 contained several points that the Body wished to highlight, which included the need to continue discussing recurrent issues, the larger implications of the 2003 Convention such as the role of intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development, and encouraging the future Evaluation Body to reflect on the best ways to evaluate the files submitted. The Body wished the very best for the new members of the Evaluation Body to be elected later in the week.
6. The **Rapporteur** introduced **Part II:** ‘Specific observations concerning the eight nominations evaluated for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List.’ Beginning with a brief summary of the observations concerning each criterion, the Rapporteur noted the main issue encountered in criterion **U.1** was the recurrent problem of submitting States not clearly defining the element. In some cases the Body found that the scope of the element was too large or too vague. When the element is not clearly defined, then the contour of the community, the viability of the element, and the threats that it faced cannot be satisfactorily defined. In other words, a weak definition of Criterion U.1 has consequences in the evaluation of criteria U.2 and U.4. The Body thus invited the States to be attentive to the ‘right’ scale and scope of the element. Problems related to the definition of the element also included the question of the role of the various actors involved. The Body understood that communities concerned with an element could include the larger population, such as an external audience, but the lack of a clear definition in certain files was problematic in understanding their involvement and role in ensuring the viability of the element proposed. The Body also found cases in which the nomination concentrated on historical characteristics or technical aspects, while omitting to describe the social function and cultural meaning of the proposed element within the community in its contemporary context. There was also a case where economic benefit appeared to be the primary reason offered for safeguarding. The Body highlighted once again the need to strike a balance between cultural significance, social function and economic development.
7. As regardscriterion **U.2,** the **Rapporteur** reported that the Bodyregretted that in more than half of the submitted nominations the viability of the element and the frequency of its practice were not sufficiently demonstrated. The submitting States were encouraged to describe the current status and situation of the element; information considered essential when evaluating safeguarding measures. The Body also observed that there was a tendency for States to list the threats in an overly generic way, for example evoking an ageing population, disinterest of the younger generation, and diminishing number of bearers. The Body recalled the need for the threats to be identified at the community level, which must be specific to the element. The threats also need to correspond to the measures proposed under criterion U.3. The Body often had prolonged discussion on criterion **U.3**,even though the criterion was satisfied in half of the nomination files. The numerous issues include concerns over choosing top-down or generic safeguarding measures, not fully involving communities in developing the safeguarding plan, as well as using out-dated historical information for planning. The Body reiterated the importance of identifying realistic resources and providing a detailed budget for the safeguarding plan, recalling that an inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List did not automatically result in the granting of international assistance. Although it was not possible to standardize a format for budgets in the safeguarding plan, the Body requested the Secretariat to share examples of good budgets. Another set of questions in U.3 concerned the issue of traditional transmission versus integration into the formal school curriculum. The Body was of view that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage required new ways of transmission that should be done in context, and communities should not be dispossessed of their own transmission processes.
8. The **Rapporteur** moved to criterion **U.4**, and the recurrent problem in the lack of community participation in the elaboration of the safeguarding plan. The Body wished to remind submitting States that the widest possible participation of the community, group or individuals should be ensured throughout the whole file: in the definition of the element; the assessment of its viability; the identification of threats; the planning and design of safeguarding measures; and in the elaboration of the inventory. Concerning the communities free, prior and informed consent, the Body regretted that submitting States continued to submit uniform consents and declarations rather than individualized and diverse evidence of consent. It highlighted the need to demonstrate consent from various actors within the community and not only by institutions or associations. Moreover, the Body often found scant information or none at all on customary restrictions on access to certain esoteric knowledge. There was also one case where the Body noticed a discrepancy between the written consent and what was shown in the film. Criterion **U.5** continued to be problematic, affecting half of the nomination files. The Body recalled that U.5 has three parts. In line with Article 11 and Article 12 of the Convention, submitting States should demonstrate: i) that the element is included in an inventory; ii) that it was drawn up with the participation of communities; and iii) that it is regularly updated. The Body attempted to apply consistency in the evaluation of U.5 across all nomination files, but decided that deficiencies in one or more parts of this three-part criterion could not alone be the basis for rejection. It should nevertheless be emphasized that the participation of community members in the nomination process does not automatically mean that they were involved in the inventory process and vice versa. Several aspects of the video also attracted the attention of the Body. The video should help viewers understand the social functions and cultural meanings of the element in its context, and to meet its practitioners and experience the element. In this regard, submitting States should strive to provide information to contextualize what is shown in the video; care must be taken not to cut the flow of a selected excerpt and to avoid using soundtracks that are not related to the context of the practice. The Body also reiterated the importance of mobilizing all actors involved in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, including those outside the culture sector. It encouraged States to ensure that nominated elements respect existing international human rights instruments, which was sometimes not addressed in the files.
9. Taking all eight files submitted for the Urgent Safeguarding List, the **Rapporteur** concluded that the Body was happy to note evidence of the commitment of States to the well-being of small, rural and indigenous communities that are under social and economic stress, as well as their efforts in demonstrating the role played by intangible cultural heritage in sustainable development, cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue, and links between nature and the environment. On the issues of transmission of intangible cultural heritage from generation to generation, the Body was also pleased to see a nomination that demonstrated cross-gender transmission from father to daughter.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for the pertinent points raised, opening the floor for a general debate on the first part of the report.
11. The delegation of **Belgium** congratulated the Consultative Body for its excellent work and its very interesting recommendations and conclusions, adding that it had a number of small points for further discussion. Firstly, regarding paragraph 24 of document ITH/14/9.COM/9.a on consent, the delegation felt that various actors in the community, not only institutions or associations, act as mediators or community representatives and should provide their consent. It believed that the Committee should develop these ideas further because mediators were often shown in a negative light when in fact they could really contribute to the safeguarding plans and programmes. Moreover, mediators could serve as cultural brokers and translators, and therefore the whole concept of who could represent the community in terms of the safeguarding procedure could be further reflected upon. Secondly, regarding paragraphs 36 and 37 of the afore mentioned document on human rights, especially gender issues, the delegation wondered about the definition of gender being applied, i.e. was it only the difference between men and women, or could it also relate to the gay or lesbian community, and was the definition of masculinity covered by the gender dimension. The delegation raised another more general question about sustainable development, especially when talking about the role a particular element could play in sustainable development. It felt that there were larger possibilities to rethink the relations between safeguarding and sustainable development, and it agreed with the comments that perhaps the very limited amount of words provided in the form did not really allow State Parties to develop these arguments, and therefore it welcomed further reflection in this regard. The delegation understood that these points would be discussed later in the agenda, but it wished to hear comments and conclusions on examining the relationship between intangible heritage, safeguarding and sustainable development.
12. The delegation of **Congo** joined Belgium in commending the Consultative Body on the objective and unbiased nature of its work based on the specific criteria. In this way, it had provided a great service to the Convention. It believed that the Evaluation Body would continue to work with the same determination in a same spirit of objectivity. With regard to paragraph 36 of document ITH/14/9.COM/9, it wondered whether the Consultative Body, in its evaluation of a nomination, should carry out field observations or whether should it be satisfied with the submitted files.
13. The delegation of **Brazil** also wished to congratulate the Consultative Body for its excellent report and work, adding that it had three specific questions. The first was in line with the question by Congo on paragraph 36 of the report about on-site observations. It sought a reply from the representative of the Consultative Body on the need for on-site observations in cases where the Committee might want to identify best practices or verify the need for urgent safeguarding. The second question was on the issue mentioned in paragraph 21 of the same report in which certain nominations proposed very interesting safeguarding measures, but the funding resources were not well identified. In a certain way this was a core problem of elements that were under threat of disappearance and required urgent safeguarding, but were under threat largely owing to a lack of financial resources. However, it understood that some countries presented nominations with the expectation that inscription would lead to new resources, either from international cooperation or from the ICH Fund; a problem that needed to be addressed. The third question also related to the Urgent Safeguarding List, with the delegation believing that once an element was inscribed on this List there should be a medium- or long-term plan of overturning the situation: either because the safeguarding measures implemented were sufficient to solve the problems posed by the threat, or because the circumstances had deteriorated to the point where the element was actually disappearing and the safeguarding measures were not sufficient to solve the problem. It therefore wished to hear further comments on how these issues could help project the future for those elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Finally, the delegation felt that it was important to mention in the decision that the new Evaluation Body would continue to benefit from this accumulated mass of experience and jurisprudence created by both the Committee and the Consultative Body.
14. The delegation of **Afghanistan** expressed its great interest in having listened to the Rapporteur explain the different facets of a submitted file, adding that it was like a presentation on anthropology that exposed profound knowledge. The delegation spoke of how every time it had wanted to prepare a file it was almost compelled to write a thesis on the subject and the diverse and profound questions raised. It was perhaps easier in developed countries, where these aspects of sociology and anthropology had already been studied, but so difficult in less developed countries where there was less experience in this approach and therefore in responding to these issues. Moreover, involving the community in the different phases of nominations, transmission, inventories, and so on, was difficult work, particularly if the community was not defined, for which the delegation had yet to find a very clear definition. In this case, everything was made possible to answer the questions through research with the diverse populations. Nevertheless, there was one truly important fact: the community could not do anything without the State. It was noted that the State was often associated in this work, and that if the State did not undertake the procedure the community alone would not be able to take on such a difficult task, which meant that there was an imbalance. The delegation remarked that there were States Parties that had many inscribed elements, while there were countries that did not yet have a single element inscribed. Thus, how could membership to the Convention be justified when certain Member States had no elements inscribed? The delegation remarked that its attention was directed to these States in order to redress the balance, as they were somehow excluded. It called for a rethink of the situation in order to build capacity in these countries so that they would at least have one element inscribed. It also spoke of the diversity of the societies and communities in the world with multiple situations and actors that had varying capacities and resources. The delegation urged the Secretariat – notwithstanding its truly extraordinary efforts so far – to further facilitate the evaluations because in many of the cases it studied there appeared to be minor differences between the responses by the submitting States and the appreciation of the file by the Committee.
15. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** appreciated the Consultative Body’s efforts to improve the quality of the nomination files, as reflected in its report. It believed that the Consultative Body had accumulated a great deal of experience and know-how in evaluating nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, hoping that this experience would be fully extended to the new Evaluation Body through their close coordination. With regard to the new form ICH-01bis, mentioned in paragraph 21 and 22 of the report, it understood that the new form was designed to allow States Parties to request International Assistance in their nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, it felt that the form would introduce further procedures to the nomination process. It therefore asked the Secretariat to clarify this point, adding that more study was needed on the integration of the two separate procedures and their possible implications.
16. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Consultative Body for its efforts, noting that some of the comments in the report were also mentioned in previous reports, including the difficulty of defining an element, reflecting the nature of intangible cultural heritage. There was also the issue of disparities in technical expertise among submitting States. Another issue was related to defining the concept of local communities, and that without an exact definition the Body could not evaluate their participation in the preparation of nomination files to the Urgent Safeguarding List. With regard to urgent safeguarding, the delegation believed that one safeguarding programme was not better than another, and therefore information could also be taken into account from field observations so that nominations were not solely based on theoretical considerations.
17. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** joined the other Members in congratulating the Consultative Body for the quality of its work. The delegation noted that there was some confusion about commercial exploitation and tourism development in the report for which it sought an explanation. It explained that it wished to know at what point did safeguarding measures become measures of commercial exploitation, and tourist development become a safeguard measure, as there appeared to a fine line that should not be crossed.
18. The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to respond to the questions and comments.
19. In response to the question by Belgium on the consent of different actors, the **Rapporteur** did not wish to imply that the Consultative Body was negative about mediators, only that it sought consent from other community members such as the bearers and practitioners. Regarding the gender and human rights issues, the Rapporteur remarked that references had been made to the decisions of the Committee, and its emphasis on greater recognition of women and youth within the nomination, which was the same case for human rights. With regard to sustainability, it was true that it was not only an issue of economics, and that the Body also placed emphasis on the importance of involving a greater number of the various actors within the community in the project of safeguarding, as this would provide a better chance for the sustainability of the safeguarding programme. With regard to the question of on-site observations raised by Congo and Brazil, the Rapporteur remarked that the Body’s examination was solely based on the files and not the reality on the ground. This is specific to the 2003 Convention compared to other conventions. In this way, it was up to the Committee to determine the type of development it wished to take. The Body was encouraging the forthcoming Evaluation Body to be in a constant process of reflection on the criteria and their interpretation. As for the definition of a community, the Rapporteur noted that there were several Members that commented that communities were not defined by the Convention and although true, the Committee had at its disposal a large body of knowledge through decisions by the Committee and General Assembly, as well as Operational Directives, which was reflected in the *aide-mémoire* that compiled this accumulated knowledge over the years. Moreover, there was a huge diversity among communities, but there was still enough information for the Body to know whether the community is well defined and to understand how it participated in the safeguarding plan and the inventorying process. The Rapporteur concluded by saying that site visits were not in the spirit of this Convention, or at least not part of the evaluation of nominations, proposals and requests.
20. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond to the other questions raised.
21. Regarding site visits, the **Secretary** wished to elaborate on the problems it posed in financial terms, remarking that it was generally agreed that – in the spirit of the Convention – intangible cultural heritage was determined by the communities, and that site visits would not alter this fact. It was the community that decides, and it was not the expert’s task to determine whether it was confronted with intangible cultural heritage. However, the State had a duty to demonstrate in the nomination that the submitted element matched the criteria, i.e. it was a demonstration exercise and not the reality, which is solely determined by the communities. Thus, it was the duty of the actors working on the submission of nomination files to gather all the information necessary. In addition, some of the elements occurred every 7 years, some every 25 years, such that it would be almost impossible to organize visits, coupled with the costs of such visits. It thus became the practice of the Convention and the Committee to base their decisions only on information contained in the nomination file. This did not imply that the reality on the ground was inexistent if it was not contained in the file. Simply put, all the elements necessary for inscription must be contained in the file. The Secretary underscored the importance of understanding that when an element was not recommended for inscription it was the nomination file under scrutiny not the intangible cultural heritage itself. The Secretary understood that it was very difficult to comprehend that it was the nomination file being considered by the Committee, not the element, especially for the communities concerned. She also spoke of the fate of the element listed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, i.e. for how long would they remain on the list. She explained that the purpose of the List was also to approve the safeguarding plan that accompanied these nominations so as to eventually remove the element from the List, though admittedly this process had not yet been established. The Operational Directives very clearly state that when an element no longer meets the criteria of a List, it should no longer be on that List, and of course if it meets the criteria of another List, it should be on that List. Thus, there were two options: either the element is transferred from one List to another, or the element is removed from the List altogether, as was mentioned by Mexico in its remark concerning the Masterpieces in which some elements were automatically inscribed to the Representative List while others corresponded better to the criteria of the Urgent Safeguarding List. A worse scenario faced on several occasions by the Subsidiary Body occurred when it found that an element would be better suited to the Urgent Safeguarding List rather than on the Representative List, but that there was no tangible mechanism to suggest the transfer. The Secretary explained that nothing in the criteria prohibited an element under threat to be inscribed on the Representative List, i.e. the criteria for the Representative List did not require the element to demonstrate that its viability was satisfactory. In addition, States preferred to submit their nominations to the Representative List, for whatever reason, even though their element was fully in line with criteria of the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Secretary agreed that this point deserved further reflection, especially if an element on the Urgent Safeguarding List no longer corresponded to that reality, and with an effective safeguarding plan, deserved to be placed on the Representative List. The question was whether this scenario could be considered as part of the ceiling of all nominations examined by the Committee. Or would it be an extra task to be added to the workload. In any case, while seeking to encourage States to consider the right List that corresponded to the reality, all elements – if they are to be inscribed – must meet all the criteria of the corresponding List, and would go through an evaluation by the Evaluation Body, the Committee and the Secretariat, all of which added to the workload. The Secretary conceded that a reflection on the entire mechanism was rather complicated, requiring creativity and flexibility – as mentioned by Afghanistan – but at the same time, States needed to continue to be rigorous when submitting elements for inscription on different Lists. Finally, on the question posed by the Republic of Korea on the mechanism that combined a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List with a request for International Assistance, the Secretary recalled that a decision was taken by the Committee in 2013 to encourage the Secretariat to create a combined form [ICH-01bis](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-01bis-2016-EN.doc)*.* It was noted that nominations were often rejected because the safeguarding plan proposed had not yet requested funds from UNESCO, and thus the funds required to implement the safeguarding were not yet in place. It was thus understandable that the Committee would wish to combine the two mechanisms. Moreover, the form would already be available for the first time for nominations in the 2016 cycle, though not for the 2015 cycle, which was launched in March 2014. It was noted that the combined nomination would only count as one, which was an added advantage. It was noted that the submitting State might obtain both the inscription and the approval of funds, but it might also obtain one but not the other, or neither.
22. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the interesting and constructive debate, adding that the evaluation of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List would begin tomorrow.
23. The **Secretary** made a number of announcements, recalling the meetings organized for the following day, namely the NGO meeting in morning and the meeting for the facilitators of capacity-building during the lunch time for the Electoral Group V(a) and V(b). She also informed that the delegates would be able to enjoy breakfast before the session thanks to the generousity of Turkey.
24. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it would elect the Bureau of the tenth session of the Committee, comprising a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairs and a Rapporteur, at the end of the week. Thus, it was expected that Electoral Groups conduct consultations within their groups. Bidding the delegates a good evening, the Chairperson adjourned the day’s session.

*[Tuesday, 25 November, morning session]*

## ITEM 9.a OF THE AGENDA:

EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/9.a+Add.*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-9.a%2BAdd.-EN.doc)

[*8 nominations*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=745)

**Decision** *9.COM 9.a*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey for the coffee provided, and was happy to note that the Committee was ahead of schedule, hoping that the good progress would continue. The Chairperson informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning to organize the Committee’s work. It was noted that agenda items 13.d and 9 had already been completed, and that the Committee would begin the day’s session with items 9.a, 9.b and 9.c, which would be followed with agenda items 13.b, 13.e, 13.f, 13.h and 13.j. Wednesday and Thursday morning would be dedicated to the evaluation of nominations to the Representative List, as many people travelled specifically for this session. Item 5.a also had to be completed. It was noted that the revised schedule was published on the Convention website, and was adjusted as necessary. The Chairperson then moved to agenda item 9.a and the examination of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. As noted in document 9.a+Add.2, four nominations had been withdrawn by Croatia, Ethiopia, Honduras and Pakistan, resulting in four files for examination. Before commencing the examination, the Chairperson outlined the five criteria U.1–U.5, which were projected onto the screen. He then invited the Chairperson of the Consultative Body, Mr Egil Bakka, to present the Body’s findings.
2. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the first nomination on **Kun Lbokkator** [draft decision 9.COM 9.a.1] submitted by **Cambodia**. Photographs were displayed on the screen. The term ‘Kun’ describes the martial art of fighting, leaping and confronting opponents, while ‘Lbokkator’ refers to all combat techniques involving the half-kneeling position. The technique developed over time into a performing art or traditional leisure game, practised during traditional festivities including the Khmer New Year. At present, Kun Lbokkator faces several threats to its continued practice: many masters are now very aged, and there are no regular teaching programmes or learning materials to facilitate transmission. The Consultative Body faced considerable difficulty in the evaluation of the file and found that none of the five criteria were satisfied. Some of the difficulty was attributed to the fact that information was often placed in an inappropriate section of the form. Hence, paragraph 9 of the draft decision invited the Committee to draw the State’s attention to its previous Decision 7.COM 20.2 on this question. The Body found that overall too much emphasis was placed on providing historical information on the element without providing a clear description of its cultural meaning and social function today (U.1). In focusing primarily on the past meaning and function, the nomination did not allow the Body to understand how the practice and its meaning had transformed over time. From the information provided, the Body could not tell who the bearers were, and how Kun Lbokkator was transmitted, or who might recognize it as constituting part of their intangible cultural heritage. As U.1 had a direct impact on U.2, the criterion did not demonstrate that the practice was in need of urgent safeguarding. The Body learnt from the file that most masters were aged and young people did not wish to invest the necessary time to acquire the practice, but the nomination lacked basic information on the frequency of the practice and the transmission of the element that would ascertain its present state of viability.
3. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** explained that the proposed safeguarding measures (U.3) were largely top-down. For example, it was stated that teams from the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts would visit the communities to ‘present the historical and cultural aspects of the element to the inhabitants’. In addition, no timetable and allocation of resources were provided for the implementation of the safeguarding measures. With little evidence of the active participation of the community in the design and implementation of the safeguarding plan and the inventorying process, the Body was unconvinced of their wide and active participation in the nomination process, except as providers of information (U.4). An association that was otherwise not mentioned in the file provided the only consent. In addition, although Kun Lbokkator appeared to be included in an inventory (U.5), the Body did not find any information to demonstrate that it had been drawn up with the participation of communities concerned or would be regularly updated. The Body could not therefore recommend the inscription of Kun Lbokkator on the Urgent Safeguarding List. In paragraph 5 of the draft decision, the Body reiterated the need for the community to be widely involved in the inventorying process and in the elaboration of the nomination, and paragraph 8 similarly called for their involvement in inventorying. Paragraph 6 emphasized the need for more information on the element’s current condition and its meaning for its practitioners, and paragraph 7 asked that the safeguarding measures be based upon a clear view of the threats facing the element and be so designed to respond to those threats.
4. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, **the Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 9.a.1 not to inscribe Kun Lbokkator on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding adopted.** With the absence of Cambodia, and the withdrawal of the nomination files by Croatia, Ethiopia and Honduras, the nomination file by Kenya was presented.
5. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the second nomination on **Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya** [draft decision 9.COM 9.a.5] submitted by **Kenya**. The Isukuti dance is a traditional celebratory performance practised among the Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya. It takes the form of a fast-paced, energetic and passionate dance accompanied by drumming and singing. An integral tool for cultural transmission and harmonious coexistence between families and communities, it permeates most occasions and stages in life. Transmission of Isukuti dance is presently weakening, however, and frequency of performance is diminishing. Many bearers are elderly and lack successors, and many audiences prefer contemporary entertainment to traditional Isukuti dances. The Chairperson reported that this was the second time the Body viewed this nomination, as it was first submitted in 2012, having been withdrawn following an unfavourable recommendation. On this occasion, however, the Body congratulated the State and was pleased that all the criteria had been satisfied. In particular, the Body was happy to note a demonstration of the active participation of the concerned communities in the entire process (U.4). It also commended the social use of Isukuti dance, which goes beyond being a recreational medium for cultural transmission to uniting the Isukha and Idahko communities and promoting harmonious balance among them (U.1). The proposed safeguarding measures (U.3) geared at building awareness, addressed the issue of transmission to the younger generation and replenished nurseries of indigenous trees needed for drum production, responding well to the identified threats (U.2). Finally, Isukuti dance was included in Kenya’s national inventory (U.5). The Body therefore recommended that Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The draft decision proposed to commend the State for resubmitting the nomination of an element that promoted mutual respect and cultural diversity in collaboration with the communities (paragraphs 4 and 5). In paragraph 6, the Body highlighted the need for a right balance among the safeguarding measures, ensuring that the communities are central in their implementation.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Consultative Body for its summary, adding that the successful experience of Kenya to revise and resubmit its file encouraged States whose applications would not be accepted in the current cycle. The Chairperson then moved to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.a.5 to inscribe Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.**
7. Thanking the Chairperson for the opportunity to address the delegates, the delegation of **Kenya** began by congratulating the Secretariat for its excellent work and for the efficient preparation of the meeting. It further extended its sincere gratitude to the Consultative Body for its coherent and meticulous work that underscored its professionalism in their evaluation of the nomination files, and for favourably recommending the inscription of Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It was delighted in joining the Isukha and Idakho communities to express gratitude that this traditional celebratory performance was recognized at the international level, which was a clear testimony of the rigorous work of the State Party, the county government, and the concerned communities. The dance is an integral tool for cultural transmission and harmonious co-existence between families and communities, as it permeates most occasions and stages in the life-cycle of the concerned communities, including child birth, initiations, weddings, funerals, commemorations, inaugurations, religious festivities, sporting events and other public congregations. However, transmission of Isukuti dance was presently weakened and the frequency of performance was diminishing. Many bearers were elderly and lacked successors. Inscription would therefore provide a strong incentive to the communities concerned to continue practising the element so as to pass on the knowledge to the next generation. The delegation would work tirelessly to ensure that other files are submitted in subsequent cycles, and it reiterated its commitment to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and, in particular, the Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya by ensuring the wildest possible participation of the communities concerned in the implementation of the safeguarding measures proposed.

*[Isukuti performance by dance troop]*

1. Thanking Kenya, the **Chairperson** noted the withdrawal of the file by Pakistan and thus proceeded with the file submitted by Uganda.
2. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the nomination on **Male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango of central northern Uganda** [draft decision 9.COM 9.a.7] submitted by **Uganda**. The male-child cleansing ceremony, performed among the Lango people of central northern Uganda, is a healing ritual for a male child believed to have lost his manhood. The child and mother remain in the house for three days, and then undergo a series of rituals involving the family to cleanse the child, promote reconciliation and restore his social status. Many bearers of the ritual are aged, however, and the practice is increasingly performed in secrecy for fear of excommunication. During the evaluation, the Consultative Body considered that all criteria were satisfied. The Body recognized the important role of the cleansing ceremony in restoring the manhood of male children and maintaining the social cohesion and continuity of the Lango people (U.1). Its relevance to their well-being is further demonstrated by the wide support and consent given to the nomination process (U.4). The Body also noted that in the face of grave threats to its viability, such as the few and aged bearers and the secrecy in which the practice is carried out (U.2), the need for the full and active participation of the community in the implementation of proposed safeguarding measures is ever more crucial (U.3). The ceremony is included in the inventory of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. The Body remarked that this nomination had helped open its eyes to the importance of intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development, in this case, for the building of strong families and communities. The Body therefore recommended that Male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango of central northern Uganda be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The draft decision acknowledged the efforts of the State in safeguarding this element and further encouraged it to ensure the full and active participation of the community in the process (paragraphs 4 and 5). The final paragraph encouraged the State to mobilize the necessary funding and urged relevant bodies to implement the safeguarding plan.
3. The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and pronounced paragraphs 1–4 adopted.
4. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to make a small adjustment in paragraph 5 by replacing ‘community’ with its plural form to include ‘communities, groups, and if applicable, individuals’ in the implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures to allow for debate in those communities on whether or not they agree, and especially to ensure that prior and informed consent was also provided, for example, by the children so that they could also express their opinion.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no support for the amendment, and thus the original paragraph 5 was retained and adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.a.7 to inscribe Male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango of central northern Uganda** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.**
6. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked the Chairperson, the Secretary, the Consultative Body, and the Committee, extending its appreciation to the Secretariat for its support. The delegation remarked that this was one of the elements that received international preparatory assistance, which had helped Uganda learn a lot in terms of community involvement and how to improve the nomination file. It spoke of the country’s commitment towards ensuring the full participation of all the communities, and especially the children who were involved in some of the elements. It was committed to identifying, inventorying and safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of its communities. The delegation took this opportunity to read a statement from the communities concerned, as a way of sharing their sentiments on hearing the favourable recommendation. The community of Lango is one of 65 communities in Uganda found in eight districts of Dokolo, Lira, Amolatar, Apac, Alebtong, Oyam, Otuke, and Kole. The communities – under the leadership of the chief of Lango – value the health of their people and children, both male and female, and hold the birth ceremonies of the children as paramount to the development of healthy productive clan members. The male-child cleansing ceremony unites families in the continuation of the family and clan lineage. The inscription of the element would thus help preserve this much-honoured tradition, which is at risk of disappearance with knowledge of the practice held only among the elderly women and men of Lango. It would also rekindle a love and pride of the Lango culture and the need for unity among the Lango people. On behalf of the community, the delegation thanked the Secretariat once again for the preparatory assistance provided, through the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, that enabled the full and active participation of all the communities from the eight districts where the element is practised, including the clan leaders and the family members of Ngami village. It extended its appreciation to the Consultative Body for the time taken to understand the male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango people of northern Uganda. The clan leaders and the community recognized that the cleansing ceremony is the culture of the Lango people and are committed to ensuring the continuity of the boy-child cleansing ceremony and the implementation of the safeguarding measures, and would work towards all the activities related with the safeguarding measures.
7. The **Chairperson** introduced the last of the nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. Once again, he was pleased to see that this nomination file from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had received a positive recommendation from the Consultative Body.
8. The Chairperson of the Consultative Body presented the fourth and last nomination on **Mapoyo oral tradition and its symbolic reference points within their ancestral territory** [draft decision 9.COM 9.a.8] submitted by the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**. The oral tradition of the Mapoyo and its symbolic points of reference within the ancestral territory encompass a body of narratives that constitute the collective memory of the Mapoyo people. They are symbolically and permanently linked to a number of places along the Orinoco River in Venezuelan Guayana. Tradition bearers recount the narratives while carrying out their daily activities, reinforcing the self-identification of the community. During the evaluation, the Consultative Body considered that all the criteria were satisfied. Moreover, the Body appreciated the efforts of the State in safeguarding the living heritage of a small rural community under social and economic stress. The Body also found that the element provided an interesting example of the links between intangible cultural heritage and the environment. Under criterion U.1, the Body had a lengthy discussion on the role of community elders for different aspects of the enactment; the nomination described the changes that took place in the mode of transmission over time. Some Body members hesitated whether the information provided in other sections could be used to evaluate this criterion. As mentioned in the Rapporteur’s report, the Body wished to remind submitting States of the necessity to include relevant information in the correct sections of the form. In the end, the Body agreed that Mapoyo oral tradition continues to hold great social and cultural significance in the promotion of a shared identity and the cultural continuity of the Mapoyo community.
9. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** explained that the Body took some time to discuss generic threats compared to threats specific to an element, as some Body members questioned whether the threats indicated were specific enough to characterize the element’s current viability (U.2). The Body reiterated that a clear picture of the element’s viability was essential as the proposed safeguarding measures could only be evaluated with respect to the viability and risks identified. In the end, the Body concluded that the information provided in the nomination was adequate, outlining a number of severe threats affecting the element’s viability. These included the decreased use of Mapoyo language in favour of Spanish, inward migration, land encroachment caused by the mining industry, and infrastructure development. In response to these threats, a number of safeguarding measures (U.3) were proposed with a view to enhancing the visibility and transmission of the element, as well as to protect the environment in which the practices take place. The Body considered that the measures were well elaborated, albeit ambitious, and that the file clearly described the role of the community, academic institutions and national authorities. The plan included a coherent and realistic timetable and noted funding sources. The Body thought that the nomination adequately described the participation of members of the Mapoyo community and the Body could verify the evidence of their free, prior and informed consent (U.4). The Body was also satisfied that the proposed element had been included in the national inventory and the Cultural Heritage Registration System of Venezuela (U.5). The Body therefore recommended that Mapoyo oral tradition and its symbolic reference points within their ancestral territory be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The draft decision commended the State for its efforts in safeguarding the heritage of a rural community in social and economic difficulty (paragraph 4). It also appreciated its attention to the relationship between heritage and nature (paragraph 5) and the element’s contribution to sustainable development (paragraph 6). Finally, it encouraged the State to ensure that the safeguarding measures respect customary restrictions on access to certain aspects of the element (paragraph 7).
10. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.a.8 to inscribe Mapoyo oral tradition and its symbolic reference points within their ancestral territory on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**.
11. The delegation of **Bolivarian Republic of** **Venezuela** was grateful for and proud of the decision taken by the Committee, which recognized the Mapoyo oral traditionand its symbolic reference points within their ancestral territory as an example that brought to the fore the relationship between nature and culture, the appropriate practice of interculturalism, and the respect for human rights in Venezuela. It was noted that the nomination file was submitted in 2013, in accordance with the national legacy plan, which saw the Mapoyo people being handed over title deeds to their land for which they had fought for centuries, as a sign of the country’s commitment to the provisions of its constitution. The delegation was convinced that this heritage required urgent safeguarding, adding that the people and the government together would deploy efforts to guarantee that the safeguarding measures proposed would consolidate its most precious element that was recognized as far back as 200 years or since national independence. The delegation wished to allow Ms Carolina Bastidas, the daughter of the eminent Mr Simon Bastidas, born in the village and representing the voice of the Mapoyo, to say a few words. **Ms Carolina Bastidas** began with a greeting in the Mapoya language to say ‘how are you?’ She spoke of the happiness of her community for the international recognition of the culture of her ancestors, and she turned to the ancestors and to their God to whom she offered thanks, as well as the Bolivarian government of Venezuela and, in particular, the Centre for Cultural Diversity at the Ministry of Culture, the Venezuelan delegation to UNESCO, and the Committee. She spoke of the community’s commitment of the Mapoyo people to continue its fight to preserve their culture.
12. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, noting that the Committee had examined the last of the nominations of which three of the four elements had been inscribed. He thus returned to the overall draft decision 9.COM 9.a related to the nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List in general, and not to any nomination in particular. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that it would later return to the draft decision 9.COM 9, adding that issues common to the different mechanisms would be treated at that time. Moreover, the draft decision 9.COM 9.a already covered a number of issues raised in the Body’s report. For example, the need for States parties to mobilize and integrate a wide range of stakeholders, including external actors in the cultural sector, when designing safeguarding measures (paragraph 9). With no comments or objections, the Chairperson proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision 9.COM 9.a on paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–7 were duly adopted.
13. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to include in paragraph 8 the reference to ‘groups and, where applicable, individuals’, and to delete ‘contours’ because it did not fit with ‘individuals’. In this way, there was a reference to groups and individuals and not only to communities, adding that it was important to maintain that difference between groups, communities and individuals, and to mention all three whenever possible.
14. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no objection to the amendment by Belgium, which was duly adopted. The Chairperson then continued with paragraphs 9–12, which were duly adopted.With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 9.a adopted**.

## ITEM 9.b OF THE AGENDA:

EXAMINATION OF PROPOSALS FOR SELECTION TO THE REGISTER OF BEST SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.CO**M/9.b+Add.*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-9.b%2BAdd.-EN.doc)

[*4 proposals*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=746)

**Decision** *9.COM 9.b*

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded to item 9.b and document 9.b+Add., adding that the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices helped share successful safeguarding experiences and provided examples of efficient transmission of living heritage to future generations. These methods and approaches were useful lessons and models that could be adapted to other situations, including those in developing countries. Since 2009, eleven Best Safeguarding Practices had been selected. In the 2014 cycle, the Consultative Body had evaluated four proposals. However, it was noted that both Mexico and Hungary had withdrawn their proposals. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that the overall decision 9.COM 9.b would be adopted upon completion of the examination of the two proposals. He thus invited the Rapporteur to present the second part of the Consultative Body’s report on the examination of proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and the examination of requests for International Assistance.
2. Presenting the Consultative Body’s report, the **Rapporteur** began by congratulating the four States that prioritized proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices for this cycle, but regretted that more countries did not follow suit. The Rapporteur stressed again that the Body was tasked to evaluate not simply a *good* practice but an exemplary safeguarding practice that could inspire other communities and States Parties. One of the issues that attracted the attention of the Body in several of the files was the apparent lack of understanding of the fundamental concepts of the Convention. States were reminded that the proposals must be designed in the framework and spirit of the Convention and should focus on intangible cultural heritage, as defined in Article 2. States should avoid, for example, selecting projects that were primarily concerned with natural or tangible heritage. Similarly, a best safeguarding practice should demonstrate knowledge of the Convention’s definition of safeguarding and should not result in folkorizing or institutionalizing intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, the Body noted that while a programme’s economic benefits could be relevant and important for the communities concerned, financial gain could not be the primary reason for the programme nor could it justify its selection as a best safeguarding practice. As previously mentioned, the identification of the communities involved in the proposed programme was one of the central themes of discussion. Once again, a poor definition of communities had an impact on the other criteria and precluded the understanding of the proposed safeguarding methodologies in general. Similarly, the issue of the contour of the communities arose, and once again an adequate description of the communities was considered indispensable for evaluating proposals. The Body also pointed issues such as the necessity for the programme to be primarily applicable to the needs of developing countries, the importance of capacity-building, and the necessity for research and evaluation demonstrating the effectiveness of safeguarding programmes before they could be put forward as best practices. It was noted that in response to the Committee’s Decision 8.COM 5.c.1, the Body held a brainstorming session on alternative lighter ways of sharing good safeguarding experiences. The Body felt that it was very important to encourage and take advantage of primary research on the effectiveness of safeguarding programmes – or on their lack of effectiveness – so as to begin drawing lessons, and so that communities could begin to learn from others and benefit from their experiences. The Secretariat had taken note of the Body’s brainstorming.
3. The **Rapporteur** concluded with the evaluation of international assistance requests greater than US$25,000. There were only two requests in this cycle and the Body regretted this low level of interest. As mentioned in the first part of the report, the Body hoped that technical assistance provided to some developing countries in the preparation of international assistance requests would improve the situation, as well as the new combined form ICH-01bis to allow submitting States to simultaneously request inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and international assistance for the proposed safeguarding plans. As previously found, the Body encountered problems with the definition of communities, as well as incoherence and inconsistency between the stated objectives, the expected results, the activities proposed, and the corresponding budget. States Parties were again encouraged to take heed of advice given by the past Committee in this regard, and to follow the instructions given in the form. Furthermore, the Body wished to emphasize that elaborating national strategies required a full consultation process at the national level, and could not be an isolated, individual initiative. Another issue that arose concerned the compensation of communities. The Body held the opinion that the time spent by community members to participate in the project should be compensated. Whether they should be remunerated at the same or different standards compared to the experts performing similar work was at the discretion of each State and varied with the context, but the reader should be able to find clear information in the file. Lastly, the Body noticed the striking similarity of two submitted requests to International Assistance requests previously approved by the Committee. While it was good to draw inspiration from successful files, the Body wished to remind States that safeguarding measures should always be specific to a given context. Concluding, the Rapporteur hoped that the report had presented an accurate and comprehensive overview of the Body’s work. She also wished to extend her sincere appreciation to the Chairperson of the Consultative Body and to all its members for their support in her role as Rapporteur.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for the concise and informative report, which gave the Committee an overview on the work of the Consultative Body regarding the two safeguarding mechanisms. He then opened the floor for comment and observations.
5. The delegation of **Brazil** was disappointed to note that only two International Assistance requests had been examined, and therefore there was a need to reflect as to why this was so given that there were resources available in the Fund and it was known that many people were in great need of assistance. Moreover, one of the two files had been rejected. The delegation suggested that the Committee reflect on its standards, adding that maybe the submitting States had too many forms to complete, or that the bureaucracy and the Committee’s demands were excessive. Difficulties could also be attributed to the fact that those requiring support and financial resources did not have the means to fulfil all the obligations imposed, resulting in them abandoning requests for funding. Additionally, people may prefer to find alternative sources of financing, or Member States were using their own national resources to support these activities. The delegation reiterated the need for reflection, adding that too many barriers were preventing Member States from presenting files and requests for support.
6. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** appreciated the Consultative Body’s hard work, especially the Secretariat-led process of feedback, which improved the quality of the nomination files and was found to be an indispensable mechanism addressing the difficulties faced by submitting States with limited resources. It commended the Secretariat for this crucial work. It also drew the Committee's attention to the low level of approval of requests for International Assistance. In 2011, four out of the four requests submitted were not approved. In 2012, eight out of ten were not approved. In 2013, the sole request submitted was not approved, and in 2014, both requests were not approved. This showed that the very few annual requests for International Assistance were rarely successful. The delegation understood that all the necessary information had to be submitted in order to meet the strict criteria governing contractual arrangements between UNESCO and the beneficiary States, as reflected in paragraph 3 of the report. However, this low approval rate raised the question as to why the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund was not actively utilized. Was it simply owing to a lack of understanding and a limited capacity among the requesting members, or were there other underlying and systematic difficulties that hindered the Fund’s active utilization? The delegation invited the Consultative Body and the Secretariat to respond to this issue. Nevertheless, it welcomed the technical assistance afforded to a number of countries to support their planning and to assist in their requests, as reported in paragraph 10 of the report. It was also noted that the Secretariat had spoken about the high level of cooperation with UNESCO Field Offices and on aligning category 2 centres to its objectives. However, the delegation was still under the impression that the Secretariat could further tap into theses resources to bring additional value to the process in the near future in a continually aligning approach. It believed that the Secretariat would soon have the potential resources at hand, and the delegation encouraged it to envisage every possible avenue to realize its objectives, adding that it would continue to support the Secretariat’s efforts in this regard.
7. The delegation of **Congo** wished to reiterate thanks to the Consultative Body for a job well done. It found particularly pertinent Brazil’s remark on the very low number of requests for funding, adding that the Secretariat – as suggested by the Republic of Korea – should make contact with the field offices and the national commissions. In this way, they could offer assistance, while renewing their availability so that States had the opportunity to apply for funding.
8. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers, but with no requests for the floor, he invited the Rapporteur to answer the questions.
9. The **Rapporteur** thanked the Committee Members for their questions, adding that she shared its concern regarding the under utilization of the Fund. This point was emphasised in the report in that the Secretariat – in the case of international assistance compared to the other mechanisms – was at the disposal of States Parties to help them fulfil all the technical requirements in their request so as to take into consideration the proposed objectives, activities, budgeting and timetable. Moreover, it had also been discussed that there was an improved Excel form for the budget outline, which would help States Parties in the budgeting part of their request to correctly link the budget with the other main components, which was therefore very useful. However, technical problems arising from the use of different computer systems was cited as a possible complication.
10. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** commended the Chairperson for his wise chairmanship, and for the quality of the work so far, adding that excellent results would likely be achieved. The delegation spoke of its intervention expressed in the past on the Representative List and the requests for international assistance. It reiterated that in spite of the efforts deployed by the Committee over the last sessions to overcome these difficulties, it had to come to the realization that the procedural mechanism for international assistance requests was more akin to an exam for Member States to demonstrate how knowledgeable their experts were in putting together a nomination file. It also seemed that files were systematically being rejected. It was aware of the difficulties encountered by the Consultative Body, and that it did not wish to reject the requests, but it also felt that the Body had to always show the very specific way in which it treated the nominations whose outcome was invariably rejection, which obviously did not help the requesting States. The delegation felt that the interventions, especially by the Republic of Korea and Brazil, had expressed most of the Committee’s concerns, and that it had to simplify the process in order to help countries requiring this assistance. It asked the Committee to keep in mind the essential goal, which was to help Member States formulate their requests as best it could. Of course, this did not imply that the Committee should help the States cheat during an exam, but that they should be given the means to do their work and thus the Committee had to find a solution.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the United Arab Emirates for its interesting comments, inviting the Secretary to respond.
12. The **Secretary** expressed that she believed that the Committee was debating a central point in the implementation of the Convention in the very idea of international assistance. She understood the underlying impression that requests received were often rejected given that the two requests under evaluation in the present cycle both received negative recommendations. However, it was recalled that the Chairperson had announced only the day before that during the course of the year the Bureau had approved requests for international assistance under US$25,000. Moreover, thirty requests had been approved since the operation of the Convention began in 2009. The Fund had therefore benefited many States. In addition, the Bureau had approved emergency assistance to Mali for the amount of US$300,000. The Secretary remarked that this situation had already been mentioned in the Secretariat’s report. Indeed, it was not the first year that this concern had been raised. Hence, the Committee’s position in Baku that enabled the Secretariat to provide more technical support for international assistance requests, whether for more or less than US$25,000. She recalled that four requests were currently in progress, and three requests were in the phase of preparation. The Secretary cited the case of Côte d’Ivoire that was first State to benefit from this technical assistance and had already submitted its request. The Secretary therefore believed that there was now a process in place that recognized the problem. The Secretariat also provided longer term support in its capacity-building programme, which integrated international assistance and the notion of the safeguarding plan. The third measure, which was also evoked by the Rapporteur, was the joint nomination form that combined the Urgent Safeguarding List with international assistance, which should help match the requirements of the safeguarding plan with funding, particularly as requests for funding where often unclear, which made it difficult for the Consultative Body to pronounce its position on a recommendation. The Secretary added that the international assistance requests, regardless of the sum requested, were the only mechanisms in which the Secretariat provided its full attention, a sort of ‘luxury treatment’. The Secretary explained that for other nominations that appeared to lack ‘technical information’, the Secretariat would provide some assistance, but for international assistance requests, the Secretariat provided a highly personalized and meticulous review of the entire nomination, often running into five pages of suggestions for improvement. In this way, capacity-building occurred not only during specific workshops but also every time a request was received. In fact, this directly responded to a recommendation of the IOS evaluation that suggested using international assistance as a mechanism for capacity-building. Thus, there were a number of actions underway to improve the situation.
13. Responding to the remarks by Brazil, and the Republic of Korea and Congo in particular, the **Secretary** explained that international assistance requests tapped into the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund that was subject to a contractual arrangement between UNESCO and the State Party upon approval to cover a number of actions corresponding to their request. The contract is subject to the Financial Regulations of UNESCO, and thus the same terms of use were applied as per Regular Programme funds. The Secretary conceded that this was bureaucratic, but only a revision to the Financial Regulations of the Organization would alleviate the situation. Indeed, it was an implementation requirement in the way UNESCO administered its funds, which applied to everyone and there were no exceptions. This was the reason that the sole solution was to provide support to the requesting States. Responding to the question by the Republic of Korea as to why there were so few requests, the Secretary was convinced that this was not due to the complicated nature of the request, given the support provide by the Secretariat, which could likely result in a positive recommendation. But that the mechanism of the international assistance request over US$25,000 fell within the overall ceiling of nominations, which meant that countries had to select one nomination among all four mechanisms of the Convention. The nominations in the current cycle were indicative of the choices being made, even by States Parties requiring financial assistance. It was noted that the IOS evaluation had recommended that the Committee grant priority to international assistance requests, i.e. to prioritize international assistance requests in the order of priorities indicated in the Operational Directives, including over States Parties that had no inscriptions. However, the Committee and the General Assembly had decided that it was up to each State to select its own priority. Hence, the actual nominations reflected the reality in the choices made by States Parties. Another suggestion invoked was to remove international assistance from the ceiling, but unfortunately this was not a tenable solution, as the Secretariat could simply not manage 70 nominations a year that would include 20 requests for international assistance receiving ‘luxury treatment’ plus 50 nominations. The Secretary conceded that this was a recurrent problem and that a solution would eventually have to be found. With regard to the field offices, category 2 centres, and other UNESCO partners, the Secretary explained that although they were trying to assist, they did not necessarily possess the know-how. For example, a credible safeguarding plan or a request for international assistance required a vision of intangible cultural heritage and the adhesion of communities in the process, among other things, knowledge that was not necessarily acquired, including among all UNESCO’s colleagues. The Secretary further explained that the Secretariat was doing its utmost to encourage this mechanism and push the limits, but that time was needed for the concepts to be well understood and, increasingly, international assistance would fulfil its expectations, which was obviously essential to the idea of international solidarity.
14. The delegation of **Jamaica** commended the Secretariat on its work and continued support, adding that it had benefited from guidance from the UNESCO Office for the Caribbean, the Jamaican National Commission for UNESCO, as well as from interregional collaboration from partners such as Trinidad and Tobago and Belize with whom it had been involved in regional capacity-building workshops funded through the kind assistance of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust. It was thus grateful for their continued assistance as it further strengthened local and regional capacities to identify and safeguard intangible cultural heritage elements. In the context of the debate, and the comments raised by Brazil, the Republic of Korea, and the Secretary, and from its own experience in its first submission and approval of Marron heritage of the Moore Town in 2008, it understood the sense of being overwhelmed by the processes. Even now, when it had its own collaborative regional workshops, it still found that in discussions with its own local indigenous groups that there was a paucity of information and understanding of how best to interpret and apply for assistance to safeguard elements. The delegation suggested that maybe the Committee should target indigenous populations and create initiatives and workshops so that the communities themselves could be empowered to strengthen their own capacities by becoming part of this process and thus helping to apply for additional assistance. In this regard, it asked for the continued support of its partners to help make this a reality, and so that creating submissions and requesting additional assistance becomes a little less tedious.
15. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** concurred that the application files were a little overwhelming and complicated for States Parties, and that technical assistance was needed from the Secretariat to get things done in the right way, which was the correct forward. However, in reality this was not solely a problem with international assistance but also the Urgent Safeguarding List, which also received very few nominations. The delegation felt that this was rather astonishing given that during the early period of negotiation, States Parties were told that they needed to adopt and implement the Convention urgently because in every minute in the world intangible cultural heritage was dying. However, once the Convention was implemented and the List was established, intangible cultural heritage ceased to die with few nominations for the Urgent Safeguarding List. Meanwhile, files for the Representative List, which were equally complicated and tedious, proved more popular as States Parties seemed more interested in putting their energy and effort into these files rather than on seeking assistance for safeguarding and capacity-building on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The delegation therefore believed that the whole process was to some extent the Committee’s fault, and that it was its responsibility to know its real priorities.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for her report, proposing to retain comments for discussion later under item 9.b. The Committee was now ready to begin examination of the three proposals based on the methodology as previously explained, and it its responsibility to select the *best* proposals that met the criteria described in Section I.3 of the [Operational Directives,](http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002305/230504e.pdf) based on the recommendations submitted by the Consultative Body. The criteria P.1–P.9 were presented and projected onto the screen. Submitting State Parties would be given a customary two minutes to present remarks, if desired, once the Committee had made its decision on its proposal. The Chairperson invited the Chairperson of the Consultative Body to present the first proposal.
17. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the first proposal on **Safeguarding the carillon culture: preservation, transmission, exchange and awareness-raising** [draft decision 9.COM 9.b.1] submitted by **Belgium**. The art of making music with bells (carillon) is traditionally performed during market and festive days. The programme aims to safeguard carillon culture and preserve its historic components, including the repertoire and instruments, and to ensure the continuity and sustainable development of carillon music. Revitalization efforts include competitions to encourage new arrangements, compositions and genres of music. The programme combines respect for tradition with a willingness to innovate, constantly seeking new ways to safeguard carillon culture in contemporary society. The Body considered that, on the whole, the file provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the preservation of carillon music is at the heart of the programme by focusing on training young musicians, expanding the repertoire, upgrading instruments, as well as creating new performing venues and promoting the practices (P.1). A lengthy debate took place with regard to whether the proposal reflected the principles and objectives of the Convention (P.3), since some members hesitated whether the proposal overemphasized the promotion worldwide of a single element. In the end, the Body was satisfied that the project was about sharing the methodologies and know-how related to the safeguarding of this type of music-making, even though the Body regretted that greater emphasis had not been placed on that aspect. In this regard, the Body wished to emphasize the importance of taking into account the specificity and objectives of the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices when preparing proposals, and a provision was included in the draft decision to this effect. The Body also took note that the programme is implemented with the participation of relevant performers and organizations (P.5) that provided their free, prior and informed consent to the implementation of the programme and to the submission of the proposal. It was also clear from the file that the communities were very willing to disseminate carillon music worldwide (P.7). The Body was also satisfied with the evidence offered to demonstrate the effectiveness of the programme in the development of carillon culture in Belgium and elsewhere, with diversified performance, a large number of interested parties, and an increase in activities and learning opportunities (P.4). The Body was also satisfied that the results of the programme were susceptible to assessment through mechanisms such as the regular submission of reports to the World Carillon Federation (P.8). The information provided demonstrated the programme’s coordinated activities among the different countries through the framework of the World Carillon Federation and in collaboration with international institutions (P.2).
18. Concluding, the **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** reported that the Body was convinced that the proposed activities of transmission, documentation and promotion, as well as balancing respect for tradition and a willingness to innovate, could serve as an international safeguarding model (P.6), including in developing countries (P.9). However, in the draft decision, the Body drew attention to the need to adapt the programme’s experience to other heritage in other contexts. In light of these reasons, the Body recommended to select ‘Safeguarding the carillon culture: preservation, transmission, exchange and awareness-raising’ as a programme, project or activity best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention.
19. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted the Decision 9.COM 9.b.1 to select Safeguarding the carillon culture: preservation, transmission, exchange and awareness-raising** **for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.**
20. Representative of the delegation of **Belgium**, coordinator of the file, and carillon player at the University of Leuven, Mr Luc Rombouts, on behalf of the community of Belgian carilloners and carillion enthusiasts in Belgium, thanked the Committee and UNESCO for this great recognition. Mr Rombouts added that this appreciation would encourage the community to continue its efforts in safeguarding the practice of making public music on tower bells, and would inspire it to share experiences with other heritage communities all over the world whether in the domain of music or in other heritage domains. Mr Rombouts spoke of how he would like to play a serenade on bells for the delegates, but that was not practical (given their size) and, moreover, the core value of bell music lies in its public and social character, so it would be best appreciated in the open air. He invited the delegates to visit Belgium to experience the beauty of this music and to feel the connection it builds among people and local communities, even today.
21. With the withdrawal by Hungary, **the Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the next proposal on **Creation of a cultural space for safeguarding, development and education in intangible cultural heritage at Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park** [draft decision 9.COM 9.b.3] submitted by **Indonesia**. Established to address the threat to intangible cultural heritage posed by widespread migration to urban areas, the Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park comprises a lake with miniature islands surrounded by provincial pavilions, museums and recreational units. The pavilions house ethnographic objects, stage performances and training in performing arts, and hold regular public performances of dance, puppetry, drama and music. They also operate training workshops for children in performing arts and handicrafts. On the basis of the information provided by Indonesia, the Consultative Body found that the proposal did not meet most of the selection criteria. The main problem emanated from the fact that the park appeared to result in the folklorization or museumification of intangible cultural heritage and that its activities seem to be divorced from the functions and meaning of the heritage in question that are important for the practitioners. First of all, the programme is oriented mainly to tourist and visitors rather than towards strengthening transmission within communities. The Body was unanimous in thinking that intangible cultural heritage is used here as recreation and entertainment for others, at the expense of meaning to its own practitioners and communities (P.1). The Body acknowledged the programme’s goal of promoting mutual respect and understanding among various communities in Indonesia, which was praiseworthy, particularly given the diversity for which the country is known. The Body, however, thought that the project decontextualized the very practices it presented (P.3). The Chairperson made clear that the problem was not that performances were removed from their original geographical locations, but that the communities were not given the central role in the programme and, in particular, do not seem to control the definition and performance of their heritage in the park (P.5). While it was clear that Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park contributed to raising awareness of cultural diversity by attracting visitors and issuing publications, the Body was left unconvinced that the proposal showed effectiveness in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. If raising awareness was potentially a measure for safeguarding, it was missing a demonstration of how it contributed to the viability of heritage within the communities concerned (P.4) due to the issues of decontextualizing the practices from the communities’ context.
22. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** reminded the Committee that the Operational Directives in paragraph 102 warned against decontexualization of intangible cultural heritage in relation to awareness-raising activities, and this proposal seemed to present a clear case in point. The issue of evaluation also attracted the attention of the Body. It found that the reported external and internal assessments concentrated on visitor satisfaction, without clearly demonstrating the impacts of the Park’s transmission and educational activities on the communities of practitioners or on the viability of elements (P.8); this was considered another example where the proposal was not in line with the spirit of the Register. The Body also wished to have had access to the original sources related to the evaluation, rather than simply being told that experts, who were unidentified in the proposal, had conducted evaluations. The Body understood that the present proposal form did not explicitly invite attachments of this kind, but that this might be a point for future discussion. The Body deemed that the park’s activities were not characterized by the coordination of sub-regional, regional or international safeguarding efforts, given that they are primarily at the national level (P.2). Since the programme also removed the practices from the local context, the Body also considered that it was not well suited to serve as a regional or international model (P.6). Finally, the Body acknowledged that the programme could be applied in developing countries, but noted that the creation of a similar park would require significant financial investment. In light of these reasons, the Body recommended not to select ‘Creation of a cultural space for safeguarding, development and education in intangible cultural heritage at Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park’ as a programme, project or activity best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention.
23. Having studied Indonesia’s proposal, the delegation of the **Republic of Korea** believed that Beautiful Indonesia might work as an effective tool to promote and enhance intangible cultural heritage in Indonesia. To better understand this proposal, the delegation drew the Committee's attention to Indonesia’s ethnic and geographical context in which numerous ethnic groups with rich intangible cultural heritage reside on scattered islands that were distant from each other. In this respect, Beautiful Indonesia could be a good first step towards safeguarding Indonesia’s myriad intangible cultural heritage by showcasing the intangible cultural heritage in one place and thereby enhancing visibility, nationally or internationally. However, Beautiful Indonesia might run the risk of decontextualising heritage by removing practices from its social functions and cultural meanings in the communities of practitioners, as pointed out by paragraph 4.a of the draft decision. It was also somewhat sympathetic with the Consultative Body’s view that the proposal did not convincingly demonstrate the positive impact of transmission and education activities on the communities or the practitioners, as reflected in paragraph 4.c. Nevertheless, the delegation suggested that under the Committee’s rules, if allowed, the Indonesian delegation be invited to further explain Indonesia's scheme in the operation of Beautiful Indonesia for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, including its viability as regards enhancing transmission and education among the communities.
24. The delegation of **Greece** congratulated the Chairperson for his well performed duties, and also the Secretariat for its thorough work, and the assistance it provided to the Consultative Body. The delegation spoke of its attraction to the proposal by Indonesia, which appeared as an attempt – over the last 30 years – to come to terms with internal immigration and mass migration to the capital that had uprooted people from their traditional environments. It was quite sure that Beautiful Indonesia was not initially conceived as a programme that considered all the sensitivities and crucial concepts of the Convention. However it sought the view of the delegation of Indonesia on the programme as it stood today, now that the Convention had become a very useful instrument to deal with intangible cultural heritage. It was clear that the Beautiful Indonesia programme was conceived at a time when the concepts of the Convention were not fully acknowledged, but the delegation wished to know whether Indonesia had made any modifications to the initial programme, and particularly whether they encompassed the communities’ participation in this programme. With regard to paragraph 7 of the draft decision, the delegation had a question for the Consultative Body regarding its proposal that the Committee recall the necessity to avoid folklorization or the museumification of the intangible cultural heritage. The delegation felt that the use of ‘folklorization’ and ‘museumification’ of intangible cultural heritage was inappropriate as they had negative connotations. Instead, it proposed decontextualization or the ‘freezing’ of intangible cultural heritage, particularly as institutions such as museums were crucial in the Committee’s work, as were folklore studies.
25. The delegation of **Brazil** concurred that the Indonesian file raised a complex question. It understood the comments made by the Consultative Body in that the Committee had to be very careful in the selection of best safeguarding practices so that it respected the spirit of the Convention. However, in certain parts of the draft decision, it was clear that the Consultative Body had a certain malaise with the proposal by Indonesia, as if it considered that the proposal did not belong within the framework of the Convention. The delegation was very aware of the problems faced by Indonesia in order to preserve its own intangible cultural heritage. It is a country composed of hundreds of islands, and different cultures and languages with different cultural traditions and religions. These people were now leaving the countryside en masse to migrate to large urban centres and this park was at least an attempt by the Indonesian authorities to keep these communities connected to their own traditions. The delegation wished to hear Indonesia’s explanations on some of the comments made by the Consultative Body, especially on the participation of communities and bearers, and how they are involved in this cultural space and manifest their consent. The delegation felt that it was important that the country be allowed to speak to try to demonstrate how this initiative was in line with the spirit of this Convention.
26. The delegation of **Bulgaria** remarked that some of its observations had already been evoked, but its general assessment was that this nomination had a lot of obvious merits. Nevertheless, the Consultative Body had raised some doubts, namely on two points. Firstly, it found no convincing evidence that the park had implemented safeguarding measures, as defined by the Convention, and secondly, it raised the issue of balance between tourism and transmission activities within the park. The delegation fully relied on the expertise of the Consultative Body, but felt that it would be useful to hear from Indonesia, specifically on these two issues.
27. Taking note of the draft decision, the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** hoped that the floor be given to the State Party to explain how the communities defined and performed their heritage, and how these activities were conducted in the context of the park’s communities. The State Party could also explain how this project reflected the principles of the Convention with regard to the nomination file, i.e. what was the relationship between the way of life of the communities and the social function of the park? And, how do the practitioners and the communities concerned play the main role in the life of the park?
28. The delegation of **Hungary** emphasized its support to see the proposal inscribed on the Register. It addressed a question to the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body and or the legal adviser as to whether or not the submitting State is allowed to provide new information that was not provided in the relevant documents at the time of the submission of the nomination file. The delegation stated that the general principle of non-retroactivty did not apply, raising also the question of Greece concerning ‘museumification’ and reiterating that the Convention supports the establishment of documentation institutions for the intangible cultural heritage as stated in Article 13.d. As such, it requested the deletion of paragraph 7 of the draft decision and asked for Indonesia to explain how the park’s activities involves safeguarding as defined in the Convention, and furthermore, how the activities contribute to the strengthening and transmission of intangible cultural heritage within communities, besides attracting a large number of visitors.
29. The delegation of **Egypt** believed that the project presented by Indonesia deserved the Committee’s respect and attention. Since many of the Members had already highlighted the many questions or reservations presented in the report, the delegation asked that Indonesia clarify the points raised on the effect of tourism, the role of the local communities, and how the Miniature Park facilitated the transmission of intangible cultural heritage. It believed that the park also led to a coming together of ethnic communities and cultural groups that represented the great diversity of cultures, languages and ethnic groups in Indonesia. The delegation thus wished to hear from Indonesia on the concerns raised. At the same time, it expressed its respect for the Consultative Body and its observations.
30. The delegation of **India** remarked that most of the Members had asked the questions it had in mind. Nevertheless, the project presented by Indonesia was appealing. With its large size and with many communities and different cultures, the delegation felt that the park was a very unique concept in which the country had tried to bring together the different cultures in one place to showcase their performances, art and culture. It felt that one of the Consultative Body’s main concerns lay in the fact that the park appeared to serve as an entertainment or amusement park for tourism purposes. It therefore wished to hear more from Indonesia on how the communities controlled the definition and performance of the heritage, and how these activities remained within their community context in the cultural space of the park.
31. The delegation of **Congo** concurred with the observations and arguments developed by the Members of the Committee, but wished for Indonesia to provide clarification on the reservations raised by the Consultative Body, which it respected, especially as the project itself was very convincing.
32. The delegation of **Uganda** asked that Indonesia respond to the criteria on social and cultural functions, which may not have been met, adding that it would have been good if Indonesia could clarify – under section 3 of its file – the transfer of information to the younger generation, and to indicate to whom ‘young generation' made reference, i.e. whether they were from the communities or from outside the communities where these cultural practices takes place. The delegation also noticed in the same section that ‘community members’ managed the training centres, and it therefore sought clarity as to who they were, adding that maybe they came from outside the communities where further cultural activities were taking place.
33. Having carefully studied the observations of the Consultative Body, the delegation of **Turkey** understood the reservations and criticisms, but it also appreciated the efforts and the commitment undertaken by the submitting State, particularly in the safeguarding of cultural diversity that was exposed to the destructive effects of uncontrolled urbanisation. It associated with the remarks of the previous speakers, and it also sympathised with the remarks made by Greece regarding the language employed, as it believed that the Consultative Body should rather use the language of the Convention when defining the issues. The delegation remarked that urbanisation was a reality, a fact of life in our age, which was having an effect all over the world. It therefore realised that the newly emerging megapoles were turning into modern villages, and in terms of migration, the vanishing cultures actually move into these new infrastructurally developed structures. It thus sympathised with several other speakers in that although the project might appear artificial, these State-controlled initiatives to safeguard the diversity of intangible cultural heritage deserved to be looked into. The delegation suggested bringing the issue to the next General Assembly in 2016 so as to find intermediate ways to accommodate these concerns, particularly with regards to nominations to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and the Urgent Safeguarding List. In any case, it wished to hear from Indonesia on the subject.
34. The delegation of **Uruguay** appreciated the efforts and work carried out by the Consultative Body and Indonesia. As with the previous speakers, it also hoped that Indonesia be given an opportunity to explain the main reservations formulated by the Consultative Body, whose opinion it respected.
35. The delegation of **Algeria** endorsed the statements made by the previous delegations, adding that it welcomed the efforts by Indonesia to present this project, which it wished to see inscribed on the Register. It also wished to thank the Consultative Body for its efforts, and sought an explanation from Indonesia on how the project was funded.
36. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** expressed its sympathy for this file, believing it to be a very good option for developing a new way to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. It also associated with the opinions of the previous speakers to give Indonesia the opportunity to answer the questions, adding that it had two additional questions. First, the delegation remarked that the international activities looked mostly to be conducted at a national level, therefore it wanted to know how they could be transferred to regional and international levels. The second question was addressed to the Chairperson of the Consultative Body. It was mentioned several times that the local communities were not involved in the park’s activity, whereas it was of the opinion that the communities were involved. Thus, it sought clarity on the criteria that enabled it to determine whether or not they were involved.
37. The delegation of **Tunisia** was convinced of the importance of this project, but it did not feel that enough data had been provided to understand how the park was managed and financed. In addition, it had questions about the social and educational function of the park, adding that it felt that there was insufficient information to determine these functions. It thus wished to ask Indonesia to provide clarification on these issues.
38. The **Chairperson** invited the Chairperson of the Consultative Body to respond.
39. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** remarked that it was not difficult to be impressed by this park, but he reminded the Committee that, as a Consultative Body, it relied on information found within the file and did not – in any way – evaluate the project itself. He also reminded the Committee that this was a Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, and not just *good* practices. With regard to the question posed by Greece on the use of the terms ‘folklorization’ and ‘museumifaction’, the Chairperson believed that folklorization was a term used in the texts of the Convention, possibly in the Operational Directives, though this would have to be verified. He agreed with Greece that it was not a good thing to use labels because it could be seen as denigrating institutions of folklore and museums. Still, the Chairperson understood ‘folklorization’ as being a common term in the practice among experts that characterised the bringing together of material for publishing purposes. Museumifiction could refer to a stable form of the museum’s responsibility, i.e. the museum governs the form and not the people who are the practitioners of the forms. In this way, the responsibility is given over to the museum, which is tasked with documenting, and somehow also working with frozen forms, as this was the old practice of museum work. The Chairperson therefore agreed that even though these terms could be a problem, it was not difficult to understand the intended way that they had been employed in the evaluation. The Chairperson did not think that it represented something totally new, adding that it was a characterisation of the phenomenon and not a criterion used in the work. It was noted that many of the comments were unsurprisingly related to community involvement, which was problematic in that the Consultative Body did not find sufficient evidence in the file to determine that the practitioners throughout the many islands of Indonesia had any clear control, or any possibility to influence, how the material was used in the park. This did not mean that it did not happen, but that the Consultative Body could not determine either way, as there was no clear evidence that the safeguarding in the park was reflected back to the communities. The Chairperson was happy to return later to other points that he may have missed.
40. The **Chairperson** invited Indonesia to respond to the questions and also to explain the information contained in the file. The Chairperson wished to remind the Committee that it was only considering the nomination and not the park itself nor the reality on the ground.
41. The delegation of **Indonesia** thanked the Committee for the many questions, proposing to go through them in the order of the paragraphs in the draft decision. The first sentence of paragraph 4.a of the decision asked about the safeguarding activities in this park, which the delegation explained could be found in section 1.b of the file. Some of the safeguarding activities included identification, documentation and inventory, and there was a centre for culture that conducted an inventory of traditional music, dance, and so on for the past 40 years, which was open to the public. There were 27 training workshops in traditional dance, traditional music and handicrafts of all the ethnic communities from the 33 provinces in Indonesia, which has also been conducted over 40 years with thousands of students at any one time. In addition, there was a lot of promotion and awareness raising activities in the park, so there were nine types of safeguarding in the park, as defined in Article 2 of the Convention. The delegation emphatically rejected the claim that the park was simply for tourists or that it was like Disneyland, explaining that community members from all over Indonesia conducted the activities within the park. It was noted that it was mostly students from all levels of the education system, from kindergarten to university students, who were participating in the training sessions, which were taught by community members. The park was therefore a culture park, not a tourist park. The delegation remarked that recreation and entertainment was part of performing arts, which was one of the domains of intangible cultural heritage, adding that these communities were very much involved in the definition and control of their heritage, as explained in section 3 of the nomination file.
42. The delegation of **Indonesia** referred to a remark that the park did not represent the principles of the Convention, remarking that there were five principles of the Convention: safeguarding, guaranteeing respect, raising public awareness, transmission, and facilitating international cooperation. The delegation had already explained ‘safeguarding’, while ‘guaranteeing respect’ was explained in the file. It further explained that people came from the 500 districts of Indonesia to perform or to teach, and they were facilitated to come to the park. In this way, it respected and encouraged them to safeguard and respect the tradition of intangible cultural heritage for when they returned home. Regarding public awareness, this was an on-going exercise for 39 years, as previously explained. With regard to facilitating international cooperation, the delegation conceded that it was mostly a national project, but that there were a few examples given in the file that explained cooperation at the regional, subregional and international level. With regard to decontextualization, the delegation maintained that the park did not decontextualise intangible cultural heritage, rather it recreated the context in a favourable way where intangible cultural heritage was practised and transmitted among communities in an urban context. It agreed with the comment by Turkey that about half the world's population was now living in cities, and thus the traditional context was shrinking and, in many cases, no longer existed. Thus, it was important to have the cultural spaces to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in cities. The delegation reiterated that it was the practitioners and the communities who had the primary role in these activities, and that their social functions and cultural meanings remained intact, which was explained in section 5.a, 5.c and 6 in paragraph 3 of the file. The delegation further explained that all the communities were consulted and were very much involved in the project when it was initially conceived, which was also explained in the file. As regards their involvement, the delegation remarked that the nomination consisted of the words of the communities that were transcribed, and that they had given their free, prior and informed consent, demonstrating their willingness to cooperate. Regarding viability, it was explained that the communities came from the provinces and performed, taught and returned home, which contributed to viability. It was also noted that this was perhaps the first file submitted to have an independent external evaluation, which was requested by the Committee in Baku, conducted by experts from the Republic of Korea, the results of which were provided in the nomination file.
43. The delegation of **Indonesia** appreciated the comment by the Consultative Body that the programme could be applied to developing countries. Regarding the scale, it was stated in the file that it could be created on a scale suitable to the local context, and that it did not have to be on the same scale as Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature. Regarding the introduction of terms such as ‘folklorization’ and ‘museumification’, the delegation remarked that these terms were not found in the Convention, the Operational Directives or the nomination form, adding that it could only complete the nomination form and could not comply with other things introduced later on. Regarding the question of funding, the delegation explained that it was based on a multi-stakeholder principle. Most of the 5,000 people working there were community members working on a volunteer basis. The provincial governments also helped fund the provincial exhibits, with government ministries operating some of the museums. It was noted that the ministries, other than culture, were involved with the park, as was requested by the Committee in Baku. On behalf of more than 5,000 community members, who were working and conducting their activities for nearly 40 years, the delegation requested the Committee to reconsider its decision.
44. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–3 were duly adopted.
45. The delegation of **Hungary** submitted an amendment, which had been sent by email.
46. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** also wished to propose an amendment in paragraph 4.d.
47. The **Chairperson** proposed treating the amendments starting with 4.a, then 4.b, and so on.
48. Raising a point of order, the delegation of **Brazil** remarked that from the interventions it appeared that many of the Member States were willing to reverse the recommendation by the Consultative Body and select the proposal for the Register of Best Practices. In which case, it would be wiser to first make a decision on paragraph 5, i.e. to decide whether the Committee decides or not to select the proposal, so that paragraph 4 could be adapted or amended accordingly. Otherwise, the Committee would be adapting the paragraphs without knowing the exact outcome.
49. The **Chairperson** remarked that the proposal was reasonable, but wished to first consult with the other Members of the Committee.
50. The delegation of **Belgium** believed that the Committee had to carefully examine all the criteria first before reaching a decision, and thus preferred to discuss paragraph 4 before paragraph 5.
51. The delegation of **Congo** believed that the key was whether to select the proposal or not for registration, and therefore the proposal by Brazil made sense.
52. The delegation of **Namibia** seconded the proposal by Brazil, supported by Congo.
53. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire**supported the proposal by Brazil.
54. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan**also supported the proposal by Uganda and Brazil to select.
55. The delegation of **Nigeria** also endorsed Brazil’s proposal.
56. The delegation of **Latvia** supported the comments by Belgium, adding that the order was first to understand whether the criteria were met before taking a final decision. It took this opportunity to contribute to the general debate by very much welcoming the proposal by Indonesia to the Register of the Best Safeguarding Practices in order to exchange the approaches applied to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. However, it also referred to the register as being one of *best* safeguarding practices, which ought to have a truly convincing consensus reflecting the spirit of the Convention, while representing an exemplary safeguarding practice. The delegation also fully respected the competences and expertise of the Consultative Body, elected by the Committee, and its recommendation. Moreover, it was noted that, during the debate within the Committee, there were numerous issues raised in which additional explanations were required from the submitting State. As the Committee had already been reminded (by its Chairperson and the Chairperson of the Consultative Body), evaluation was based solely on the information found within the file, and as the file – if approved – would be made broadly visible as a best practice without the additional explanations provided by Indonesia, the delegation supported maintaining the overall evaluation as proposed by the Consultative Body.
57. With no additional comments, the **Chairperson** sensed a favourable trend to accept the proposal by Brazil.
58. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that this would be a huge precedent, as this had never happened before. It recalled earlier remarks in which it was said that consistency and credibility go hand-in-hand, and therefore sought to proceed logically as always, which was to first examine the criteria before coming to a decision.
59. The **Chairperson** noted that there were two approaches, adding that there was also logic in the argument presented by Belgium. He suggested that if the Committee agreed, it could proceed with the traditional methodology, but that it would support a consensus.
60. The delegation of **Congo** did not see how it was possible to correct the criteria only to arrive at a negative decision. First, the Committee had to state whether it was for or against the selection of the project. If the Committee chose to select the project, then the criteria would be corrected accordingly.
61. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested a compromise in which the Committee continued to debate the criteria, and thus arrive at a position for or against selection without yet dealing with the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. In this way, both positions would be dealt with more thoroughly, which would eventually determine whether the Committee was leaning towards selection or not.
62. The **Chairperson** felt that proposal might be accepted, but would first listen to Brazil.
63. In an effort to allay the concerns on first analysing paragraph 5, the delegation of **Brazil** explained that its suggestion was made to clarify the debate, because in effect the Committee was discussing paragraph 4.a without knowing where it would lead, i.e. whether it would accept the amendment or adapt the text. Thus, it was uncomfortable with the lack of clarity. It was clear that Members in favour of accepting the proposal by Indonesia would wish to edit paragraph 4, while Members who were not in favour would not wish to accept the amendment. Meanwhile, Members that were neutral were placed in an awkward position because the outcome was unclear. Thus, there was need for clarity, at least to gauge the tendency among the Members, i.e. whether the Committee was going to select the proposal, and if not, was it going to revert to the recommendation by the Consultative Body, in which case there would be no point in editing the draft decision should the decision in paragraph 5 remain the same. This would only waste many hours because the Committee would be discussing a text without knowing why it was changing it or not, as there was no clarity in the final decision.
64. The delegation of **Bulgaria** found that the two proposals by Brazil and Belgium were justified in different ways, both with their merits. However, it did not wish to set a precedent, inviting the Secretariat to clarify the position on the issue, i.e. whether it was a precedent and was acceptable in terms of the functioning of the Committee or not.
65. The delegation of the **Belgium** agreed that it did not want to waste time, but felt that there was still room for debate, adding that clarity in the answers should be contained within the submitted file. The exercise of checking every criterion was in order to find the answer in the submitted files in the right place. The Committee should take the time to evaluate the file criterion-by-criterion to find the answers in the file, which would enable it to come to a decision. It was thus inappropriate to state a positive or negative opinion before careful examination of the file, for which the Committee had time.
66. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to pronounce a position on the issue.
67. The **Secretary** confirmed that the Committee and its bodies had never reached a conclusion before first examining the criteria, as the conclusion resulted from the criteria and not the other way around. The Committee did not therefore decide in advance whether or not to inscribe; each criterion would first be checked and that would lead to the conclusion. In the case of the Lists, the conclusion would be automatic because just one rejected criterion would result in a negative outcome. However, for the Register of Best Practices, not all ten of the criteria had to be met, as they were not necessarily eliminatory. Concluding, the Secretary concurred that the criteria must be evaluated one-by-one, as examined by the Body, and that the opinion on each criterion formed the conclusion, which was how the Committee always worked.
68. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Secretary for the explanations, adding that it was right that the decision would come from the verification of the criteria. However, the Committee had asked many questions precisely to clarify its understanding about the criteria and Members had already made up their minds on whether the criteria were satisfied or not. The delegation simply wished to avoid unnecessary debate on every criterion by suggesting a smoother and easier methodology, especially since Members had already asked questions and read the report, and therefore had decided for or against selection of the project. Nevertheless, should the Committee wish to go through the editing exercise and debate the criteria, the delegation would accept its decision.
69. Having heard the explanation by Brazil, the delegation of **Turkey** intended to join the quorum.
70. The **Chairperson** wished to listen to the different approaches on this issue, asking whether the Committee agreed with the amendment to its procedures as proposed by Brazil. It was noted that nine delegations supported the proposal, which was insufficient to change the procedure. Thus, the Committee would proceed with the evaluation of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. The Chairpersonthen turned to paragraph 4.a and the amendment by Hungary, which read: ‘The programme’s activities involve safeguarding as defined in the Convention in all five domains of intangible cultural heritage. The intangible cultural heritage training workshops in particular contribute to strengthening intangible cultural heritage transmission within communities.’ Noting that there was no support for the amendment, the original paragraph 4.a was adopted. With no amendments paragraphs 4.b and 4.c were duly adopted.
71. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** presented an amendment in paragraph 4.d, which read: ‘The cultural space is primarily on a national level, but is open for international cooperation and could contribute to collaboration on sub-regional, regional or international levels.’
72. The **Chairperson** noted the amendment on the screen, inviting the Committee to express its support for the amendment.
73. The delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the amendment by Kyrgyzstan.
74. The **Chairperson** noted that Egypt, Brazil, Greece, Nigeria, India, Congo and Bulgaria also supported the amendment. However**,** a broad support was not reached and the original paragraph 4.d was adopted. The Chairperson then moved to paragraph 5.
75. Referring to the decision in paragraph 4.d, the delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it was UNESCO practice to accept an amendment whenever it was supported by a sufficient number of Members, unless other Members vocally opposed the amendment. The delegation explained that eight Members had supported the amendment by Kyrgyzstan, with none of the Members opposing the amendment, and yet it had not been accepted. The delegation was fine with the decision, but understood that the Committee did not require 50% plus 1 Members in order to adopt an amendment, because it was not voting for the amendment, only proposing it.
76. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that as has been explained in previous sessions and can be read in the summary records, the practice of this Committee was to remain silent if it agreed with the recommendations of the Consultative Body. It had thus acted accordingly.
77. The delegation of **Congo** remarked that the Committee was not voting, and that nine countries had supported the amendment in paragraph 4.c. Consequently, the Committee did not adopt the original paragraph, even though it was required to take into account the views of those who endorsed the proposal by Kyrgyzstan.
78. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the Members who raised this issue and wished to go through the paragraphs once again, adding that its own amendment had been deleted because of the rule of silence. The procedure was therefore unclear for the Committee, and consequently the decision was unclear as well.
79. The delegation of **Turkey** endorsed the remarks by Congo.
80. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to provide her opinion.
81. The **Secretary** explained that it was up to the Chairperson to sense the general mood of the Committee, adding that Congo was right to say that when a voting process had begun, the voting procedure should be formally announced by the Chairperson with votes counted for and against, as well as abstentions, among those present and voting. However, in this case, it was not a formal vote, as the Committee was looking to find if indeed an amendment, proposed by a Member of the Committee, had garnered sufficient support. As noted by Saint Lucia, it has been the Committee’s practice that – by default – the draft decision presented by the Chairperson of the Consultative Body is accepted. An amendment to this draft decision must have strong support from the Members of the Committee if it is to be accepted. But the notion of broad support was subjective, i.e. it was not a mathematical calculation, and the Chairperson had to determine whether there was broad support or not for a proposed amendment.
82. The **Chairperson** was of the opinion that nine Members of the Committee did not constitute broad support for the amendment. He then turned to paragraphs 5 and 6, and with no comments or objections, they were duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 7.
83. The delegation of **Hungary** proposed to delete this paragraph because it did not see any association between museumification and the park.
84. The delegation of **Brazil** spoke of a recent meeting funded by Brazil that argued for the new roles of museums in the world, which would be presented as a recommendation at the next UNESCO General Conference. As such it was against paragraph 7 that criticised museums, and therefore supported the amendment by Hungary.
85. The delegations of **Belgium** and **Turkey** also supported the deletion of the paragraph.
86. The **Chairperson** invited Members of the Committee to pronounce their support for the proposal.
87. The delegations of **Algeria** and **Egypt** also supported the deletion of the paragraph.
88. The delegation of **Bulgaria** also joined the other Members in supporting the deletion.
89. The **Chairperson** noted the broad support to delete paragraph 7, which was duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.b.3. not to select ‘Creation of a cultural space for safeguarding, development and education in intangible cultural heritage at Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park’ for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.**
90. The delegation **Turkey** remarked that since paragraph 7 was deleted with overwhelming support from the Committee, it also wished to delete the same words from the recommendations of the Consultative Body in the earlier texts.
91. The **Chairperson** replied that the text had already been adopted, but should the Committee agree with the proposal, the Secretariat could act accordingly. As there was general agreement, the paragraph was also deleted. The Chairperson invited Indonesia to speak.
92. The delegation of **Indonesia** expressed deep sadness and disappointment, adding that this was the second time in two years that its nomination file had been rejected, adding that the communities who had supported the file would also feel sad. It found the format of the draft decision to be unfortunate in that it was not specific to the criteria, but rather it was presented in the form of nine prose paragraphs, which mentioned many different aspects, in which the criteria were scattered. The delegation suggested that the draft decision in the future be presented using the separate criteria so that the Committee could very clearly evaluate the criterion in question. As an Asian country, it did not wish to publicly criticize, however, it hoped that the new Evaluation Body in the next cycle would have a more just and fair evaluation process, and deal with the information found in the nomination file rather than introducing other things that cannot possibly be fulfilled by the submitting State because they were not contained in the nomination form. Nevertheless, Beautiful Indonesia in Miniature Park would continue its work. The delegation recalled the comment from the United Arab Emirates, which highlighted the large number of rejections: almost 51 per cent of files over the last four meetings, particularly from the Asia-Pacific region with 60 per cent, 59 per cent from Africa, and 83 per cent from the Middle East. This continual rejection was starting to make it difficult for States to justify governments supporting the activities of the Convention, as it led to disappointments and sadness. The delegation spoke of its deepest respect for the Members of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Consultative Body who had worked hard according to their capacity and the instructions they received.
93. The **Chairperson** thanked Indonesia for its statement, inviting the Secretary to make a few announcements.
94. The **Secretary** announced the meetings of the NGO working groups and the information meetings on the capacity-building programme for Electoral Groups V(a) and (b).
95. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session.

*[Tuesday, 25 November, afternoon session]*

## ITEM 9.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.):

EXAMINATION OF PROPOSALS FOR SELECTION TO THE REGISTER OF BEST SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the examination of agenda items 9.a and 9.b had been completed, but that it still had to adopt draft decision 9.COM 9.b. Before the adoption, the Chairperson introduced a dance performance by Kenya.

*[Isukuti dance presentation by members of
Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya]*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of draft decision 9.COM 9.b as a whole. With no objections or comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 9.b adopted**.

## ITEM 9.c OF THE AGENDA:

EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/9.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-9.c-EN.doc)

[*2 requests*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=747)

**Decision** *9.COM 9.c*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the agenda item 9.c and the examination of requests for International Assistance. The examination of the three mechanisms entrusted to the Consultative Body would thus be completed and the Committee would then consider draft decision 9.COM 9, which covered a number of transversal issues common to the three different mechanisms. The Chairperson noted that there were only two requests for International Assistance to be examined, adding that it was very surprising considering the financial assistance needed for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage around the world. As the Rapporteur had already presented the general issues relating to international assistance, the Chairperson invited the Chairperson of the Consultative Body to introduce the two requests for the Committee’s consideration.
2. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the first request for International Assistance on **Establishing and promoting the inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania** [draft decision 9.COM 9.c.1] submitted by **Albania**. The project aims to establish and promote an inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania. Activities would include the development of a national strategy for inventorying, promoting and disseminating intangible cultural heritage, followed by awareness-raising sessions to educate communities, policy-makers and the public about its importance. The project aims to build the capacities of local and national stakeholders through training sessions and fieldwork. The inventory would be accessible via a dedicated database and website, and published via brochures and an encyclopaedia. The Body was faced with difficulty considering the striking similarity of the two requests submitted for International Assistance to other requests that had previously been approved by the Committee. It discussed at length the need for each request to be aligned with the specific context of the country in order to address its specific needs, particularly considering Article 11 and Article 12 of the Convention in which States Parties shall draw up inventories in a manner geared to their own situations and with the participation of communities. The Body therefore proposed in paragraph 9 of the draft decision that the Committee reinforce the Body’s previous advice that ‘each file should have its own identity and cannot be the mere adaptation by analogy of previously successful files’. During its evaluation, the Body looked at the request in its totality, addressing both its strengths and shortcomings. Among the strengths, the project responded to criterion A.6, insofar as it aimed to establish an inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania and reinforce human and institutional capacity in the area of inventorying: the primary obligations of a State Party to the Convention. It also noted the will and commitment of the State to share 12 per cent of the costs of the proposed activities (A.5). Nevertheless, the Body considered that the request failed to meet a number of key criteria. One of its major weaknesses was the lack of community participation in its preparation and planning (A.1). The information about future community participation in the implementation stage did not inspire confidence: the request stated that the community representatives would be selected by government officials (mayors) to form a Steering Committee, but not the communities themselves. There was also little information on their role in the Steering Committee.
3. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** noted that it was clear that key activities in the development of the national inventory strategy would rely completely on expert consultants. Hence, in paragraph 8 of the draft decision, the Body recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party, if it wished to resubmit its request, to ensure the widest possible participation of concerned communities in the preparation, design and implementation of activities. Subsequently, the Body found a lack of details concerning the planning and organization of project activities, which made it difficult to determine how well-conceived or feasible they were, as required in criterion A.3. The proposed activities appeared top-down and did not correspond to the timetable or budget in areas such as field collection of data, which further questioned their feasibility. For example, the timeline indicated six months for inventory collection, whereas the budget indicated 15 months or 22 months. The Body thus suggested in paragraph 7 that the State attach greater attention to these aspects if it wished to submit a new request. Relating to the lack of details, the Body were unable to ascertain the appropriateness of the amount requested, as required for A.2. The budget also appeared to be top-down and had calculation errors and inconsistencies, and did not correspond well to the proposed activities and timetable. The main impression given was that the process of inventorying itself was the smallest part of the project. The Body also found it worrisome that remuneration was only foreseen for experts and officials, and the file was unclear about whether or how the community representatives conducting the inventory would be compensated. Despite the fact that a central part of the project was to build capacities among local and national stakeholders, the request did not demonstrate the sustainability of the project and its lasting results once the proposed activities had been completed (A.4). It was stated that the project would benefit from several partnerships at the local and national level, but potential actors were not clearly identified. Hence, the Body was unable to assess the real likelihood of future support for the updating of the inventory or other related safeguarding activities. The Body could not therefore recommend the approval of the request for International Assistance on Establishing and promoting the inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania. Paragraphs 7–9 of the draft decision offered suggestions the Committee might wish to bring to the attention of the State if it wishes to re-submit its request.
4. Noting that there were no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, which were duly adopted. The **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.c.1 not to approve International Assistance in the amount of US$158,200 for Establishing and promoting the inventory of intangible cultural heritage in Albania.**
5. The delegation of **Albania** began by thanking the Secretariat for the great support it provided throughout the evaluation process, noting that it had received detailed letters of advice on how to improve the nomination file. Secondly, it thanked the Consultative Body for their evaluation work, adding that it took the comments and feedback very seriously and had created a working group that had already started to work on submitting a new request by the March 2015 deadline. Finally, it reiterated its commitment towards taking all the necessary measures to sustainably safeguard intangible cultural heritage in Albania.
6. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** presented the second request for International Assistance on **Documentation and inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the Republic of the Sudan** [draft decision 9.COM 9.c.2] submitted by **Sudan**. This project aims to carry out a pilot inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of Kordofan and Blue Nile states, thereby contributing to a larger inventory in Sudan. The project would review existing research, develop a national strategy, establish a database and website, purchase equipment for use by five specially trained inventory teams and build stakeholder capacity. It aims to raise awareness among and conduct fieldwork with local communities, classify the data collected, and elaborate and publish lists of each region’s heritage. As a related request was previously submitted for the 2012 cycle and received a negative recommendation by the Committee at that time, we regretted that in spite of substantial improvements in this resubmission, there were still several serious weaknesses affecting key criteria. The Body noted, like the previous request, that the request bore a striking similarity to others previously approved for other States. With regard to inventorying, which should be carried out ‘in a manner geared to its own situation’, as stipulated in the Convention, the Body found it odd that several countries would proceed in such similar ways. Hence paragraph 11 of the draft decision in which the Body invited the Committee to once more echo the need for each request to be based on its own specific country context in order to address that country’s specific needs. It recognized certain strengths in the request, particularly its aim to strengthen the capacities of all stakeholders (governmental institutions, coordination teams and communities). The project included several training activities to build awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage, as well as the skills and methodology necessary to enable them to participate in the documentation and establishment of an inventory, responding well to criterion A.6. Furthermore, it was expected that the pilot inventory would serve as the foundation for future work to establish a national inventory and a cultural map of Sudan. The State Party had demonstrated its commitment and shared the costs of about 11 per cent of the total project budget (A.5).
7. The **Chairperson of the Consultative Body** reported that despite these commendable intentions, the Body noted several limitations with key criteria. The file did not provide detailed information about the tasks in the pilot process that would allow the Body or the Committee to determine what they entailed and thus whether they would be feasible (A.3). The timetable of 15 months did not seem realistic for the activities proposed. With regard to the activities, a reader would not know the outputs generated from them or how they would contribute to safeguarding. As with the previous nomination, the Body also questioned the extent of community participation in the preparation of the requests (A.1). Although community representatives of Kordofan and Blue Nile participated in the elaboration of the request and gave their consent to it, the file did not well demonstrate how they were going to be included in the actual planning and inventorying process. The approach again appeared to be top-down and did not provide the community with an active role, with the local authorities deciding which community representatives would be involved in the process and how. The Body therefore recommended (in paragraph 9) that the Committee remind the State Party of the essential role of the communities and the need to ensure their active participation in all stages of the preparation and implementation of activities, including the inventory process. Owing to the lack of description of the planned tasks, the Body was unable to assess the appropriateness of the requested amount (A.2). The budget had several inconsistencies and in some cases did not correspond to the duration of activities in the timetable. The Body was surprised to see that the actual inventory fieldwork had a relatively low budget compared to the services of experts and the purchase of equipment. In its view, this was not justified considering the aim of the project, hence its recommendation in paragraph 8. The Body did not doubt that a project of this nature could potentially have lasting results (A.4) and serve as the foundation for future inventory work in Sudan. However, the request did not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate the feasibility of its activities and outcomes beyond the date of its completion. There was no strategy to take the project forward and the request did not address future possibilities for funding. As a result, the Body could not therefore recommend the approval of the request for International Assistance on Documentation and inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the Republic of the Sudan. The draft decision invited the Committee to draw the attention of the State Party to the concerns mentioned in paragraphs 8 to 11 of the draft decision if it wishes to re-submit its request.
8. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Consultative Body for its work and recommendations. Having examined the request for International Assistance, it wished to draw the Committee’s attention to the important efforts made by Sudan to safeguard its intangible heritage, asking the Sudan delegation to explain its efforts to improve the nomination since its referral in 2012, particularly with regard to the participation of communities in the process.
9. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Consultative Body for its exhaustive report that covered every detail of the nomination file, adding that the Committee benefitted a great deal from these reports for which it was grateful. The delegation wished to recall that Sudan was going through very difficult times, which was well known, and that some of the observations might be linked to its current situation. It believed that it was a race against time to collect the intangible cultural heritage in the two regions of Kordofan and Blue Nile. The delegation knew that Sudan had a number of prominent experts in the field of inventorying and collecting cultural heritage, some of whom were well known in the Arab world, having studied in American and other universities. Sudan therefore had the necessary scientific and technical knowledge and field expertise, and the delegation had no doubt of the capabilities of the Sudanese experts in collecting and preparing an inventory of their intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, the submission of the file raised the issue of the participation of the local communities, which in turn was linked to the prevailing political situation. The delegation spoke of the great instability in Sudan, and it feared that the cultural heritage in these two provinces was threatened if nothing was done to help Sudan prepare a database of their intangible cultural heritage and establish an inventory. It suggested that the Chairperson allow the delegation of Sudan to speak in order to dispel any worries or doubts about the submitted file.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** concurred that it was of vital importance for every State Party to prepare its national inventories, which constituted the essence of the implementation of the Convention. This was particularly true for those countries that lacked the expertise, resources, and capacity to prepare national inventories, and the reason the Committee should act in solidarity to support those nations’ capacities for inventorying-making. From that perspective, the delegation believed Sudan’s request was justified and had a very relevant place among the top priorities of the Convention. Having carefully examined the observations of the Consultative Body, the delegation understood the shortcomings, yet the request came at a time when there were sufficient resources to meet such requests. Thus, the States Parties that were more capable of fulfilling the requirements of the Convention should support such requests. It welcomed the comments by Sudan, suggesting that afterwards the Committee look once more into the possibility of providing assistance.
11. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked on the earlier comments that spoke of the difficulties faced by States Parties in having their proposals accepted for financial support from the Fund, adding that this was one of those cases where it regretted that the proposal by a State Party, which was greatly in need of resources, had its proposal rejected, perhaps because of the strict interpretation of the rules. The delegation was not against the financial rules for UNESCO funding, but felt that the interpretation of some of the Convention criteria was perhaps too tough on States Parties, especially with lesser resources and who need financial support in order to fulfil their obligations to the Convention such as inventorying and documentation. In the case of Sudan, it had already presented a request for financial support, which was not accepted, and thus it revised its request, presenting it a second time. However, despite the country’s efforts, and the fact that it had received support from the Secretariat in order to present a proposal that would be deemed adequate, it did not succeed. The delegation asked that Sudan clarify whether the required information was contained within the file, perhaps not in a manner that was considered sufficient, but maybe the information was in the file and that it was just a matter of interpretation. For example, with regard to the training activities, the Consultative Body considered that there was insufficient information about the content of training activities. The delegation therefore asked Sudan to clarify whether this information was contained in the file. In addition, it sought clarification on the involvement of communities in the inventorying and the elaboration of the proposal. A third point was related to the lack of a detailed description of the tasks, while the timetable was considered inaccurate. Finally, the delegation sought clarification on the outcomes of the project, even though it was evident that it sought to establish a regional inventory for the Kordofan and Blue Nile regions, which was accepted as important. Another comment requiring clarity concerned the reason behind the attribution of resources between fieldwork and the services of experts and equipment, which appeared to be imbalanced.
12. The delegation of **Ethiopia** also mentioned the fact that there were only two proposals under examination, with one already being rejected, and it fully supported the concerns raised by Brazil, the Republic of Korea and Congo in this regard. It also concurred with the comments by Algeria, Egypt, Turkey and Brazil in the case of Sudan, which clearly sought to document its intangible cultural heritage by establishing an inventory, which was the first step towards the implementation of the Convention. Moreover, it was noted that the request dealt with the development of its national inventory strategy on awareness-raising and capacity-building, and that despite a negative recommendation in 2012, the Consultative Body had observed substantial improvements compared to its initial request, albeit there were still some shortcomings. The delegation therefore wished to ask Sudan to explain how they rectified the gaps and responded to the earlier concerns in its 2012 request. In this way, the Committee would have a balanced overview of the amendments made and thus base its decision to help the State Party implement the basic steps towards documenting and inventorying its intangible cultural heritage.
13. The delegation of **Tunisia** noted that the report had revealed various shortcomings in the file, particularly related to the participation of local communities and the incoherence between the various tasks and the 15-month timeframe. However, it believed that these factors were related to the formulation of the file and did not affect the value of the project. The delegation spoke of how the region and its cultural heritage was at risk, adding that a positive response to the request would convey a positive message to this part of the world that would later have a positive impact. It therefore asked the Committee to consider sending an encouraging message to Sudan, and to allow it to respond to the concerns.
14. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that only two requests for international assistance had been presented, both receiving negative recommendations. It therefore considered that there were issues regarding the presentation of nomination files. In the case of Sudan, the delegation felt the situation in the country deserved a message of hope, as expressed by Tunisia. It therefore requested that Sudan be given the opportunity to respond to the questions raised by the Consultative Body. The delegation made reference to paragraph 4.d in the draft decision, which states, ‘the request does not sufficiently describe how the outcomes of the project will last beyond its completion date’, suggesting that the lack of a complete description could be attributed to the limited word count.
15. The delegation of **Uganda** appreciated the observations made by the Consultative Body, adding that it had noted some inadequacies and inconsistencies, but it also agreed with the previous speakers that the proposal submitted by Sudan was pertinent, especially in view of the turbulences within Sudan that could contribute to the loss of its intangible cultural heritage. The delegation remarked on the observation by the Consultative Body that States Parties encountered difficulties in presenting International Assistance requests, and as such strongly believed that this request could be salvaged. It therefore requested that Sudan be allowed to respond to some of these issues.
16. The **Chairperson** noted that all the interventions had followed the same direction, inviting Sudan to respond to the questions.
17. The delegation of **Sudan** was happy to be given the opportunity to address the Committee, and was equally happy to hear the support of its Members at this sensitive stage of the country’s history. In order to understand the reasons behind its request, the delegation wished to express its reservations concerning a number of recommendations made by the Consultative Body. It asserted that the intangible cultural heritage in the regions of the Blue Nile and Kordofan were given the highest priority in the country because of the high risk of the intangible cultural heritage becoming undermined if urgent steps were not taken to collect data in an inventory. The delegation spoke of the common borders with many countries that exceeded 1,000 km, adding that these were the most vulnerable regions in an area prone to conflict and thus a grave threat to its cultural heritage. It also spoke of Sudan’s involvement at the forefront of countries advocating for the safeguarding of cultural heritage. It had many experts, and had established in the University of Khartoum in 1964 a centre specializing in intangible cultural heritage, which produced a number of experts who were well known to UNESCO. Sudan was now putting into practice the necessary provisions in order to produce an inventory of its intangible cultural heritage, in line with the need to promote cooperation with Sudan and to promote peace and eliminate all sources of conflict. Indeed, UNESCO had provided support to Sudan through regular funding and extrabudgetary resources. It hoped that the Committee would reconsider its decision and provide the support it needed to protect its cultural heritage.
18. Following the comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or proposed amendments to paragraphs 1–3, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to sub-paragraphs 4.a through to 4.f, and with no comments or objections, they were duly adopted.
19. In light of the discussion, the delegation of **Turkey** proposed to reconsider paragraph 5.
20. The delegation of **Uruguay** agreed with the position proposed by Turkey.
21. The delegation of **Ethiopia** was satisfied with the explanation provided by Sudan regarding the risks that undermined its cultural heritage unless there was urgent intervention. In light of the discussion, the delegation reiterated the observation from the Consultative Body that there was a substantial improvement in the content of the file, in which case, the Committee should reconsider the case, as had been expressed by the Committee Members.
22. The **Chairperson** asked Turkey to submit its amendment to paragraph 5.
23. Having heard the explanation provided by the State Party, the delegation of **Turkey** proposed, ‘Decides to approve the International Assistance request from Sudan and encourages the government of Sudan to complete the missing elements in line with the observations made by the Consultative Body’.
24. The delegation of **Brazil** wished to propose an amendment along the same lines as Turkey, and approve the International Assistance request. It also proposed a second paragraph that would encourage the government of Sudan to work with the Secretariat to complete the missing information in line with the recommendations by the Consultative Body, as proposed by Turkey. The delegation recalled that this was the second time Sudan had made a request, and was thus very urgent. Nevertheless, the State Party would be asked to work with the Secretariat to complete the necessary information in the file so as to have a complete plan for the utilization of the resources.
25. The **Chairperson** noted that there were two complementary proposals.
26. The delegation of **Ethiopia** remarked that the important point was to approve the request by the State Party, while recommending that Sudan work with the Secretariat. It therefore supported the proposal by Brazil.
27. The delegation of **Uganda** agreed with Brazil that Sudan work with the Secretariat and the Bureau to complete the missing information.
28. The delegation of **Namibia** supported the proposed revision of paragraph 5.
29. The delegation of **Algeria** also supported the proposal by Brazil.
30. The delegation of **Turkey** also endorsed the second paragraph, as proposed by Brazil.
31. The delegation of **Belgium** noted that there was now a huge discrepancy between paragraph 4 and paragraph 5, and thus suggested that the amendment by Brazil be inserted between these paragraphs. It also remarked that the approval of the request by the Committee would be a huge precedent and therefore, if accepted, should be clearly mentioned in the decision that this was made on a very exceptional basis. In this way, the precedent would not become a rule. The delegation also referred to paragraph 4.e, which stated, ‘In the absence of detailed description of planned tasks, the amount requested cannot be assessed as appropriate’. Thus, the Committee was deciding positively despite the previous paragraph stating that there was insufficient information. This implied that more work had to be done than simply accepting the proposal, and in any case, a paragraph had to be included between paragraphs 4 and 5 that clearly stated that this could not be a precedent in future decisions.
32. The delegation of **Nigeria** alsoendorsed the proposal by Brazil.
33. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** agreed to go along with the proposed paragraph 5, however, as indicated by Belgium, there was a discrepancy between paragraphs 4 and 5, so the new paragraph 6 would provide a good link between the two paragraphs. It therefore supported the proposal for paragraph 6, adding that the comments by Belgium was also very valid, and therefore required a sentence to indicate that this was an exceptional case.
34. In light of the response by Sudan, the delegation of **Tunisia** also supported the proposal by Brazil.
35. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the proposal by Brazil, noting that the amendments proposed were necessary so as to ensure that the rules were followed. It noted that the Committee wished to help Sudan, but at the same time, it did not want to set a precedent. Thus, it supported the proposed amendments on the understanding that this was an exceptional situation.
36. The delegation of **Uruguay** agreed with the new paragraphs 5 and 6, but it also wished to see mentioned in the decision that this constituted an exceptional case due to the very special circumstances in Sudan. Finally, it appreciated having a timeline for the online presentation of the missing information by Sudan with the help of the Secretariat. In this regard, the delegation asked that the Secretariat provide an appropriate timetable for this presentation.
37. The delegation of **India** also supported the proposition by Brazil and Turkey to approve the International Assistance to Sudan, requesting the State Party to work with the Secretariat to complete all the necessary work as recommended by the Consultative Body.
38. The delegation of **Greece** concurred that the proposed amendments by Brazil and Turkey should stand owing to the exceptional circumstances on the ground. However, there was a need for consistency between the paragraphs and decisions. The delegation regretted that the draft decision was not formulated on a criterion-by-criterion basis, as this created confusion in the Committee’s debates. It understood that this may be better for the evaluating bodies to examine files in this way, but that this did not facilitate the findings when presented to the Committee, as was seen in the discussions earlier in the day. The result being that the Committee had a decision in which there were contradictions. Nevertheless, it felt compelled by the situation on the ground to support the amendments.
39. The delegation of **Congo** supported the amendment by Turkey and Brazil as explained.
40. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported paragraph 5, as amended by Brazil, and it also supported the remarks made by Côte d’Ivoire, Greece and Uruguay, adding that it expected Members wishing to amend paragraph 5 to amend paragraph 4. However, there was now a big contradiction in the decision and yet the Committee had to be credible. The delegation therefore insisted that the Committee add the paragraph, suggested by Belgium, which mentioned the exceptional nature of the decision owing to particular circumstances in Sudan, otherwise, the decision not to approve Albania’s request would be inconsistent.
41. The delegation of **Egypt** agreed to Brazil’s proposal, adding that the Committee must show flexibility in its work, but at the same time, it must respect the rules. This was an exceptional situation in a country that wants to preserve its intangible cultural heritage under very difficult circumstances. Thus, the Committee should demonstrate a certain degree of flexibility, and it reiterated its support for the proposal of Brazil.
42. The delegation of **Uruguay** also wished to be included among those Members wishing to highlight the exceptional nature of the approval.
43. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted the discrepancies in the draft decision and proposed a formulation to facilitate understanding of the draft. Firstly, it believed that in paragraph 4 ‘acknowledges’ should replace ‘decides’, as the Committee acknowledges the limitations contained in Sudan’s proposal. The delegation could also go along with Belgium’s proposal, but with an improved formulation, which would read, ‘taking into account Sudan’s special circumstances on an exceptional basis despite paragraph 4’.
44. Before making a decision on paragraph 5, the **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to read the proposal.
45. The **Secretary** presented the current wording for paragraph 5, which read: ‘Decides to approve on an exceptional basis due to the special circumstances in Sudan, the International Assistance request from Sudan for ‘Documentation and inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the Republic of Sudan’.’
46. Noting the broad support for the amendment in paragraph 5, and with no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced the amended paragraph 5 adopted.
47. In the new proposed paragraph 6, the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** suggested to replace ‘Encourages the submitting State’ with ‘Requests the submitting State’, as this had a greater sense of obligation.
48. The **Secretary** wished to make a proposal based on the request by Uruguay to set a deadline, as well as taking into account the various interventions, which proposed that the Secretariat work with the State, while the Bureau formally adopts the revised request. Paragraph 6 would thus read: ‘Requests the submitting State to work with the Secretariat in order to submit to the Bureau within a maximum timeframe of six months a revised request, including the missing information, in line with the recommendations of the Consultative Body’. The Secretary asked that Sudan confirm that it agreed with the 6-month period.
49. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its gratitude and support for the excellent suggestion.
50. The delegation of **Uruguay** also thanked the Secretary for her suggestion, and agreed with the new paragraph 6.
51. The delegation of **Egypt** also thanked the Secretary for her suggestion, which was in line with the spirit of the Convention. It also thanked the Secretariat and the Consultative Body.
52. The delegation of **Congo** remarked that it was a good proposal and offered its support.
53. The delegation of **Turkey** commended the Secretariat for the wording, and for the sake of drafting, suggested to replace the second ‘submit’ with ‘to present to the Bureau’.
54. The delegation of **Uganda** agreed with Brazil, Uruguay, Egypt and Turkey, however, it suggested deleting ‘including the missing information’ since the ‘missing information’ was already cited in the recommendations of the Consultative Body.
55. The **Secretary** repeated the proposed new paragraph 6, which read: ‘Requests the submitting State to work with the Secretariat in order to present to the Bureau within a maximum time-frame of six months a revised request in line with the recommendations of the Consultative Body.’
56. Noting the consensus, and with no further comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** pronounced the new paragraph 6 adopted. The Chairperson then proceeded with the adoption of paragraphs 7 and 8, which were duly adopted. As a result of the adopted amendments, paragraph 9 was deleted, and the original paragraphs – the new paragraphs 10 and 11, were duly pronounced adopted. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 9.c.2 to approve International Assistance in the amount of US$174,480 for Documentation and inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the Republic of the Sudan**.
57. The delegation of **Sudan** expressed its deepest thanks to the Committee for its approval of its request on an exceptional basis so that it could prepare an inventory for its intangible cultural heritage, which would act as a spring for many ethnicities and many cultural heritage manifestations, which have accumulated over decades and centuries. The decision conveyed a positive message to Sudan, a country that is the crown jewel in Nubian culture with a deeply rooted history and a melting pot for African and Islamic culture, and a cradle for a number of cultures. Sudan therefore reiterated its commitment towards cooperating with the Secretariat in submitting the additional information, adding that it would meet the requests submitted by the Consultative Body.
58. The **Chairperson** thanked Sudan before proceeding to the adoption of the draft decision 9.COM 9.c on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. It was noted that the draft decision tackled the transversal issues presented by the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body. With no objections or comments in paragraphs 1–6, they were adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 9.c adopted.** Having evaluated the nominations, proposals and requests examined by the Consultative Body, the **Chairperson** suggested moving to the overall decision 9.COM 9 on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
59. The delegation of **Turkey** would intervene later in paragraph 6.
60. The delegation of **Greece** commended the work of examinations by the Consultative Body, and had two observations. The first concerned the compilation of the criteria for the two later mechanisms, which were not formulated as have been the case in previous years on a criterion-by-criterion basis. This was said to have caused confusion in the debates, which could have been avoided if the criteria had been laid out separately instead of compiled in a consolidated text. The second point related to certain expressions employed such as folklorization or museumification.
61. The **Chairperson** asked that the Members of the Committee present their amendments at the time of its corresponding paragraph, he then proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision 9.COM 9. With no comments or objections in paragraphs 1–5, they were duly adopted.
62. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed a new paragraph 6, which read: ‘Takes note that despite broad consensus on promoting the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding as well as the Best Safeguarding Practices, the number of files submitted have been rather limited and encourages States Parties to present nominations in these areas.’
63. The **Chairperson** invited comments to the new paragraph 6, as projected onto the screen.
64. The **Secretary** asked Turkey whether it had intentionally only wished to mention the two mechanisms when it had also been noted that there were so few requests for International Assistance.
65. The delegation of **Turkey** had no objections in including International Assistance.
66. The delegation of **Bulgaria** suggested removing ‘as well as’ because International Assistance was now added, and perhaps mentioning requests for International Assistance.
67. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that this was a very good suggestion by Turkey, though wondered if in addition to encouraging States Parties to present files, the paragraph could also include the support to States Parties by the Secretariat, especially in the case of International Assistance. The delegation asked the Secretary whether this was indeed possible. In any case, it supported the amendment by Turkey.
68. The **Secretary** repeated the recommendation that States Parties should give greater attention to these mechanisms, adding that it was already clear that the Secretariat provided substantial technical support on International Assistance and that it would continue to do so in a serious manner.
69. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced the new paragraph 6 adopted. The Chairperson then proceeded to paragraph 7, which was duly adopted.
70. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed a new paragraph 8, which read: ‘Further recalls paragraph 38 of the *Aide-mémoire*, which recognizes the need to elaborate nomination files with utmost care in order to avoid provoking misunderstanding among communities in any way, with a view to encouraging dialogue and mutual respect.’
71. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments on the new paragraph 8.
72. The delegation of **Brazil** proposed a slight modification to the proposal by Turkey, which would read ‘further recalls the need to elaborate’ without mentioning the specific paragraph in the *aide-mémoire*, as this alluded to another State Party. The delegation remarked that the recommendation was not directed to one specific State Party, as it was a general recommendation for all States Parties to follow.
73. With no further comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** pronounced the new paragraph 8 adopted, and then proceeded to paragraph 9, which was also duly adopted.
74. With regard to paragraph 10, the delegation of **Belgium** proposed to include after ‘communities’, ‘groups and if applicable, individuals concerned’, as they were always mentioned together.
75. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the proposal by Belgium and suggested that the Secretariat made it an unwritten rule that all texts have the same approach and same wording.
76. With no further comments or objections to paragraph 10, as proposed, the **Chairperson** pronounced it adopted. He then proceeded to the new paragraphs 11 and 12, which were duly adopted.
77. The delegation of **Greece** proposed two new paragraphs that would relate to its earlier remarks, and which referred to the new Evaluation Body that would read in paragraph 13: ‘Invites the Evaluation Body to follow the practice of presenting their draft decisions criterion-by-criterion and not in consolidated text’ and in another new paragraph 14: ‘Further invites the Evaluation Body to refrain from using elusive and not fully substantiated terms like ‘‘folklorization’’ and ‘‘museumification’’.’
78. The **Chairperson** noted the new proposed paragraphs, as projected on the screen.
79. The delegation of **Belgium** fully supported paragraph 13, but proposed to delete paragraph 14.
80. The delegation of **Brazil** also supported in paragraph 13, but felt that the language used in paragraph 14 was inappropriate, as it appeared to criticize the Consultative Body, adding that this message belonged in an oral report and not in a decision.
81. The delegation of **Latvia** supported the proposal by Belgium and Brazil to delete paragraph 14, adding that paragraph 12 already mentioned the conceptual issues, which could also apply to these terms.
82. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the statement by Brazil.
83. The delegation of **Hungary** also supported the statements.
84. The **Chairperson** proceeded with paragraph 13, which was duly adopted. With no support for paragraph 14, it was duly withdrawn. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 9 adopted**.
85. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee’s task relating to the work of the Consultative Body was now complete, and he congratulated its members for their thorough evaluation of all the files within the very tight deadline. The Chairperson was certain that the future Evaluation Body could rely upon the solid foundation created by the advisory bodies over the years. He thanked the Rapporteur and the Chairperson of the Consultative Body for having led the Committee so professionally through the many complex issues faced by the Body during its evaluation of the files.

## ITEM 13.b OF THE AGENDA:

EXPERT MEETING ON SAFEGUARDING INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.b-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.b*

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 13.b, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that this item was linked to the Committee’s work, arising as a result of its eighth session in Baku when the Director-General was asked in Decision 8.COM13.a to convene a category VI meeting of experts to develop preliminary recommendations for a possible new chapter in the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. The Secretary recalled that during the discussion of a preliminary draft amendment to the Operational Directives on safeguarding, commercialization and sustainable development, the Committee preferred to group the issues of sustainable development at the national level within a single chapter of the Operational Directives. This chapter could also fill gaps identified in the 2013 evaluation [report](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-13-8.COM-INF.5.c-EN.doc) of the Convention that found that the Operational Directives did not explain ‘how intangible cultural heritage should encourage sustainable development’. The Secretariat, therefore, organized a meeting of experts in Istanbul, Turkey, from 29 September to 1 October 2014, funded, hosted and co-organized by the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO. The meeting brought together 12 experts including seven women from the six Electoral Groups of UNESCO, two per electoral group. The Secretariat prepared a first draft of the new chapter of guidelines structured around the four key dimensions of sustainable development defined in the [report](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/untt_report.pdf) *Realising the Future We Want For All* based on the results of Rio +20. These four areas comprise inclusive social development, environmental sustainability, inclusive economic development, and peace and security. At the Istanbul meeting, the experts agreed on a set of improvements to the first draft; the revised version was annexed to document 13.b. This revised version is submitted to the Committee for debate, and it is proposed that at its tenth session in 2015, the Committee adopt a revised text in the light of the present debate and, if adopted by the Committee, submit them to the General Assembly in June 2016. Draft decision 9.COM 13.b thus incorporated these points.
3. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
4. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Secretariat and the expert group for the document, adding that it had a few questions and remarks. The first concerned the concept of sustainable development, which normally refers to three pillars of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental, though culture was often a fourth pillar in cultural publications. The delegation noted that the report *Realizing a Future We Want For All* had not developed culture as a fourth pillar, but actually spoke about three fundamental principles: human rights, equality and sustainability, from which four core dimensions were distinguished: inclusive social development; environmental sustainability; inclusive economic development; and peace and security. It further noted that document 13.b gave the impression that the four core dimensions were to be seen as the four pillars of sustainable development, which had caused some confusion, making it difficult to work with the document. It recalled the Internal Oversight Service report on the evaluation of the ten years of the Convention, referring to paragraph 64, which stated, ‘knowing about and appreciating the linkages of ICH and sustainable development is one thing, consciously building on such linkages in practice and even creating such linkages where they do not yet exist is a wholly different challenge’. The delegation emphasized ‘building… and creating’, which is a very active way of engaging with intangible cultural heritage. The point it wished to raise is that the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development is a different question than that of the linkage between safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. It noted that in the Internal Oversight Service report, there were a number of recommendations, for example Recommendation 2 proposed to ‘promote increased NGO and community involvement in the development of policy, legislation, safeguarding plans and sustainable development plans’; Recommendation 3 proposed to ‘enhance cooperation with sustainable development experts for integrating ICH into non-cultural legislation and policy and other work related to ICH and sustainable development’; and Recommendation 5 stated ‘cooperate with sustainable development experts when supporting State Parties with the integration of ICH into non-cultural legislation and policy and with other work related to ICH and sustainable development’. The delegation believed that these recommendations could be reinforced when developing the Operational Directives. It also believed that it would be interesting to consider safeguarding as a way to find the balance between the different dimensions, namely, economics, social aspects, ecology or environment, and culture, which would involve the mediation of cultural brokerage. The delegation considered it worthwhile to develop the role of mediators who work with the different groups and sectors trying to find adequate solutions. Finally, the delegation suggested exploring the possibilities to make linkages with the 2005 Convention.
5. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its utmost appreciation of the States Parties, the Secretariat, as well as the experts involved in producing the document. It believed that work initiated on the amendments to the Operational Directives was an important input for UNESCO’s contribution towards integrating culture in the post-2015 UN Development Agenda. As noted from previous debates, UNESCO had struggled to make that effort and the outcome had not been as successful as expected. The delegation was pleased to note that the proposed substance for the amendments embodied a vision of culture as being at the heart of development goals. Moreover, it was also certain that by endorsing these principles within the Operational Directives, and subsequently in national policies and planning documents, States Parties would be fully able to comprehend the potential of intangible cultural heritage for the benefit of sustainable development. Although the document emphasized intangible cultural heritage in particular, the delegation also believed that the document might become a reference for inspiration in other fields of heritage, adding that awareness of the cultural aspects of development was already present in various regional development organizations and platforms within their respective debates. It therefore welcomed the proposed document, the debate and the diversity of issues raised. At the same time, it wished to draw the Committee’s attention to the need to connect this document closely with the spirit of the Convention, as well as its scope of application. With this in mind, the delegation raised its concern in how the document addressed intellectual property rights in paragraph 4 of the Annex. Although these issues were being dealt with by various countries nationally and worldwide, either providing specific protection or explicitly recognizing intangible cultural heritage as part of the so-called public domain, it was also aware that no global approach had been agreed within the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO); debates of connected issues has been going on for decades. Referring to the history of the elaboration of the 2003 Convention in which a certain distance had been taken with regard to intellectual property regimes, and also in the present debates and positions taken by the Committee where any claims to intellectual property rights are treated with great caution, the delegation would not be ready to accept the reference to intellectual property rights within the document. Nevertheless, it very much welcomed the continuous cooperation between UNESCO and WIPO on these issues.
6. The delegation of **Mongolia** encouraged the linkages between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, adding that they were closely integrated and very important for the livelihood of communities. It was noted that as recently as three weeks ago, organizations such as the World Heritage Committee and the ICOMOS General Assembly had discussed issues about the cultural landscape, which combined intangible, tangible and natural values, and intangible and tangible cultural heritage. It therefore endorsed and supported the expert meeting on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. During the discussions in the present session, the delegation noted the difficulties within the Committee to identify the scope of communities, adding that the expert meeting was important in that it combined intangible cultural heritage and the development of communities that would help identify the scope of the communities. It thus encouraged the efforts of the Secretariat and the Committee to pay greater attention to the issues of sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage.
7. Thanking the Committee Members for their relevant remarks, the **Chairperson** added that the Secretary had taken note of their suggestions and that the Committee would examine an enhanced version of the proposal in 2015.
8. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Secretariat for the document and the expert meeting for having discussed this very important issue, adding that it looked forward to seeing the guidelines on these issues, even though it would not be an easy task. The delegation wished to state some general principles. Firstly, it should be made clear that the Convention was about safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and not about development as such, nor about commercialization and tourism, and thus the guidelines should flow from this principle. Nevertheless, commercialization and tourism were realities that had to be dealt with. They were even welcome in some cases because they helped sustain intangible heritage, but the issues had to be dealt with caution and the guidelines should be drafted to precisely limit any threat brought about by excessive commercialization or tourism. Thus, it was clear that it was not the Committee’s role to promote tourism or commercialization. The delegation also wished to share the comments made by Belgium on the way the document was drafted with regard to human rights issues. It also felt uncomfortable in the paragraphs concerning gender issues, adding that care should be taken when dealing with these specific subjects. Finally, the delegation differed from the position held by Latvia on the topic of commercialization, adding that when speaking about how communities should be the beneficiaries of commercialization, the document should mention intellectual property rights, as this was already mentioned in paragraph 104 of the Operational Directives and was a reality that could not be ignored.
9. The delegation of **Afghanistan** commented that, given the post-2015 UN Development Agenda, there was a general tendency at UNESCO to reduce everything to sustainable development. Moreover, it had become a creed, even though the dimensions and requirements of sustainable development were still unclear. What was known is that it affected ecology, but had also expanded to other social, political and economic areas. The delegation remarked that the concept was still in its infancy and required yet more experience to see how it would work because the criteria, such as harmony, peace and balance, were still very diffuse. The question was how the Committee would be able to accommodate these requirements whenever it considered an already complicated nomination file. Only this morning, the delegation recalled, the very nuanced evaluations had let to the rejections of files even when gaps or deficiencies were unclear to the submitting States. The delegation was therefore concerned that the notion of sustainability would add to the complication, particularly as it had yet to be defined. The fact that the Committee would refer to something that was not yet defined, in a Convention that was yet in its infancy, was thought to create obstacles and impede the work so far on intangible cultural heritage.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that more time should be given to discuss this very important point, adding that it could also be interesting to discuss a number of Operational Directives already presented to the Committee. It was also important to question the idea that intangible cultural heritage should only be instrumentalized to serve a number of goals. The delegation wished to emphasize the notion of safeguarding, and finding a suitable balance for a particular context or phenomenon. It spoke of its surprise, for instance, to have found the recurrent sentence in the draft Operational Directives that ‘States Parties are encouraged to foster scientific studies and research methodologies including those conducted by the communities themselves’, adding that it neither understood where this phrase came from nor what the research methodologies conducted by the communities meant. It therefore wished to know why the sentence was there. It further wondered whether the Committee was going to accept directives like paragraph 8 in which ‘States Parties are encouraged to recognize that inclusive social development cannot be achieved without sustainable food security, quality health care, access to safe water and sanitation […]’. The delegation accepted that these were true and important, but wondered whether the Committee should accept these as Operational Directives. It found other paragraphs, for example, on food security, which stated that ‘States Parties shall endeavour to ensure the recognition of, respect for and enhancement of those traditional farming, fishing, hunting, pastoral, food-gathering […]’, or for instance under ‘health care’ in which ‘States parties shall endeavour in recognition of and respect for and enhancement of those traditional health practices that contribute to well-being’. The delegation found that these were very specific items and wondered how they would fit into the Operational Directives. Another example cited was in draft Operational Directives 13 in which ‘States Parties shall endeavour to recognize and promote the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to social cohesion, overcoming all forms of discrimination […] to transcend differences of gender, colour, ethnicity, origin, class and locality and to those that are broadly inclusive of all sectors and strata of society including indigenous peoples, migrants, immigrants and refugees, people of different ages and genders, persons with disabilities, and members of marginalized groups’. These were indeed important thoughts, but this was introducing a lot of new words and concepts to the Convention. The delegation added that one of the things that made the Convention work was that it adhered to a limited number of relatively neutral words, while users then develop their own appropriate vocabulary. Every new word introduced to the Operational Directives therefore takes on a life of its own, and should therefore be reflected upon and be the subject of debate. It therefore wondered whether the Members of the Committee agreed with these draft Operational Directives, adding that it did not think the General Assembly could be convinced to accept them all.
11. The **Secretary** explained that the evaluation found that although the preamble to the Convention stated that intangible cultural heritage was a guarantee of sustainable development, concrete evidence to support this affirmation did not figure either in the Convention or in the Operational Directives. As commented by Afghanistan, the issue of sustainable development is present everywhere, which posed a challenge to culture, as culture was not *a priori* part of the agenda of sustainable development. This had concrete – and negative – implications on cultural agents working to support culture, who were convinced that culture brought an essential element to sustainable development. One problem lay in the fact that there was no specific goal dedicated to culture, unlike education, health, and so on. Thus, the question was how to promote the importance of culture, and the relationship between culture and sustainable development. The Secretary explained that funding associated with development, particularly the United Nations or large funding agencies, had no cultural component because most people did not understand this relationship, at least in areas that were not purely economic, for example, cultural tourism, or the marketing of cultural goods and services or crafts. It was thus a problem for UNESCO and more broadly for cultural actors in how they could demonstrate that their actions were conducive to sustainable development. The evaluation conducted of the normative framework of UNESCO and the Convention concluded that this link should be more clearly established. This was the starting point of the Committee’s discussion in Baku, which was also based on a proposal by the Secretariat to propose three preliminary paragraphs on the subject. The Secretary recalled that Morocco had intervened at the time, arguing that three paragraphs were inadequate and that it would take something far more substantial to understand the link. The Secretary further explained that it was true that the Operational Directives regulated the inscription of elements, but that the directives were primarily for States to understand how to implement the Convention at the national level, and therefore the Committee's decision requested the Secretariat to propose a chapter on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level. This did not concern nominations but national development policies, and how intangible cultural heritage could make a contribution. Noting that the structure of the document was completely arbitrary, the Secretariat researched existing Directives and the [report](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/untt_report.pdf) *Realising the Future We Want For All* to find paragraphs from the general principles that could link up with intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the vocabulary had come from these sources, which the experts had used to try and make a connection with safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The Secretary conceded that the structure might not be satisfactory, but that this was a starting point and could eventually be presented in another form. Nevertheless, the idea was to show that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage was not just an act of cultural preservation, but that this cultural dimension had an impact on health, environmental management, human rights, gender equality, and so on; dimensions that were part of the agenda for sustainable development. While the Secretary understood that Belgium could not entirely identify with the presentation, they were the results of very sophisticated and detailed discussions among experts. The Secretary recalled that the question of scientific research ‘conducted by the communities themselves’ was brought forward by experts who felt that they should not create the impression that science came only from a cultureless ‘scientific community’ but that communities themselves were interested in studying and demonstrating how their intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding helped them in the development process. The experts thus suggested introducing research ‘conducted by the communities themselves’, together with broader academic research. This was why there was a tendency to repeat the same pattern of actions, as this was expected from the States Parties in their implementation of the Convention, rather than thinking that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage was limited to ‘the field of responsibility of the Ministry of Culture’. This was deemed to deprive the safeguarding of intangible heritage of its real contribution to all the social aspects affected by the agenda for sustainable development. The Secretary remarked that the expert meeting lasted three days, during which vocabulary was taken from the Operational Directives to create the links between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. Moreover, it was noted that the text referred to by Latvia was the exact wording found in paragraph 104 of the Operational Guidelines. The Secretary appreciated the remarks by Belgium in that every time a word was used it brought with it a history. The Secretary remarked that it was interesting to note that indigenous peoples and their established organizations were not fully integrated into the Convention and they regretted that they were absent from the Convention and the Operational Directives. The Secretary explained that the addition of words was problematic, but also omissions were equally problematic for those who wished to feel part of this family. The Secretary concluded by saying that there was a lot of time to work on this issue, and hoped that the contributions would be as broad and comprehensive as possible.
12. The delegation of **Morocco** wished to contribute to the discussion, having participated at the expert group meeting at the invitation of the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO and UNESCO. The delegation recalled that before the Istanbul meeting, a meeting had been convened in Rabat where the main conclusions from Baku in 2013 on the relationship between economics and intangible cultural heritage had been discussed. An important conclusion from that meeting found that the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and economics could not be reduced to a strictly commercial and statistical dimension, and in fact went beyond that simplified notion. The Istanbul meeting went further by saying that the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development goes beyond the economic dimension, and that in fact intangible cultural heritage contributed to sustainable development in various ways and at various levels through health, the environment, society, culture and in other ways. The delegation found that the document was submitted within this spirit, and it welcomed the debate it raised, which it felt was very important as it involved the future of the implementation of the Convention.
13. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Secretary and Morocco for their comments, adding that sustainable development required the involvement of many stakeholders, which was a very important aspect. The participatory approach was therefore crucial that included the mediation and translation between the different groups and sectors of society, which was an important success factor when setting up safeguarding programmes. It therefore wished to see the idea of mediation, translation and brokerage reflected in the Operational Directives.
14. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the Chairperson then moved to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. The **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 13.b adopted.**

## ITEM 13.e OF THE AGENDA:

DEVELOPING AN OVERALL RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONVENTION

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.e*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.e-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.e*

1. With the departure of the Chairperson, the **Vice-Chair,** Mr Philippe Potjes from Belgium, introduced the next agenda item, inviting Mr Proschan to present item 13.e.
2. **Mr Proschan** explained that the Committee would begin now to deal with all the topics that the Secretariat had been assigned at previous meetings but could not fit within its workload, for the reasons previously evoked by the Assistant Director-General and the Secretary. The present item arose from the 2013 evaluation of the Convention conducted by the Internal Oversight Service, and the Committee’s response in Decision 8.COM 5.c.1. Mr Proschan recalled that the IOS was generally impressed with the Convention’s impact among Member States, but noted that it was difficult to draw strong conclusions about its real effectiveness in the absence of objectives, indicators and benchmarks. The IOS therefore called for ‘development of an overall results framework for the 2003 Convention (with objectives, time-frames, quantitative and qualitative indicators, and benchmarks)’. The Committee took up this suggestion with great enthusiasm, and asked the Secretariat to propose a draft text of Operational Directives for the Committee’s examination at the present session. However, he noted, document 13.e did not include those draft Directives. This was because the Committee’s debates in 2013 pointed to the importance of a broad and inclusive consultative process, led by States Parties, in which they should be fully involved. The draft decision therefore proposes that the Committee put such a consultative process in place, if possible. It proposes that the Committee convene an open-ended intergovernmental working group in 2016, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources to permit the participation of representatives of developing countries that are parties to the Convention. The aim would be to develop draft Operational Directives that could be examined during the eleventh session of the Committee in 2016, and adopted by the seventh session of the General Assembly in 2018. Mr Proschan remarked that this was indeed a long process but that if Member States wished to see broad consultation and not entrust the Secretariat or a small expert group to make a proposition, then this was one possible option. The draft decision therefore laid out how the Committee could move forward with that process.
3. Noting that there were no forthcoming comments, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to paragraphs 1–6, they were duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 13.e adopted.**

## ITEM 13.f OF THE AGENDA:

COORDINATED CULTURE SECTOR FUNDRAISING STRATEGY

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.f*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.f-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.f*

1. The **Vice-Chair** introduced item 13.f, noting that the Committee would continue with the chapter concerning the follow-up of decisions and resolutions adopted by the Committee and the General Assembly at its previous sessions, which covered the coordinated fundraising strategy of the Culture Sector.
2. The **Secretary** explained, as with the previous points, that this item stemmed from the evaluation conducted by the IOS in 2013, which highlighted the added value that would come about with a coordinated fundraising strategy for all of the cultural conventions. Resource mobilization was indeed a major challenge in the support of UNESCO’s Regular Programme, and the audit concluded that the creation of a team dedicated to mobilizing resources that was common to all the conventions would be a first step towards a coordinated strategy. One of the functions of the Conventions Common Services Team, established in July 2104, was to develop this strategy in close consultation with the division responsible for cooperation with extrabudgetary funding sources: the Bureau of Strategic Planning. She noted that consultations had already begun to identify which donors, including those in the private sector, had affinities with a particular Convention, and CCS was working on a brochure entitled ‘Three steps to becoming our partner’ to present something simpler and more convincing than currently exists. The Secretary explained that programmes were trying to find their own extrabudgetary funds, adding that the work was still only in its infancy so the Committee was only asked at this stage to note that more discussion was needed, and that a proposal for a coordinated strategy should be presented to it at its next session. In other words, a strategy could not be developed since the Committee’s last session as the team was only formed half a year ago. It was therefore hoped that the Committee would have access to this coordinated strategy next year, which would obviously involve the committees of all the conventions since it would be a shared strategy.
3. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Secretary for the clarification of the Secretariat’s preparations for the development of this strategy, which was obviously of great importance for reasons that were well known. The Vice-Chair then moved to the adoption of the draft decision. Noting that there were no forthcoming comments or objections to paragraphs 1–5, he declared them adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 13.f adopted.**

## ITEM 13.g OF THE AGENDA:

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES TO MEMBER STATES IN SYNCHRONIZING THE MEETINGS OF CULTURE CONVENTIONS

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.g*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.g-EN_.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.g*

1. The **Vice-Chair** turned to item 13.g, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that in the same logic of the decisions taken in response to the audit of the working methods of cultural conventions last year, the Committee considered that one of the conclusions of the audit had been to study the advantages and disadvantages for the Member States of synchronizing the statutory meetings. Indeed, this was recommended as a potential source of savings. After studying the different parameters of such a measure, which are reflected in the document, it was concluded that there were unfortunately too many statutory meetings of cultural conventions that it would be rather counterproductive, affecting the quality of the work of the members of the respective committees, and hence did not necessarily bring about substantial improvements. In fact the contrary was found in that States Parties had repeatedly requested the Secretariat – not only to the 2003 Convention but also to the other conventions – to better distribute the meetings during the biennium in order to have more time to prepare for the various meetings and have some latent time between them. Thus, convening all meetings over the same period would not allow for the proper distribution of the workload of the Common Services Team, which was helped support the participants and so on. It was thus clear that distributing the meetings over the year would be more manageable for them rather than managing all the participants at the same time for three months during the year. These considerations were reflected in the draft decision submitted to the Committee, and therefore did not in principle support the idea of synchronizing meetings during a short period, but emphasized the importance of early confirmation of meeting dates and locations with proper planning in terms of spreading these meetings throughout the year. The draft decision concluded by encouraging the Secretariat to continue its efforts to effectively coordinate the dates of meetings at appropriate intervals, as requested by States Parties.
3. The **Vice-Chair** opened the floor for comments, noting that this proposal was based *a priori* on common sense.
4. The delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the comments made by the Secretary in that the Committee should be careful with these proposed modifications of planning statutory meeting one after the other, and not necessarily bringing everything together, as it might create more problems than cost-effective benefits. The advantages of reducing costs in the use of the rooms, interpreters, and so on, might not offset the probable excess paperwork that this would generate in the same period, or by bringing people from their capitals for 3 weeks in Paris for example. The delegation therefore supported the suggestions.
5. Thanking Brazil and noting that there were no further comments, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision. With no comments or objections to paragraphs 1–10, they were duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 13.g adopted.**

## ITEM 13.h OF THE AGENDA:

EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES, COOPERATION AND SYNERGIES BETWEEN UNESCO’S CULTURE CONVENTIONS

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.h*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.f-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.h*

1. The **Vice-Chair** turned to item 13.h, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that this was also the result of the recommendations of the evaluation, not the audit, which were carried out simultaneously. The evaluation was far more ambitious that it resulted in many recommendations, with suggestions on how to work and think about the best way to increase synergies between the conventions. The Secretary recalled that there was already a coordination mechanism in place since 2012, the Cultural Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG), which was presented at the Committee’s last session. This group comprised the secretaries of the different conventions[[5]](#footnote-5) that meet regularly. Since September 2014, and the appointment of the new Assistant Director-General for Culture, the frequency of the meetings had increased – every two or three weeks – to focus on strategic issues of common interest between the conventions. The document outlined the topics covered by the Liaison Group. The Common Services Team was another entity set up in July 2014 whose task was to facilitate the work of the secretariats of the conventions on such aspects as support to participants or the logistical organization of statutory meetings. The Secretary also reminded the Committee that the Executive Board of UNESCO, at its session in April 2014, requested the Director-General to convene a working group of States Parties to implement the recommendations of the IOS on cultural conventions. In this regard, an information meeting would be held on the follow-up of audit recommendations towards early 2015 for the permanent delegations. In terms of programmatic cooperation, the Secretary gave the example of Kasubi Bridge in Uganda, a World Heritage site, in which the intangible cultural heritage was important, and so it was clear that one aspect of collaboration between the two secretariats would be necessary and complementary with regard to the sensitivity of UNESCO’s action. Another aspect would be the complementarity of joint expert and committee meetings in order to deliver the potential complementarity of conventions through an appropriate financial framework. However, there was still some progress to be made from the principle of synergies, particularly for colleagues in the field who work directly with the States and see the benefits of a synergistic approach to the conventions, instead of working on six programmes of six different conventions. Another aspect was to see how the governing bodies of the conventions communicated and shared actions in a consistent way that respected the respective texts of the conventions so as to ensure that they work together for the safeguard of culture in general. Before concluding, the Secretary made a final point on the necessary funding required to achieve synergy and cooperation. The draft decision therefore incorporated these points.
3. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Secretary for the debriefing and for sharing the information on these welcome developments, noting the call for extrabudgetary contributions to fund these efforts. Noting that there were no forthcoming comments, the Vice-Chair proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision. With no comments or objections to paragraph 1–8, they were duly adopted. With no objections to the decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chair declared Decision 9.COM 13.h adopted.**
4. The **Secretary** made a number of announcements on the NGO meeting, the meeting of facilitators, and an information session on the capacity-building programme for Electoral Group III.
5. The **Vice-Chair** reminded the Committee that at the end of the week it would be asked to elect the Bureau for its tenth session: a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairs and a Rapporteur. The Vice-Chair adjourned the day’s session.

*[Wednesday, 26 November, morning session]*

## ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA:

REPORT OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2014 AND EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY

**Documents** [*ITH/14/9.COM/10+Add.3*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-10%2BAdd.3-EN.doc)

[*46 nominations*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=748)

**Decision** *9.COM 10*

1. Reprising his role, the **Chairperson** thanked the Republic of Korea for offering the coffee during the day’s meeting, continuing the session with agenda item 10 and the examination of the 39 nominations to the Representative List (seven States Parties had withdrawn their nominations), which was expected to take a full day and a half. The Chairperson took the opportunity to remind submitting States that those wishing to withdraw their nominations had to do so before he opened this item of the agenda. The Chairperson recalled that a decision by the Committee not to inscribe an element would trigger a suspension period of four years before the file could be resubmitted. The Chairperson then briefly recalled the examination procedure, which was the same as conducted in the examination of the report by the Consultative Body.Firstly, the Rapporteur of the Subsidiary Body presents an oral report on the work of the Subsidiary Body and a number of general considerations. This is followed by a short debate where observers may speak, if they so request. The draft decision *chapeau* 9.COM 10 will be examined only after every nomination file had been examined and decided upon. The Chairperson invited the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body to introduce each nomination and summarize the key points of the discussions that led to the Body’s recommendation. Members of the Committee would be given the opportunity to discuss each decision before proceeding with its adoption. Interventions during the debate on the draft decisions would be restricted to Committee Members.The Chairperson thus declared the agenda item open with the gavel. It was noted that seven nominations had been withdrawn by Argentina, Bangladesh, Egypt, Nigeria, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, resulting in a total of 39 nominations to be examined. The Chairperson recalled that Members of the Subsidiary Body also sat as Members of the Committee, and that once the Subsidiary Body had presented its report, it had completed its mandate in accordance with its terms of reference. The Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body would however continue to present the Body’s recommendations on each nomination. During the debate on the draft decisions, the Chairperson encouraged the other eighteen Committee Members to express their opinions, as the report already reflected the consensus view of six of its Members. He further recalled that all Members of the Committee, including those serving on the Subsidiary Body, could speak, supposing that the six Members of the Subsidiary Body would likely focus on clarifying the underlying reasoning behind the collective recommendations. Finally, each submitting State would be granted two minutes to speak after the Committee had made its decision on its nomination. The Chairperson also wished to clarify the way he wished to conduct the debates with regard to potential amendments to the draft decisions submitted by the Subsidiary Body. He emphasized his will to privilege spirit of consensus. The Members of the Committee would therefore be asked to show their support for any amendment proposed, and the Chairperson would decide if it met broad agreement. If another way of conducting business was preferred, then Members of the Committee should signal it and the procedure foreseen in the Rules of Procedure [voting] would be applied. But he felt that consensus was preferable. The Chairperson then invited the Rapporteur of the Subsidiary Body, Ms Stavroula Fotopoulou, to present the report.
2. The **Rapporteur of the Subsidiary Body** recalled that the Body was composed of Greece, Latvia, Peru, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Tunisia, and that it met for the first time in March 2014. Mr Augustus Babajide Ajibola from Nigeria was elected as Chairperson and Ms Fatma Fekih-Ahmed Kilani from Tunisia as Vice-Chairperson. Ms Stavroula Fotopoulou was elected as the Rapporteur. The Rapporteur explained that Ms Kilani was present on the podium in place of Mr Ajibola because Mr Ajibola had been called away by other urgent duties during the second day of the Body’s evaluation meeting from 1 to 5 September 2014 (when only the first 18 files had been discussed). Ms Kilani therefore assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting, during which time the Body modified some of its conclusions. Given that it was the Chair’s task to present the individual recommendations to the Committee, and defend the coherency of the recommendations overall, the Body asked Ms Kilani to take on that duty for all the files evaluated. In total, the Body evaluated a total of 46 nominations out of 49 files treated by the Secretariat. The evaluations had followed using the same working methods as previously explained by the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body. The resulting recommendations and draft decisions, presented in Section B of document 9.COM 10, represented – in all cases – the Body’s unanimous consensus. Subsidiary Body members, who were nationals of a nominating State Party, did not evaluate the corresponding nominations, had no access to the written reports of other members, and left the meeting room during the evaluation.Of the 46 nominations, the initial evaluation reports of the members before their face-to-face meeting showed unanimous support for only 9 files and divergent opinions for the 37 others, yet collective discussions resulted in 32 recommendations to inscribe. As previously indicated by the Rapporteur of the Consultative Body, the Secretariat compiled an [*aide-mémoire*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-02-aide-m%C3%A9moire-EN.doc) that collated the previous decisions of the Committee and the preceding recommendations of the Subsidiary and Consultative Bodies. Hence, the Body agreed that recurrent issues would refer in its written report to the *aide-mémoire* instead of providing detail, as has been done by previous Bodies. Section C of the document thus offered synthesized observations and retrospective lessons learned through previous cycles, which would be briefly presented. The Rapporteur explained that when examining the 46 nominations, the Body was once again impressed with the diversity of intangible cultural heritage nominated and was also pleased to find expressions emphasizing the link of intangible cultural heritage with nature and environment, or its role in the promotion of social cohesion and sustainable development. Moreover, the Body was satisfied to observe a more balanced geographic distribution than in 2013, with at least five files from each regional group. The Rapporteur reiterated once again on behalf of the Body that its recommendation not to inscribe an element at this time in no way constituted a judgement on the merits of the element itself, but referred only to the adequacy of the information presented within the nomination file. In this regard, the Body sometimes found it appropriate to include specific feedback and suggestions in the draft decisions, regardless of whether the element was recommended for inscription or not.
3. The **Rapporteur** turned to the substance of the evaluations in the section: Criteria for inscription, beginning with paragraph 42 of the written report, and commenting on the criteria for which 14 nominations did not receive a recommendation for inscription at this time. Before starting, the Rapporteur insisted once again on the importance of the *aide-mémoire* that helped States Parties in responding to the criteria, as it provided useful and detailed guidance on the expected information. With regard to criterion R.1, the Body sometimes found it difficult to understand from the information submitted in the nomination whether the element submitted constituted intangible cultural heritage. Indeed, like its predecessors, the Body found that States were often ambiguous in describing the element. Hence, the Body wished to encourage States Parties to provide clear argumentation on the current signification of the element for the communities concerned, including its social function and cultural meaning. In the same context, the familiar question of the scale and scope of an element was once again highlighted in the discussions, despite extensive debates, including an expert meeting, on the subject. The Body acknowledged the right of the submitting State to choose the element it wished to propose to the Representative List. However, the element’s nature and its multiple components should be sufficiently explained and detailed in the nomination in order to make clear to the reader how the element is constituted. For multinational nominations, the Body wished to recall the importance of emphasizing the unifying aspects of the element to make clear that it constituted a single element shared by all of the communities concerned. With regard to the transmission process, previous Bodies have already called attention to the importance of detailing the ways in which a practice was reproduced from one generation to the next. Finally, the Body missed more substantial information regarding the compatibility of the element with existing human rights instruments and the requirements of sustainable development.
4. **The Rapporteur** reported R.2 as the most problematic of the criteria. The Body was frustrated to see that despite repeated decisions by the Committee, States Parties failed to understand that they were required to demonstrate how inscription of the element would contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage *in general* and not to the visibility of the element itself. Moreover, the Body noted a frequent lack of argumentation regarding the contribution of the inscription to human creativity and dialogue. However, as implemented last year, where the other four criteria were satisfied, the Body did not disregard a nomination because of weaknesses only in this criterion (except in one case which was a referral, as indicated in the written report). Moreover, due to the link between criteria R.1 and R.2, when descriptions were not clear for R.1 the Body found it difficult to decide that R.2 had been satisfied. In the same vein, the Body discussed the importance of maintaining coherence between R.1 and R.3 on safeguarding measures. Furthermore, it noted cases where communities had given their consent to the inscription of the element but had not participated in the elaboration of the nomination or the planning of safeguarding measures. In this regard, the Body wished to emphasize the need for consistency also between criteria R.3 and R.4. Regarding criterion R.3, the Body noticed that safeguarding measures were sometimes vague or too ambitious, and wished to remind submitting States that safeguarding measures should be concrete, precise and detailed with a primary focus on transmission. In addition, like its predecessors, the Body found several cases where the feasibility and viability of safeguarding plans was questionable because the commitment of the State Party was not demonstrated. In other cases, measures were presented as being contingent upon the inscription of the element. This conditionality should be avoided. In addition, with regard to multinational nominations, the Body wished to point out that the quality of safeguarding plans should be balanced across the participating States. Nevertheless, the Body was pleased to find several good examples of safeguarding approaches and methods, in particular when the State developed integrated intersectoral approaches or proposed extensive safeguarding measures. Tourism and commercialization were often mentioned among safeguarding measures. In this regard, the Body was pleased to see examples of nominations with adequate consideration of the possible negative impacts of mass tourism and over-commercialization and corrective or preventive actions foreseen among the safeguarding measures. The Body also welcomed some good examples of safeguarding measures involving communities, for example, the inclusion of a law for the benefit of the communities, the introduction of a code of conduct for tourists, the explicit inclusion of a variety of stakeholders in safeguarding plans, or the incorporation of the element in school curricula.
5. The **Rapporteur** further reported that for criterion R.4, the Body again invited submitting States to demonstrate the free, prior and informed consent of all relevant actors. The Body appreciated some evolution compared with previous cycles, and took note in its report of some good examples regarding community participation in the nomination process. However, many nominations were still deficient on this criterion. The Body thus recalled the importance of demonstrating the legitimacy of spokespeople representing the community, the importance of providing the most diverse and individualized expressions of consent, and the need to provide details on the consultation mechanisms used. Concerning the latter, the Body wished to join its predecessors in encouraging States to include bottom-up approaches instead of top-down perspectives. With regard to multinational nominations, States were invited to make sure that communities were fully aware of the nature of the nomination and that their consent explicitly acknowledged the participation of other groups and individuals from other States. This would become increasingly important with the proliferation of multinational nominations evident with the 2015 cycle. Regarding criterion R.5, the Body recalled that while multiple forms of inventorying were accepted, the involvement of communities in their elaboration, as well as periodic updates, constituted an obligation that must be clearly described in the nomination. The Body regretted the frequent lack of evidence of community participation in the inventory, underlining that community participation in the elaboration of the nomination corresponded to criterion R.4 and should not be confused with that requested in criterion R.5. Moreover, the Body regretted that the proof of inclusion in the inventory was still irregular and recalled that, according to [Decision 7.COM 11](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-12-7.COM-Decisions_-EN.doc) applicable to the current cycle, documentary evidence should be provided. For the 2015 cycle, the Body drew the attention of States Parties to [Decision 8.COM 8](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-13-8.COM-Decisions-EN.doc) requesting them to provide an extract from the inventory itself in the nomination. The Body hoped that in the future the Evaluation Body would not be faced with simple lists or collections of documentation that do not constitute a proper inventory. Another concern arose in connection with both the evidence of inclusion in an inventory and the evidence of free, prior and informed consent. In several cases, this evidence seemed to have been created only after the submission of the nomination. Given that files were expected to be complete at the time of submission, the Body deemed that only in exceptional circumstances should such documentary evidence be created after 31 March, and those circumstances should be clearly explained within the nomination file. Finally, regarding audio-visual materials, the Body noted some improvements in the submitted videos and recalled that videos were the most visible part of the nomination upon inscription such that States should take particular care to avoid potential and unintended aggressive messages in the video or photographs, when the practice included the presence of weapons, for example.
6. The **Rapporteur** continued with the section on Global issues**:** a series of other over-arching issues addressed by the Body, adding that the Body had had long discussions regarding several nominations in which ambiguous messages or unclear formulations could potentially lead to misinterpretation or offend certain communities. In this regard, the Body recommended that submitting States anticipate possible sensitivities of other communities around the world and to take the utmost care in preparing their nominations, as was pointed out by the Committee in 2010 in its [Decision 5.COM 6](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-10-5.COM-CONF.202-Decisions-EN.doc). In this regard, the use of animals within intangible cultural heritage, particularly when such use appears to involve violence for public entertainment, might be acceptable at the local or national level but might well generate misunderstanding when proposed for recognition at the international level. Here too, the Body emphasized that it did not wish to prejudge practices and whether they might be acceptable or not. States Parties should therefore keep in mind that their nomination is addressed to a global audience and that the element proposed has due respect for the sensitivities of others, in the spirit of the Convention. As with last year, the Body welcomed nominations that illustrated the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development. Explanations of the interaction of living heritage practices and the natural environment, or their role in conflict resolution and peace-building as well as in fighting against racism and oppression, were provided in several interesting nominations. The Body encouraged future nominations such as these because they contributed fully to the significance and purpose of the Representative List and were also consistent with the view that culture is a fundamental enabler of sustainability. The Body also wished to encourage submitting States to be more explicit about women’s participation and to give greater attention to the participation of communities, including different generations and stakeholders. The Body also noted the aesthetic dimension of intangible cultural heritage beyond its functional aspects in society. Moreover, it positively noted the interest of elements that did not necessarily rely upon advanced technology but were nevertheless useful in today’s life. All of these cases – cited more specifically in the written report – constituted interesting examples of how intangible heritage could be economically viable in current times and thus contributed to sustainable development. Finally, the Body was particularly impressed when submitting States chose elements that had been discouraged or even prohibited in the past and were being revitalized in the present. In this regard, the Body also wished to express its receptivity to expressions that emphasized dialogue between groups separated in the past or even formerly in conflict, highlighting the spirit of tolerance and dialogue.
7. The **Rapporteur** concluded with Technical or formal issues, returning to paragraph 19 of the written report. Like its predecessor, the Body welcomed the submission of several well-prepared nominations, and like its predecessors, wished to add some nominations to the online list of ‘[Files considered good examples by the Committee](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=11&exemplary=1#tabs)’. For this cycle, good examples had been submitted by countries from diverse geographical regions and thus might serve as references for other submitting States around the world. The Body nevertheless recalled that good practices of other countries must be adapted to each State’s own context. For the 2014 cycle, the Body cited the good examples submitted by Burundi, France, Portugal, Republic of Korea and Turkey. However, in general terms, the Body observed visible but slow progress in the quality of nominations. For example, it still found a tendency to assert rather than to demonstrate. The Body wished again to invite submitting States to take advantage of the lessons learned in previous cycles, encouraging them to take advantage of the *aide-mémoire* when elaborating future nominations. In examining the nominations, the Body followed certain working methods as reflected in the *aide-mémoire*. Referring to paragraphs 21–41 of the written report, the Rapporteur outlined the main points of note: i) the Body only considered the information the State provided in the nomination file and not any prior or external knowledge of the evaluators. In addition, information had to be found in the proper section within the form; ii) the Body tried to ensure that decisions were consistent with previous Committee decisions throughout the process of evaluation within the current cycle, and within each nomination. Hence, the Body wished once again to encourage submitting States to read its recommendations carefully, especially in cases of resubmission; iii) the Body was sensitive to the clarity of explanations and the linguistic quality of nominations, which were considered essential factors, leading in some cases to a rejection or referral because the information was simply not understandable; iv) the Body paid particular attention to the vocabulary used, which should be consistent with the 2003 Convention, and inappropriate vocabulary and expressions not favourable to dialogue should be avoided; v) In the same vein, the Body recommended thatreferences to specific countries or adjectives of nationality be avoided in the titles of the nominations so as to not to provoke sentiments contrary to the Convention’s principle of international cooperation. The Rapporteur recalled that the inscription of an element on the Representative List did not imply exclusivity or ownership, nor did it constitute a marker of intellectual property rights; vi) Regarding multinational nominations, the Body looked for evidence that the element was a single shared practice or expression, identified as such by its communities, rather than a disparate set of practices celebrated by diverse communities on the same day; and finally vii) the Body had difficulty in implementing the referral option during the current cycle. It respected the Committee’s instruction to limit its use, applying it only for cases with a lack of technical detail, but this was often difficult since this had not been clearly defined. It was noted that in most cases, members could quickly agree that a criterion was satisfied. However, once agreed that the answer could not be ‘Yes’, the Body had difficulty distinguishing between ‘No’ and ‘Refer’. The referral option served as a compromise when the Body’s members were not convinced that the criteria were satisfied but were reluctant to recommend the non-inscription of the element. Time-consuming debates often took place on whether to refer or not to inscribe the element in question. The Body had to constantly negotiate whether the State had failed to demonstrate that a criterion was satisfied or whether the nomination was simply lacking specific technical details. Finally, after several exchanges, there was agreement among the Body’s members that the removal of the four-year waiting period could be beneficial for the evaluation process and would avoid unnecessary disappointment to the communities and States concerned. The Body also agreed that two options – positive and non-positive – would have facilitated its task and would have brought greater efficiency to its debates. The Body found that framing a single ‘not yes’ option could allow the Committee to provide submitting States with substantial feedback, while encouraging them and the communities concerned to revise and improve files. The Rapporteur was confident that the Committee’s debate and decision under item 13.c would provide guidance to the future Evaluation Body on this delicate issue. The Rapporteur hoped that the report had given an accurate and complete overview of the Body’s work.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for the pertinent points that would lead the debates.
9. The delegation of **Belgium**warmly thanked the Subsidiary Body for the hard work and for proposing a set of coherent draft decisions, adding that it appreciated its comments and suggestions. In point 23, the Subsidiary Body stated that they accord particular importance to the consistency of its decisions, which was considered a very good thing, as the Committee should always be as consistent as possible. The delegation recalled Decision 5.COM 6.2, taken by the Committee at its fifth session in Kenya, on ‘Azerbaijani carpet’ in which Morocco intervened to emphasize that *processes* not *products* should be the focus. As a result, an addition was made to avoid the inscription of a product on the Representative List and the title was changed to ‘Traditional art of Azerbaijani carpet weaving’. The delegation therefore wished to emphasize the central part played by the process and not product, and refer to Decision 5.COM 6.2 when making similar decisions. Furthermore, in point 54, the Subsidiary Body stated that submitting States should implement concrete and precise safeguarding measures that focus on transmission rather than a museological approach that tends to freeze elements. It wished to recall yesterday’s discussion on the role of museums, adding that museums also played an important role that does not necessarily imply the freezing of an element. Museums can work as mediators and were very important actors in the safeguarding process.
10. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea**thanked the Subsidiary Body for its hard work and valuable contributions in evaluating the 46 nomination files, and in producing a substantive report on its examination. It was also grateful for its selection of the Korean nomination file as one of the good examples. In addition, it appreciated all the valuable comments made on every nomination, whether positive or not, as these would help the submitting States better prepare their nominations in subsequent cycles, including the Republic of Korea. It was the delegation’s hope that the new Evaluation Body will inherit the wealth of experience and know-how from the Subsidiary Body, and that it looked forward to such close cooperation.
11. With no Observers wishing to take the floor, the **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its interventions and turned to its examination of nominations to the Representative List. As mentioned at the beginning of the session, the Chairperson suspended the examination of the *chapeau* of the draft decision until the individual decisions had been taken, inviting the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body to introduce the nominations.
12. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the first nomination on **Ritual and ceremonies of Sebeïba in the oasis of Djanet, Algeria** [draft decision 9.COM 10.1] submitted by **Algeria**. The ritual and ceremonies of Sebeïba are practised by two communities in Djanet during ten days in the first month of the Islamic lunar calendar. Dancers and singers compete for the right to represent their communities during a nine-day competition. Once there, the dancers stand in a ritual circle rattling their swords continuously as the women sing traditional songs to the rhythm of the tambourine. The ritual symbolically wards off potential violence between rival communities by simulating and transposing it to the realm of artistic competition. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3 and R.4, but that it lacked the technical details to determine R.2 and R.5. The Body found that the submitting State had sufficiently described the main features of the ritual and ceremonies that gave the community a sense of identity and continuity, promoting a peaceful life in society. It also considered satisfactory the overall safeguard measures and the level of community participation and involvement of public institutions in the elaboration of the nomination. However, criterion R.2 was not well understood, which had been a recurrent problem. The Vice-Chair reminded the Committee of Decision 8.COM 8: ‘Decides that criterion R.2 will only be considered to be satisfied if the nomination demonstrates how the possible inscription will contribute to ensuring visibility and awareness of the significance of the intangible cultural heritage in general, and not only of the inscribed element itself, and to encouraging dialogue which respects cultural diversity.’ Criterion R.2 should not demonstrate the benefits that would follow inscription for the element itself but to demonstrate how it would help increase the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and to raise awareness of its importance, which is the very purpose of the Representative List. As presented, the nomination lacked sufficient information to do so. The Body therefore could not conclude the criteria was met. Finally, in R.5, the Body found that although a certificate had been provided, stating the inclusion of the element in a database of intangible cultural heritage, information was needed to demonstrate that the database was indeed an inventory drawn up in accordance with the Convention, in particular with Article 11.b, which requires the participation of communities, and Article 12 requiring that inventories are regularly updated. The Body thus recommended that the nomination be referred to the submitting State, inviting it to resubmit the nomination for examination to the Committee during a subsequent cycle. Furthermore, the use of certain expressions were deemed at odds with the spirit of the Convention and therefore the Body wished to draw the submitting State’s attention to this point in paragraph 5 of the draft decision.
13. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to the Committee Members.
14. Wishing the Committee fruitful deliberations, the delegation of **Turkey** spoke of its careful examination of the nomination and found that R.2 satisfied the principles and framework laid down by the Convention vis-à-vis the visibility of the Convention and its fundamental requirements. With regard to R.5, the delegation noted that this was not the first nomination from Algeria and that in earlier submissions, the Algerian national inventory had been accepted. It therefore wished to hear from the submitting State in this regard.
15. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Secretariat and the Subsidiary Body for the efforts made in reviewing the nomination files, adding that the Subsidiary Body’s report demonstrated the very specific criteria that were taken into account to assess these files to better study these decisions. However, it understood that the majority of States had faced difficulties with regard to R.2, adding that it hoped that the Committee’s work would make it easier to understand this criterion so that it would be better applied in future nominations. The delegation valued the part played by ceremonies and rituals passed on from one generation to another that safeguarded intangible cultural heritage, and it believed that the inscription of the rituals and ceremonies of Sebeïba on the Representative List was justified. It invited Algeria to provide clarifications on the database pertaining to intangible cultural heritage in Algeria, bearing in mind that this corresponded to R.5.
16. The delegation of **Brazil** also considered that this was a very good nomination and that it satisfied all the criteria proposed, however it wished to hear from Algeria on the issue of R.2 and R.5, especially on how this nomination would favour social cohesion and dialogue, and respect for the principles of the Convention. In R.5, it sought clarification on how the database was regularly updated, and how the collected data demonstrated community participation.
17. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** studied the nomination with interest, and wished to hear Algeria respond to the reservations by the Subsidiary Body.
18. The delegation of **Egypt** agreed with Tunisia, Brazil and Côte d’Ivoire, adding that it appreciated the efforts by the Subsidiary Body, and also sought clarifications on R.2, as it seemed that this criterion was an issue in many files and not just this one.
19. The delegation of **Greece** agreed with the previous speakers that the nomination was very interesting and seemed to fulfil all the criteria. It was a very ancient tradition practised by a large number of people, and communities would be very much encouraged if this element was inscribed. It also wished to hear from Algeria.
20. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** appreciated the Subsidiary Body’s report and hard work in analysing this nomination, noting that the missing information was related to criteria R.2 and R.5. It therefore wished to give Algeria an opportunity to explain its position.
21. The delegation of **Afghanistan** expressed its satisfaction with the rich and detailed report, adding that it would surely help the Committee in its work in the future, especially in the preparation of nominations. With regard to the nomination, the delegation noted that it had received the general approbation of the Committee Members, except in R.2 criterion, which was a difficult requirement because it required the contribution of the element towards the enhancement of culture in general. The delegation was of the opinion that this was rather a test of time, adding that if the element persisted and was accepted by a community then it was in harmony with the rest of culture. It therefore asked Algeria to provide more clarification in order to knowingly make a decision.
22. The delegation of **Ethiopia** welcomed and appreciated the very good nomination by Algeria, and it shared the opinion expressed by previous speakers, especially the question by Turkey. With regard to the recommendation of the Subsidiary Body on R.2, it understood that submitting States should give careful attention to the way nominations are formulated and to be particularly attentive so that the nomination did not inadvertently give rise to misunderstandings that might undermine dialogue and mutual respect. Thus, it wished to ask Algeria whether its nomination could provoke some misunderstanding among communities in any way. Secondly, it sought more information from Algeria on how the inscription could increase the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, which might help in reviewing the nomination.
23. The delegation of **India** complimented Algeria for a very succinct nomination, adding that it would like Algeria to respond to the points made by the Subsidiary Body, especially with regard to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general.
24. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Algeria to respond.
25. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Committee Members for their questions, and the Subsidiary Body for the quality of its work. Concerning R.2, the delegation explained that the nomination provided evidence that the inclusion of Sebeïba would promote visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, especially with regard to the Tuareg language in which the poetry is expressed, and in the diversity of its oral traditions through crafts, skills, know-make related to jewellery, costume-making and the irrigation of gardens. The inscription of these crafts was thus likely to promote human creativity by the poetic creation of each ritual. Regarding R.5, the delegation further explained that all the aspects of the element functioned in collaborative and fruitful partnership with the community, its associations, and the cultural and scientific institutions in charge of heritage. Moreover, the community was involved in the development of safeguarding measures, in the preparation of the nomination file, and in all aspects related to identification, inventorying and contribution to the database of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation confirmed that Algeria held a national database of intangible cultural heritage that was created by decree, whose operation was both territorial and thematic. Documentary elements of the national databank were available to specialized cultural and scientific bodies, including via a hyperlink. It was noted that the work of editing, scanning and securing the different documents required time, as well as material and human resources. Nevertheless, it was true that the hyperlink to the database had been omitted from the nomination form. It was noted that the database was constituted in various ways, though the most important was carried out by Tassili Cultural Park, which managed a World Heritage Site, and whose staff counted many members of the community. It was also noted that the cultural park had created a unit in 2010 that collected data on intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, the director of the cultural park, Ms Aisha Tagabou, was herself a member of the community. The collection of data was also carried out through an annual cultural festival created in 2009 whose organizing committee comprised members of the community and bearers of the element, as well as through the network of associations, including the association called Sebeïba that featured in the accompanying video, and whose members are all from the community. Finally, the element was updated at least once a year on the occasion of the performance of the ritual according to the agreed coordination and traditional partnership between the communities, represented by these associations, with bearers on the one hand, and the festival’s organizing committee and the Tassili Cultural Park on the other. In addition, the research centre regularly initiated scientific research in collaboration with the community and the bearers. The collection of poetry, texts, stories, founding myths, oral tradition and music recordings. This work was published in book form, as that published in 2012 and again in 2013, which were provided in the bibliography in the nomination form.
26. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted.
27. Following consultations with other delegations, as well as experts from Algeria, the delegation of **Brazil** wished to present two amendments, in paragraph 3 in R.2, which read: ‘The inscription of the element on the Representative List can contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, and beyond, to foster social cohesion and dialogue’; and in R.5: ‘The element is included in the national database of the intangible cultural heritage of Algeria maintained by the Ministry of Culture, which is regularly updated and accessible on the internet.’
28. The **Chairperson** noted that the draft amendments were displayed on the screen.
29. The delegation of **Belgium** noted a technical problem in that the Committee had already adopted paragraph 2, and it could thus no longer be changed.
30. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it had submitted the amendments earlier to the Secretariat, adding that it had not changed any of the three sub-paragraphs that were included in paragraph 2. It was thus proposing the deletion of paragraph 3, and the insertion of the new formulations in criteria R.2 and R.5 in the right paragraph, which meant paragraph 2. The new paragraph 3 would be the decision to inscribe the element. The delegation therefore asked Belgium to accept this procedure, especially if it did not have anything against the substance of the proposal.
31. The delegation of **Belgium** reiterated that paragraph 2 had been adopted, adding that it also appreciated the Algerian nomination. Referring to point 21 of the Subsidiary Body’s report, the delegation noted that it clearly stated that the evaluation was solely based on the information contained in the nomination file, which was also what the Committee should do. It was also noted that there were a number of details missing, i.e. in point 2.1 on page 6, and on page 14 in section five of the nomination file. The delegation added that this was the reason behind the introduction of the referral option to correct technical details. It believed that lessons could be drawn on the problems encountered with some of the criteria, including R.2, suggesting that perhaps the Operational Directives be changed so as to rethink the entire system. However, at the moment the system used five relatively easy criteria, which were examined thoroughly and severely. Nevertheless, the delegation agreed that it would be interesting to reopen the debate and to reconsider how to deal with criteria, and perhaps using a Wikipedia solution where there could be lot of proposals on the list. Thus, if a discussion would ensue in the future to revise the Operational Directives, then criterion R.2 should also be looked at so as to avoid these kinds of situations.
32. The delegation of **Brazil** wished to elaborate on the nature of its amendments, particularly in light of the explanations provided by Algeria and knowing the importance of this element to Tuareg culture. It explained that Tuareg culture is the native culture of the entire Maghreb region over millennia, before the Greeks, the Carthaginians, the Romans, the Christians and the Muslims. The Tuareg had thus preserved their traditions, which would contribute to dialogue among all countries in the region, while preserving the very important creative culture of Tuareg language and traditions. This was why the delegation believed the nomination fully provided the information necessary in R.2 to be accepted. It surmised that perhaps the use of swords in the Tuareg dance was inappropriate, adding that as a 10-year-old he had witnessed a wedding in Brazil of a person belonging to the national military academy. After the wedding, the bride and groom passed through a tunnel of swords, which was impressive and beautiful and not aggressive or contrary to dialogue and social cohesion. In the same way, the delegation did not see why this would be case in traditional Tuareg culture in the Maghreb. With regard to R.5, the delegation remarked on the clarifications given that explained the system of collecting information for the national database of their intangible cultural heritage, and how it was accessible to everyone. It therefore strongly believed that the nomination satisfied all five criteria, and the reason it proposed the amendments in criteria R.2 and R.5, and thus the inscription of the element.
33. The delegation of **Turkey** concurred with the remarkable statement by Brazil, adding that it was aware of the importance of Tuareg culture, not only for Algeria but the entire region. It believed that the proposed amendments were very pertinent, and it endorsed the Brazilian amendments, inviting the Algerian delegation to provide its statement to the Secretariat.
34. The delegation of **Peru** congratulated the Chairperson and the Secretariat for the smooth organization of the work, and the Subsidiary Body for its great work. It was noted that Peru was a serving Member of the Subsidiary Body, and thus fully supported the evaluation and the draft decision. That said, having listened attentively to the previous speakers, especially the explanations provided by Algeria, and agreeing with the amendments proposed by Brazil, while also taking into account Belgium’s concerns, it supported the amendments for the following reasons. Algeria had explained that it failed to present evidence required in the nomination file, and thus the Subsidiary Body was right in deducing that there was a ‘lack of information’ in R.5, as evidence of the existence of the inventory must be provided. Moreover, the delegation recalled that in previous Committee meetings, States that had not provided the necessary evidence of the existence of an inventory, but had provided an explanation during the Committee meeting had resulted in the Committee accepting the explanation. In this way, this would resolve the issue in criterion R.5, i.e. that the Committee could accept the explanation, and actually was aware that Algeria, through previous nominations, maintained more than one inventory of intangible cultural heritage. In addition, given that the Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body explained that no nomination would be rejected on the sole basis of criterion R.2 not being met, and as R.2 was difficult to interpret, the delegation believed that the Committee had to accept the nomination and therefore the amendments proposed by Brazil, while taking into account the impeccable work carried out by the Subsidiary Body.
35. In light of the information provided by Algeria, the delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its support for Brazil’s amendments. Moreover, the element was not only relevant for Algeria but for Maghreb as a whole, and there was sufficient information provided on the database maintained by Algeria.
36. The delegation of **Greece** thanked Algeria for its pertinent clarifications, as well as Brazil for its explanation of the importance of the ancient Tuareg tradition throughout the Maghreb region and its emphasis on the need to safeguard these ancient traditions. It therefore supported the amendments by Brazil.
37. The delegation of **Hungary** thanked Algeria for the much needed and relevant clarifications, adding that it supported all three amendments by Brazil.
38. Following the explanations by Algeria, the delegation of **Congo** firmly supported the amendments by Brazil on R.2 and R.5. With regard to the remark by Belgium, the delegation concurred that the Committee had indeed adopted paragraph 2, but that it had yet to consider the other criteria R.2 and R.5 for which Brazil had submitted amendments. It therefore supported and welcomed the two proposed amendments by Brazil.
39. The delegation of **Ethiopia** fully supported Brazil’s amendments, and in light of the additional information provided, believed that criteria R.2 and R.5 were fully satisfied.
40. The delegation of **Uruguay** thanked the Subsidiary Body and Algeria for their efforts and work. Taking into consideration the information provided by Algeria, and thanking Brazil for its proposals, it supported the amendments.
41. In light of the explanations provided by Algeria, the delegation of **India** seconded the amendments proposed by Brazil in R.2 and R.5.
42. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked Algeria for the explanations provided, and Brazil for the proposed amendments. Considering the explanations, the delegation believed that the file should be accepted, thanking those that supported the Algerian nomination.
43. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Committee for the debate, noting however that it was creating a precedent, as paragraph 2 had already been accepted and there was no question of reopening it. Thus, the amendments should appear in a separate paragraph 3 to clearly distinguish the outcome and motivation compared to the initial decision. Regarding the Tuareg culture, of course, the delegation appreciated the Tuareg culture enormously but as the Committee had been reminded countless times, it was not making statements about culture, but examining nomination files, adding that this argument was not useful in this document. If so, then it should be clearly stated that the Committee was creating a precedent and changing directives, which was very clearly a problem. Thus, a separate paragraph 3 was needed if the Committee was introducing new things that were not in the file, but that had been explained in the room, which was also a precedent in the Subsidiary Body’s procedure. The delegation hoped that the future Evaluation Body would not copy this bad example in trying to reconfigure an element.
44. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** spoke of its hesitance to take the floor on this nomination. Of course, it agreed with Belgium, however, its position was similar to Peru. It was known that the Committee did not refrain from inscribing nominations on the sole basis of criterion R.2, though it did not accept new information on R.2 given in the room. However, there were big problems with R.2, which – as noted by Belgium – the Committee wished to revisit. The delegation believed that the visibility of intangible cultural heritage resulted from inscription, and was not an obligation of the State Party. Regarding the inventory, it was noted that the link was missing but that it was the presented afterwards, and that it contained the missing information and the inventory. However, if this Committee had not decided two years ago to inscribe an element of a country that did not have an inventory at the time of the nomination, but was shown a ministerial letter that the element was included on the inventory, the Committee would not be in a position to consider this element today and accept the addition of the hyperlink after the deadline. The delegation however believed in the importance of consistency and fairness to all Member States, and the reason it was very nervous when the Committee took decisions lightly and created precedence, adding that precedence could be used later to transgress again from decisions taken by the Committee on how to evaluate files. Thus, because the Committee accepted to inscribe an element two years ago when the inventory was done at the last minute, it now had to accept the nomination from Algeria dispite the link was missing. Consequently, if the Committee accepted R.5, then it could not refuse the inscription based on R.2.
45. The **Chairperson** remarked that Belgium had made a point of order on the fact that paragraph 2 had already been adopted, adding that the solution could be to adopt paragraph 3 with the amendments by Brazil. Moreover, it was a matter of procedure that did not change the substance. The Chairperson asked Belgium if it would accept to reconsider the amendment of Brazil in paragraph 2. Otherwise, it would be examined in a new paragraph 3.
46. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that it would be useful to have a third paragraph so that at least there was an indication that there had been a discussion, and that criteria R.2 and R.5 had been revisited. It therefore proposed a new paragraph to reflect how the decision came about and to make clear that the Committee was creating a precedent, while maintaining the adopted paragraph 2.
47. The delegation of **Brazil** wished to clarify that the amendment it submitted in written form to the Secretariat included a new sub-paragraph on criteria R.2 and R.5 in paragraph 2. When paragraph 2 was being discussed, it had not raised the flag because the Committee was not modifying the three criteria in the original paragraph 2. However, the amendments were mentioned once the Chairperson moved to paragraph 3. Moreover, the Secretariat had already inserted the text in the right place. The delegation concurred that a new paragraph 3 could also be created that ‘further decides that the information included in the file also satisfy the following criteria’, but that this would create a precedent, as this was not the Committee’s usual practice when a decision on a criterion was reversed. It believed that a criterion that was not initially considered satisfied, but was later found to be satisfied should be put in the right place. If the Committee adopted the suggestion by Belgium then it would create a precedent, which would have to be adopted in every other future decision whenever the original proposal by the Subsidiary Body was reversed. The delegation remarked that it was the Committee that made the final decision and as such, the Committee should maintain its practice whenever it changed a proposal by the Subsidiary Body to ensure that it was made in the right place.
48. The delegation of **Afghanistan** was of the understanding that the Subsidiary Body did not adopt a decision, and that the Committee had not approved the text as a whole. From a legal point of view, the Committee had the authority to change the recommendation. If this was not the case, then why seek explanations from Algeria or the reasons behind the amendments by Brazil? The fact remained that the text was submitted to the Committee for the first time, and the Committee had the authority to bring about amendments. The delegation found this procedure to be quite normal and it did not see why this would cause a precedent, as it was fully in compliance with the legal rules for such debates.
49. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that this procedure would make discussions difficult if the Committee adopted parts of the text only to revisit them whenever it so wished. The proposal by Belgium was seen as a compromise, with the same result. In this way, at least the decision would indicate that the information on three of the criteria proposed by the Subsidiary Body was found in the file. The delegation found it perfectly acceptable to include another paragraph that ‘further decides that the information included…’ as this would recall the discussions, while the Committee would still conclude to inscribe the element.
50. The **Secretary** noted that two options were put before the Committee, adding that it was important to follow the Rules of Procedure, as it was true that the Committee had already adopted paragraph 2, which should have been amended beforehand. The Secretary explained that a third paragraph that used the exact or slightly modified wording of the *chapeau* of paragraph 2 could be inserted for the other two criteria. Apprehending advice by the Legal Advisor who was absent, she cautioned against diverging from the strict procedural rules to justify the adoption of decisions, not least because there would be other nominations of this type in the future. She therefore suggested that the Committee consider the wording of the sub-paragraphs in criteria R.2 and R.5, as well as the *chapeau* of paragraph 3, as proposed by Belgium. In any case, the overall decision would be the same, while respecting the Committee’s procedural rules. As a final note, the Secretary remarked that since Belgium had called a point of order, the Chairperson could not ignore it.
51. The delegation of **Brazil** recalled that it had presented the amendments in written form and in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, adding that when the amendment was proposed it should have been discussed under paragraph 2. It was noted that the Committee had adopted paragraph 2 in good faith, while the delegation thought that the appropriate moment to discuss criteria R.2 and R.5 would be once the criteria in paragraph 2 had been dealt with. However, the delegation was willing to call for a motion to reopen paragraph 2, as the decision had not been approved as a whole. It did not think that it was a good idea to have a separate paragraph 3, as it would not change the overall decision, adding that additions to a proposal by the Subsidiary Body did not require a new paragraph. The delegation sought the opinion of Algeria on this matter on whether it was comfortable with paragraph 3, before moving to reopen paragraph 2 in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. Moreover, Rule 25 regarding voting on amendments had not been respected, as the proposal had been given to the Secretariat in written form.
52. The **Chairperson** asked Belgium whether it accepted the solution as proposed by Brazil.
53. The delegation of **Belgium** consented to reopening paragraph 2, if the Committee agreed.
54. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it agreed to open paragraph 2 to make its corresponding decision, noting that Brazil’s proposal on R.2 was projected onto the screen.
55. The **Secretary** presented the new sub-paragraph for R.2, which read: ‘The inscription of the element on the Representative List can contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and, beyond, to fostering social cohesion and dialogue.’
56. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced adopted the new sub-paragraph for R.2, before turning to R.5.
57. The **Secretary** presented the new sub-paragraph for R.5, which read: ‘The element is included in the national database of the intangible cultural heritage of Algeria maintained by the Ministry of Culture which is regularly updated and accessible on the Internet.’
58. Noting that there were no comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced adopted the new sub-paragraph for R.5, before turning to the new paragraph 3.
59. The **Secretary** then read the new paragraph 3: ‘Inscribes Ritual and ceremonies of Sebeïba in the oasis of Djanet, Algeria on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.’
60. For practical reasons, the delegation of **Turkey** wished to incorporate in the last paragraph the use of appropriate vocabulary in the spirit of the Convention to avoid expressions such as ‘unique’ and ‘exceptional’.
61. The **Chairperson** noted that the comment was related to paragraph 4, and that the Committee was still considering paragraph 3. With no comments or objections, the Chairperson pronounced paragraph 3 adopted.
62. The delegation of **Afghanistan** wished to point out that the proposed paragraph was inappropriate in this instance, as this was a general recommendation for all nominations files and not just Algeria now that it had been decided to inscribe the element. It therefore proposed its deletion.
63. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** concurred with Afghanistan that this was a general recommendation, one that the Subsidiary Body had made in its general comments. However, the delegation felt that it was still relevant in this case, adding that if the file had been referred, these issues would have been dealt with in the revised nomination, but since it was inscribed, it should be included in case of publications in the future concerning this nomination. This highlighted the fact that such language as ‘uniqueness’ was not appropriate in this Convention or in any documents related to intangible cultural heritage.
64. The delegation of **Brazil** agreed with Afghanistan that the right place for such a paragraph would be in the overall Decision 9.COM 10 that provided general guidelines on the evaluation process of nominations. Thus, it preferred to delete the paragraph and to include it in Decision 9.COM 10.
65. Instead of deleting the principle of the paragraph, the delegation of **Turkey** proposed: ‘Invites the State Party to use the vocabulary appropriate to the spirit of the Convention and avoiding expressions such as ‘‘unique’’ and ‘‘exceptional’’.’
66. The delegation of **Peru** associated with the remarks by Saint Lucia to maintain paragraph 4. It agreed that the issue of appropriate vocabulary should be recalled overall, but also that it should be maintained in the present decision as it related to a specific nomination file. Moreover, the State Party should not be ‘invited’ as such because the element was already inscribed. However, it should be recalled that words such as ‘unique’, ‘outstanding’ and ‘universal value’ did not correspond to intangible cultural heritage. It proposed to maintain the paragraph, as seen in previous decisions, and maintain the paragraph as proposed by the Subsidiary Body.
67. The delegation of **Uganda** requested the Committee to maintain paragraph 4 because the State Party had ‘unique’ and ‘exceptional circumstances’ in the file, but also in view of the fact that other State Parties might refer to this file in the future for guidance. It also agreed with Turkey and Peru that the State Party be invited to use appropriate vocabulary in the future.
68. The delegation of **Belgium** supported the opinion expressed by Saint Lucia and Peru.
69. The delegation of **Congo** felt that this issue was not unique to Algeria but to all Member States. It thus supported its deletion in this decision, but its insertion elsewhere.
70. The delegation of **Bulgaria** endorsed the position expressed by Saint Lucia and Peru, supported by Belgium for the paragraph to be retained.
71. The **Chairperson** submitted the proposal by Afghanistan to delete the paragraph, but it did not receive broad support from the Committee, and the original paragraph was retained. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to read out the paragraph.
72. The **Secretary** remarked that the issue was rather complicated because Afghanistan had proposed something other than Brazil and Congo in that there were several proposals. The Secretary therefore suggested that the Chairperson proceed in the order of support, i.e. commence with the support for the proposal by Afghanistan to delete the paragraph, and then see which version of the wording proposed by Turkey received support.
73. The **Chairperson** noted that the proposal to delete the paragraph by Afghanistan did not receive broad support, and he thus invited the Secretary to present the amendment as proposed by Turkey.
74. The **Secretary** read out the following proposal: ‘Invites the State Party to use appropriate vocabulary to the spirit of the Convention and avoiding expressions such as ‘‘unique’’ and ‘‘exceptional’’.’
75. The **Chairperson** noted that the proposal by Turkey did not benefit from broad support by the Committee, and therefore the original text was retained. With no objections to the original formulation, paragraph 4 was adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.1 to inscribe Ritual and ceremonies of Sebeïba in the oasis of Djanet, Algeria on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
76. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to sincerely thank the Committee and the Subsidiary Body for the quality and rigour of its analysis, as well as the Committee Members who supported the nomination, and the Secretariat for its continuous assistance. The delegation was full of emotion, and made special mention of those in the community who also wished to share their thanks and appreciation. It was grateful to the Committee for having privileged the element over the imperfections justly found during the elaboration of the nomination file. Finally, it assured the Committee that the Tuareg community of Djanet would spend a night different from all other nights, looking at the sky whose star would shine even brighter.
77. The **Chairperson** turned to the next draft decision 9.COM 10.3.
78. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Lavash, the preparation, meaning and appearance of traditional Armenian bread as an expression of culture** [draft decision 9.COM 10.3] submitted by **Armenia**. Lavash is a traditional thin bread that forms an integral part of Armenian cuisine. Its preparation requires great effort, coordination, experience and special skills, and strengthens family, community and social ties. Women prepare lavash in groups and it is commonly served rolled around local cheeses, greens or meats. It plays a ritual role in weddings, where it is placed on the shoulders of newlyweds to bring fertility and prosperity. Men are also involved through the practices of making tools and building ovens. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the nomination adequately demonstrated that all the criteria were satisfied. It particularly appreciated the transmission of know-how related to the preparation and use of lavash within families, as well as certain safeguarding measures proposed by the submitting State, including those in the field of education and research. The Body also considered that the participation of a wide range of stakeholders at every stage of the nomination’s elaboration had been well described, and the free, prior and informed consent of the communities had been well demonstrated. The Body found that the file sufficiently demonstrated the inclusion of the element on the list of Intangible Heritage of the Republic of Armenia, accessible on the Internet. However, in accordance with the Guidelines on the treatment of correspondence, the Secretariat had drawn attention to two letters received from Azerbaijan and Turkey, as well as the response from Armenia, which had been made available online. Having carefully read this correspondence, the Body was satisfied that the issues raised did not affect the outcome regarding the criteria. It therefore formulated a draft decision in favour of the element’s inscription on the Representative List.However, sensitive to the broader cultural context of the element in the region, and in order to promote dialogue and respect for cultural diversity, the Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the element under a different title, namely, ‘Lavash, the preparation, meaning and appearance of traditional bread as an expression of culture in Armenia’. It also took note that inscription on the Representative List did not imply exclusivity and it encouraged the submitting State to keep in mind that the element was shared by other communities. In addition to these recommendations, the Body suggested that the Committee recall, as in the previous case, that concepts such as ‘uniqueness’ or ‘originality’ had no place in the Convention.
79. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body for the brief summary of the debates, as well as for informing the Committee of the correspondence between the different parties. The Chairperson was delighted to tell the Committee that the nomination had been treated in a spirit of consensus among the various stakeholders. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.3 to inscribe Lavash, the preparation, meaning and appearance of traditional bread as an expression of culture in Armenia on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
80. The delegation of **Armenia**, represented by Arev Samuelyan, Vice-Minister of Culture, congratulated the Chairperson on his excellent leadership. She also commended the Secretariat, and in particular the Secretary, for the excellent organization of the Committee and for its permanent presence. She also thanked the Committee, especially the Subsidiary Body, for its evaluation of the file. She was grateful to the generations of communities that allowed lavash, an indispensable element of Armenian identity, to be preserved and inscribed on the Representative List. She highlighted the role and participation of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology of the Academy of Sciences of Armenia, as the author of the file, while not forgetting the joint work provided by the departments of the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The entire population of Armenia and its diaspora worldwide recognized the element and know-how in the preparation of lavash, as an old legacy passed from generation to generation by Armenians. The Vice-Minister then pronounced the element in Armenian, remarking that this was the fourth inscription for Armenia, following ‘Duduk and its music’ in 2008; ‘Armenian cross-stones art. Symbolism and craftsmanship of Khachkars’ in 2010; and ‘Performance of the Armenian epic of “Daredevils of Sassoun” or “David of Sassoun”’ in 2012. Armenia believes that UNESCO is a powerful and effective instrument for reconciling differences between States in an atmosphere of dialogue and shared common values, and that cultural heritage is a platform for successfully hosting a multiplicity of different cultures. The Vice-Minister underlined that the element was in full compliance with the provisions in the Convention, and was about the preparation, meaning and appearance of Lavash traditional bread as an expression of culture, and not about the physical bread. It thus comprised a whole range of traditions, symbols and meanings uniting Armenians all over the world. Lavash was thus part of the Armenian identity and the popularity of the national cultural identity in the context of global standardization. This element was accessible and practised by the entire population and fosters good and friendly relations between individuals, while promoting the values shared by all humankind.
81. The **Chairperson** turned to the next draft decision 9.COM 10.4.
82. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Traditional art and symbolism of Kelaghayi, making and wearing women’s silk headscarves** [draft decision 9.COM 10.4] submitted by **Azerbaijan**. Kelaghayi making consists of several stages: fabric weaving, dyeing and woodblock decoration. Weavers choose thin silk threads to make square-shaped cloths. The colours of headscarves have symbolic meanings and are often tied to specific social occasions, such as weddings, mourning ceremonies, daily activities and celebrations. The traditional practice of making and wearing headscarves is an expression of cultural identity and religious traditions, and a symbol of social cohesion, reinforcing the role of women and strengthening the cultural unity of Azerbaijani society. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The Body concluded that the nomination demonstrated how this living tradition, common among families of artisans and Azerbaijani women, is an important part of their identity, transmitted by experienced practitioners through non-formal apprenticeship only. The Body was also convinced about its potential contribution towards raising awareness of the importance of traditional crafts and craftsmanship as vectors of human creativity. The Body particularly appreciated the long-term safeguarding measures that demonstrated strong community participation and a strong commitment from the national authorities. The inscription of the element in the Azerbaijani register of intangible cultural heritage was also established. The Subsidiary Body concluded by recommending the inscription of Traditional art and symbolism of Kelaghayi, making and wearing women’s silk headscarves on the Representative List.
83. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, which was duly adopted.
84. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe Traditional art and symbolism of Kelaghayi, making and wearing women’s silk headscarves on the Representative List. The delegation was delighted to join the community of Kelaghayi weavers in extending its gratitude, joy and pride in having this art form recognized at an international level. Being part of the identity of many Azerbaijanis, especially women, the art of Kelaghayi is an expression of the Silk Road tradition and bears the cultural values of the Azerbaijani people. It was noted that the inscription was the result of years of hard work carried out by an excellent team who prepared the file, as well as the community of Kelaghayi weavers and women’s associations in Azerbaijan. Its inscription would strongly encourage Kelaghayi communities to continue practising the element of traditional sericulture, passing it on to future generations. On behalf of the government of Azerbaijan, it thanked the Committee for its efforts that resulted in this inscription, as well as the Subsidiary Body and the Secretariat for its support in this exercise. The delegation was certain that this inscription would further reinforce the measures to safeguard intangible heritage and would support the implementation of the Convention in Azerbaijan.
85. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy-Minister of culture of Azerbaijan for honouring the Committee with her presence.
86. Congratulating Azerbaijan, the delegation of **Belgium** remarked that the Committee had yet to adopt the draft decision as a whole.
87. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.4 to inscribe Traditional art and symbolism of Kelaghayi, making and wearing women’s silk headscarves on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
88. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Pujllay and Ayarichi, music and dances of the Yampara culture** [draft decision 9.COM 10.6] submitted by **Bolivia**. Pujllay and Ayarichi are the main musical and choreographic forms of the Yampara culture. Pujillay is performed during the ritual celebrating the renewal of life and abundance brought on by rains. Ayarichi is performed during the dry season during festivals dedicated to various Catholic saints. Pujillay and Ayarichi create unity as a favoured way to communicate with nature. Extensive community networks are mobilized, notably through children who acquire the knowledge through collective games and observation. The Subsidiary Body understood that these expressions are part of a system of beliefs corresponding to the memory of Yampara communities and their worldview. Given that Pujillay and Ayarichi are shared by Andean cultures, inscription of the element would not only contribute to greater awareness of the importance of these cultures in general, but would also reflect its intrinsic creativity. The information provided on the proposed safeguard measures, including the transmission activities, was satisfactory, and the file provided adequate community participation in the elaboration of the nomination file. Nevertheless, the Body was keen to draw attention to the measures envisaged in the safeguarding plan concerning tourism, so that they do not alter the meaning of these practices for the communities concerned and that they remain the main beneficiaries. In addition, an exchange of letters between Peru and the submitting State had been brought to the attention of the Body. Noting that the Quechua population of Peru share the element, Peru had requested the deletion of a sentence in the original text that might have caused confusion in this regard, which was accepted by Bolivia. The Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied and concluded by recommending the inscription of Pujillay and Ayarichi, music and dances of the Yampara culture on the Representative List, while proposing two additional paragraphs. Paragraph 4 concerned the possible effects of tourism and paragraph 5 cited the same formulation adopted earlier for Armenia, that the inclusion of an element on the Representative List did not imply exclusivity.
89. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.6 to inscribe Pujllay and Ayarichi, music and dances of the Yampara culture on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
90. The delegation of **Bolivia**, represented by the Minister of Culture,spoke on behalf of the country and the Yampara community in its appreciation of the inscription of the element on the Representative List. This recognized the significant cultural contribution of Yampara communities in the celebration of an ancient culture that is related to fertility rites in relation to Pachamama.
91. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Zmijanje embroidery** [draft decision 9.COM 10.7] submitted by **Bosnia and Herzegovina**. Zmijanje embroidery is a specific technique practised by the women of Zmijanje villages in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Traditionally, Zmijanje embroidery is used to decorate female costumes and household items, including wedding dresses, scarves, garments and bed linen. A deep blue thread is used to embroider improvised geometrical shapes; the richness and variations of the embroidered designs determine the social status of the village women. Embroidery is usually performed among groups of women, who engage in needlework while singing and chatting. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. By combining religious rituals, oral traditions, know-how linked to traditional crafts and a symbolic universe, the embroidery was shown to be an important element of identity and a living heritage transmitted to younger generations. Similarly, the nomination satisfactorily demonstrated that inscription would enhance the understanding and appreciation of intangible cultural heritage at the national level, but would also stimulate dialogue among embroiderers internationally. In addition, the Body unanimously appreciated the proposed safeguarding measures, which were well designed and realistic, adequately responding to the needs. There was also broad participation of different actors, whose roles were clearly described, and the widest possible participation of the community in the elaboration of the file and the inclusion of the element in an inventory were clearly demonstrated. The Body therefore recommended that Zmijanje embroidery be inscribed on the Representative List, recalling paragraph 4 of the draft decision that expressions such as ‘authentic’ and ‘original’ did not comply with either the spirit or the letter of the Convention.
92. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body for the explanation, noting that the Committee was ready to adopt the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
93. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to emphasize, as was stated in the file, that ‘embroidery’ referred to an abstract concept that comprised the technique practised by the women and not the object itself.
94. The **Chairperson** concurred with the remark by Belgium, and proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, which were duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.7 to inscribe Zmijanje embroidery on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
95. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked on the last paragraph in which it was mentioned that it was inappropriate to mention terms such as ‘unique’, ‘original’ and ‘exceptional. As this was second time, it was apparent that a general recommendation should be made, as one might not necessarily refer to specific decisions of a particular State or inscription, which would be clearer for all.
96. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire for the pertinent intervention. The Chairperson then turned to the next draft decision 9.COM 10.8.
97. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Capoeira circle** [draft decision 9.COM 10.8] submitted by **Brazil**. Capoeira is an Afro-Brazilian cultural practice that can be interpreted as a tradition, a sport and even an art form that promotes mutual respect and social cohesion. Capoeira players form a circle at the centre of which two players engage with one another. The movements require great bodily dexterity. The other players around the circle sing, chant, clap and play percussive instruments. Capoeira circles comprise a master, counter-master and disciples. The master is the bearer and guardian of the knowledge of the circle, and teaches the group through observation and imitation. The Subsidiary Body found that the file satisfactorily demonstrated that the element constituted the intangible cultural heritage of Brazilians and that it also embodied the memory of the African diaspora in Brazil as well as being a symbol of Brazil around the world. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded favourably on all the criteria. The nomination demonstrated how the inclusion of this element would contribute to ensuring visibility of similar expressions related to resistance against oppression and discrimination, especially among communities of African descent, and that it fostered dialogue. The proposed safeguarding measures were comprehensive and detailed. The participation of communities as well as the submitting State, particularly through the National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN), had been clearly demonstrated. The Body were convinced of the widest possible participation of the community in the elaboration of the nomination and its free, prior and informed consent, as well as its inscription in an inventory. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Capoeira circle on the Representative List.
98. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, which was duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.8 to inscribe Capoeira circle on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
99. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Committee, the Subsidiary Body, the Secretariat, and colleagues from the Brazilian delegation, the chief of intangible heritage of IPHAN, and the practitioners of capoeira, masters who were represented from Brazil and groups composed of French, Portuguese and Brazilian practitioners in Paris. The delegation wished to thank all those who promote and safeguard intangible cultural heritage all over the world, and mostly for the inscription of capoeira by the Committee. The delegation described capoeira as a game, a fight and a dance. It is a ritual performed around a circle, which is a metaphor for the cycle of life, and has its own hierarchy and mechanisms of transmission. Capoeira also gave rise to its own musical form accompanied by specially developed instruments and rhythms that facilitate the improvisation of capoeira gestures. Created by African slaves brought to Brazil more than 300 years ago during a long period of slavery, it served as a survival tool in the face of continued violence. For at least three centuries, capoeira was forbidden by white society but even so it managed to survive all kinds of oppression, imprisonment and prejudice and was played inside the plantations, the mining areas, in the poorest urban suburbs. Capoeira is recognized as national heritage since 2008, and for this reason Brazilian intangible cultural heritage policies coordinated by IPHAN had stimulated the creation of local and regional committees all over the country, as well as many other safeguarding measures. The delegation expressed the country’s emotion for the international recognition and visibility of capoeira; the opposite of the situation faced so many years ago. Reflecting on its history since the first slaves invented the capoeira, the delegation was grateful to the bearers and masters who for such a long time had transmitted their knowledge. It believed that capoeira reinforced the principles of the Convention, and at the same time it emphasized its role as an instrument of social cohesion in fighting discrimination.

*[Performance of capoeira]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Chiprovski kilimi (Chiprovtsi carpets)** [draft decision 9.COM 10.9] submitted by **Bulgaria**. Kilimi are hand-woven carpets made by the women of Chiprovtsi. The weavers take several threads of the warp, interlace the weft yarn into the warp to make tapestries traditionally utilized as floor coverings. The process of transmission occurs informally from mothers and grandmothers to daughters, often while working together on large carpets. The men of the town typically engage in wool production, processing and dyeing. The finished carpets are renowned for their composition, ornamental motifs and colour. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. It was convinced that the nomination demonstrated the knowledge and skills associated with this practice, ranging from breeding sheep, wool processing and the weaving itself, and were recognized by the Chiprovtsi villagers as part of their cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation. The Body also concluded without difficulty that the inscription of the element would improve the visibility of traditional craftsmanship and its diverse skills to promote dialogue between communities with similar traditions. The proposed safeguarding measures appeared adequate, benefiting from proven support by the submitting State. The Body concluded that the nomination process had the full participation of the practitioners and inhabitants of Chiprovtsi, local authorities, and relevant NGOs. The Subsidiary Body concluded by recommending the inscription of Chiprovski kilimi (Chiprovtsi carpets) on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that Bulgaria wished to change the title of the element in order to respond to remarks, especially from Belgium, on the importance of highlighting the *process* and not the productin the title.
3. The **Secretary** read the proposed title, ‘The tradition of carpet-making in Chiprovtsi’.
4. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** agreed with the decision of the Subsidiary Body and supported the proposal. Indeed, it was not the carpet that should be inscribed but the tradition of carpet manufacture.
5. The delegation of **Belgium** asked that the proposal be transcribed in paragraph 3.
6. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.9 to inscribe **the tradition of carpet-making in Chiprovtsi** on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
7. The delegation of **Bulgaria** explained that it had introduced the amendment at the last moment in order to adhere to the principle of consistency. It expressed its utmost satisfaction with the positive evaluation by the Subsidiary Body and the Committee to inscribe. The inscription held enormous value for the country where the tradition of carpet making had for a long time not only become an overarching symbol of cultural identity but also a powerful example of the continuing efforts to ensure the vitality of cultural tradition. The inscription of the element bore special importance for the local community where the preparation of carpets was the most representative local occupation, engaging men and women, children and the elderly, and where the traditional transmission of carpet weaving skills was well preserved. Intertwined with a range of beliefs, verbal, formal and ritual practices, carpet weaving was deeply integrated in the social and cultural life of the population of Chiprovski, enabling social contact and shedding light on the fundamental importance of natural resources in human creativity.
8. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Ritual dance of the royal drum** [draft decision 9.COM 10.10] submitted by **Burundi**. The ritual dance of the royal drum is a spectacle combining powerful, synchronized drumming with dancing, heroic poetry and traditional songs. The dance calls for at least a dozen or so drums, always in an odd number, arranged in a semicircle around a central drum. Two or three drummers then perform dances to the rhythm. The ritual dance is an opportunity to transmit cultural, political and social messages, and a privileged means of bringing people of diverse generations and origins together, thereby encouraging unity and social cohesion. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied, and – following the practice of its predecessors – wished to cite the nomination as a ‘good example’ that could inspire other States in this exercise. Indeed, the submitting State had convincingly demonstrated that the element, having undergone various transformations of meaning and practice, today constituted an expression of identity recognized by the people of Burundi, including its diaspora. The explanation in R.2 clearly showed how the element’s inscription promoted inter-generational dialogue and human creativity. The Body found that the nomination presented a rich and detailed safeguarding plan, including measures designed not only to ensure learning, transmission and dissemination of the practice, but also tackled such issues as the protection of the raw materials used to make the drums. The participation of drummers had been adequately demonstrated in the elaboration of the safeguarding plan and the nomination file, as well as the inventory. The Subsidiary Body was thus pleased to conclude its recommendation of the inscription of Ritual dance of the royal drum on the Representative List.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair of Subsidiary Body for the summary, and was pleased to note that the nomination was among those considered to constitute a ‘good example’.
10. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated Burundi on its nomination, its first element inscribed on the Representative List. It wished the people of Burundi all the best, congratulating them for the great tradition of the ritual dance of the royal drum.
11. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** congratulated Burundi for the inscription of the element on the Representative List, agreeing with the Committee in its encouraging remark on the high quality of the nomination.
12. The delegation of **Uganda** joined the other States in congratulating Burundi for the quality of its nomination file, remarking that her director had suggested that Uganda consider nominating the royal drums of Uganda, and it would thus use this file as an example for its nominations in the future.
13. The delegation of **Turkey** joined the previous speakers in commending the nomination, constituting the first ever inscription for Burundi, and it welcomed and encouraged such initiatives, which was fully in the spirit of the Convention.
14. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.10 to inscribe Ritual dance of the royal drum on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
15. The Minister of Sports and Culture of **Burundi** spoke of the country’s honour and privilege to have been honoured by the Committee, remarking that UNESCO had strengthened the ties that united it with Burundi. He congratulated the Subsidiary Body for its productive and objective work in its evaluation of nominations. The Minister spoke of the country’s pride that the element had been inscribed on the Representative List. It was a proud moment for Burundi and a great day for all the peoples of Africa and the world, adding that entire population of Burundi recognized ‘The ritual dance of the royal drum’ as part of its cultural heritage and national identity. This dance was practised today throughout the country in primary schools, colleges and universities, and showcased in other cultural events in the country. It was also practised abroad by the Burundian diaspora. The representatives of the drummers, supported by the government, wished to have their art recognized for its values and originality on the Representative List. Now that this had been achieved, the dance would be popular abroad through cultural festivals. Furthermore, Burundi had already presented this ceremonial dance at regional, continental and world events. This dance thus represented Burundi’s immense cultural wealth, which would enhance the quality of intangible cultural heritage as a whole. The Minister spoke of several measures that were envisaged for the transmission, protection, promotion, and research of this dance. It would strengthen and promote the dance in schools, universities and youth clubs dance. The government was already protecting the plant species that was necessary in the manufacture of the drum, as well as the historical sites and shrines connected with this dance. Inscription would encourage cultural partners to promote the sending of drummers outside the country to raise awareness and foster cultural exchange, and an international festival of percussion was also planned. Thus, several activities were planned, which required support, including from UNESCO. The Minister was grateful for the support in the promotion of the dance nationally and internationally, inviting the delegates to join the performance of Ritual dance of the royal drum later in the evening.

*[Performance of ritual dance of the royal drum]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister of Sports and Culture of Burundi for honouring the Committee with his presence.
2. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of the meeting of the NGO working groups, as well as an information session on the capacity-building programme for Electoral Group III.
3. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session.

*[Wednesday 26 November, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the session, inviting the Vice-Chair to continue with the presentation of nomination files to the Representative List.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Baile Chino** [draft decision 9.COM 10.11] submitted by **Chile**. Bailes Chinos are brotherhoods of musicians who express their faith through music, dance and singing. Organized mainly by men, dances consist of jumps and flexing movements of the legs, performed to the rhythm of flutes and percussion. The leader sings rhyming couplets that recount holy stories and address religious subjects, while a drummer leads the choreography and controls the tempo of the music. The brotherhoods function as a model for social integration and cohesion to which almost the entire local community subscribes. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The nomination adequately described the Baile Chino as the intangible cultural heritage of the entire territory of Chile, which strengthened social cohesion and integration. Similarly, the Body found that the nomination demonstrated how inscription of the element reflected cultural diversity, through the diversity of the brotherhoods, which promoted values of respect and reciprocity. The proposed safeguarding measures were adequately described and articulated, reflecting the close cooperation of the submitting State, particularly through its local governments and the groups of practitioners. The nomination also provided the consent of a large number of practitioners, as well as evidence of inscription on the national inventory. The satisfaction of the five criteria therefore followed the recommendation of the Body to include the Baile Chino on the Representative List.
3. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 11 to inscribe Baile Chino** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
4. The delegation of **Chile** expressed its deep gratitude to the Committee for inscribing the element on the Representative List, a brotherhood of musicians and dancers associated with the Catholic devotion of syncretic figures with participants expressing their faith through a unique style of singing, dancing and music. The first traces of Baile Chino date back to 1585 in the town of Andacollo, an event that remains in force to this day. There were currently 60 active brotherhoods of Bailes Chinos that transmit this art from generation to generation. The inscription was thus of great importance for the country, its culture and people. The delegation remarked that this was the first inscription for Chile on the Representative List, adding that it would motivate nominations in the future, as well as encourage more spaces for dialogue and exchange of experiences between the different Bailes Chinos and their members. The proposed safeguarding measures would also strengthen the groups in their regional location so as to facilitate their travel to meet and exchange experience. The delegation thanked its Latin American colleagues at the Centre for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Latin America that had encouraged the submission of the nomination. It also thanked the Subsidiary Body for its recommendations, the Committee for its generous comments and encouragement, and UNESCO as a whole.

*[Film projection of Baile Chino]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Chile for its first inscription.
2. The delegation of **Peru** welcomed Chile’s first inscription, adding that it was absolutely sure that Baile Chino would enhance the visibility of the Representative List.
3. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Committee and the Subsidiary Body for their excellent work, and congratulated Chile for its first inscription on the Representative List. Baile Chino represented the spirit of the Convention that enriched the culture of the country and the world. It encouraged Chile to soon submit other nominations.
4. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated Chile for its excellent nomination, adding that it was proud of its South American neighbours to see this element inscribed on the Representative List. It was certain that cooperation with all the other countries in South America, when an element was inscribed, reinforced the regional politics in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and fostered cooperation, integration, and a culture of peace.
5. The delegation of **India** joined the other speakers in congratulating Chile on its inscription, adding that it was their first nomination although they had been part of multinational nominations.
6. The delegation of **Ethiopia** also extended its congratulations to Chile on its excellent first inscription, adding that it hoped that there would be many more nominations to come.
7. The delegation of **Turkey** remarked on yet another great success on the part of the submitting State, as well as the Subsidiary Body towards a more efficient implementation of the Convention. As its first inscription, it commended Chile, while welcoming the neighbourly and mutual cooperation demonstrated among all the relevant partners, which was a model for UNESCO in making a difference towards building peace together.
8. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Torch festival of the Yi people** [draft decision 9.COM 10.12] submitted by **China**. The Torch Festival is celebrated every year among the Yi people of southwest China to dedicate offerings to the ancestors and prayers for a bountiful harvest. This traditional festival derives its name from the torches that villagers ignite to illuminate their fields amid a host of traditional and ritual practices, games and competitions, accompanied by folk songs, festivities, dances with masks and swords, and sacrifices at the fire. The Torch Festival functions as an important bridge for social interaction and cultural reconciliation between communities of the Yi, as well as a harmonious channel for interethnic dialogue and cultural exchange. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5 were satisfied, but that the nomination lacked technical details to satisfy criteria R.1 and R.2. The Body agreed that the different proposed safeguarding measures were coherent and well structured. It also concluded that the Yi community had actively participated in the elaboration of the nomination and that the element was included on local and national inventories. However, the Body had engaged in lengthy debate on the inscription of an element – that would have international reach – which included certain practices that might be interpreted by some communities as highlighting violence towards animals during a public performance. At least three times, the file referred to fights of bulls, rams and roosters with audio-visual material displaying such images. The Body therefore found it necessary to request the submitting State to provide additional information in order to determine whether the practices were consistent with the principles of respect for the sensitivities of various communities and sustainable development. The Body emphasized that it did not question the fact that the communities themselves recognized the festival as their intangible cultural heritage, but considered that the nomination did not contain sufficient information to enable it to ensure that it met the definition of intangible cultural heritage as set out in Article 2 of the Convention, as required in criterion R.1. Considerations on criterion R.2 naturally stem from R.1. The Body was therefore unable to assess how a possible inscription could promote dialogue. Some communities were likely to be upset by the inscription of an element evoking the violent use of animals for entertainment purposes. The Subsidiary Body therefore recommended to refer the nomination to the submitting State for additional information on these aspects for resubmission in a subsequent cycle.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for her detailed presentation.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** supported the remarks by the Subsidiary Body on criteria R.1 and R.2, which focused on the use of animals in fights that might be shocking and violent. It asked that the responses concerning these fights be reviewed in a subsequent cycle.
11. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it looked carefully at the file, spoke to colleagues from the delegation of China, contacted other delegations about these sensitive subjects, and felt that the Committee was imposing its own concepts of what was acceptable or not on other people’s cultures for which it had to be careful not to sanitize its vision of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation explained that rural people have had traditional relationships with animals for millennia that were part of their way of life, adding that imposing urban concerns on them risked interfering with their practices that would de-characterizing them and achieve the opposite of that originally intended by the Convention. It wished to give China the opportunity to clarify how these animal fights take place in this festival, and its importance for the people. It was of the understanding that the animals were not killed during the fights, but that it was a demonstration of strength, comparable to games and disputes among the members of these communities. In addition, the community was a Tibetan minority in China that now lived at the frontier of Myanmar and Thailand, and other countries. This nomination would safeguard the traditions of this minority in China. The delegation therefore had two questions. Firstly, in criterion R.1, whether the component involving animal fights during the Torch Festival was compatible with respecting the sensitivity of communities, groups and individuals; and in criterion R.2, how the components of the festival, which use animals, encouraged dialogue among communities with a different sensitivity. The delegation further stressed the need to protect a very ancient, rural culture, adding that it did not wish to safeguard a fake nomination, but to protect the Yi people and their traditions, which had been practised for millennia.
12. The delegation of **Bulgaria** noted the justified decision of the Subsidiary Body, but it also sought more information in order to make an informed decision, and it associated with the questions posed by Brazil.
13. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** noted that China had submitted an ancient practice involving rural communities, but the Subsidiary Body also drew attention to practices that might upset those of a sensitive nature, adding that the respect for animals was important to UNESCO. It therefore proposed that China explain the use of animals.
14. The delegation of **Mongolia** found the nomination very interesting, and agreed with the remarks made by Brazil. It also sought clarifications from China on the animal fights, and whether they had some symbolic meaning.
15. The delegation of **Greece** echoed the remarks by Brazil with whom it fully agreed. It noted that the festival was a very old tradition about offerings to the ancestors and sacrifices to the fire, which was at the heart of every civilization. The delegation sought further clarification from China on the role of the animals, as it felt that it did not refer to fighting but a way of showing strength.
16. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** acknowledged that the animal fights was a major element that stood in the way of inscription, as cited in paragraph 3 of the draft decision. It supported the Subsidiary Body’s view that the violent use of living animals for entertainment did not respect the sensitivity of diverse communities and sustainable development, and did not encourage dialogue among communities that have a different sensitivity. However, when examining the inscription of the entire element, with the use of animals only playing a part in the multiple aspects, their use should be considered within the wider perspective of the element’s social function and cultural meaning. For example, how did the audience recognize the use of living animals: as part of ritual symbolism or as simple entertainment. If it proved to be a part of a ritual symbolism, it would thus give more flexibility in considering the use of animals. These could include whether intended violence takes place in the ritual, and whether protective measures were in place for those animals engaged in the ritual. In its opinion, this evaluation process could be applied to the element to fully assess the implication of animal fighting as part of the festival. In this regard, it wished to give China the opportunity to share more information on the use of living animals.
17. The delegation of **Peru** reminded the Committee that its decisions were observed worldwide and would remain so for a very long time. It agreed with the Subsidiary Body that the element was a very sensitive, important, beautiful, and meaningful expression. However, the nomination did not explain the true nature of these animal ‘fights’, as was clearly written in the file, which had a connotation of violence. Unfortunately, the file did not explain how the fights occurred, and whether there was death or suffering, or even symbolism. Nevertheless, even if the expression represented cultural symbolism, it must be recalled that intangible cultural heritage in the Convention, not specifically for the people of Yi, must be respectful of the sensitivities of communities and sustainable development. Thus, this was not a simple matter of a missing detail, but rather a greater reflection on this issue in order to act with full knowledge of the element, which was why a referral was recommended. Moreover, the Committee’s work was not about pleasing States Parties in the moment, but working towards a future for the sake of intangible cultural heritage of humanity, which was extremely important. The delegation spoke about the Committee’s responsibility, adding that it wished no harm to the people of Yi or China to ask for additional information. It also suggested that the Secretariat create a working group to look into the aspect of animal cruelty for entertainment purposes, adding that, based on the information in the file, the fights were not a ritual sacrifice, or for food, but for entertainment.
18. The delegation of **Afghanistan** remarked that the essential points were already mentioned by Brazil, adding it would be easy to make a decision about the animal fights if they were central to the festival rather than part of a set of rituals. The delegation wondered whether the Torch festival was greater and deeper than this sole aspect, presenting a different vision of life, for which China was well known. Moreover, rural China might have a specific vision inherited from a state of harmony or Confucius with its own way of presenting these aspects of life. The delegation therefore sought greater clarification from China.
19. Having carefully reviewed the file, the delegation of **Egypt** agreed with Brazil that the Committee should hear the clarifications from China, bearing in mind however the concerns of the Subsidiary Body. It believed that it was very dangerous to apply one’s cultural principles to other cultures under the pretence of respecting cultures and traditions. After all, the Convention called for the respect of all cultures. Moreover, as scientific research and the process of implementation of the Convention were concerned, one cannot distinguish or remove an element from its context. It would be very difficult to examine an element without due consideration for its context and the cultural meaning it provided to the local community. The delegation noted that the Committee should not tolerate cruelty towards animals for entertainment purposes. However, was violence or cruelty towards animals acceptable on other grounds? Thus, if it is unacceptable for entertainment purposes then it must be unacceptable in other contexts or for other purposes. The delegation further remarked that humans and animals had a very long and complex cultural, social and economic relationship, adding that in many cultures they figured in tales, legends and myths, as well as in cultural and social practices in various civilizations. This relationship was therefore often present in intangible cultural heritage, and as such the delegation requested an opportunity for China to clarify these issues.
20. The delegation of **India** remarked that the nomination was very interesting as it proposed a millennia-old tradition in rural China where animals played an integral part of the festival. It was of the understanding that the animals were displaying their raw strength and skills, and the practice did not entail the killing of animals. It further remarked that for religious purposes, as a vegetarian, should everybody stop eating meat if it entailed cruelty to animals? Thus, the nomination should be looked at in a broader perspective. Moreover, except for the use of animals, the State Party had satisfied all the criteria. The delegation therefore requested that the State Party elaborate on the use of animals during the festival.
21. The delegation of **Algeria** remarked that it had attentively read the nomination and the findings of the Subsidiary Body, and wished to hear China express its position on the issue of animal fighting. More generally, it supported Peru’s remarks in asking that the Committee and the Secretariat organize a meeting in order to discuss this sensitive issue and sustainable development, adding that it was known that sacrifices were an anthropological subject that implied symbolic events that was part of intangible heritage. However it was important to discuss this in the context of the Convention during the working group meeting.
22. The delegation of **Turkey** also read the file very carefully and believed that the statement by Brazil had merit and should not be disregarded. Every nation, every civilization had age-old rituals and practices, and one standard cannot be implemented for all. Nevertheless, it understood that animal cruelty or systematic violence in a cultural practice was an important concern for the entire international community. It therefore wished to learn more from China and if there were certain measures on the part of the government, local authorities or non-governmental institutions to refrain from any intentional cruelty against the animals, while continuing to practice these rituals. It was also important to note that the animal fights only constituted a small part of the entire ritual and festivities, and thus it could not sacrifice an important part of the cultural life of the community, and that the Committee should be cautious in establishing precedence on that issue.
23. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that some disturbing statements had compelled it to speak, adding that it was uncomfortable to hear of accusations against the Subsidiary Body or Members of the Committee that they carried value judgments on the element. The delegation recalled that there was no value judgment on the element, and that everyone recognized that the element was of great interest, an old civilization with ancient rituals. Moreover, nobody was trying to impose civilization standards on another civilization. This was absolutely not the issue. The delegation explained that the issue lay in what the Committee could and could not promote internationally, adding that there were many elements that have not yet been submitted that might cause the same kind of problems for UNESCO, particularly as an international organization. For this reason, it was important to fully reflect on the elements inscribed on the international list. The delegation therefore supported the statements made by Peru in seeking more information so as to be very clear on what the practice entailed. The delegation also believed that the working group should consider other issues such as gender and other problematic themes. It concluded by recognizing the Committee’s respect for the element and for the bearer community, but that there were also issues that could not be put on an international list.
24. The delegation of **Tunisia** considered it natural to expect an element to be in line with the international conventions. However, it believed that there was a problem of interpretation, not only of this element but also in a number of other elements, questioning whether it was the responsibility of the submitting State or those evaluating the element. It was therefore appropriate to ask China for some clarification, in support of the request made by Peru.
25. As Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body, the delegation of **Nigeria** was reluctant to speak, recalling the intense debates about this issue, adding that the boundaries of what was acceptable was indistinct. The delegation spoke of a place in Nigeria where they ate dog meat, which was considered a local delicacy, even though many people would consider killing dogs as barbaric. There was therefore a fine line between killing dogs, which is considered a delicacy, and animal fights, and thus it was important to approach the issue with caution. It believed that more debate was needed on this issue. Moreover, it was important to note that the file was not rejected, but referred for more information.
26. The **Chairperson** invited China to respond to the concerns raised.
27. The delegation of **China** referred to criterion R.1 related to the respect for the sensitivities of diverse communities and sustainable development. The Yi ethnic group is a minority group with a time-honoured writing system and a sophisticated knowledge of astronomy and animal husbandry. The Torch Festival is a 3-day festival that features various kinds of folkloric activities, including sacrificing to the fire, playing with the fire, and sending off the fire. Each and every activity includes the participation of animals during the three days, and is an integral part of the ritualized practice as a whole. The Yi people have always shown respect for the protection of animals. In their worldview, humans and animals are both progeny of snow, meaning that they are brothers and equal in origin. The Torch Festival was not only for the people but for animals as well. The animal contest was just one way in which the animals participate, which was reflected in section 1(v) of the nomination form. The Torch Festival originated from the legend about the competition between the heaven god and the earth goddess. It was also regarded as a strength contest between yin and yang. The vivid description of this legend can be found in the film of the free, prior consent of the communities. The delegation explained that the wrestling and horse racing, the beauty contest, the endurance contest between bulls, and the horns contest between rams were an imitation of the change of nature with profound ritual connotations, and was not for the purpose of entertainment, and were carried out under traditional rules. The contest between animals was not only the reflection of the spirit of the animals, but also a special way for people to appreciate and respect the life of animals. In addition, the Torch Festival takes place during the time of great heat in the region when bulls and rams suffer great pain due to parasites. They mitigate the pain by killing the parasites by chasing and horn-heading one another. Thus, the health of animals and the driving away of pests during the Torch Festival were based on folk knowledge, wisdom and experience that respected the life and the quality of the animals in the development of animal husbandry. The contests not only enhanced the health of the animals they also encouraged the communities to improve production, passing down the knowledge of animal husbandry, this was reflected in the film submitted with the nomination file. The delegation therefore believed the animals had a profound understanding of their relationship with humans and its unique space for dialogue, adding that it was compatible with the requirement of respect for the sensitivities of diverse communities and sustainable development.
28. The delegation of **China** then referred to the question of how the components of the festival involving living animals could encourage dialogue among communities. It wished to state that the Torch Festival consisted of a series of ritualized activities. The contest between animals, livestock in particular, during the Torch Festival did not involve any violent use of animals. Instead it had a profound symbolic meaning and special social and cultural functions. The Yi people make a living through farming and animal husbandry and since ancient times, they have become attentive to livestock and treat them equally as family members. The involvement of animals thus reflected vividly the Yi’s philosophy for harmonious coexistence of humans and animals, as well as the delight of humans and gods, and all living beings during the Torch Festival. It was by no means of source of entertainment from animals. In section 1(v) of the nomination form, a quote of the Yi folk song clearly reflected the Yi philosophy of equality and collective participation in the festival and harmony between nature and communities. The animal contests on the second day of the Torch Festival are the imitation of the change of nature. These contests are governed by traditional contest rules and folkloric animal ethics carried out under surveillance throughout the performance where neither humans nor animals are wounded. Section (d) of the nomination form mentioned that many other ethnic groups in southwest China also celebrate the festival. They have different religious beliefs, culture and language and so far no sensitivity issues or objections have been raised. The delegation reiterated that the animal contests did not involve violent use of animals for entertainment nor did they provoke objections among communities. The festival played a distinctive role in maintaining ethnic identity, enhancing social harmony, and promoting cultural exchange among local communities and groups in response to their environment. The delegation also wished to emphasize that due to the word limitation in the nomination form, it was not possible to fully explain the animal contests, which was only a small component of the festival, while neglecting the main theme that is the sacrifice to the fire. It hoped that the Committee would focus on the fundamental attributions and integrity of the ritual practice of the festival, adding that animal contests should not be judged as a violent use of animals for entertainment purposes. Nevertheless, it fully understood the concerns expressed by the Committee, and regretted the use of ‘animal fights’ that caused confusion, adding that it also came about because of difficulties in translation and differences in cultures. The delegation invited the expert on the Yi festival to explain the word ‘fight’ in the original language of the Yi people.
29. The **representative of the Yi people** was from the Liangshan 凉山 (‘Cool Mountain’) region of Sichuan Province. She admitted that cross-lingual translation was difficult and one of the main language obstacles in the nomination files. She cited the Chinese word for ‘fight’ in expressions such as ‘bullfight’, ‘ram fight’ and ‘cock fight’, explaining that they did not exist in various Yi dictionaries, and that ‘fight’ as cited in the nomination form originated from the literal translation of the Chinese character ‘do’. The verbal usage of ‘animal contests’ in the Yi language is a specific verb stemming from traditional contests, which strictly indicated a contest of stamina and raw force featuring animals. Considering the word limit in the form, it was therefore considered impractical to interpret the fine differences in the verb usage. Moreover, it was difficult to find a comprehensive word in translating the Yi language from Chinese and English to describe these three contests. The verb ‘fight’ in Yi language therefore did not match its usage in English. A more accurate translation in English could be ‘contests of strength’, which has an essential difference compared to the notion of a true fight. The representative believed that such culture translations like this presented challenges, and thus it was reasonable to make allowances for these difficulties.
30. The delegation of **China** also wished to draw attention to the erroneous description of the element in the draft decision, which made reference to epic folksongs and ballads that are performed on traditional flutes and other instruments in the Torch Festival. It was noted that there was no such mention of epic folksongs and ballads in the nomination file. According to the Yi tradition, the practices of instruments, epics and poems were independent. The epics were only practised at weddings and funerals, and rituals for sending out the soul of the dead. It therefore wished to draw the Committee’s attention to the wrong message in the description of the element.
31. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked Saint Lucia for its statement, adding that it wished to clarify Brazil’s position. The delegation appreciated the work of the Subsidiary Body and its report, which provided useful orientations for the future. It took into consideration that the Subsidiary Body’s report had stressed that an element submitted for inscription had to be very clearly described in criterion R.1 so that criterion R.2 could be appropriately met. Having talked to the Chinese delegation, and listened to the explanations, it was sure that these clarifications described the values of the Chinese people, which could be difficult to judge in light of one’s own values. In addition, it was convinced that language difficulties had led to a misinterpretation of the true meaning of the animal participation in this festival. Thus, the explanations provided by China gave a clearer indication of the element to better analyse the nomination file.
32. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or amendments in paragraph 1, it was duly adopted.
33. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it had presented the amendments to the decision to the Secretariat, which were projected on the screen. It wished to emphasize that these amendments were not intended as a criticism, adding that it sought to debate ideas and was not in any way personal. The delegation felt that it was important to discuss ideas so as to determine what was anthropologically and scientifically correct. It spoke about modern civilization and a world where people eat steak, wear leather shoes, and take medicines that use animals in research in the belief that this was kind to animals because we did not see what happened to them. Moreover, some traditional cultures had a more direct contact with animals and a different relationship with animals, which is often more respectful than in modern cultures. Thus, care should be taken whenever one was compelled to impose one’s own values. Hence, Brazil’s amendments reflected the notion of debating ideas among a Committee of experts.
34. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to read out the amendment to R.1 in paragraph 2.
35. The **Secretary** presented the proposed amendment in R.1, paragraph 2, which read: ‘The Torch festival includes different cultural expressions and practices transmitted from generation to generation, and is part of the cultural identity of the Yi communities; it is compatible with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.’
36. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee toshow its support for the proposed amendment. It was noted that the amendment did not receive broad support, and was thus rejected.
37. The delegations of **India** and **Kyrgyzstan** supported Brazil’s amendment.
38. The **Chairperson** remarked that the decision had already been adopted and thus moved to the second amendment proposed by Brazil in R.2.
39. The **Secretary** presented the proposed amendment, which read: ‘The file demonstrates how inscription of the Torch festival on the Representative List could contribute to the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage and could encourage dialogue among communities by linking up various subgroups of the Yi neighbouring ethnic communities, domestic and international scholars.’
40. The delegation of **Algeria** supported Brazil’s amendment in R.2.
41. The **Chairperson** noted that there was insufficient support for the amendment, which was duly rejected, and the original paragraph was retained and adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the draft decision and sub-paragraphs R.3, R.4 and R.5 of paragraph 2. With no comments or objections, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 3 and the original sub-paragraphs on R.1 and R.2.
42. The delegation of **Brazil** proposed the deletion of the word ‘violent’ in paragraph R.2, which was duly adopted.
43. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 3 as a whole, which was duly adopted.
44. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it had proposed an amendment to this paragraph, but as its amendments in paragraph 2 were not adopted, the former paragraph 3 had been maintained. Thus, it withdrew its amendment, and the original paragraph to refer the nomination to the submitting State was maintained.
45. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 4, which was duly adopted.
46. On behalf of the 8 million people of the Yi community, the delegation of **China** expressed its sincere appreciation of the great efforts by the Subsidiary Body, the Secretariat and the Committee on the evaluation of this element, as well as all the valuable comments. However, it expressed disappointment with the Committee’s decision, remarking on the representatives of the communities in their beautiful folk costumes that had come to the meeting during a week when the communities were celebrating the Yi New Year’s festival. One could only imagine their disappointment on hearing the news. The delegation was disappointed, as it believed the decision was made on the basis of a misinterpretation of the definition of the element, and not because of any technical issue or lack of information, adding that this was unfair to the communities. As one of the States Parties who ratified the Convention at an early stage, China had closely followed the development of the Convention and actively participated in relevant activities and events under its framework. It remarked how during the development of the Convention it had continuously encountered controversial issues, which always served to reflect on how the Convention could better guide the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. From a positive perspective, it believed that the case of the Torch Festival could be a new study on the promotion of cultural diversity and dialogue between cultures in the spirit of the Convention. It presented a new space for dialogue between communities, and particularly communities with different sensitivities, and helped think about the relationship between humans, animals and nature. As the Chinese goes, ‘seeing is believing’. The delegation therefore invited the delegates to visit China and join the Torch Festival with the local communities in the near future. It concluded with a quote by the Chinese president who visited UNESCO earlier this year, ‘civilizations have come in different colours and such diversity has made exchange and mutual learning among civilizations relevant and valuable. A single flower does not make spring while a hundred flowers in full blossom bring springs to the garden. An attitude of equality and modesty is required if one wants to truly understand the various civilizations’.
47. With no further comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.12 to refer Torch festival of the Yi people to the submitting State for additional information**.
48. The delegation of **Uruguay** noted the consideration for the very sensitive issues just discussed, and suggested to consider the proposal by Peru to organize a meeting in this regard with a view to easing the Committee’s work in the future.
49. The **Chairperson** thanked Uruguay for its interesting proposal, and suggested discussing this point in the next agenda item. He then turned to draft decision 9.COM 10.13.
50. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Spring celebration: Hıdrellez or Saint George’s day** [draft decision 9.COM 10.13] submitted by **Croatia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia, Romania, the Republic of Moldova and Turkey**. Hıdrellez or Saint George’s Day is celebrated on 6 May or 23 April to mark the reawakening of nature. Different ceremonies and rituals linked to nature are performed in each locale to promote well-being, fertility and prosperity, and to protect livestock and crops for the coming year. The knowledge and skills are actively transmitted from one generation to the next, through the involvement of family members, groups or communities, who have distinct roles in transmission. The Subsidiary Body failed to find sufficient information to understand the unifying aspects of the Spring celebration: Hıdrellez of Saint-Georges day that made it a single element for all the communities involved. The nomination provided detailed information on how the different festivities were experienced by the different communities, but the Body questioned whether there was indeed a common ground that the communities would recognize. As a result of this ambiguity on the scope of and contours of the element, as well as on a common denominator for the different celebrations described in the nomination, the Body concluded that the nomination should be referred in criterion R.1. Consequently, this had a knock-on effect at the level of each criterion. Indeed, the lack of information meant that the proposed element could not be clearly identified and thus it was impossible to measure how inscription would contribute to the objectives of the Representative List, particularly regarding awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage (R.2). The Body also found disparities in the proposed safeguard measures, where the level of information provided varied greatly from one State to another, resulting in a set of measures that were inconsistent, thus requiring further information. The evaluation of R.4 lacked clarity in the definition of the element, leading to an inadequate identification of the communities concerned. The Body sought to verify whether each community had given its consent to the submission of the joint nomination as a whole and not just that part of the element practised by its own community, as is implied by ‘informed’ consent. Given the diversity of the consent letters, the Body sought additional information in order to verify that the communities concerned had consented to the nomination of the same element. This ambiguity continued in R.5, since the information provided about inventories and evidence of inscription on the inventories in each of the countries did not enable the Body to determine whether it referred to single and same element, even though they appeared under different names. The Subsidiary Body therefore concluded by recommending referring Spring celebration: Hıdrellez or Saint George’s day to the submitting States for additional information for resubmission in a subsequent cycle.
51. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the presentation of the debates, opening the floor for comments.
52. Having worked on the elaboration of a file, the delegation of **Algeria** understood the difficulties of elaborating a multinational file involving various communities in different States, which was difficult even when involving several communities in the same country. The delegation found the nomination interesting because it raised questions on what the Subsidiary Body termed the ‘common core’, which could be called ‘invariance’, i.e. an aspect that does not vary and which is transformed in every community. It believed that although the nomination did not satisfy any of the criteria that it was nonetheless interesting. Thus, it would be good to hear from the submitting States about the problems they encountered, so as to learn from a pedagogical point of view.
53. The delegation of **Greece** was particularly pleased to have six countries from its region submit a joint nomination, which was deeply embedded in the spirit of the Convention, and it thus supported such nominations. However, as was mentioned by Algeria, it was extremely difficult to gather all the elements when there were various communities. The delegation therefore invited one of the submitting States to shed light on the whole process, adding that the figures of Hıdrellez and Saint-Georges were emblematic for the entire region and was an extremely interesting and ancient tradition.
54. The delegation of **Tunisia** realized how significant and important multinational submissions were. Indeed, this illustrated the uniqueness of intangible cultural heritage. However, it also realized how difficult it might be to draft such a nomination, not only drafting the paperwork but also on a theoretical approach, trying to identify the commonalities of an element or its expressions from one country to the next. Occasionally there might be an impression that there was not one single element but a number of elements. Thus, the delegation wished to hear from one or more of the submitting States in order to really understand the core of the nomination, and the heart of the element.
55. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the States Parties for their multinational nomination. Aside from the value of the element, it believed that this was a clear demonstration of how the Convention contributed to dialogue and a culture of peace and understanding among neighbouring countries. It highly appreciated the efforts of all the countries in the region that have different perspectives on religion and culture, and have even had a difficult history in the past, which was overcome by working together on this file to safeguard this very interesting practice.
56. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** was very sensitive to the fact that this was a multinational nomination, adding that this was an example to follow. However, it noted that none of the criteria had been satisfied and thus wondered how this had come about. The delegation asked that the submitting State(s) be allowed to provide an explanation.
57. Before moving to the adoption of the decision, the **Chairperson** opened the floor to the submitting States for comment.
58. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Committee Members and the Subsidiary Body for their encouraging remarks. It explained that preparing a multinational file was a great challenge due to the logistic challenges, challenges of different legislative restrictions or practices, the challenge of linguistics and many other aspects, as well as a relatively broad geography across the boundaries of nation States. However, what was surprising among the observations was that the experts did not perceive the core intention of the file, which was to demonstrate that multiple nations and communities belonging to different religions, convictions and geographic locations, were for centuries practising the same rituals with common practices on the same day. The difference being that in some communities this was called Hıdrellez, and in others Saint George, but the festivities overlapped. The delegation remarked that at a time of a disaccord among civilizations, interreligious disharmony, tensions between nations, communities, cultures, religions and States, the inscription of such a multinational file would have constituted a very strong message. It was obviously disappointed, but not to the point of giving up on the nomination, adding that it had faced similar constraints when preparing the multinational file on Novruz inscribed in 2009; now more countries seem to wish willing to join this file. In the case of Hıdrellez and Saint George, the delegation spoke of the determination of the submitting States to work together with its commitment to and confidence in the file, which had not diminished. Thus, together they would take on board the observations of the Subsidiary Body and restructure the file for submission in a subsequent cycle. It hoped that the Committee and the Subsidiary Body would be struck with the message of inter-civilization and interreligious coexistence and cohabitation.
59. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey for its important statement. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.13 to refer Spring celebration: Hıdrellez or Saint George’s day to the submitting State for additional information.**
60. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Arirang folk song in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** [draft decision 9.COM 10.14] submitted by **the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**. Arirang is a popular lyrical singing genre performed on various occasions among family, friends and communities, as well as on public occasions and at festivities. Transmitted and recreated orally, it exists in multiple traditional forms as well as symphonic and modern arrangements. Arirang typically contains a gentle and lyrical melody and speaks about leaving and reunion, sorrow, joy and happiness. The folk songs reinforce social relations, thus contributing to mutual respect and peaceful social development. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied, and that the nomination file demonstrated how the different variants of the lyrical singing provided a sense of identity and continuity to Koreans of all ages, creating a symbolic bond. The emphasis on the unifying character of the songs in the nomination led the Body to believe that inscription was likely to promote intercultural dialogue between communities practising similar traditions elsewhere in the world. The detailed description of the proposed safeguarding measures, some of which were already underway, demonstrated the commitment of both the State and the communities concerned. The participation of a wide range of stakeholders in the elaboration of the nomination file and the inscription of the element on the National List of Intangible Heritage were adequately demonstrated. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Arirang folk song in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea on the Representative List.
61. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or amendments, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.14 to inscribe Arirang folk song in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
62. The delegation of **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** spoke of its pleasure on this significant occasion of inscribing the Arirang folk song on the Representative List, adding that it was an auspicious and sentimental moment for all Korean people who were descendants of Dangoon of the Arirang nation. It deeply thanked the Committee, the Subsidiary Body, and the Secretariat for their sincere cooperation. The delegation remarked that it paid special attention to the protection of national heritage, regarding it as an important and patriotic undertaking that shone light on the national history and cultural traditions, as well as the enormous achievements made by the great leaders. Thanks to the wise guidance of the supreme leader Kim Jong-un, national heritage protection was carried out with the full participation of all people. The country would strive to fulfil its commitment to the Convention and further promote exchange with UNESCO and other countries.
63. Before moving to the next nomination, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia that had asked to speak.
64. On behalf of the delegation of **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** that participated in the multinational file, it wished to express its full support of the statement by Turkey. It emphasized that the celebration in its country expressed the same cultural expression as that of the other multinational communities, adding that it was an element that unified the entire population in the country. On the national level, this element was inscribed in five different languages, and was a very good example of the connectedness of different multinational cultures.
65. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Smoke sauna tradition in Võromaa** [draft decision 9.COM 10.16] submitted by **Estonia**. The smoke sauna tradition is an important part of everyday life in the Võro community of Estonia. It comprises a rich set of traditions including the actual bathing customs, the skills of making bath whisks, building and repairing saunas, and smoking meat in the sauna. Generally practised on Saturdays, but also before major festivals or important family events, it is above all a family custom whose main function is to relax the body and mind. Families take turns hosting each other. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The nomination convincingly demonstrated that the tradition of the smoke sauna is a living practice and a set of skills that is meaningful for the Võro community. The file contained adequate information about its features, its practitioners and their modes of transmission. The contribution of possible inscription to the objectives of this Representative List were presented in a realistic and reasoned manner, including through the strengthening of transboundary dialogue with practitioners from neighbouring countries with very similar traditions. The submitting State presented a rational and well-designed safeguarding plan that demonstrated the involvement of a range of stakeholders at different territorial levels, including several community associations whose participation in the elaboration of the nomination was also deemed satisfactory. The element was also inscribed in an inventory. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Smoke sauna tradition in Võromaa on the Representative List.
66. Thanking the Vice-Chair for the summary, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or amendments, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.16 to inscribe Smoke sauna tradition in Võromaa** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
67. The delegation of **Estonia** expressed its sincere gratitude for the positive decision, adding that it appreciated the careful observations made by the Subsidiary Body and the Committee. This was significant recognition for the Võro community who initiated the process of inscription on the tradition of smoke sauna in 2009. It was noted that smoke sauna was a place to cleanse the body and the soul, and that this undertaking had brought together all stakeholders. The International Sauna Society also supported their work with the hope of raising awareness about sauna traditions and practices worldwide.
68. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Gwoka: music, song, dance and cultural practice representative of Guadeloupean identity** [draft decision 9.COM 10.17] submitted by **France**. Gwoka is one of the most identifiable elements of Guadeloupean society. It combines responsorial singing in Guadeloupean Creole, rhythms played on the Ka drums and dancing. Gwoka unites these three areas of expression and emphasizes individual qualities of improvisation. The participants and public form a circle in which dancers and soloists enter in turn and perform, facing the drums. It strengthens identity and provides a feeling of communal development and individual pride, conveying values of conviviality, resistance and dignity. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body not only found that all the criteria were satisfied, but was unanimous in praising the quality of the nomination, which deserved to be considered among the ‘good examples’ selected by the Committee. The nomination clearly demonstrated that gwoka constituted intangible cultural heritage, as described in Article 2 of the Convention, having evolved over time while still fulfilling social and cultural functions for the people of Guadeloupe. The Body was also convinced that its inscription would contribute towards raising awareness of the role of intangible cultural heritage as a factor of social cohesion and creativity. It particularly appreciated the visibility given in the nomination of the participation of the many gwoka associations and local authorities, not only in the design of innovative safeguarding measures, but in the elaboration of the nomination itself, as well as the inscription of the element in the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of France. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by not only recommending the inscription of Gwoka: music, song, dance and cultural practice representative of Guadeloupean identity on the Representative List but suggested that the Committee include it among those that could serve as an inspiration to other submitting States.
69. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.17 to inscribe Gwoka: music, song, dance and cultural practice representative of Guadeloupean identity on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
70. The delegation of **France** began by thanking the experts and the Committee for their decision, expressing the attachment of France to the Convention, its principles and values. It remarked that this inscription would add to the 12 elements already inscribed, illustrating the wealth of its culture and the diversity of its heritage, of which it was proud. The delegation gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Regional Council.
71. **Mr Victorin Lurel** was happy for this landmark decision to inscribe gwoka on the Representative List, which was the result of a long process carried out by determined groups of men and women, cultural and political activists. This was a combat of *vieux nègres*, as it is said, who continued to practice their art, instruments and culture. He spoke of culture that lived on if carried by people who are proud of their identity. Gwoka itself escaped slavery and colonialism, and was thus a time to thank the ancestors, the Africans of all backgrounds and to congratulate the great masters of *ka*. Mr Lurel congratulated Mr Félix Cotellon for his long fought cultural combat together with his association Repriz. He also thanked France and the Ministry of Culture for supporting its nomination, as well as UNESCO. **Mr Félix Cotellon** remarked that it was a great day for gwoka and for Guadeloupe, and thanked the working group that worked on the nomination file for years, the Directorate of Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of Culture for having selected the nomination, and the Committee for inscribing gwoka on the Representative List. His first thoughts were for the deported and enslaved Africans who had introduced elements of Guadeloupean gwoka today and made it a space for resistance to dehumanization.He then wished to thank the small farmers of the post-slavery society and the *vieux négres* popular classes, the *ka* masters, and the generations, especially during the 1970s and 1980s who, despite the prohibition, made it a space of cultural resistance. Representative of the Guadeloupean identity, gwoka carries universal values of resistance, dignity and respect. However, inscription was not an end in itself, as gwoka formed part of a safeguarding project. It would contribute to the awareness of Guadeloupean intangible culture heritage as a common and transdisciplinary foundation for creating a new cultural policy.

*[Performance of Gwoka]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Know-how of cultivating mastic on the island of Chios** [draft decision 9.COM 10.18] submitted by **Greece**. Mastic is cultivated on the island of Chios from the aromatic resin mastiha, which is extracted from the shrub *Pistacia lentiscus*. Its traditional culture is a family occupation. Men take care of the natural fertilization and pruning of the shrubs in winter, while women sweep, level and clean the ground around the trunk, so that the mastic can easily be recovered. The culture of mastic represents a comprehensive social event, around which networks of alliances and mutual help have been established. It was recalled that the nomination had been presented to the Committee at its seventh session in 2012 and had been referred to the submitting State for additional information on criterion R.5. In addition, the State had reworked the entire nomination such that the Body evaluated the nomination in its entirety. This time the Body concluded that all the criteria had been satisfied: one of the few elements in which all Members were unanimous in their individual evaluations. The Body particularly appreciated the definition of know-how associated with the cultivation and harvesting of mastiha with its emphasis on the respect for the principles of sustainable development, which adequately demonstrated that its inscription would contribute to greater awareness of the role of intangible cultural heritage. The Body also appreciated the transversal nature of the proposed safeguarding measures, as well as the involvement of communities and their associations in both the elaboration of measures and throughout the nomination process. Finally, the Body was satisfied that the information provided on the inclusion of the element in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage and that the process had benefited from the participation of the community as well as experts and scientific foundations. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Know-how of cultivating mastic on the island of Chios on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the presentation of the examination of a previously referred nomination.
3. The delegation of **Turkey** remarked that the shrub *Pistacia lentiscus* served as a bridge of beauty joining the two shores of the Aegean Sea, connecting island life and the rural community in Greece and elsewhere in the region. It commended Greece and the authorities for their commitment to the nomination following its referral in 2012, adding that they had done fantastic work. It also thanked the constructive observations of the Subsidiary Body, and hopefully the Committee. It hoped that the nomination would set another example for States Parties that once they believe in their constructive asset for humankind and cultural unity, then they can deliver, despite initial complications in the file.
4. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or amendments, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.18 to inscribe Know-how of cultivating mastic on the island of Chios on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
5. The delegation of **Greece** expressed sincere thanks and appreciation of the inscription of the element on the Representative List, which is a very old and important tradition for the region. It also expressed its deepest appreciation of the communities involved in the cultivation and production of mastic who had made great efforts to present a complete nomination, in exemplary cooperation with the Museum of Mastic, local authorities and the Ministry of Culture. The delegation remarked that this was the first element inscribed on the Representative List in spite of the fact that Greece had extensive experience with intangible cultural heritage, but it sought to develop cooperation between the communities among the hundreds of intangible heritage elements found in Greece. It spoke of the exemplary network of cooperation among the communities, the local authorities and the Ministry of Culture, adding that the Convention was at the very forefront of rapprochement between communities, but also of neighbouring peoples and countries with common elements of intangible elements. It concluded with warmest thanks to the Secretariat for its work so that all countries could understand the Convention.
6. The **Chairperson** remarked that the perseverance of Greece had paid off.
7. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Traditional brass and copper craft of utensil making among the Thatheras of Jandiala Guru, Punjab, India** [draft decision 9.COM 10.19] submitted by **India**. The craft of the Thatheras of Jandiala Guru constitutes the traditional technique of manufacturing brass and copper utensils in Punjab. The process begins with procuring cooled cakes of metal that are flattened into thin plates and then hammered into curved shapes. Utensils are manually finished by polishing with traditional materials such as sand and tamarind juice. Utensils may be manufactured for ritual or utilitarian purposes such as weddings or at temples. The process of manufacturing is transmitted orally from father to son. It was recalled that the Committee had referred the nomination in 2011 for several criteria, namely R.1, R.2, R.4 and R.5. This time the Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. Indeed, the Body found that the revised nomination not only clearly described the Thatheras community but the craftsmanship was well characterized and its modes of transmission and social and cultural functions were explained in detail. The Body also concluded that the nomination adequately demonstrated how its inscription would promote dialogue with communities practising similar crafts, while highlighting creativity in the metal processing and the manufacture of utensils. The only reservation was attributed to the use of non-compliant expressions such as ‘unique art’ or ‘unique cultural heritage’, which was recalled in paragraph 4 of draft decision. Information on R.3 was barely changed from the original nomination and the Body continued to consider that safeguarding measures were adequately designed and planned in the short, medium and long term. The revised nomination also seemed to contain more detailed information describing the participation of Thatheras artisans and the many other local actors in the nomination process, while demonstrating their free, prior and informed consent. This participation was also demonstrated in the inventorying that led to the inclusion of the element in two inventories managed by two organs of the Ministry of Culture, which allayed the reservation expressed by the Committee in 2011. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Traditional brass and copper craft of utensil making among the Thatheras of Jandiala Guru, Punjab, India on the Representative List.
8. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or amendments, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.19 to inscribe Traditional brass and copper craft of utensil making among the Thatheras of Jandiala Guru, Punjab, India on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
9. The delegation of **India** expressed its sincere and heartfelt thanks to the Committee for the inscription of the element on the Representative List, as well as the Subsidiary Body for the positive recommendation. It remarked that the centuries-old technique of making beautiful utensils from copper and brass was passed through the generations and was an art that transcended the boundaries of religion, and was respected by Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims in a cohesive way. It was thus a beautiful example of how intangible heritage could be economically viable in current times, while contributing to sustainable development. The delegation was particularly happy and emotional because he was from the State of Punjab where the craft was flourishing. He had been to the place as a kid and listened to the pitter-patter of the hammer and mallets banging the metal plates in a rhythmic way. The delegation concluded by expressing its sincere thanks to the Secretariat for its guidance.
10. The **Chairperson** congratulated India and its example of successful perseverance.
11. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Bārān Khāhi, rain-seeking rituals of Kaburān village, Tafresh** [draft decision 9.COM 10.20] submitted by the **Islamic Republic of Iran**. The Bārān Khāhi rituals, also known as ‘Kuse-gardi’, are enacted by shepherds in Kaburān village, Tafresh, and are usually performed in midwinter, traditionally the period of drought to seek blessings and abundance for the village. Male performers and musicians, robed in costumes and masks, weave their way through the village, dancing and singing melodies. In return, the shepherds receive foodstuffs, agricultural products and money to help them secure their living. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that criteria R.1 and R.2 were satisfied, but felt the nomination lacked technical details to enable it to position itself on criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5. The Body took the view that the rituals had been properly characterized as living practices that have a symbolic significance for the entire region of Kaburān that continued to be transmitted by the older to the younger generation. The nomination also satisfactorily demonstrated that the inscription of the element would contribute to greater awareness of the importance of certain practices of intangible cultural heritage such as these that enabled better adaptation to difficult environments and promote dialogue between bearer communities. However, the Body also encountered serious difficulties in ascertaining whether some of the proposed safeguarding measures, including tourism promotion, had been prepared with the necessary precautions to help ensure the viability of the element without altering the meaning or purpose of the ritual for the community concerned. Measures such as ‘building a new hotel, and the other needed facilities to welcome tourists’ or ‘allocation of a permanent site in Tafresh for exhibitions on Iranian, even world, Rain-seeking Rituals’ struck the Body in particular. The Body therefore concluded that additional information was needed to evaluate R.3 and determine if *all* the proposed safeguarding measures were appropriate to safeguard and promote the element without affecting its nature or viability. Regarding R.4, there was evidence that the villagers of Kaburān were aware of the submission of the nomination and were in favour of the inscription of the element on the Representative List. However, the nomination must also demonstrate it is the result of the broadest possible community participation, which was not apparent in the description, and therefore the *active* participation of the community in the elaboration of the nomination, including the design of safeguarding measures, could not be determined. Additional information was also required on the groups and individuals who, in the village of Kaburān, actually practice and transmit the rain-seeking rituals. Finally, with regard to R.5 and the inscription of the element on an inventory, the Body suggested that the submitting State be given the opportunity to provide technical details in a subsequent resubmission. Indeed, it was noted that although the nomination made reference to the inscription of the element on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage of the Islamic Republic of Iran from February 2014, the date was posterior to the deadline of 31 March 2013 on which the Secretariat received all the nominations currently under examination. On further investigation, it was noted that the original nomination submitted by Iran in 2010, which had not been treated in a previous cycle, contained proof of registration dated August 2010 on the same inventory, but under a more generic title, namely ‘rain-seeking rituals’. The Body thus required additional information in order to understand the relationship between the evidence of the two registrations in the inventory. Thus, the Body could not conclusively determine whether the element had been inscribed in an inventory before the deadline for submission of nomination for this cycle, i.e. 31 March 2013. The Subsidiary Body therefore recommended to refer the nomination to the submitting State for additional information for resubmission in a subsequent cycle.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanation of the various issues raised in the evaluation of the nomination file, opening the floor for comments.
13. The delegation of **Afghanistan** wished to see the Islamic Republic of Iran be given the chance to comment on the observations and remarks regarding the lack of technical detail and the inadequate safeguarding measures. The delegation remarked on the joy and celebration that came with the inscriptions of elements, but also noting that human beings were also subject to moments of distress, which meant that they sought fervour and spirituality. The delegation spoke of the its own country, adding that at times it was in a similar situation such that if Iran managed to inscribe this element, it would be encouraged to respond to the need that existed in its own country. The delegation further remarked that this way of expressing spirituality in times of distress was part of human nature and society, and probably often occurred in the village of Kaburān as well as other villages. It was noted that Iran suffered from drought that had lasted for five years, adding that as a boy he had witnessed these moments of calling the rains in all its various aspects in order to address a social need. This was seen as an opportunity to bring people and the different elements of society together. Moments of distress thus brought about moments of joy. Remarking the country’s important spiritual past in its poetry and arts, the delegation sought clarification from the submitting State so as to examine the nomination more thoroughly.
14. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its close examination of the nomination, as well as the Subsidiary Body for its comments. The delegation endorsed the remarks by Afghanistan, adding that the Islamic Republic of Iran was entitled to provide answers and clarification in response to the questions raised. It spoke of how it learned much about the ritual and the element, adding that that in relation to other files, criteria R.3 and R.4 were satisfied.
15. The delegation of **Bulgaria** fully understood the proposal by the Subsidiary Body to refer the nomination because, out of five criteria, they were unable to agree on three criteria owing to a lack of information that would enable to reach a positive decision. Nevertheless, it sought clarity from the Delegation of Iran on criterion R.3 in particular.
16. The delegation of **Greece** also sought clarifications from Iran, remarking that rain-seeking rituals was a very old tradition in all civilizations, making it a very interesting file. It also wished to know more on how the management of water was connected to the reality of today and to the rituals, as clearly there were water problems in the region. It also sought clarity on criterion R.3, particularly the cited tourist attractions.
17. The delegation of **India** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its examination of the file, requesting Iran to provide more information that would enable the Committee to determine that the element was submitted with the widest possible participation of the community.
18. The delegation of **Brazil** also wished to hear from the delegation ofIran on the issue of community participation in the preparation of the nomination file, as well as an explanation on the tourist aspect of people going to the village of Kaburān to see these rituals. It also sought more information on the safeguarding measures that would ensure that tourism did not interfere in the life of the people in this village. The delegation of Brazil knew about a number of very interesting measures in place, but wished to have more details about these measures to safeguard the expression. With regard to criterion R.5, although it understood that there was some delay in presenting evidence of the national inventory, it noted that the documents had been delivered to UNESCO and was thus a minor point. The delegation thus concentrated its attention to the two other criteria on community participation and the safeguarding measures, and looked forward to hearing explanations.
19. The delegation of **Turkey** remarked that Bārān Khāhi or Kuse-gardi or rain prayers was a tradition as old as human civilization, with Iranian communities widely exercising this ritual for millennia. The delegation explained that its national experts were of the opinion that the file submitted would be acceptable in criteria R.3 and R.4, but would very much like the submitting State to provide additional information to help understand the links between its national inventory and this particular element, adding that Iran had broad experience and established practice of national inventories with other already inscribed elements.
20. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** appreciated the Subsidiary Body’s report and took note of the opinions on the nomination in terms of R.3 and R.4 criteria. After analysing the file and consulting with the Iranian delegation, it considered that the file contained more information than described by the Subsidiary Body in the draft decision and during this session. It therefore wished to invite Iran to further explain its effective set of safeguarding measures and its efforts in ensuring free, prior and informed consent from the community concerned.
21. The delegation of **Uganda** appreciated the work of the submitting State in its nomination on an element that was similar to one of the rain-making practices among one of the communities in north-western Uganda, which it was considering nominating in the future to the Representative List. Thus, the element, if favourable by the Committee, would provide Uganda with an added impetus to consider nominating its element on rain-making in the future. Noting the comments made by the Subsidiary Body, the delegation found that R.3 on safeguarding measures and R.4 were clearly met. However, under the section 3.a. on safeguarding measures, it was indicated that greater measures were being taken to control the possible negative effects of commercialization and tourism. It thus sought clarification on how that would be done and reflected in the file.
22. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its work and recommendations, congratulating Iran for the excellent nomination presented, particularly in criterion R.2, one of the few delegations that had appropriately met this criterion. Regarding criterion R.3, it wished to hear the Iranian delegation on the measures taken to safeguard the element in light of what was said on the museumification and folklorization of cultural property. A balance must therefore be found between museumification and the sanitization of cultural property to be shown to the world. The delegation was convinced that Iran had managed to find the right balance, adding that it also wished to hear from Iran about R.4 and R.5.
23. The delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that in R.3, which was linked to safeguarding measures, it was noted that a new hotel had been built, and it wished to know the underlying reasoning behind the construction of the hotel, particularly as Kaburān village was close to a big city where there were hotels. Regarding R.5, the delegation wished to know why it felt that this element concerned two elements on the Representative List.
24. The delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** remarked that it was in 2001, at the 31st session of the General Conference, that the Director-General was authorized to organize the drafting of this Convention, giving shape to the enthusiastic process of intangible cultural heritage welcomed by so many nations. The delegation thanked the efforts of the Committee, the Subsidiary Body, and the Secretariat, adding that it would respond to the questions raised in criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5. Concerning R.5, the delegation noted that it had being asked to clarify the relation between the nomination submitted in February 2014 and that of 2010, when the nomination was initially submitted. It explained that its first submission in 2010, ‘Rain-seeking rituals in Iran’, was said by the Committee to be overly inclusive. It therefore revised the file to reduce the scope to a representative village, Kaburān, which required an update in the national inscription document for 2014. This was done in accordance to the advice of the Committee, as per Article 11.b and Article 12 of the Convention. The original file covered this heritage in the Iranian desert area, while the revised file of 2014 focused on this small village of 150 families. Thus, the 2014 file came from the file of 2010, i.e. it was the updated version of the already submitted file. With regard to R.3, it was said that the file focused on Bārān Khāhi as a decontextualized performance for tourists, and thus additional information was required to demonstrate the suitability and adequacy of measures for enhancing the viability of the element. The delegation further explained that in 2008, at the time of drafting the first submission, the local community expressed its will to be open to tourists, researchers, artists, and so on. On the one hand, their wishes had to be respected, but on the other, it was important to prevent any risk of decontextualization so as to safeguard the originality of the event from the possible negative effects of public visits. Thus, it was considered that visitors should not reside in the village but in a hotel in the nearby city of Arak, around 150 km from Kaburān. In this way, the original context of the ritual would remain undisturbed. The delegation highlighted the sections in the nomination file where this was clearly described and explained, including: section 1. (iv); the opening paragraph of 3.b. (i); paragraph c, 3.b. (i); and section 4.c. In addition, the opening paragraph of 3.b (i) clearly described the uniqueness of this culture and the attitude of the people that resulted in successful safeguarding of the element. Moreover, the ten proposed safeguarding measures, described in section 3.b. (i), would allay any fears of decontextualization. With regard to R.4, the delegation explained that around 50 signatures had been collected from mostly the shepherds, who were the real performers of the ritualistic march and dance, from the 150 households that comprise the village. It was also noted that a group of 15 representatives of the local community also closely cooperated in drafting the nomination text, as could be seen in section 4 of the nomination, especially section 3.b and section 4.a. In addition, of the six members of the drafting team, four were from the village. The delegation believed that this clearly demonstrated the widest possible participation of, what was effectively, a small community. The delegation hoped that the explanations would enable the Committee to reconsider its decision to inscribe the element.
25. The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, pronouncing paragraphs 1 and 2 adopted.
26. The delegation of **Brazil** understood that there were some forthcoming amendments to paragraph 3 that should be inserted in paragraph 2, and therefore asked the Chairperson to keep paragraph 2 open to verify if this was indeed the case.
27. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil for its comment.
28. The delegation of **India** supported Brazil’s request that paragraph 2 remain open, as it had submitted an amendment to R.4 in paragraph 3, and if accepted, would be in paragraph 2.
29. The delegation of **Belgium** noted that paragraph 2 had already been adopted, adding that this was becoming a new procedure to adopt and then reopen paragraphs, which was a strange practice.
30. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that it had raised its flag trying to ask for the floor before the paragraph was closed.
31. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Secretary had informed him that Brazil had requested the floor before the decision, requesting that Brazil present its amendment to paragraph 2.
32. The delegation of **Brazil** explained that it did not have an amendment, but knew of other Members wishing to present amendments.
33. The **Chairperson** asked the Members to make known their amendments.
34. The delegation of **Egypt** had submitted an amendment in writing to the Secretariat.
35. The **Secretary** began by citing the amendment in paragraph 2 for R.3 submitted by Egypt, which read: ‘Reliable and practical safeguarding measures have been proposed aimed at transmission, identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection and promotion, while considering the eager spirit prevailing in Kaburan and respecting the will of the bearers to guarantee constructive cooperation among the State, the local authorities, and especially the local community, and to sustain the viability of the element.’
36. The **Chairperson** solicited support from the Committee for the amendment by Egypt.
37. The delegation of **Afghanistan** supported the amendment by Egypt.
38. The **Secretary** turned to the amendment in paragraph 2 for R.4, as proposed by India, which read: ‘The practitioners of Bārān Khāhi rituals, several bands composed of 3 to 5 shepherds, the rest of the local community, the people of Kaburan village, as well as the local authorities, took part in the drafting of the nomination file, participated in the related research and documentation activities, and have annexed the documents of their free, prior and informed consent, the widest possible participation of the community concerned has been achieved.’
39. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment proposed by India.
40. The **Chairperson** asked those Members wishing to support the amendment by India to raise their flags. Noting that India’s amendment did not receive sufficiently broad support, he declared the original text would remain. The Chairperson then moved to paragraph 3.
41. The delegation of **Turkey** asked the Chairperson to provide the numbers of support received and counted, as it wished to know who and how many supported the nomination.
42. The **Chairperson** replied that this was not a vote but an overall assessment of the support, which did not receive sufficient support. He then turned to paragraph 3.
43. The delegation of **Brazil** acknowledged the point raised by Turkey, adding that there were 24 Committee Members of which about half, i.e. 11 or 12 had raised their flags in support of the amendment. It asked for a count in the future whenever there was a very close number.
44. Thanking Brazil for its remark, the **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 3, and with no comments or amendments in the sub-paragraphs to criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5, paragraph 3 was adopted as a whole. The Chairperson then moved to paragraph 4, which was duly adopted.With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.20 to refer Bārān Khāhi, rain-seeking rituals of Kaburān village, Tafresh** **to the submitting State for additional information and invites it to resubmit in the following cycle.**
45. The delegation of **Islamic Republic of Iran** agreed with Turkey and others that it would have been good for the Committee to count the votes so that it could see who was in support of the file, adding that it was not difficult to count the votes.
46. The **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of draft decision 9.COM 10.21.
47. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Traditional agricultural practice of cultivating the ‘vite ad alberello’ (head-trained bush vines) of the community of Pantelleria** [draft decision 9.COM 10.21] submitted by **Italy**. The traditional practice of cultivating head-trained bush vines *(vite ad alberello)* is transmitted through generations of vine growers and farmers of the Mediterranean island of Pantelleria. The technique consists of several phases: the ground is prepared by levelling the soil and digging a hollow to plant the vine, pruning, and then harvesting. The knowledge and skills of bearers and practitioners are handed down in families through oral and practical instruction in the local dialect. In addition, rituals and festivals organized between July and September allow the local community to share this social practice. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. It found that the nomination adequately described the element as a set of skills that were linked to the environment and agricultural practices passed down from generation to generation. The nomination convincingly demonstrated how inscription would contribute to greater awareness of creative adaptation of intangible cultural heritage to a specific and challenging environment. Similarly, the nomination provided a series of safeguarding measures that were well articulated and coherent to ensure the viability of the element, reflecting significant and coordinated national, regional and local efforts, as well as the Pantelleria community. Community participation in the elaboration of the nomination and inscription of the element in an inventory of intangible cultural heritage had been convincingly demonstrated. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Traditional agricultural practice of cultivating the ‘vite ad alberello’ (head-trained bush vines) of the community of Pantelleria on the Representative List.

[The Vice-Chairperson from Belgium replaced
the Chairperson of the Committee in his absence]

1. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.21 to inscribe Traditional agricultural practice of cultivating the ‘vite ad alberello’ (head-trained bush vines) of the community of Pantelleria on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
2. The delegation of **Italy** was happy to note the Committee’s decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List. It thanked the Italian Ministry of Agriculture and the Pantelleria community that enabled the completion of the file. Its inscription would certainly play an important role in increasing knowledge about this cultural practice, which preserved the landscape and its biodiversity. It is an ancient agricultural technique, dating back to the Phoenicians who managed to maintain its specificity and original rituals through the centuries thanks to the commitment of local communities. Over time, despite difficult natural and climatic conditions and the different populations on the island, the culture of ‘vite ad alberello’ had maintained its strong symbolic identity for the communities that transmitted this knowledge through the generations, sometimes acting as a bridge between cultures. The delegation was convinced that all the practices encompassing sustainable development could help raise awareness among populations of their heritage, thus ensuring intercultural dialogue. The link between culture and sustainable development was the message that emerged from the 3rd UNESCO World Forum on Culture and Cultural Industries (also known as FOCUS) held in Florence in October 2014, and was one of the important elements of the Convention. These themes would also be the mainstay of the World Expo in Milan between May and October 2015.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Washi, craftsmanship of traditional Japanese hand-made paper** [draft decision 9.COM 10.22] submitted by **Japan**. The traditional craft of hand-making paper, or Washi, is practised in three communities in Japan. The paper is made from the fibres of the paper mulberry plant and is used not only for letter writing and books, but also in home interiors to make paper screens, room dividers and sliding doors. Families and their employees work and learn under Washi masters, who have inherited the techniques from their parents. The communities play different roles in keeping this craftsmanship viable, ranging from the cultivation of mulberry, training in the techniques, and the creation of new products. It was noted that this was the first time that the Committee had to deal with a broader nomination submitted by a single country. Indeed, in 2009, the Committee had already inscribed the element ‘Sekishu-Banshi: papermaking in the Iwami region of Shimane Prefecture’. The nomination put before the Committee would extend this inscription to other communities, namely Hon-minoshi and Hosokawa-shi communities. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied, and that the nomination demonstrated with clarity and precision that washi satisfied the definition of intangible cultural heritage. Indeed, the extended nomination manages to satisfactorily describe the technical features common to the traditional practice, while specifying the cultural and social functions for each community concerned. The submitting State had also shown that inscription would help raise awareness of the importance of safeguarding know-how linked to traditional crafts and the establishment of mutually supportive links between artisans from Japan and other countries. The Body also found convincing information on the full participation of the three associations of washi paper manufacturers both in the elaboration of the proposed safeguarding measures and in the preparation of the extended application for which free, prior and informed consent had been given. With proof of inclusion of the three manufacturing techniques comprising this nomination in the national inventory maintained by the Agency for Cultural Affairs of Japan, the Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Washi, craftsmanship of traditional Japanese hand-made paper on the Representative List.
4. The **Vice-Chair** noted that the new nomination was the first case for the Committee of an extension in scope of an already inscribed element by a State. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the Vice-Chair proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.22 to inscribe Washi, craftsmanship of traditional Japanese hand-made paper** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
5. The delegation of **Japan** thanked the Committee, the Chairperson, the Subsidiary Body, all the States Parties, and the Secretariat, adding that it was a great honour to express its gratitude for the inscription of the element on the Representative List. The process of creating Washi placed importance on the sustainable use of natural elements such as the fibres of the mulberry plant or the clean and cool water of rivers, while the techniques of creating Washi have been handed down through generations. Washi had united all the people involved and given them a common identity. With this inscription, the delegation was confident that the dialogue within and among concerned communities would be further enhanced. It would continue to lend its full support to the communities and their efforts to safeguard the craftsmanship of Washi.
6. Congratulating Japan, the **Vice-Chair** turned to the next nomination.
7. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Kazakh traditional art of Dombra Kuy** [draft decision 9.COM 10.23] submitted by **Kazakhstan**. The art of Dombra Kuy refers to a short solo composition performed on a traditional pear-shaped, long-necked, two-stringed, plucked musical instrument. The music aims to connect people to their historic roots and traditions through classical and improvised pieces. It is performed at social gatherings, holidays and festive celebrations and is usually accompanied by narrated stories and legends. It serves an important role in strengthening social cohesion among Kazakhs, while giving them a sense of identity and belonging. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The nomination adequately demonstrated that Dombra kuy constituted intangible cultural heritage as an art form passed on from teacher to student but also through formal educational institutions, and was considered by the Kazakh as a means of communication and social integration. The nomination also convincingly demonstrated that inscription would lead to greater awareness of the ability of the intangible cultural heritage to serve as a vehicle for integration and solidarity. Similarly, the proposed safeguarding measures were precisely detailed and were deemed appropriate for ensuring the viability of the element, especially since they seem to benefit both the efforts of the State and the participation of the community and practitioners of Dombra kuy. The nomination described in detail the process of its elaboration and the participation of the bearers and the general public, providing adequate evidence of their free, prior and informed consent as well as the inscription of Dombra kuy in the National Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Kazakhstan. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Kazakh traditional art of Dombra Kuy on the Representative List, while suggesting that the Committee recall in paragraph 4 of the draft decision that expressions such as ‘pure nature’, ‘essence’, ‘true meaning’ and ‘true beauty’ had no place in the framework of the Convention.
8. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.23 to inscribe Kazakh traditional art of Dombra Kuy on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
9. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** spoke of the truly historic moment to have the country’s first element inscribed on the Representative List, thanking the Committee for endorsing this decision. Given that the country ratified the Convention in late 2011, this inscription represented a big step towards the world’s knowledge of the intangible cultural heritage of modern Kazakhstan with its history of Central Asian, Turkic and nomadic civilizations. It expressed its deep gratitude to UNESCO and its partners from other countries, particularly Norway, Republic of Korea and the ICHCAP[[6]](#footnote-6) centre for supporting activities aimed at capacity-building, inventory-making and the popularization of intangible cultural heritage of Kazakhstan and Central Asia. Equipped with knowledge and the principles of implementing the Convention, the delegation was determined to ensure further viability, safeguarding and the transmission of the element in the future.
10. The **Vice-Chair** congratulated Kazakhstanon its inscription and welcomed the Kazakh musicians.

*[Performance of Dombra kuy]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the last nomination of the day on **Traditional knowledge and skills in making Kyrgyz and Kazakh yurts (Turkic nomadic dwellings** [draft decision 9.COM 10.24] submitted by **Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan**. The yurt is a nomadic dwelling used among the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples. It has a wooden circular frame covered with felt and braided with ropes, and can be easily assembled and dismantled. Men and their apprentices make the wooden frames by hand, while women make the interior decorations and exterior coverings, ornamented with traditional zoomorphic, vegetative or geometric patterns. All festivities, ceremonies, births, weddings and funeral rituals are held in a yurt. As such, the yurt remains a symbol of family and traditional hospitality, fundamental to the identity of the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied, which was unanimously agreed by all the Members of the Body before the evaluation meeting. Indeed, the Body found that the submitting States demonstrated in a pedagogical way how the knowledge and traditional know-how related to the manufacture of yurts were constitutive of intangible cultural heritage shared by Kyrgyz and Kazakh communities who were devoted to its transmission to teach the younger generation about the harmonious connection between nature and human creativity. The explanation given on the contribution of its inscription to increasing awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in the sustainable management of natural resources was also convincing. In addition, the safeguarding measures included a long list of events and activities to ensure the viability of the traditional manufacture of yurts in both countries. Moreover, the Body congratulated the two submitting States for the quality of their descriptions concerning the participation of the communities in the nomination process. The element was also inscribed in both the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Register of Kazakhstan and the National Inventory of Kyrgyzstan. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Traditional knowledge and skills in making Kyrgyz and Kazakh yurts (Turkic nomadic dwellings) on the Representative List.
2. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.24 to inscribe Traditional knowledge and skills in making Kyrgyz and Kazakh yurts (Turkic nomadic dwellings) on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
3. Speaking in Kyrgyz, the delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** remarked that this was its first Kazakh-Kyrgyz joint nomination, which demonstrated not only an understanding of the union of basic cultural values but a deep mutual understanding and will to cooperate, including in joint work on safeguarding shared heritage between the two nations. The unique architectural construction of the Kyrgyz and Kazakh yurt was not only a hearth, but a symbol of the State as well. Despite urbanization and changes in lifestyles, the meaning of the yurt remained at the centre of the traditional mode of life, along with other demonstrations of traditional culture and living in harmony with nature. The delegation was proud that the international community recognized the yurt as intangible cultural heritage of humanity, and it expressed its appreciation of the support by the Committee and the communities concerned in keeping the yurt alive.
4. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed special regards to Kyrgyzstan for initiating this multinational nomination, and all the partners involved in the process of its preparation. It believed that the Turkic nomadic lifestyle existed in full harmony with nature, and that the inscription of the traditional knowledge and skills in making a yurt would help promote rational management of natural resources, and an ecological awareness among people as a contribution to sustainable development at a global level. Moreover, such multinational projects played an important role in strengthening intercultural dialogue by raising awareness of common historic and cultural heritage. The delegation believed that this would gain momentum in the future, particularly during the current International Decade for the Rapprochement of Cultures (2013–2022). It expressed deep gratitude to the Committee for endorsing the decision to inscribe the element, and was happy to invite everyone to see the yurt demonstration model exhibited in UNESCO’s courtyard.
5. The **Vice-Chair** adjourned the session.

*[Thursday, 27 November, morning session]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** [Mr Dries Willems, also from Belgium] greeted the Committee, thanking the Republic of Korea for offering the coffee, and reminding the Committee that of the 39 nominations submitted, it had examined 21 and inscribed 18 elements on the Representative List. So there were 18 nominations left to complete before continuing with item 11, and the other agenda items.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on
**Al-Zajal, recited or sung poetry** [draft decision 9.COM 10.25] submitted by **Lebanon**.
Al-Zajal is a form of Lebanese folk poetry declaimed or sung at social and family celebrations and in daily life. During poetic jousts, troupes of poets perform verses often in the form of challenges in front of a mixed audience to the rhythm of the tambourine and derbouka. These verbal exchanges evoke the beauty of Lebanon, the importance of tolerance, dialogue between communities and religions. Poetic jousts serve as a safety valve and play an important role in resolving conflicts and strengthening social cohesion. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The Body found that the nomination adequately demonstrated how the Lebanese people recognized
Al-Zajal as its intangible cultural heritage, which – through its ability to bring communities with various political and religious sensitivities together – confers to them a sense of cultural identity and continuity. The Body was also convinced of the potential of the element’s inscription to foster dialogue and promote respect for cultural diversity. The nomination also contained adequate information on the implemented safeguarding measures or those designed to protect and promote the element. The joint efforts of the Ministry of Culture and the two NGOs representing Al-Zajal poets were described in the elaboration of the safeguarding measures as a whole, and provided evidence of free, prior and informed consent from a large number of players. In addition, the Body found an adequate description of the steps that led to the inscription of Al-Zajal on the national register of intangible cultural heritage established by the Ministry of Culture, as well as evidence of its inscription. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of
Al-Zajal, recited or sung poetry on the Representative List.
3. Thanking the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, paragraph 1 was duly adopted.
4. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** wished to maintain the working method previously adopted. Initially, the paragraphs were adopted paragraph-by-paragraph, but when there were no amendments proposed, the decision was adopted as a whole.
5. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Côte d’Ivoire for its intervention and thus turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chair declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.25 to inscribe Al-Zajal, recited or sung poetry on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
6. The delegation of **Lebanon** spoke of its great honour and warmly thanked the Committee for its decision. It also thanked UNESCO and the Secretariat, adding that it was at the initiative of UNESCO and the partnership created among Mediterranean countries with the MEDLIHER project, which resulted in the inscription of its first element on the Representative List. The concept of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguard was new in Lebanon in that there was no legislation to define communities or to determine the intellectual property rights of heritage for the practitioners. It was thanks to these individuals, groups and communities that the country had embarked on a law-making action in this regard. Thus, legislation had been developed to take into account the new intangible cultural heritage concepts and the need for safeguarding. Similarly, a reorganization of the Ministry of Culture included a sub-directorate for intangible cultural heritage. The delegation spoke of its pride in the country’s rich and varied tangible and intangible heritage, whose origins were lost in history. Al-Zajal is an ancient practice rooted in Lebanese folk tradition. Its inscription would give the Lebanese people a sense of special pride, and would generate interest and awareness of the value of intangible cultural heritage, and not only in the spaces where these traditions were expressed but also in the transmission of this heritage in the collective memory of the people. Lebanon remained firmly convinced that the safeguarding of its intangible heritage involved establishing and maintaining strong partnerships with other Member States. It therefore relied on the formidable international cooperation mechanism that the Convention facilitated in the safeguarding of the intangible heritage of humanity.
7. The **Vice-Chair** congratulated Lebanon for its first inscription on the Representative List.
8. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Tchopa, sacrificial dance of the Lhomwe people of southern Malawi** [draft decision 9.COM 10.26] submitted by **Malawi**. Tchopa is a performing art practised among Lhomwe communities in southern Malawi. The dance is usually performed during celebrations after good harvests and successful hunting trips and during offerings to ancestral spirits after calamities such as droughts and outbreaks of disease. Knowledge and skills for the dance are transmitted during practice sessions and occasional performances. Tchopa dance strengthens social cohesion among Lhomwe communities with members providing mutual support in times of need, such as during ill health and bereavement, and participates in communal labour in the field. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. It found that the nomination demonstrated in a clear and reasoned manner that Tchopa fulfilled many functions for the Lhomwe community while strengthening its cohesion and nurturing its spiritual life. Regarding R.2, the Body found that the information provided showed how potential inscription would raise the capacity of intangible cultural heritage to serve as a factor of social cohesion. The nomination also provided a clear overview of the safeguarding measures that were focused on transmission and the promotion of Tchopa in the communities. The respective responsibilities of the various actors involved in their implementation, including the communities themselves, were also adequately defined. The nomination also contained the required evidence of the free, prior and informed consent of the communities, traditional authorities and associations, and the inscription of the element on the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of Malawi in 2010 was also demonstrated. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Tchopa, sacrificial dance of the Lhomwe people of southern Malawi on the Representative List.
9. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.26 to inscribe Tchopa, sacrificial dance of the Lhomwe people of southern Malawi on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
10. The delegation of **Malawi** thanked the Committee for upholding the decision of the Subsidiary Body. With this inscription, Malawi now had three elements on the Representative List, as well as achieving regional balance at national level, as the two previously inscribed elements were from communities in the northern and central regions; an important aspect in Malawi’s context. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its invaluable guidance on the technical requirements, urging the Committee to ensure that the Secretariat continued this important stage of the process of dealing with nominations, despite the additional workload. The delegation felt that this preliminary examination and guidance was essential as it was directed at a specific nomination and helped the submitting State correct inadequacies in the information provided. It also served as a learning process, contributing to the development of capacity and confidence in the nominating State, as well as communities on how to elaborate future nominations. It also acknowledged the generous support of Belgium through the Flanders Funds-in-Trust, which continued to support a project on strengthening capacities for implementing the Convention in some countries in Southern Africa, and Malawi was grateful to be among the beneficiaries. This project enabled the regional facilitator to train members of a number of communities in Malawi, including the Lhomwe community, when inventorying and documenting intangible cultural heritage. The results of the project included an inventory compiled by the Lhomwe community themselves, which included Tchopa dances. In fact, as a result of this project, five files had been elaborated with the participation of communities throughout Malawi. The delegation added that the other four files would be submitted over the next four cycles.
11. The **Vice-Chair** presented his warmest congratulations to Malawi.
12. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Coming forth of the masks and puppets in Markala** [draft decision 9.COM 10.27] submitted by **Mali**. The coming forth of the masks and puppets is a ritual festivity practised among the Markala communities. During the dry season, young neophytes participate in the rites that take place in a sacred wood next to the Niger River and is characterised by dances with masks and puppets. Each mask and puppet symbolizes the sacred link between man and nature, with particular animals incarnating specific virtues of society. The ritual illustrates the cohesion, dialogue, tolerance and continuity of the plural cultural identities of the Markala communities and neighbouring villages. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. It was recalled that the nomination had first been presented to the Committee during its seventh session in 2012 and had been referred to the submitting State for additional information in criterion R.4, notably on measures taken to ensure compliance with customary practices that restrict access to certain parts of the element. Although the submitting State introduced changes in the new nomination for the criteria that had been deemed satisfied, they were considered mainly stylistic. The Body therefore focused primarily on the information regarding the referred R.4, deciding to maintain the same formulation as provided in Decision 7.COM 11.20 for the criteria that had already been satisfied in 2012. The Body found that the new information in R.4 sufficiently explained the State’s commitment to ensuring that inscription did not affect the continuity of the ritual practices and ensured respect for customary practices governing access to sacred and profane knowledge and know-how associated with this practice. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Coming forth of the masks and puppets in Markala on the Representative List.
13. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.27 to inscribe Coming forth of the masks and puppets in Markala on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
14. The delegation of **Mali** praised the Chairperson for his difficult but exciting task, which up until now had obtained satisfactory results. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its efforts that led to the successful organization of this meeting and the various exchanges that continued to be established with States Parties in the preparation of periodic reports and nomination files. It thanked the Subsidiary Body for its objective reviews and in-depth analyses of the nominated elements, and expressed gratitude to the Committee for accepting the element on the Representative List. This inscription was the culmination of hard work and the effective participation of Markala communities who were now filled with joy. In addition, the element was a unifying factor in promoting peace and intercultural dialogue. Moreover, it was one thing to inscribe an element but quite another to initiate and maintain daily actions that contributed toward the safeguarding and promotion of the element under anthropogenic and natural threats. Mali would spare no effort to initiate actions to safeguard and promote this element in the implementation of the Convention and the fulfilment of its commitments.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Traditional Mauritian Sega** [draft decision 9.COM 10.28] submitted by **Mauritius**. Traditional Mauritian Sega Tipik is an emblematic performing art of the Creole community. Each soloist improvises lyrics while a frame drum, box rattle and triangle keep time and produce the rhythmic beat. Dancers move their hips and hands using short steps to manoeuvre around each other. Practitioners transmit their skills both formally and informally through participation and imitation. Sega can be performed by all the members of the community and contributes towards unifying the various groups around a shared Mauritian heritage. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. In clearly and precisely describing the various components of the Mauritian sega and its modes of inter-generational transmission, the nomination demonstrated that the element constituted intangible cultural heritage, providing Mauritians with a strong sense of identity and continuity, while playing a central role in building a highly multicultural society. By focusing on dialogue between the migrant cultures from where the Mauritian sega was born, the nomination also convincingly demonstrated that inscription would contribute towards a better understanding of the importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage to promote intercultural dialogue. The various safeguarding measures proposed were coherent and focused on the transmission, documentation, recognition and promotion of Sega Tipik. The safeguarding activities, in particular the different government programmes, were supported by the State. The Body noted that the proposed safeguarding measures had been prepared with care and consistency to ensure the transmission and documentation of the practice. Both the active participation of the different actors involved in the Mauritian sega in the nomination process and its inscription in the national inventory were also satisfactorily demonstrated. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Traditional Mauritian Sega on the Representative List.
16. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, declared **adopted Decision 9.COM 10.28 to inscribe Traditional Mauritian Sega on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
17. The delegation of **Mauritius**, represented by Mr Mookhesswur Choonee, Minister of Arts and Culture, expressed its sincere thanks to the Subsidiary Body, the Committee and the Secretariat for its great support in its first inscription on the Representative List. The delegation added that it was a recognition of its ancestors’ living traditions transmitted from generation to generation. It particularly honoured the memory of its ancestors of African descent, which came at an opportune time to coincide with the International Decade for People of African Descent (2015–2024), the General History of Africa project, and the Commemoration of the 180th anniversary of the abolition of slavery in Mauritius on 1 February 2015. This nomination would thus help reinforce its national identity and contribute towards further promoting intercultural dialogue, cultural diversity and sustainable development. Mauritius, its artists in particular, and the communities were fully committed to safeguarding and promoting the traditional Sega for coming generations. This first nomination was testimony to the continuous efforts by the Mauritian government and its people to the cause of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation concluded by quoting the UNESCO Director-General in her address to the sixth session of the Committee in Bali, ‘intangible cultural heritage is our bridge from the past to the future’.
18. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Minister for having honoured the Committee with his presence, congratulating Mauritius again on its first inscription and its continuous efforts for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.
19. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Mongolian knuckle-bone shooting** [draft decision 9.COM 10.29] submitted by **Mongolia**. Knuckle-bone shooting is a popular Mongol game played in teams of six to eight players who flick thirty domino-like marble tablets on a smooth wooden surface towards a target of sheep knuckle-bones, aiming to knock them into a target zone. Each shooter possesses their own shooting tools and instruments, and wears costumes embossed with distinguished characteristics depending on their rank and merits. The tradition brings team members from different backgrounds closer together, encourages their interaction and respect towards elders and one another, and improves their social cohesion. It was recalled that the nomination had been recommended for referral in 2012 but had been withdrawn by the submitting State before its evaluation by the Committee. The Body thus evaluated the nomination in its entirety and found that it demonstrated that all criteria were satisfied. Indeed, the information showed that knuckle-bone shooting was recognized as part of Mongol intangible cultural heritage by each village or provincial team in a spirit of mutual respect and social cohesion. The nomination also provided sufficient information to find that its inscription would contribute to greater awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage as a resource for ethics education and social cohesion. The proposed safeguarding measures appeared appropriately designed to protect and promote knuckle-bone shooting nationwide. The participation of practitioners and governmental and non-governmental institutions in every step of a long nomination process was adequately demonstrated, as well as its inscription on the National Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Mongolian knuckle-bone shooting on the Representative List.
20. The **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and with no forthcoming comments or objections, **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.29 to inscribe Mongolian knuckle-bone shooting on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
21. The delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Committee and experts for their unanimous decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List. It also wished to convey the gratitude of the community of Mongolian knuckle-bone players to the Secretariat and the Subsidiary Body for their hard work and positive recommendation. The representatives of the European Community of the Mongolian knuckle-bone players were present in person to thank and express their respect to the Committee. Knuckle-bone shooting is an expression of Mongolian nomadism and one of team-based games of Mongolia practised over the centuries. It is not only about knuckle-bone shooting, but a combination of rituals, knowledge, skills, techniques, traditional melodies and songs associated with the game, which were transmitted through apprenticeship. This game provided a favourable environment in which each member contributed to the team’s success, social well-being and development by supporting and learning from each other. The tradition brought team members from different backgrounds closer together, and encouraged interaction and respect towards the elderly and improved social cohesion. Inscription was the recognition of its identity, continuity and survival through the centuries, which contributed towards living in peace and harmony with nature, and fostering friendship among communities. The delegation was confident that its inscription would contribute towards increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage for ethics education and social cohesion, and thus promote intergenerational dialogue through safeguarding measures.
22. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Mongolia for the way it approached the nomination and its efforts following the referral to rework the file, by taking the advice of the Subsidiary Body to heart and re-submitting the file again to the Committee.
23. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** presented the next nomination on **Practices and know-how concerning the argan tree** [draft decision 9.COM 10.30] submitted by **Morocco**. Rural women and, to a lesser extent, men living in the Arganeraie Biospehere Reserve practice traditional methods to extract argan oil from the fruit of the tree. This oil has multiple uses for cooking, medicines and cosmetics, and is given as a wedding gift. All the cultural aspects of the argan tree, including the cultivation of the tree, oil extraction, the preparation of recipes and derived products, and the crafting of traditional tools for the various tasks are transmitted by means of imitation and through non-formal education. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. The Body found that the nomination clearly and comprehensively demonstrated that the practices and know-how related to the Argan tree were recognized by the bearers, mostly women, not only as a valuable source of livelihood but as a fundamental component of their cultural heritage, which contributed to the local economy and ecological sustainability. The nomination also demonstrated that the inscription of an element whose practice is based on a close relationship with the environment could contribute to greater awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage for the conservation of the natural environment, enriching the concept of sustainability. The proposed safeguarding measures reflected the will of the State Party to safeguard the practices and know-how related to the argan tree, as well as those proposed by the practitioners, appeared to be appropriately designed to promote them nationally and internationally, and to establish appropriate legal frameworks while strengthening their role in sustainable development. The Body also found detailed information demonstrating the broad participation and involvement of the communities. The Body particularly appreciated the description of the role played by the researchers who provided support to the communities, working with them during the nomination process. Finally, evidence of the inscription of the element in the national inventory of Morocco was sufficient. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Practices and know-how concerning the argan tree on the Representative List.
24. The **Vice-Chair** opened the floor for comment.
25. Having consulted with experts, the delegation of **Turkey** found that argan was not only the name of the tree but, among the people of Morocco, was very broadly recognized to define the entire ritual. It therefore believed that ‘Argan’ could be inserted at the beginning of the title name, i.e. ‘Argan, practices and know-how concerning the argan tree’, as it was more representative of the element and would also add visibility to this very important element.
26. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Turkey for its proposal, and noting no objections, proposed to move to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, which included the amendment by Turkey.
27. Supporting the proposal by Turkey, the delegation of **Brazil** remarked that the change needed to be reflected when the Committee decided to inscribe.
28. The **Vice-Chair** thanked Brazil for its relevant remark, adding that the title would also be introduced in the third paragraph.
29. As the change concerned the title itself, the delegation of **Latvia** found it relevant to hear the opinion of the submitting State as to whether this change was acceptable.
30. The delegation of **Morocco** accepted the amendment by Turkey.
31. With no further comments or amendments, the Vice-Chair proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.30 to inscribe Argan, practices and know-how concerning the argan tree on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
32. The delegation of **Morocco** welcomed the inscription of the element, adding that argan was endemic to Morocco, dating back to the Tertiary period and closely linked to the landscape and culture of the people in the central southwest of the country. Mentioned by the chroniclers in the Middle Ages, the practices and know-how related to the argan tree were transmitted from generation to generation among the communities in the region, particularly through women. According to the bearers, seven processes were required to obtain this prodigious oil, which had multiple uses from consumption to cosmetics. The delegation wished to express its warmest thanks to the Committee for this inscription in addition to the five elements already on the Representative List. It also thanked the Subsidiary Body and the Secretariat for their serious examination of the nomination. It was particularly sensitive to the Subsidiary Body’s appreciation of the Moroccan contribution to the visibility of women whose role was so central in the preservation and transmission of skills and knowledge related to the argan tree. The delegation also wished to congratulate all the partners involved in the preparation of this nomination file, as well as those involved in the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage linked to the argan, especially the ‘arganières’ women and their regional cooperatives, communities and NGOs, the Ministry of Culture, the High Commissioner for Water and Forests and the Combat against Desertification, the Mohammed VI Foundation for Research and Protection of the Argan Tree, and the National Development Agency of Oases Zones and the Arganeraie. The delegation was committed to safeguarding the practices and know-how related to the argan tree, as stated in the safeguarding plan, starting with the protection of the tree itself. The partners involved in the preparation of the nomination would thus work together to ensure its safeguard.
33. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Practices and expressions of joking relationships in Niger** [draft decision 9.COM 10.31] submitted by **Niger**. Joking relationships are a social practice performed among ethnolinguistic communities, groups and individuals to promote fraternity, solidarity and conviviality. The members have a duty to tell each other the truth, to joke together and to pool their respective assets, knowing that any dispute must be settled peacefully. Transmitted informally from generation to generation, joking relationships are a tool for reconciliation and peace-building and promote the cohesion and stability of families, ethnic groups and communities. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. It was recalled that the nomination had been presented to the Committee at its seventh session in 2012 and had been referred to the submitting State for additional information in criteria R.1, R. 2 and R.3. The Body found that the nomination demonstrated that ‘joking relationships’ included a set of practices that weave social links between communities and was recognized as a vehicle for shared values of solidarity and non-violence. The Body found that the nomination had now provided enough information to determine that the inscription of an element, focusing on values and principles of reconciliation between communities, could promote dialogue and promote mutual respect and cultural diversity at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels. The Body also found detailed safeguarding measures in the nomination that covered both traditional modes of transmission and more institutionalized modes, and that they were likely to contribute towards the preservation and promotion of the practice. However, the Body wished to invite the State Party, through the Committee, to focus more on the practices and expressions specific to the joking relationships during the implementation of the many listed safeguarding measures, and ensure the full involvement of the bearer communities. This was the meaning behind paragraph 4 of the draft decision. Although the State had chosen to slightly revise the information in criteria R.4 and R.5, which had already been satisfied by the Committee, the Body remained convinced of the participation of traditional leaders and other authorities in the elaboration process of the resubmitted nomination, as well as the inscription of the element in the national inventory administered by the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Practices and expressions of joking relationships in Niger on the Representative List.
34. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.31 to inscribe Practices and expressions of joking relationships in Niger on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
35. The **Vice-Chair** invited Niger to take the floor.
36. The Minister of Culture, Arts and Leisure of **Niger** spoke of the delegation’s great joy and emotion in expressing its profound gratitude to the Committee and Subsidiary Body for the excellent work done on the inscription of the element on the Representative List. He added that the inscription of the element, which conveyed the values of peace, brotherhood, solidarity, integration and tolerance, would further contribute to its promotion but also its transmission to younger generations. He reiterated its commitment to strengthen the safeguarding measures of this ancient practice, but also to take appropriate action in implementing the recommendations by the Committee. The joking relationship was practised everywhere around the world, and was why Niger encouraged and invited other countries to synergize actions in favour of this valued practice. The Minister congratulated UNESCO for its continued efforts in promoting cultural heritage, a factor of sustainable development for all communities.
37. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Minister for his encouragement, congratulating the delegation once again for its inscription and for its efforts in safeguarding cultural intangible heritage.
38. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on
**Al-Ayyala, a traditional performing art of the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates** [draft decision 9.COM 10.33] submitted by **Oman and the United Arab Emirates**. Al-Ayyala is a popular and expressive cultural performance practised in north-western Oman and throughout the United Arab Emirates during weddings and other religious and national festivities. Al-Ayyala involves chanted poetry, drum music and dance, and simulates a battle scene. Two rows of men face each other, carrying thin bamboo sticks. The men move their heads and sticks synchronously with the drum rhythm and chant poetic lyrics, while other performers move around the rows holding swords or guns, which they hurl to the sky and catch. The lead performer is usually an inherited role and is responsible for training other performers. It was recalled that the nomination was first presented to the Committee during its seventh session in 2012 and had been referred to the submitting States for additional information in criteria R.4 and R .5. Changes introduced by the submitting States on criteria already satisfied were mainly editorial in nature. Therefore, the formulations in the draft decision in criteria R.1, R.2 and R.3 were virtually identical to those already adopted by the Committee in 2012. The evaluation thus focused on the referred criteria. This time, the Body found that the resubmitted nomination contained sufficient information on the nomination process and provided evidence of free, prior and informed consent of dozens of practitioners from both submitting States; their support was also expressed in the accompanying video. In addition, the nomination satisfactorily demonstrated there were no customary practices that restricted access to certain aspects of this traditional art. Regarding criterion R.5, evidence was provided that demonstrated the inscription of the element on both the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of the United Arab Emirates and Oman, and that the nomination provided sufficient information on the elaboration process of these inventories to comply with Article 11 and Article 12 of the Convention. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Al-Ayyala, a traditional performing art of the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates on the Representative List.
39. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.33 to inscribe Al-Ayyala, a traditional performing art of the Sultanate of Oman and the United Arab Emirates on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
40. The delegation of **Oman** spoke of its delight to have the element inscribed, congratulating the practitioners of Al-Ayyala. Indeed, thanks to the good preparation of this file, the delegation was able to count on the participation of all stakeholders, practitioners, academics and the communities that practice this element. Working together on the file, the delegation spoke of how research was conducted in order to develop some training programmes to guarantee the transmission of knowledge of Al-Ayyala. It thanked all those who took part in this process, as well as the Subsidiary Body, the Secretariat, and the Committee. It was grateful for the assistance of the Secretariat during the preparation of this file, and congratulated the States that also had elements inscribed.
41. The delegation of **United Arab Emirates** echoed the remarks by Oman in expressing its happiness and gratitude for the inscription of this joint element. It thanked the Committee and the Subsidiary Body for inscribing the element on the Representative List, as well as the Secretariat for providing assistance and advice whenever needed. The delegation remarked that this was an important performing art in the two countries, and was a symbol of joy, and it would have liked to have a troupe of Al-Ayyala perform to the Committee, perhaps at a future session. The element was widespread in the two countries and was practised by all levels of society whenever there was a special event people would gather around this element in order to express their feelings. Since the beginning of the Convention, the United Arab Emirates had thought of the Al-Ayyala and looked for a partner State, which came about very naturally because it had so many commonalities with the Sultanate of Oman, and thus it was able to inscribe a third element. The delegation also had on-going nominations with Qatar, Saudi Arabia and others countries, as it really sought to focus on the links between countries and to this common heritage. Indeed, there existed cultural dialogue in the region as countries assisted each other when submitting files, which demonstrated a real spirit of cooperation and solidarity. It hoped that countries that had been unsuccessful during the present session would achieve success in a later session. The delegation concluded by saying that the Committee needed to preserve this joyful dimension and the sharing of happy moments, which was part of the Convention and represented the cultural lives of countries. The delegation congratulated the local communities in the two countries, and thanked all those with whom it had cooperated.
42. The **Vice-Chair** conveyed warm thanks to both submitting States for their commitment to the Convention and their perseverance in putting this file forward. On behalf of the Committee, the Vice-Chair conveyed thanks to the Secretariat for having assisted both submitting parties.
43. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Festivity of Virgen de la Candelaria of Puno** [draft decision 9.COM 10.34] submitted by **Peru**. The Festivity of Virgen de la Candelaria, celebrated every February in the city of Puno, draw on Catholic traditions and symbolic elements of the Andean worldview of local Quechua and Aymara ethnic groups. A liturgical act leads into a religious procession as the image of the Virgin is carried aloft along the village streets. Rehearsals and crafts workshops by three associations of practitioners are the places where these traditional skills are passed on to younger generations. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. Indeed, the information provided in the nomination convincingly demonstrated that the Festivity of the Virgen de la Candelaria constituted intangible cultural heritage for the communities of the Quechua and Aymara in the Puno region, who were fully mobilized in the organization of the religious, festive and cultural activities, displaying a shared sense of continuity and belonging. The Body also found that the nomination adequately demonstrated the link between the inscription of the element and the awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in general, notably due to its openness and innovation, and sense of intercultural and inter-community dialogue. The current safeguarding measures to safeguard and promote the Feast of the Virgen de la Candelaria were concretely described and reflected a combination of will and commitment from both the submitting State at the local, regional and national levels, and the communities concerned. The nomination also demonstrated the participation of a wide range of government and civil actors in all stages in the elaboration of the nomination process, and had provided their free, prior and informed consent. The information provided on the process that led to the declaration of the Virgen de la Candelaria in Puno as ‘Cultural Heritage of the Nation’ was deemed sufficient to conclude that the element was inscribed in an inventory of intangible cultural heritage in accordance with the internal procedures in Peru. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Festivity of Virgen de la Candelaria of Puno on the Representative List.
44. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body for the summary of the debates. Before moving to the draft decision, the Vice-Chair informed the Committee that extensive consultations had taken place between Bolivia and Peru in order to facilitate consensus in the adoption of the draft decision. He was very happy to report that the concerned parties had successfully concluded their consultations. Draft decision 9.COM 10.34 thus incorporated two additional paragraphs that was submitted to the Committee for its consideration. The Vice-Chair congratulated both delegations for their efforts, and trusted that the Committee would agree to adopt the draft decision as a whole. The Committee was asked to take note of the amended paragraphs 4 and 5.
45. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its full support for the consensual solution found by the delegations concerned, and was extremely happy to see this nomination inscribed on the Representative List, adding that it was also an honour for all the countries in the region. It also thanked Peru for the very beautiful music presentation the previous day by the singer Tamaris from Puno.
46. The delegation of **Egypt** endorsed the statement by Brazil and the draft decision, and commended both delegations for this compromise, which reflected the spirit of the Convention, adding that it would like this approach to be applied to all similar nominations.
47. The delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the mutual solution attained by Peru and Bolivia, and was happy to endorse the amendments. It wished to highlight that this was yet another example demonstrating the need to promote multinational files in order to bridge cross-boundary cultures and concentrate on the common goal of demonstrating diversity, which was not a dividing but a uniting element. The Convention was thus the ideal tool to demonstrate this to the rest of the world and to other multilateral platforms. In order to avoid a spirit of competition and exclusion, the delegation believed that the Committee needs to send a strong message at the end of its session to promote multinational files, and even consider having an expert meeting on this aspect of the Convention on how to find solutions when faced with challenges caused by the difficulties in preparing multinational files.
48. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.34 to inscribe Festivity of Virgen de la Candelaria of Puno on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
49. The delegation of **Peru** spoke of the eruption of western civilization to the coastal lowland deserts, the high Andean mountains and valleys and the deep Amazonian jungles that brought about desperation and extreme livelihood changes. But at the same time, a dim light of hope manifested in the incarnation of divinity in images and cults that people in these regions regarded as their own. Traditional cults and ritual practices were syncretized, mixed and combined with a new and foreign faith expressed in multiple cultural manifestations, and hope had been found side-by-side with misery, reconciliation and exploitation. The delegation explained that it was quite difficult for rational people to understand the real meaning behind the festivities of the Virgin of Candelaria of Puno as it implied understanding of a symbolic value that populations aspire to in the search for hope and celebration, whether in Puno, the region of Candelaria or the entire Andean region. Before Christian faith laid roots in these places, the ‘Mama Pacha’ as it is called in the local language, conceived the female figure as the source of life and fertility. The Andean virgins give continuity to these beliefs, adapting and syncretizing the values represented in the figure of the Virgin mother in Catholic liturgy with European traditions where the Virgin is a protective mother. The delegation, the peoples of Puno, and the Ministry of Culture of Peru expressed its deep gratitude to the Committee for the opportunity to bring this exceptional cultural expression to a world forum, and to the many organized religious and cultural communities in Puno that with dedication put together an impeccable nomination file.
50. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the Vice-Minister of Culture, congratulating him once again on the inscription, as well as the community of Puno.
51. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Cante Alentejano, polyphonic singing from Alentejo, southern Portugal** [draft decision 9.COM 10.35] submitted by **Portugal**. Cante Alentejano is a genre of traditional two-part singing performed by amateur choral groups in southern Portugal characterized by distinctive melodies, lyrics and vocal styles, and performed without instrumentation. Existing or recently composed melodies accompany a vast repertoire of traditional poems that address traditional and contemporary themes. It permeates social gatherings in both public and private spaces, reinforcing dialogue between different generations, genders and individuals from different backgrounds, thereby contributing to social cohesion. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body was unanimous on the quality of the nomination and thus found that all the criteria were satisfied. The Body found that the nomination clearly demonstrated that the Cante Alentejano was representative of intangible heritage in the region, reaffirming a sense of belonging and emotional connection to the Alentejo community. The Body was also convinced of the explanation provided in the nomination of its possible contribution towards a broader awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage as a vehicle of sustainable development and the promotion of the diversity of polyphonic singing traditions. The nomination clearly described the many safeguarding measures to protect and promote Cante Alentejano, which documented the will and firm commitment of the State and the choirs to implement them within the stated timetable. The description of the nomination process demonstrated that the community and groups concerned had, from the outset, been actively involved, and their free, prior and informed consent came not only for the submission of the nomination but also for the implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures. The Body also found satisfactory evidence of the inclusion of Cante Alentejano in the databases of the Casa do Cante and e-Museu do Património Cultural imaterial. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Cante Alentejano, polyphonic singing from Alentejo, southern Portugal on the Representative List and suggested to the Committee to add this nomination to the list of files considered as good examples.
52. The **Vice-Chair** noted the very clear opinion from the Subsidiary Body.
53. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its happiness with this nomination, adding that it was fond of its Portuguese heritage and as such was as emotional as the Portuguese people.
54. The **Vice-Chair** concurred that this was indeed an exemplary nomination. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chair** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.35 to inscribe Cante Alentejano, polyphonic singing from Alentejo, southern Portugal on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
55. The delegation of **Portugal** welcomed the decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List, thanking the Committee for the joy and pride it had brought to all those who supported the inscription. The international recognition of Cante Alentejano, which joined Fado on the Representative List, was mostly a project led by the men and women of Alentejo who inhabit the vast expanses of southern Portugal, and for whom polyphonic song was an important element of identity and social cohesion. This consecration was also an important step in the protection, enhancement and transmission of this unique heritage, contributing to cultural diversity and universal objectives, which are at the heart of the Convention. Cante Alentejano is a song of work, solidarity and fraternity, and a reference to peace and dialogue, the crossroads of cultures and different populations. Recognition by UNESCO was thus meaningful as it shared the same universal values, which must be promoted and defended against intolerance, war and hatred that threaten our common future. The delegation reiterated its gratitude to the Committee and to all those who worked for the exemplary success of this nomination.

*[Performance of Cante Alentejano]*

1. The **Vice-Chair** thanked the delegation of Portugal for the magnificent demonstration of polyphonic chants that lifted the spirits, expressing thanks once more for having brought forward this exemplary nomination file.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Nongak, community band music, dance and rituals in the Republic of Korea** [draft decision 9.COM 10.36] submitted by the **Republic of Korea**. Nongak is a popular performing art of the Republic of Korea, combining a percussion ensemble and sometimes wind instruments, parading, dancing, drama and acrobatic feats. It is practised to appease gods, chase evil spirits, pray for a rich harvest in spring and during autumn festivals for fund-raising for community projects, enhancing solidarity and cooperation in the community and establishing a sense of shared identity among community members. The public becomes familiar with Nongak through observation and participation in its performances, while community groups and educational institutions play an important role in teaching and transmitting the different components. The Subsidiary Body was unanimous on the quality of this nomination and easily concluded that it clearly demonstrated that all five criteria were satisfied. The Body concluded that the nomination was clear, precise and richly detailed demonstrating that Nongak, through its inherent creativity and vitality, has aptly evolved over time and adapted to the contemporary culture, while constituting an element of intangible cultural heritage that functioned as a vector of social cohesion. The information provided in the nomination also showed that, besides the obvious effect of international recognition, Nongak’s inscription could help promote greater awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage to promote dialogue between practitioners across different generations and communities, while illustrating the ability of intangible cultural heritage to adapt to cultural and social changes. The nomination provided a particularly strong safeguarding plan, affording special attention to the possible consequences of its inscription on the Representative List, such as over-commercialization or tourist exploitation. In addition, the nomination described the different stages in the elaboration of the nomination, clearly demonstrating the active involvement of the practitioners in each of them in close collaboration with their representatives and those of local governments. Finally, the nomination satisfactorily demonstrated how several variants of Nongak had been included in the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Nongak, community band music, dance and rituals in the Republic of Korea on the Representative List, adding that it was one of the good examples selected by the Committee.

[The Chairperson resumed his role]

1. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.36 to inscribe Nongak, community band music, dance and rituals in the Republic of Korea on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
2. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its deepest gratitude to the Committee for its valuable support in inscribing Nongak on the Representative List, especially the Subsidiary Body for its hard work in evaluating the nomination file. Nongak community band music, dance and rituals plays a significant role in the cohesion and cooperation of Korean communities, passed from generation to generation, enriching the cultural diversity of Korea with its regional variations of styles, rhythms and lyrics. Today, Nongak enjoys the status as an independent channel of performing folk arts in the country. The delegation invited the delegates to enjoy a performance of Nongak by bearers of five different local communities who came especially to perform at UNESCO.

*[Performance of Nongak]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Republic of Korea for this inscription.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Alardhah Alnajdiyah, Saudi Arabia dance, drumming and poetry** [draft decision 9.COM 10.38] submitted by **Saudi Arabia**. Alardhah Alnajdiyah is a performing art practised at social events throughout Saudi Arabia. During the performance, a ‘warmonger’ with a loud, sonorous and strong voice encourages poets to compose and recite verses that aim to inspire unity, enthusiasm and courage among the crowd. The poet is carried on the shoulders of the people for the recitation, which is accompanied by drumming and dances. If the poet fails, he gets down and another poet is raised up. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the nomination demonstrated that R.5 criterion was satisfied but not criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. Indeed, the Body found that the nomination had demonstrated that the element was inscribed in the local inventory of intangible cultural heritage (R.5). However, concerning R.1, the Body found that the nomination did not contain sufficiently clear or detailed information to determine the nature and scope of the element, the context of its practice, nor the contours of the communities who recognized it as intangible cultural heritage. Although the video could not substitute the text of the file, the Body could not find clarification on this criterion, as the video only presented one staged show. Additionally, information provided in criterion R.2 seemed too general or repetitive and was limited to explaining how inscription might encourage the submitting State to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The nomination had not shown how the inscription of the item on the Representative List met the requirements of R.2, as specified in the nomination form. The Body also found that the safeguarding measures were not sufficiently detailed or described in a concrete way to conclude that their objective was to ensure the viability of Alardhah. The majority of the proposed measures related to the safeguarding of traditional music and art in *general* and not specifically to the element proposed for inscription. The absence of clear and practical information on both the safeguarding measures and the role of national institutions in their implementation did not allow the Body to conclude that these measures will actually safeguard the nominated element (R.3). The Body took note of the consent provided by folk groups and practitioners. However, the Body was responsible for evaluating, as requested by the criterion R.4, whether the element nominated had the widest possible participation of the communities. In this regard, it had encountered two major issues. Firstly, in the absence of an adequate description of the communities concerned, the Body was unable to determine the extent to which the consent provided was sufficiently representative of the communities in question, particularly as the documents did not correspond to the communities identified in the form. Secondly, the description of the process of elaboration of the nomination file did not clearly demonstrate whether there was sufficiently broad participation, especially as the file itself indicated that the element was ‘one of the most famous national habits in Saudi Arabia’. Finally, the nomination made repeated reference to the warrior character of Alardhah in each criterion. Although this did not refute the nature of the element as intangible cultural heritage, it raised a lot of questions about the pertinence of a cultural expression with these characteristics inscribed on the Representative List that provided its listed element with international visibility. Once again, the Body referred to previous Committee decisions, recalling Decision 5.COM 6, which requires that States ‘in case of proposals of elements containing references to war or conflict or specific historical events, the nomination should be developed with great care to avoid provoking misunderstanding’. In addition to the major problems encountered in criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4, the Body was of the opinion that the nomination had not taken into account the special care required with regard to these aspects. Based on these findings, the Subsidiary Body concluded not to recommend the inscription of Alardhah Alnajdiyah, Saudi Arabia dance, drumming and poetry on the Representative List, while paragraph 6 of the draft decision echoed the decision already taken by the Committee in 2010.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanations of the different questions raised during the evaluation.
4. Thanking the Subsidiary Body for its comments, the delegation of **Egypt** remarked that it was said this traditional dance was linked to war and conflict, but historically speaking, everyone in the kingdom practised this dance to celebrate and express joy. Today, this dance symbolized happiness and is practised during weddings and national celebrations, with no association to war and conflict. The King and members of society in various parts of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as well as in some neighbouring Arab countries, practised Alardhah Alnajdiyah. It had even been presented at the UNESCO Headquarters on three different occasions during various celebrations, most recently during a visit by the Crown Prince. This dance was thus extremely important to the country. The delegation added that not all countries had the ability to prepare files successfully, as some countries faced difficulties in understanding the criteria and lacked the capabilities to complete their files adequately. It hoped the Committee would respect the spirit of the Convention, as the goal was to achieve rapprochement between cultures and spread a culture of peace.
5. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its precise evaluation of the shortcomings, but questioned the observation of the warring nature of the performing art in festivals, adding that in western culture, the poetry of the founding fathers of Homer and Virgil came from a tradition of war. Poetry in this warring tradition was transcended from classical poetry to the Nordic sagas and even some Shakespearean tragedies. This warrior tradition, transcended in poetry, had thus transformed into something totally different, a celebration of life and the courage of man facing the adversities of life. The delegation was convinced that this element contained this transcendence of a warrior past into a very positive life-affirming message. That was why it was practised throughout the country and a motive of pride for the people of Saudi Arabia. It wished to hear from Saudi Arabia in response to comments on the nature of this element, and also on the shortcomings of the file, and possibly how this be solved, perhaps using more information and different language. It was recalled that this was the second time Saudi Arabia had presented this element, and that it was a very important tradition in the country, adding that it had no elements yet inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation of Brazil would later present some amendments in order to suggest change the decision to a referral, so that the country could correct the shortcomings of the file and present the nomination again.
6. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its work and for the quality of its recommendations. It recalled previous discussions about the sensitivities of certain cultural practices that were rooted in the traditions of countries and societies for many centuries and were certainly tainted from violence or war, as was the present case, but today had nothing to do with its warlike origin and had become an integral part of the spirit and culture of everyday life. As pointed out by Egypt, this tradition was practised by princes and kings, but also by the most humble people who participated during weddings and family celebrations. Moreover, it was presented in UNESCO, which would make it difficult for people of Saudi Arabia to understand how their heritage could be presented to UNESCO but not inscribed. That said, the delegation wished to hear from Saudi Arabia in response to the remarks made by the Subsidiary Body.
7. The delegation of **Congo** congratulated the Subsidiary Body for its pertinent examination, noting that this was the second time the nomination had been presented, which demonstrated the commitment of the submitting State and its attachment to the element. It therefore wished to hear from Saudi Arabia, and hoped that the Committee would consider a referral that would allow the State to revise the nomination rather than having to wait several years.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** fully associated with the remarks made by Brazil, adding that it recognized the serious work of the Subsidiary Body and appreciated its findings, but it also recognized that Saudi Arabia did not have a single element inscribed and were committed to do so. The delegation believed that they were willing to revise its nomination and was in favour of giving the State Party another chance to resubmit its file.
9. The delegation of **Afghanistan** remarked that this was the second submission of an element that had reinterpreted its past, which was disadvantaging the submitting State. The delegation explained that if we re-examined our past and the values and practices today, we would notice a definite evolution that related to all humankind. It was possible that some ritual dances of today had a religious origin with an element of fire, or perhaps even war, but what counted was how the element was practised in today’s society. For example, did it serve as a link to ensure cohesion between the different communities? It was clear that this dance, like others, brought joy today, and there existed dances that were not practised by women, but today they were also practised by women. These were thus developments to a traditional practice in a reinterpretation of the past. The delegation remarked that this was similar to the nomination by China yesterday. It also noted that the submitting State had presented the element in good faith in its description of its warrior character, adding that Brazil provided clarification in this regard. It believed that Saudi Arabia had the right to provide clarifications, and also benefit from a shorter delay, as suggested by Congo.
10. The delegation of **Bulgaria** subscribed to the Subsidiary Body’s position on this nomination, adding that it had discussed the file with the delegation of Saudi Arabia that admitted the shortcomings in the nomination. However, it was also impressed by its very strong commitment to improve the nomination file, and considering that Saudi Arabia did not have any elements inscribed, felt that the Committee might be in a position to encourage the nominating State by deciding on a referral option and inviting it to resubmit the nomination at the earliest possible stage.
11. Having studied the file, the delegation of **Greece** agreed that there were shortcomings in the file. However, as the submitting State did not yet have any inscribed elements, and also that this was the second time the nomination was being presented; the delegation felt that it would be useful to allow Saudi Arabia to provide some explanations.
12. The delegation of **Tunisia** was very much aware of the shortcomings identified by the Subsidiary Body. However, it wished to draw the Committee’s attention to the fact that this was an extremely important element for Saudi Arabia. It had deep roots across society and across the kingdom. It was a vector of joy, celebration and rapprochement between members of Saudi society, and also within the region with neighbouring societies. Moreover, there was a sense of how difficult it was for Saudi experts to elaborate the nomination, as gaps were clearly related to the methodology and not the actual substance of the information found in the nomination file. The delegation supported a referral in order to give Saudi experts an opportunity to redraft and resubmit the file at the next cycle.
13. The delegation of **Peru** supported the notion that the file be referred given the fact that this would be the first accepted nomination from Saudi Arabia, and like many of the observations made by the Subsidiary Body, considered the gaps more quantitative than qualitative. Thus, more information would be needed to support a further examination, which should be carried out in the shortest time possible.
14. The delegation of **Uganda** took note of the comments by the Subsidiary Body, but also noted in the eighth session in Baku that the Committee requested that each State Party submit only one file, and as such this was Saudi Arabia’s only file in this cycle. Knowing that it took a lot of time to prepare one file, the delegation supported the option of referral so that the submitting State might resubmit the file in 2015.
15. The delegation of **Uruguay** respected the recommendation by the Subsidiary Body, however, taking into consideration the importance and significance of this proposal to Saudi Arabia, its people and communities, it favoured a change in the draft decision to a referral.
16. The delegation of **India** supported the option for Saudi Arabia to be given another chance to resubmit the file at its earliest, and thus amend the decision to a referral. It noted the observations of the Subsidiary Body, but wished to hear the State Party respond to the observations so as to decide whether they could work to resubmit the file at its earliest.
17. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that the hesitation that appeared before the Committee was whether Saudi Arabia should come back in four years from now, which was in the current decision, or next year, in the case of a referral. The delegation saw no problem with Saudi Arabia resubmitting the file. However, what mattered was that Saudi Arabia did not receive a third negative recommendation. It was thus really important to make sure that the next submission was successful, adding that the Committee had to be very clear in its messages and in what it believed was wrong in the file that led the Subsidiary Body to make its recommendation. Initially, the delegation felt that it concerned the dance with the swords, but it also noted that there were dances with swords in several inscribed elements. The problem therefore appeared to be in the relation between the dance and the language in the nomination files. It was beautiful poetry, but even the most beautiful poetry, if it called for war made it difficult for UNESCO to promote. It was now understood from previously speakers that this element had evolved, and that the dance was now poetry performed during weddings and celebrations. The delegation sought more information from the State Party in this regard, but most of all, the information should be clearly described in the resubmitted file. It reiterated that it had no problem seeing the nomination resubmitted provided the Committee was very clear in its message, and that the State Party had a chance to obtain a positive recommendation.
18. The delegation of **Nigeria** found it noteworthy that two different Subsidiary Bodies had recommended not to inscribe the element. In addition, it was important to remain consistent with the integrity of past decisions. Referring to the issue of the referral, or a polite ‘no’, the delegation believed that there was a difference between ‘no’ and ‘referral’ in that a referral implied that technical details had to be provided by the State Party, but if this was not the case, then it would be a resounding ‘no’. The delegation added to the comments by Saint Lucia, suggesting that if the file received a ‘no’ in a subsequent submission, then there was a fundamental flaw with this file.
19. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that it systematically tried to support an evaluation by the Subsidiary Body and its draft decision. It also had no problem with a referral for this file. However, it expressed surprise that at least three of the six Members of the Subsidiary Body did not support the draft decision.
20. The **Chairperson** noted the majority of Members were following the same direction, inviting Saudi Arabia to speak.
21. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the States Parties that had supported the nomination file, adding that it concurred with the many observations by the Subsidiary Body that not enough time had been spent on drafting the file. Hence its request for another year to work on it. As for the war-like aspect of the element, the delegation referred to the remarks by Afghanistan in which it was clearly indicated that this dance had – in the past – been an expression of joy after victory on the battlefield. However, it had changed over time and today it expressed joy at various celebrations, such as weddings and festivals. The delegation remarked that this was not specific to this dance as there were many artistic expressions that had been inscribed that were initially war-like but had evolved over time. The dance was therefore no longer related to war and was now a performance. The poetry used to be war-like, but now those poems are patriotic and full of emotion, and speak of love and affection for the Fatherland. The delegation concurred with the Subsidiary Body with regard to the administrative measures that were deemed insufficient, as was noted by Tunisia in which it was clearly indicated that the problem was not so much the intrinsic value of the element, but a shortcoming in the paper work. The delegation reiterated its request to have another year to work on the file, particularly as this was second time it had submitted the nomination and that it had yet to inscribe an element on the list.
22. The **Chairperson** noted that Brazil had proposed a number of amendments, inviting the Secretary to introduce the amendments.
23. The **Secretary** noted that the amendments pertained to criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 in the current paragraph 3 with paragraphs 1 and 2 remaining unchanged, and including an amendment in paragraph 4. The amendment to the *chapeau* would read: ‘Further decides that the information included in the file is not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List are satisfied.’ The amendment in R.1 would read: ‘Additional information is needed to identify clearly the nature and scope as well as the current social functions and cultural meanings of the element beyond its staged representations.’ The amendment in R.2 would read: ‘Given the nomination’s lack of clarity, information is needed to demonstrate how inscription of the element on the Representative List could contribute to the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage in general or raise awareness of its significance.’ The amendment in R.3 would read: ‘The nomination does not explain the safeguarding measures in concrete terms or demonstrate that they are oriented to safeguarding Alardhah and not heritage in general; further information is necessary to understand if they will effectively help to ensure the viability of the nominated element once its nature and scope are more clearly identified; demonstration of the involvement and contribution of national institutions is also needed.’ The amendment in R.4 would read: ‘Although several practitioners granted their free, prior and informed consent for the inscription of Alardhah, the participatory process for the preparation of the nomination is not clearly described; further information is necessary to clarify issues related to the communities indicated in the form and their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination.’ The amendment in paragraph 4 would read: ‘Decides to refer the nomination of Alardhah Alnajdiyah, Saudi Arabia dance, drumming and poetry to the submitting State Party and invites it to resubmit the nomination to the Committee for examination during a following cycle.’ In Brazil’s proposal, paragraph 5 would be deleted.
24. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** noted that the delegation of Saudi Arabia agreed with the comments made by the Subsidiary Body and recognized that the nomination file needed work in order to receive a better recommendation next time. Thus, the most important point was to ensure that Saudi Arabia did not receive a third rejection, and therefore it was important to be very clear about the improvements required in the nomination file. The delegation agreed with the paragraphs on referral, but felt that the other amendments did not help the State Party because they replaced the clear and specific recommendations by the Subsidiary Body on what needed to be improved, with general recommendations that were not really helpful. It therefore accepted to refer the file if all the other paragraphs were kept in their original language.
25. The delegation of **Egypt** supported Brazil’s amendments, adding that the delegation of Saudi Arabia recognized that the points raised by the Subsidiary Body were accurate and was thus aware of what needed to be done to improve its nomination file for the next cycle. Even though the amendments by Brazil were general, the delegation felt that the submitting State was aware of the need to improve the quality of the file, which was a prerequisite for inscription. As such the submitting State would do its utmost to inscribe the element.
26. The delegation of **Ethiopia** took note of the precise explanations provided by the submitting State, adding that it was clear it was well aware of the concerns expressed by the Subsidiary Body, and were committed to revising the nomination. The delegation was convinced that the State Party would work in cooperation with the Secretariat to resubmit their nomination at the Committee’s next session, which would bring about a successful outcome and inscription. It was further convinced that the State could manage to complete the revisions in the coming year, adding that the proposal of Brazil seemed very feasible. It thus strongly supported the amendment by Brazil for a referral and the addition of the paragraphs in their entirety.
27. Clarifying the nature of the amendment, the delegation of **Brazil** explained that the amendments proposed in paragraph 3 did not change the substance of the Subsidiary Body’s recommendations. They simply employed a different language, as the original language in the draft decision was more conducive to a non-inscription, i.e. in the use of ‘the nomination does not […]’. Thus, in the case of a referral, alternative language should be employed, but none of the changes modified the recommendations. The only major modification was the deletion of the original paragraph 5, which dealt with the question of martial sentiments and the connotations to battle. The delegation noted that the submitting State had clearly stated that this was not the case with the element. Thus, it could be part of the Chairperson’s oral report, as the message was well understood. The amendments were therefore considered constructive and in line with the Committee’s debates.
28. The delegation of **Belgium** supported the proposal by Brazil for a referral, but agreed with the wise words spoken by Saint Lucia. For example, in R.1, it wondered why the reference to the contours of its communities and the role of different practitioners should be deleted, especially as the Committee maintained that the communities, groups, and if applicable, individuals were at the centre of the Convention. The delegation thus wished to keep this paragraph. In addition, in R.2, the delegation felt that the statement, ‘it often contains general or repetitive information, and does not respond to the questions posed in the nomination form’ was a good one and proposed to keep it, as other States and researchers examining these files will at least learn lessons about how the criterion was evaluated. It therefore wished to maintain the suggestions and feedback of the Subsidiary Body online. It therefore agreed with Brazil to refer, but wished to retain in the text some of the observations by the Subsidiary Body.
29. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked all those that had provided comments, adding that there appeared to be a consensus. It also appreciated the effort by Saudi Arabia in accepting the remarks made by the Subsidiary Body. With regard to the amendments proposed by Brazil, the delegation felt they made sense, given the fact that the nomination was no longer rejected but Saudi Arabia was invited to revise its nomination, which it had agreed to do. With regard to criterion R.1, the delegation agreed with the remark made by Belgium regarding the role of communities. However in R.2, it sought to delete the sentence that made reference to general or repetitive information, as the file would be revised and resubmitted and therefore would not serve as an example to others, and was thus unnecessary.
30. The delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the suggestion by Belgium in R.1 to keep the reference to communities and the different practitioners, adding that it thought the reference to their consent in R.4 was adequate, but it accepted to maintain the original text. Considering the amendment in R.2, the delegation felt that the language used in the original text was particularly heavy. However, it did not seek to create a problem and agreed to maintain the original language if Belgium insisted.
31. The delegation of **Bulgaria** found that the proposal by Belgium was good, and with Brazil accepting it, the Committee now had to find the correct wording for the other two paragraphs. For instance in R.1, the delegation proposed, ‘additional nomination is needed to identify clearly the nature and scope of the element, the contours of its communities, the role of different practitioners, as well as the current social function and cultural meaning of the element, beyond its stage representations’. The Committee could also find suitable language for R.2.
32. Noting that there was almost unanimous support for the referral, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to paragraphs 1 and 2, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the *chapeau* of paragraph 3, as amended by Brazil, which was duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to its sub-paragraph in criterion R.1.
33. The delegation of **Brazil** accepted the suggestion by Belgium in R.1 to bring back the element of communities.
34. The **Chairperson** felt that there was general consensus to agree with Belgium in R.1, which was duly adopted. He then turned to the sub-paragraphs in criteria R.2, R.3 and R.4, as amended by Brazil. With no further comments or objections, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the proposal by Brazil to delete paragraph 5.
35. The delegation of **Afghanistan** proposed to delete paragraph 5 as it contradicted the adopted paragraphs.
36. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** failed to see the contradiction with the previous paragraphs, adding that this was a major argument for improving the subsequent file. The delegation remarked that although Saudi Arabia had provided remarks in this regard, the Committee was not considering the element, but the file, and thus wished to retain the paragraph.
37. The delegation of **Belgium** supported the proposal by Saint Lucia.
38. In response to the remark by Saint Lucia, the delegation of **Afghanistan** explained that the contradiction lay in the wording, ‘Invites the State Party, if it wishes to resubmit the nomination […]’, as it implied a rejection of the nomination file, when the decision was to refer the nomination. Thus, in the spirit of referral, the paragraph should be deleted.
39. The delegation of **Egypt** supported the deletion of paragraph 5, as suggested by Brazil and Afghanistan.
40. In response to the remark by Saint Lucia, and in the spirit of consensus, the delegation of **Brazil** proposed: ‘Invites the State Party, when reformulating its nomination, to exercise the utmost care to highlight the contribution of the element to social cohesion and dialogue.’ The remaining sentence on ‘martial sentiments and exhortations to battle’ could then be deleted, as this was clearly understood and could instead be included in the oral report.
41. The delegation of **Algeria** supported paragraph 5, as amended by Brazil.
42. The delegation of **Belgium** did not understand the remark by Afghanistan because even as a referral, it was up to the submitting State – as a sovereign State – to decide if it wished to resubmit its nomination file. In the current wording, the Committee was almost forcing the reformulation of the nomination upon the State. The delegation supported the original language, as it provided valuable feedback by the Subsidiary Body. Nevertheless, it also agreed to its deletion, even though it preferred to maintain the original text.
43. The delegations of **Namibia** and **Tunisia** supported the modification of paragraph 5 with the amendment by Brazil.
44. The delegation of **Turkey** remarked that R.5 in paragraph 2 had already been adopted. It thus supported Brazil’s proposal to resubmit the file with the required elements.
45. The delegations of **Congo** and **India** supported the amendment by Brazil in paragraph 5.
46. The delegation of **Ethiopia** also supported Brazil’s amendment. With regard to the remark by Belgium, the delegation explained that the Committee wished to encourage Saudi Arabia to resubmit its nomination, as they had yet to inscribe an element. Moreover, Saudi Arabia had made it known that they have a strong will to resubmit.
47. The delegations of **Peru, Uganda, Bulgaria** and **Greece** supported Brazil’s revision of paragraph 5.
48. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the wording of paragraph 5, as proposed by Brazil, which was duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.38 to refer Alardhah Alnajdiyah, Saudi Arabia dance, drumming and poetry** **to the submitting State for additional information.**
49. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the Subsidiary Body, the States Parties, and the Committee for their understanding of the situation in Saudi Arabia. On behalf of the Head of the Saudi Foundation for the Preservation of Heritage, the delegation and all its members assured the Committee that it would revise its nomination for it to be successful when presented next year. The delegation assured the Committee that it would not provide an inaccurate picture of its history, although it acknowledged that there were swords in this art, and that the element was a symbol of peace and unity whose symbolism had changed over the last three centuries.
50. The **Secretary** announced the NGO working group meeting and the information session on the capacity-building programme for Electoral Group IV that would take place over lunch.
51. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session.

*[Thursday 27 November, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced the session by turning to draft decision 9.COM 10.39.
2. The **Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Slava, celebration of family saint patron’s day** [draft decision 9.COM 10.39] submitted by **Serbia**. In Serbia, Orthodox Christian families celebrate an important holiday in honour of the patron saint, Slava, A specially designed candle is lit in the family home, then wine is poured over a Slava cake, which is then cut crosswise, rotated and broken into four parts and lifted up. Women play an important role in transmitting knowledge concerning the performance of the rituals, their meaning and purpose. The Slava feast reinforces social relations and maintains dialogue in multi-ethnic and multi-confessional areas. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that all the criteria were satisfied. Indeed, the Body found that the detailed nomination clearly demonstrated that Slava is transmitted from generation to generation, enjoying broad support among the Orthodox Christian families in Serbia and affording its practitioners a sense of belonging and continuity. The Body particularly appreciated the important role played by women in the transmission of knowledge related to the practice within families. Similarly, the nomination demonstrated that the inscription of Slava could contribute to greater awareness of the ability of intangible cultural heritage to encourage both dialogue and reconciliation between communities, promoting an open and respectful community, illustrating the creative potential of traditional celebrations. However, in criterion R.2, the Body noted the use of certain words that were not in conformity with the spirit of the Convention, as shown in paragraph 4 of the draft decision. The proposed safeguarding plan was considered by the Body as realistic, well-designed and demonstrating respectable efforts to promote the element and safeguard its practice both in its traditional form and in all its variants. In addition, the Body was of the view that the nomination satisfactorily demonstrated the participation of the representative groups and a number of public institutions in the elaboration of the nomination, having provided their free, prior and informed consent. The Body also found sufficient evidence of the inscription of Slava in the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage in accordance with Article 11 and Article 12 of the Convention. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Slava, celebration of family saint patron’s day on the Representative List.
3. The delegation of **Brazil** congratulated Serbia for the inscription of its first element on the Representative List, remarking on Serbia’s long cultural tradition of the Orthodox Church.
4. The delegation of **Hungary** expressed its sincere support of Serbia’s nomination, a young State Party to the Convention, adding that this first inscription was a milestone. It appreciated Serbia’s efforts and wished the country well in its valuable work of safeguarding its rich and diverse cultural heritage.
5. The delegation of **Greece** congratulated Serbia, a neighbouring country, on the inscription of its element, which manifested the wealth of intangible cultural heritage in south-eastern Europe. It hoped that its inscriptions would multiply to demonstrate the wealth that was still very much alive in the region. It also thanked the Secretariat and the Subsidiary Body for their work.
6. The delegation of **Algeria** congratulated Serbia for the quality of its nomination and its first inscription.
7. The delegation of **India** congratulated Serbia on its first nomination, which it supported.
8. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.39 to inscribe Slava, celebration of family saint patron’s day on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
9. The delegation of **Serbia** expressed its sincere gratitude to the Committee, the Subsidiary Body and the Secretariat for supporting Serbia in its very first nomination to the Representative List. It was a great honour, but at the same time it was a reminder to States Parties to create the necessary conditions for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage on their territory. In Serbia, families celebrate Slava in honour of the patron saint who is believed to be their protector and provider of welfare. This centuries-old tradition is passed down through generations within families. It promotes dialogue among communities and encourages creativity, reinforcing social relations and playing an important role in establishing and maintaining dialogue in multi-ethnic and multi-confessional areas. The delegation was proud to be a part of the UNESCO’s lists, and hoped to enrich them with new nominations in the future.
10. **The Chairperson** congratulated Serbia on its first inscription.
11. The **Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination of **Tamboradas drum-playing rituals** [draft decision 9.COM 10.42] submitted by **Spain**. Tamboradas are festive events of drum-playing held each year in Spain during the Catholic Holy Week. Over several days and nights, thousands of drummers simultaneously beat drums, creating a festive, liberating atmosphere. The drums and the costumes are made by local craftspeople. Any person can participate in the Tamboradas, regardless of gender, age or socioeconomic level. It is the drum community as a whole, through verbal codes and specific gestural patterns, who transmit the instructions needed in order to achieve a synchronized performance. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the nomination demonstrated that criteria R.4 and R.5 were satisfied, but that it lacked the technical details to enable it to position itself on criteria R.1, R.2 and R.3. It found that the submitting State had sufficiently demonstrated how the communities had been involved throughout the nomination process and had given their free, prior and informed consent (R.4). The nomination also demonstrated that Tamboradas was included in the inventories of various autonomous communities of Spain where it is practised, and that this had been carried out with the active participation of the communities (R.5). Conversely, criteria R.1, R.2 and R.3 raised many questions, particularly owing to a constant shift in the nomination between the characterization of the element as a ‘ritual’ or a ‘festival’. The Body was aware that there was no question of attempting to establish a definite distinction between these two terms from the scientific point of view, but it agreed that the information provided to characterize the proposed element was unclear. Moreover, the Body felt that more information was needed to understand the nature and scope of the element in order to evaluate whether the element did indeed constitute intangible cultural heritage, as defined in Article 2 of the Convention. For example, the nomination did not provide information about the components of the element as presented, such as the manufacture of drums or costumes, or on its social function or cultural meaning. In addition, the nomination consistently brought together Tamboradas with the celebration of the Catholic Holy Week, suggesting that this association was integral to the nature of the element, but this link was not clearly stated or explained in the nomination. For all these reasons, the Body concluded that the nomination should be referred on criterion R.1. Logically, this would have a cascading effect because in the absence of a clear definition of the element, the Body was unable to pronounce on criterion R.2 on the potential contribution of inscription of the element to a greater visibility of cultural heritage intangible in general. Similarly, the Body was faced with the challenge of positioning itself in relation to criterion R.3, as the relevance and timeliness of the many proposed safeguarding measures could not be seen in relation to an element that had been inadequately characterized. The Body therefore concluded that criterion R.3 be referred so that the effectiveness of the proposed safeguarding measures could be evaluated once the element had been appropriately defined. The Subsidiary Body therefore recommended to refer the nomination to the submitting State for additional information on these aspects for resubmission in a subsequent cycle.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the clear and detailed explanations of the various issues, and opened the floor for comment.
13. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked the Subsidiary Body for its clear and specific assessment of the nomination file. It had personally attended the rituals and festive seasons that occurred every year in Spain, remarking that thousands of Spaniards and foreigners attended. In Seville, for instance, the streets were very busy during these events, and hotels had to be booked well in advance of the Holy Week. Having carefully reviewed the nomination, the delegation understood that the element was clearly intangible cultural heritage and that the file provided sufficient information on all the criteria. Moreover, the social and cultural elements related to this element were very clearly stated in the nomination file, as were the skills and knowledge, and its transmission from generation to generation. It thus believed that the link between Tamboradas and Holy Week was very clear and properly explained, as was the accompanying video, particularly with respect to criterion R.1. The delegation therefore considered that R.1 was fully satisfied, as was R.2. It also believed that R.3 was satisfied, but that others might have divergent views due to the Subsidiary Body’s observations in R.1. The delegation therefore asked the submitting State to take the floor so as to respond to the questions raised by the Subsidiary Body.
14. The delegation of **Bulgaria** accepted the decision, proposal and the remarks of the Subsidiary Body. At the same time, it considered that the additional information required by the Subsidiary Body was in fact contained within the nomination file albeit not necessarily in a lengthy or detailed way. It therefore wished to invite the nominating State to provide some explanations to R.2 and R.3.
15. Having carefully read the file, the delegation of **Greece** remarked on this popular cultural expression of religiosity that distinguished the notion of rituals within a vibrant tradition in the urban space. It sought the opinion of Spain on the definition of the element in criterion R.1, while expressing its great respect for the opinions of the Subsidiary Body and its work.
16. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** appreciated the Subsidiary Body’s evaluation, noting that the nature and the scope of these rituals were the main obstacles in the inscription of this file under criteria R.1 and R.3. After analysing Spain’s nomination, the delegation was under the impression that the specific activities, timeframe and craftsmanship of the element were sufficiently described in the nomination, and as such, the nature and scope of the element was easily definable. It was noted that the Subsidiary Body highlighted the issue of nomenclature between ‘festival’ and ‘ritual’, and the delegation questioned whether the nomenclature of the element should be a deciding factor for inscription. With regard to criterion R.2, the delegation understood that the file had failed to demonstrate how the drum-playing culture could contribute to the visibility and awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general. In this regard, the delegation invited Spain to provide more information.
17. The delegation of **Brazil** deeply appreciated the recommendations by the Subsidiary Body, and from its own examination, could only see a problem in R.1, adding that the comments made about criteria R.2 and R.3 were consequences of those observations made in R.1. With regard to R.2, it argued that this element could promote dialogue among communities, not only in Andalusia and southern Spain but also all over the Iberian Peninsula, the Mediterranean basin, the Christian world, and even with the Muslim world. With regard to criterion R.3, it was noted that the Subsidiary Body mentioned that several safeguarding measures had already been proposed, and with clarifications from Spain, the delegation was sure that these measures were sufficient. Thus, it was necessary to clarify whether the nomination file contained sufficient information to satisfy R.1, after which a decision could be taken. It therefore asked Spain to clarify where the information could be found in the nomination file, and to further comment on the nature of the element. The delegation commented on the strong link between the Holy Week, Holy Friday and the Tamboradas, in which the Gospels speak of when Lord Jesus Christ died on the cross and darkness covered the earth, the earth shook, and the veil that covered the holiest of temples was torn down. The delegation remarked that the Tamboradas represented the earth-shaking thunder covering the earth, as well as the sadness of the people of the region preparing for Holy Week. The sounding of drums was as if the earth was awakening and crying. Thus, it believed that there was a strong link, and it is clear that the element was solid and integrated.
18. The delegation of **Algeria** echoed the remarks by Egypt, Brazil and others, arriving at the conclusion that criteria R.1 and R.3 were satisfied. However, it recognized the relevance of the Subsidiary Body’s recommendations, and was grateful for the quality of its work, which sought to improve the quality of the file, though it wished to hear from Spain on these issues. Regarding R.2, it recognized from previous debates that clarifications were required from all delegations in order to address this particular criterion more satisfactorily, which was thus not just a problem for Spain, and it wished to hear from Spain in this regard.
19. After examining the nomination file, the delegation of **Ethiopia** found that the element constituted intangible cultural heritage as defined in Article 2 of the Convention, noting Spain’s presentation of multifaceted elements of intangible cultural heritage. It was noted that Tamboradas is a festive event as well as a collective drum-playing ritual. The drums and the traditional clothes were made and maintained by local craftsmen, and as such there was also a component of traditional knowledge and craftsmanship. In this regard, and unlike the recommendation of the Subsidiary Body, the delegation felt that the nomination had sufficient information on the nature and scope of the element, as well as the cultural and social functions of the element. It was further noted that the Subsidiary Body recognized that the element represented a component of cultural identity, and the nomination also identified other social and cultural functions. It therefore found that the nomination satisfied criterion R.1. As for R.2 and R.3, the delegation understood the decision of the Subsidiary Body, which resulted from a cascading effect that led to a negative decision in these criteria, as explained by the Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body. It therefore believed that if the Committee decided that R.1 was met then this would also reverse the decisions on the remaining two criteria. It asked Spain to clearly explain these issues, especially R.1.
20. The delegation of **Uganda** appreciated the comments by the Subsidiary Body, remarking that the nomination clearly explained the festival of drums that were performed during the Holy Week, whose activities related to the drum-playing festival, which were clearly articulated in terms of its social and cultural functions within the community, related to criterion R.1. With regard to R.2, the delegation noted the viability of the element and its awareness raising aspect as it was passed on to the younger generation and others through the public and private space through documentation and studies related to the element. The delegation requested the State Party to elaborate further on R.3 for a better appreciation of the criterion.
21. The delegation of **Spain** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to clarify the questions raised by the Subsidiary Body and Members of the Committee. Regarding criterion R.1, and specifically its nature and scope, it was noted that the information was addressed in parts of the paragraphs in section 1(i), which read: ‘A Tamboradas is a collective ritual consisting in the simultaneous, intense and seamless beating of thousands of standard brass drums. Everyone competes against each other, in a public space during Easter Week. The drums create an individual and collective backdrop of sound. The standard drums and bass drums used are indigenous to the area, and a local industry of craftsmen and craftswomen make them and look after their maintenance. The ritual is part of a visual language and it has a symbolic significance. It is made mainly by local craftswomen, and varies according to the area. This social ritual is characterized by the fact that it goes on continuously for several days and nights, even up to four days. During the ritual everybody enjoys having something to eat and drink together in certain places especially prepared for this purpose, such as clubs, private homes and brotherhood and headquarters’, as was shown in the video. In section 1(iii), it was stated: ‘It is the drum community through verbal codes and a specific gestual patterns which transmits the behaviours needed in order to achieve mass performance so anybody wishing to join it is well received.’ With regard to the many social and cultural functions, the delegation explained that the following aspects could also be found in the nomination form, which included: the integration of individuals in the community, for example, the immigrants; initiation into the community’s social and cultural rituals; the creation of a link between the community and land; the development of creativity linked to crafts and musical language; the promotion of values like brotherhood, solidarity and collective happiness; identification with the ritual, creating the so-called drum villages; the safeguarding of associated cultural spaces, i.e. the historic downtown of drum villages; and finally, generating and creating a peaceful and harmonious social atmosphere. With regard to its place within the celebration of Catholic Easter, the delegation further explained that the first image of the video demonstrated the association between the Tamboradas and Easter, adding that it was a special and temporary inter-relationship with both elements occurring at the same time and in the same place. Thus, this element had its own character that was integrated with the Easter rituals, as described in R.1. Furthermore, the inventories of the regions, in criterion R.5, reinforced the fact that these were two distinct elements that converged in time, but with their own characteristics. Moreover, the inventories catalogued Tamboradas under its name, and there were specific museums and interpretation centres focusing on the Tamboradas. This implied that for the communities concerned and the institutions represented by them, the Tamboradas have their own identity, as well as a timeless space relationship with Easter, coexisting in harmony.
22. With regard to specific techniques and knowledge associated with the element, the delegation of **Spain** referred to the nomination form where it was stated that the standard brass drums were indigenous to the area and were made and maintained by local craftsmen and women according to the area. The ritual represented a visual language with symbolic significance. People cover their heads with helmets and pointed hoods and they wear tannic dress coats, trousers and scarves. The video from minute 4.30 to 5.13 clearly showed the different aspects of the specific techniques associated with this element. With regard to knowledge and the role of the family, formal and non-formal education was said to be fundamental to its transmission. At home, boys and girls were initiated into the tradition and thus there were whole generations of families of drummers. The delegation therefore believed that criterion R.1 was clarified, and that criterion R. 2 was satisfied. It was also stated that the inscription of the element would bring to the forefront those civilizations where percussion was the main creative element used to express emotions such as fear or happiness. Finally, once R.1 was clarified, the delegation believed that the safeguarding measures set out in R.3 were adequate and were reinforced by the on-going involvement of local communities, as set out in R.4, which was approved by the Subsidiary Body. The delegation hoped to have properly answered the questions required by the Committee.
23. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that previous Committee meetings had never taken into account personal experiences of its Members who had visited a ritual or a festival, and thus it should not begin to do so, particularly as it was not evaluating the ritual itself but the information contained in the nomination file. It thanked Spain for the interesting explanation and new information, and it looked forward to its inclusion in the right places in a resubmitted nomination file, as proposed by the Subsidiary Body. The delegation spoke of its surprise at the introduction of a new way of evaluating, the so-called cascade effect, where as soon as criterion R.1 was satisfied then automatically R.2 and R.3 were satisfied. If this was the case, then only R.1 would need to be satisfied, and the remaining criteria would be automatically approved. It therefore questioned this line of reasoning, adding that its own understanding relied on the evaluation being conducted on a criterion-by-criterion basis on information contained in the file and in the right place. This was especially the case for R.3 in which information should be clearly stated so as to understand how it would effectively ensure the viability of the nominated element once its nature and scope were clearly identified. The delegation explained that R.3 was not clear from the information provided in the file, just as it was unclear for the six Members of the Subsidiary Body. Moreover, even if R.1 was clear to a number of Members, the delegation was unable, based on the information in the file, to ascertain how criterion R.3 could be met.
24. Having carefully listened to the explanations, the delegation of **Turkey** was convinced that the file could be inscribed, and thus wished to propose an amendment to paragraph 2 in the sub-paragraphs related to R.1, R.2 and R.3. The new sub-paragraph in R.1 would read: ‘The collective ritual of simultaneously beating of thousands of drums intensely in public spaces represents a component of cultural identity of the communities in many villages. The creation of instruments made by craftsmen and typical costumes made by local craftswomen are an example of the specific techniques and knowledge associated with the element transmitted through the family and the drummers’ groups.’ The new sub-paragraph in R.2 would read: ‘This element will bring to the forefront all of those civilizations and cultures where a percussion is the main creative element used to express such emotions as fear or happiness; the visibility and the need to protect or to celebrate this ritual worldwide will thus be reinforced.’ Finally, the new sub-paragraph in R.3 would read ‘Along the nomination file several safeguarding measures are being proposed and all of them will contribute to ensure the viability of the nominated element.’ As a result of the amendments, paragraph 4 would read: ‘Decides to inscribe the nomination of Tamboradas as drum-playing rituals on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.’
25. The delegation of **Brazil** took note of the fact that some of the explanations provided by Spain came verbatim from the nomination form, and as such, it was not introducing new information; at the same time, it also explained where in the nomination form the information could be found. The delegation invited Belgium to carefully read the nomination, as the information was clearly included. It found that the information was provided in criterion R.1, and R.2 on the measures to encourage dialogue and the importance of inscription of the element, and R.3 on the extensive safeguarding measures. It therefore favoured the amendments proposed by Turkey to inscribe the element, adding that perhaps the Subsidiary Body could not understand the definition of the element to have clarity on R.1, but given the explanations there was now clarity in this regard. The Committee could therefore adopt the decision with an inscription.
26. The **Chairperson** noted the amendments by Turkey, and proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections on paragraph 1, it was duly adopted. He then turned to the *chapeau* of paragraph 2, which was duly adopted. The **Secretary** then read the amendment in R.1, as previously cited.
27. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment by Turkey in R.1.
28. The delegation of **Ethiopia** also supported the sub-paragraph R.1, as well as the following two sub-paragraphs.
29. The delegation of **Bulgaria** also supported the amendment in R.1.
30. The delegations of **Uganda**, **Algeria**, **Egypt**, **Hungary**, **India** and **Republic of Korea** supported all three amendments in R.1, R.2 and R.3.
31. The delegation of **Bulgaria** wished to clarify that it supported R.1, noting that the decision was first on R.1, and that the Committee should stick to the adoption of criteria-by-criteria. Otherwise also Bulgaria would support the three paragraphs, but we should be clear on that.
32. The **Chairperson** was clear that R.1 was under consideration.
33. The delegation of **Latvia** raised the question of gender roles proposed in the draft amendment by Turkey, adding that it would appreciate if Turkey could refer to the nomination file with regard to the craftsmen and craftswomen and their respective involvement in safeguarding this tradition.
34. The delegation of **Greece** joined in the remark by Bulgaria that the Committee was treating the amendment by Turkey on R.1 and wanted to support the Turkish amendment on criterion R.1.
35. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that as the criteria currently stood, it could relate to a file presented by the World Drum Society anywhere in the world, adding that it was losing the connection with the information contained in the file, for example the disappearance of the reference to the Holy Week and so on. It was thus a good illustration of the reservations of the Subsidiary Body that had been unable to clearly identify the scope of the element, as now it was so general that it could apply to many places in the world. As such, the delegation did not support the amendment in R.1.
36. The **Chairperson** noted that there was insufficient support for criterion R.1, and the original text was retained. He then moved to the amendment in R.2.
37. The delegation of **Uruguay** supported the amendment by Turkeyin R.2.
38. The delegation of **Brazil** supported Turkey’s amendment in R.2 and R.3.
39. The delegations of **Bulgaria**, **Republic of Korea**, **India** and **Greece** supported the amendment by Turkey in sub-paragraph R.2.
40. The **Chairperson** noted that the amendment received broad support from the Committee, which was duly adopted. He then turned to the amendment in R.3.
41. The delegations of **Bulgaria, Republic of Korea**, **India**, **Greece** and **Namibia** supported the amendment in R.3.
42. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment in R.3, adding that the safeguarding measures were present in the nomination form and were in line with the same safeguarding practices adopted in Brazil.
43. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that it could still not find the information necessary to understand whether the safeguarding measures would effectively help to ensure the viability of the nominated element, as it was unable to clearly identify the nature and scope of the element. Thus, it sought more information in the nomination to make a decision, recalling the need to keep a link between what the Committee decides and what can be examined in the file.
44. The **Chairperson** noted the broad support of the Committee for the amendment in R.3, which was duly adopted. He then turned to sub-paragraphs 4 and 5, related to criteria R.4 and R.5 respectively, which remained unchanged. With no comments or objections, they were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the *chapeau* of paragraph 3, which was adopted.
45. The **Secretary** remarked that sub-paragraphs R.2 and R.3, originally in paragraph 3 had been reinstated in paragraph 2, and therefore R.1 was the sole criterion in paragraph 3, whose text had changed accordingly.
46. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 4, which was duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.42 to refer Tamboradas drum-playing rituals** **to the submitting State for additional information**.
47. The delegation of **Brazil** did not have a problem with the decision just adopted, but had a comment of a technical nature in criterion R.3. It was noted that R.3 had just been adopted, and the nomination file had a limited word count where the submitting State was supposed to describe the safeguarding measures in great detail. The delegation remarked however that Spain had provided a detailed account of many safeguarding measures of transmission, documentation and research, preservation and promotion, diffusion and transmission, which were all described in the file. Nevertheless, some Members could not find the measures in the file, which the delegation failed to understand, suggesting that there should be greater clarity in this regard, particularly as these were the kinds of safeguarding measures adopted in Brazil. Clarity was thus needed because otherwise there would be two measures, depending on the file under examination. There should therefore be at least a consensus on what constituted sufficient information in the file to consider that the criteria of safeguarding measures were fulfilled.
48. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil for its comment,inviting Spain to take the floor.
49. The delegation of **Spain** greeted all those present on behalf of the government of Spain and the local and regional bearer communities of this event, which unfortunately was not inscribed. The delegation spoke of its surprise that this was the case, given the apparent support in the Committee. Despite its disappointment, it hoped to have the opportunity to nominate the element again.
50. The **Vice-Chair of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Kopachkata, a social dance from the village of Dramche, Pijanec** [draft decision 9.COM 10.43] submitted by **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**. Kopachkata is a dynamic and energetic social dance performed by local residents of the village of Dramche in the region of Pijanec. It is danced at weddings, public gatherings and religious holidays. The dance starts with a slow walking movement, then changes to swift and short steps, followed by quicker steps and foot stamping. For local audiences, the Kopachkata dance is a symbol of cultural identity, not only of the community of the village of Dramche, but for the wider Pijanec region. The Vice-Chair recalled that the nomination was first presented to the Committee at its seventh session in 2012 when it had been referred to the submitting State in criteria R.2, R.3 and R.4. In its evaluation, the Subsidiary Body found that the resubmitted nomination demonstrated that criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5 had been met, but additional information was still needed in order to decide on R.2. Although criterion R.1 had been deemed satisfied by the Committee, the submitting State had opted for a slight revision of the text. The Body found however that this criterion was satisfied because the nomination adequately demonstrated that Kopatchkata, and the social, ritual and festive practices associated with it, had become a symbol of identity for the inhabitants of Dramtche. Regarding criterion R.3, the Body found that the proposed safeguarding measures were described with clarity, focusing more explicitly than in the past on the awareness of the various cultural centres and agents involved in the organization of the festivities as well as documentation and register of the element. The nomination described well the participation of relevant organizations in the Pijanec region, and the process through which the free, prior and informed consent of the association, representative of the community of practitioners, was obtained (R.4). The Body also found that the nomination provided evidence of the inclusion of Kopatchkata in the National Register of Cultural Heritage. However, in R.2, given that it was a previously referred criterion, the Body compared the 2012 nomination with the nomination currently under consideration. It found that although some of the formulations had changed, the new text did not provide new or additional information (as per Decision 7.COM 11.31) to argue how inscription would promote greater visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Instead, the nomination focused on the benefits that a listing may provide practitioners, and even declared that it would offer the ‘possibility for the wider Pijanec community to develop cultural tourism’, which was not a requirement of the criterion. Furthermore, the text, shown for the first time in the resubmitted nomination, stated that inscription would contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage of The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the international level, which reinforced the Body’s sentiment that the submitting State did not understand the requirements of the criterion, despite the guidance provided in the Committee’s previous decision. In keeping with the consistency of previous Committee recommendations and decisions in the current cycle, the Body concluded by recommending to refer Kopachkata, a social dance from the village of Dramche, Pijanec, to the submitting State for additional information for consideration in a subsequent cycle.
51. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chair for the detailed explanations that led to the decision, opening the floor for comments.
52. Referring to section 2(i) in the nomination form, the delegation of **Belgium** questioned the Subsidiary Body’s interpretation of the first two sentences where it was stated: ‘Inscription of the Kopachkata on the Representative List would raise the awareness of other communities with similar traditions, and that each tradition was a unique example of intangible cultural heritage. Due to differences in the performance, this dance is an essential marker of local identity on the basis of which inhabitants of certain villages distinguish one another.’ The sentence did not refer specifically to other communities or villages in Macedonia, but that it could imply villages all over the world. In this way, this sentence could be interpreted as a more general statement of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in general.
53. The delegation of **Bulgaria** appreciated the efforts of the submitting State to propose the element a second time. It also noticed that the reservations of the Subsidiary Body related only to a part of criterion R.2 and therefore wished to ask the submitting State to provide more information in this regard. Considering that there were no objections to the other four criteria, it believed that the Committee could make an effort to inscribe the element, after first hearing from the submitting State.
54. The delegation of **Algeria** noted that the Committee was once again examining R.2, remarking that many delegations had a problem with it and it wished to draw the Committee’s attention to that fact. In the Subsidiary Body’s report on page 13, a table was provided with the results of its decisions, and it was noted that this was the only nomination rejected on the basis of criterion R.2. It appealed to the Committee’s indulgence not to allow Macedonia to be alone in this case. It also wished to hear from Macedonia in this regard.
55. The delegation of **Turkey** recalled that this nomination had been referred in 2012 and, in the course of the past two years, the submitting State had undertaken significant efforts to meet the requirements of the criteria. It understood that the Subsidiary Body was satisfied with four of the criteria and yet there were still reservations in R.2. The delegation wished to hear from Macedonia, but was inclined to consider the inscription of the element.
56. The delegation of **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** expressed its gratitude for the evaluation and the positive attitude towards the decision, as well as to the Members of the Committee that offered the opportunity to clarify the content in criterion R.2. The delegation explained that the content of R.2 could be found in section 2(i) where it was stated that ‘the inscription of this element on the Representative List would raise the awareness of other communities with similar traditions’. Also, ‘the proposed safeguarding measures will contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general on national scene’, and which ‘will draw attention to the creativity of other communities’. Other citations include, ‘the inscription of Kopachkata on the Representative List would also contribute to the visibility of Macedonian intangible heritage internationally’, as this region has a border with Bulgaria. Additionally, in section 2(ii) it was stated that ‘Kopachkata traditional dance will and is encouraging the intercultural dialogue between the Macedonian and Romani communities in this region, and it is the reason that there is greater regional awareness of nurturing this element as a common ICH element in wider region’. Furthermore, this ‘inscription would enable others who cherish similar cultural expression to start recognizing it as a valuable element that might bridge the differences inside their community’. In section 2(iii) it was again stated that this inscription ‘can also strengthen the intercultural connection between the musicians (predominantly ethnic Roma) and the dancers of ethnic Macedonian nationality’. It also stated that this inscription would inspire the creativity and provide a successful example to neighbouring communities in the region, especially in the south-eastern European context. The promotion of awareness of other communities with similar traditions, even across national borders, was of particular significance and international benefit. Collaboration of musicians and dancers, both from Roma and Macedonian ethnic communities presented an excellent example on the international level. Inscription could provide a key to appreciate and defend cultural diversity both locally and globally, and can become the theme of understanding, mutual respect and appreciation. The delegation also wished to point out that in countries like Macedonia with a population of two million, the nomination itself generated huge visibility in general. For example, the visibility of the importance of intangible cultural heritage at national level as a result of inscription of its the first element, ‘The Feast of the Holy Forty Martyrs’ in 2013 generated an increased number of initiatives, projects and applications for inscribing different intangible cultural heritage on the national inventory. As a result, in October 2014 two higher State awards in cultural art and science were offered for the first time to two bearers of intangible cultural heritage: a dancing element and traditional song. This ensured that they also received a national pension as a full artist, acknowledged by the President and the Ministry of Culture. Furthermore, the delegation recalled that four other criteria had been satisfied, and that the Committee would reject a nomination only due to a weakness in R.2. The delegation sincerely hoped that the explanation clarified the criterion, emphasizing the importance of inscription, not only for the bearers of Kopachkata dance but also for the entire population of the country.
57. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** felt obliged to maintain the Subsidiary Body’s position, which accurately summarized the debates within the Body. The Vice-Chair concurred that the section in R.2 had stated, ‘The “Kopachkata” traditional dance encourage the intercultural dialogue between the Macedonian and Romani communities in Dramche, but with the inscription of the dance on the UNESCO’s Representative List, there would be greater regional awareness of nurturing the Kopachkata as a common ICH element in wider region’, explaining that this remained essentially an assertion without evidence. The Vice-Chair understood that it was only criterion R.2 that led to a referral, however, the Subsidiary Body wished to remain consistent with the decisions of previous Committees rather than take another decision.
58. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to paragraph 1, it was duly adopted.
59. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed an amendment in R.2 that would also reposition sub-paragraph R.2 from paragraph 3 to paragraph 2.
60. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the proposal by Turkey, adding that the Subsidiary Body was right in that the last time the Committee did not inscribe because there were several criteria that had not been met, while the Committee should inscribe when there was only R.2 that was not satisfied.
61. The **Secretary** presented the amendment by Turkey, which read: ‘The nomination demonstrates benefits that might be brought to the local bearers of the element, but also promotes awareness of the intangible cultural heritage for other communities in other countries having similar traditions; of particular significance and benefit is the collaboration in the practice of the element between ethnic communities speaking Romani and Macedonian languages; the file thus promotes appreciation and respect of cultural diversity as well as collaboration for safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage between different communities on both local and international levels.’
62. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed to delete the word ‘ethnic’, considering it inappropriate.
63. The delegation of **Hungary** supported the amendment by Turkey, as amended by Belgium.
64. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the amendment by Turkey, as amended by Belgium, which was duly adopted. The **Chairperson** turned to the sub-paragraphs in criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5, which were duly adopted. He then turned to the new paragraph 3, which inscribed Kopachkata, and with no objections it was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.43 to inscribe Kopachkata, a social dance from the village of Dramche, Pijanec on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
65. The delegation of **The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** was pleased and honoured to express its satisfaction and appreciation for the inscription of Kopachkata, Macedonia's second element on the Representative List. It spoke of how inscription would have many positive influences in its institutions, local communities and civil society for implementation of the Convention, and would raise awareness of the importance of protecting and promoting intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development as a vector of human creativity.
66. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Ebru, Turkish art of marbling** [draft decision 9.COM 10.44] submitted by **Turkey**. Ebru is the traditional art of creating colourful patterns by sprinkling and brushing colour pigments onto a pan of oily water and then transferring the patterns to paper. The art of marbling is commonly used for decoration in the traditional art of bookbinding. The knowledge and skills of artists and apprentices are transmitted orally and through informal practical training within master-apprentice relationships. Ebru encourages dialogue through friendly conversation, reinforces social ties and strengthens relations between individuals and communities. In their individual evaluations, Members of the Subsidiary Body were unanimous on the quality of this nomination and therefore easily concluded that all five of the criteria were fully met. The Body found that the nomination fully demonstrated that the transmission of Ebru from master to apprentice extended to all regions in Turkey such that many people saw it as part of their cultural heritage. The Body welcomed the emphasis placed on the role of women and youth in the preservation of this craft. The information contained in the nomination adequately demonstrated that inscription would highlight the diversity of artistic forms that illustrated human creativity through intangible cultural heritage, and would promote dialogue and strengthen ties, especially between young artisans. The various proposed safeguarding measures were well described and considered able to promote the element, while reflecting the concern of the State Party to document techniques and expressions associated with Ebru to anticipate any deterioration in its practice, as well as the active participation of Ebru masters, communities and NGOs. The nomination also demonstrated their participation in the preparation of the nomination file and the inclusion of the element in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Turkey. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending the inscription of Ebru, Turkish art of marbling on the Representative List, while suggesting to the Committee to add this nomination to the list of files considered as good examples.
67. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.44 to inscribe Ebru, Turkish art of marbling on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
68. The delegation of **Turkey** expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee, the Subsidiary Body, the Secretariat and all the delegates for their understanding and support of the inscription of Ebru, Turkish art of marbling on the Representative List. It appreciated the expertise and efforts of the Subsidiary Body in its examination of the file and its confirmation of one of the five best files among the 46 nominations. Just as the Mevlevi Sema ceremony inscribed on the Representative List in 2008, Ebru was yet another art that embraced practitioners from different backgrounds throughout the country without the distinction of nationality, cultural or ethnic origins, language or other different social environments, expressing its own imagination of water as simple but elegant, and which can be a reflection of cultural identities. Ebru art thus triggered human creativity and served the purpose of the Convention in a unique way, and together with the other elements inscribed was testimony that diversity did not divide but unite. In this regard, it hoped to see more files – particularly multinational files – that encouraged neighbouring countries to work together. Having been elected to the Committee for the second time, Turkey once again was committed to the promotion of the spirit of our Convention. The delegation was accompanied by the Director-General of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Mr Okan Ibiş, and the Chairman of the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO, Prof. Öcal Oğuz, along with experts and associates, whose strong team was committed to cooperation with every country to learn and share experiences and expertise, particularly those in need of technical assistance and support. It invited States Parties to make contact through its delegation, its Ministry of Culture and Tourism or the Turkish National Commission. It was therefore fully committed to this kind of cooperation, regardless of time and venue. It spoke of Ebru as representing the rainbow, poetry, humanity and culture. The delegation cited the remarks by the Director-General and the Secretary-General of the United Nations when they spoke about how it was high time to raise the voice of culture louder and higher, at a time when our world was faced with multiple challenges, and that UNESCOwas one big family for a culture of social peace and stability and coexistence among cultures, communities and nations. The delegation concluded by introducing a brief video clip *of Ebru* art in Turkey, adding that delegates could see the artists performing the art outside the meeting hall.

*[Video projection by Turkey]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the next nomination on **Askiya, the art of wit** [draft decision 9.COM 10.45] submitted by **Uzbekistan**. Askiya is a genre of Uzbek verbal folk art that takes the form of a dialogue between two or more participants, who exchange witticisms around a particular theme. Bearers and practitioners, mainly men, must master the peculiarities of Uzbek language, and be able to improvise and reason quickly and skilfully, using humour and banter. The dialogues, although humorous, play an invaluable role in raising awareness of social tendencies and events, drawing attention to important issues through acute observation of daily life. In its evaluation, the Body found that the nomination demonstrated that all criteria had been met. It also found that the nomination described Askiya with adequate information of its main features, its bearers and its modes of transmission to demonstrate that it constituted the intangible cultural heritage of many communities in Uzbekistan and conferred a sense of identity. In describing Askiya as an art of communication, the nomination satisfactorily demonstrated that its inscription would contribute to a greater awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage to promote intercultural dialogue and mutual respect. The Body also found that many safeguarding measures proposed were consistent and sufficiently developed to ensure the continuity of Askiya and that it clearly reflected the involvement of the bearers of the tradition and the broader community. Their participation in all stages of the nomination process was also demonstrated. The evidence of the inscription of Askiya in the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage was deemed sufficient, as was its collaboration with the Republican Scientific-Methodological Center for Folk Art, the bearers of the practice, and the local government entities developing this list, as described in the nomination. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending Askiya, the art of wit for inscription on the Representative List.
2. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.45 to inscribe Askiya, the art of wit on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**
3. The delegation of **Uzbekistan** expressed its pride in the decision to inscribe Askiya on the Representative List, adding that every citizen of the country will be very happy to hear this news, which is a big achievement for everyone. Askiya embodied a very special element and was unique to Uzbekistan, playing an important role in connecting people. Bearers of Askiya were involved in the whole process, injecting it with positive energy. They have good knowledge and mastery of the language, an exquisite sense of humour, pure thinking and reaction, and the art of expressing one's thoughts in a beautiful manner. The delegation concluded by thanking all those who participated in the process of evaluating the Askiya file, particularly the Secretariat, the experts, representatives of NGOs, and the Committee.
4. The Vice-**Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** turned to the last nomination on **Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh** [draft decision 9.COM 10.46] submitted by **Viet Nam**. Ví and Giặm songs are sung by a wide range of communities in north-central Viet Nam. The songs are sung while people cultivate rice in the fields, row boats, make conical hats or lull children to sleep. Many of the songs focus on key values and virtues including respect for parents, loyalty, care and devotion, the importance of honesty and a good heart. Singing provides people with a chance to ease hardship while working, to relieve sorrow in their lives, to express feelings of sentiment between men and women. In their individual evaluations, the members of the Subsidiary Body were unanimous on the quality of the nomination, which allowed it to easily conclude that the nomination demonstrated that all the criteria were fully satisfied. The Body found that the nomination convincingly demonstrated that the folk songs performed by a wide range of Việt communities from different backgrounds was transmit from one generation to the next and provided a sense of identity and cultural continuity. Relevant information was also provided to convincingly demonstrate that inscription would contribute to greater awareness of the importance of folk songs and dialogue between performers who sing similar songs in the region and throughout the world. The proposed safeguarding measures were sufficiently specific, adequately reflecting the commitment of the authorities and the communities to protect and promote the element. The active participation of Nghệ Tĩnh communities, not only in the preparation of the nomination file but also in the identification of the multiple safeguarding measures was amply demonstrated, as well as the inclusion of the element on the National List of intangible Cultural Heritage administered by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism. The Subsidiary Body thus concluded by recommending that Ví Giặm and folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh for inscription on the Representative List.
5. The delegation of **Belgium** was happy to discover the general [report](http://vicas.org.vn/Home/images/Tinkhoahoc/vigiam.e%20.pdf) on the scientific inventory of Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh on UNESCO’s website connected to this file, congratulating Viet Nam on its very interesting and critical report.
6. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and **declared adopted Decision 9.COM 10.46 to inscribe Ví and Giặm folk songs of Nghệ Tĩnh on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
7. Speaking in Vietnamese, the delegation of **Viet Nam**, represented by the Vice-Minister of Culture, Sports and Tourism, spoke of the solemn occasion for the communities of Nghệ Tinh who have learned with great emotion the decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List. The decision was of significant importance as the Vi and Giặm folk songs were closely related to the daily activities of local people such as working in rice fields, fishing, hat-making or lulling children to sleep. Vi and Giặm songs occupied an important place in the cultural and spiritual life of the Nghệ Tinh communities, reflecting their cultural identity. The songs were transmitted from generation to generation and represented shared values, dialogue, and exchange between communities. Viet Nam was strongly committed to implementing the action plan to promote the viability of intangible cultural heritage, and had introduced policies to valorize the singers who have the main role in conserving, transmitting and educating young people. The delegation warmly thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for their high appreciation of the element. It welcomed the delegates to Nghệ An and Hà Tinh provinces so that they could see for themselves the vitality of Ví and Giặm folk songs.
8. Thanking Vietnam, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it had examined 39 nominations of which 34 had been inscribed. However, it still had to adopt the *chapeau* draft decision 9.COM 10 on the transversal issues relating to the Representative List in general and not to any specific nomination. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to introduce the draft decision.
9. The **Secretary** explained that decision 9.COM 10 reflected the discussion of the Subsidiary Body as presented by the Rapporteur in the oral report. In paragraph 5, it recalled the specific challenge presented by multinational nominations, notably on the participation and informed consent of communities concerned; commended the increasing number of nominations addressing the role of women in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and the role that intangible cultural heritage can play in sustainable development; took into account the customary practices governing access to specific aspects of intangible cultural heritage; and called on States Parties to introduce approaches into their safeguarding plans that were not strictly cultural but were within the broader field of development. The Body also recalled that the evaluation was conducted on the nomination file and thus a decision to ‘not inscribe’ or ‘refer’ referred only to the pertinence of the information contained within the nomination and not the element itself. The draft decision also wished to recall the existence of the list of good nomination files, which included another five nominations from the current cycle, inviting States Parties to refer to these files, not to reproduce or copy them, but to understand the level of detail and evidence required through these nominations. It also recalled that files must be completed by March 31 and, as such, evidence of the inventory or community consent must be received before this deadline. The draft decision also recalled the objectives of the Representative List, which were broadly mentioned in criterion R.2, and that inscription did not imply any rights of exclusivity or intellectual property rights to the element. The draft decision also requested that States Parties refrain from using adjectives of nationality in the title of elements, as the element would systematically be associated with the submitting State. In this way, avoiding any sense of ownership or exclusivity that might be inferred.
10. The **Secretary** further explained that paragraph 13 of the draft decision echoed Decision 5.COM 6 taken by the Committee at its fifth session to refrain from making references to conflict, war or violence in order to avoid any misunderstanding between different communities. Paragraph 14 reaffirmed the importance of the active participation of the communities at all stages: in the development of inventories; the preparation of the nomination file; the promotion of intangible cultural heritage; and the implementation of safeguarding measures, requiring the submitting States to provide evidence of this commitment and at all stages. Finally, paragraph 15 recalled the repeated suggestion by Subsidiary Bodies to encourage individual expressions of community consent over petitions and standardized consent forms. The Secretary concluded that the draft decision essentially summarized the points raised by the Subsidiary Body in its introduction, adding that the Committee might decide to add or amend the draft in light of its own evaluation of the nominations and the ensuing debates.
11. The **Chairperson** concurred that the draft decision 9.COM 10 reflected well the transversal issues raised in the examination of nominations to the Representative List. The Chairperson proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed an amendment in paragraph 5, which read: ‘Appreciates the submission of multinational files, while noting the challenges of framing elements of the intangible cultural heritage, in their various contexts, that are shared by different communities, and encourages States Parties to highlight the sense of belonging of the concerned communities, groups and individuals and to clearly demonstrate their free, prior and informed consent to the multinational nomination as it is formulated; encourages States Parties to submit multinational nominations on elements shared by different communities, groups and individuals in order to assist dialogue between cultures and communities.’
13. The **Secretary** read out the amendment, with a slight edit by the Secretary, to read, ‘in their varied contexts’. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the proposed edit.
14. The delegation of **Algeria** fully supported the amendment, adding that it had submitted a multinational element with Niger and Mali in 2013 and thus subscribed fully to it.
15. The delegation of **Afghanistan** supported the amendment by Turkey, but remarked that the extension of membership of an already inscribed multinational nomination was complicated, which rendered the addition of a State Party problematic. It therefore proposed to include an amendment at the end of paragraph 5, which would read, ‘Expresses its desire for the posterior process of extending multinational inscriptions to be simplified’.
16. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment by Turkey, proposing a slight modification to insert ‘further’ before the second ‘encourages’, which would read, ‘further encourages’. The delegation also felt that the proposal by Afghanistan would be better placed in a different paragraph.
17. The **Secretary** read out the paragraph: ‘Appreciates the submission of multinational files, while noting the challenges of framing elements of the intangible cultural heritage, in their varied contexts, that are shared by different communities, and encourages States Parties to highlight the sense of belonging of the concerned communities, groups and individuals and to clearly demonstrate their free, prior and informed consent to the multinational nomination as it is formulated; further encourages States Parties to submit multinational nominations on elements shared by different communities, groups and individuals in order to assist dialogue between cultures and communities.’
18. The delegation of **Namibia** proposed to replace ‘assist dialogue’ with either ‘encourage dialogue’ or ‘facilitate dialogue’.
19. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** concurred with the remark to ‘facilitate dialogue’.
20. The delegation of **Algeria** supported Afghanistan’s proposal to simplify the existing procedure for future file extensions.
21. The **Chairperson** remarked that Afghanistan’s proposal would be treated as a separate paragraph. He then turned to the amendment by Turkey, and with no further comments or objections, it was duly adopted.
22. The **Secretary** read out the amendment by Afghanistan: ‘Expresses its desire for the posterior process of extension to multinational inscriptions to be simplified.’
23. The delegation of **Latvia** was not convinced about adopting this kind of addition to the decision, and sought further consideration regarding the existing wording. It noted for example that it only concerned multinational nominations, and thus it excluded those that were submitted nationally. In addition, if the amendment should receive the support of the Committee then it should probably keep the existing wording in the Operational Directives, namely concerning inscription on an extended basis.
24. The delegation of **Belgium** agreed with Latvia, and although it understood the wish of Afghanistan, it wondered what ‘simplify the procedure’ actually entailed, as the Operational Directives already provided a description on submitting a multinational nomination. The exact nature of the amendment was thus unclear.
25. The **Chairperson** sought support for Afghanistan’s proposal.
26. The delegation of **Brazil** sought clarification from the Secretariat as to whether this proposal by Afghanistan would mean that the Operational Directives would have to be amended to simplify this procedure or not.
27. The **Secretary** recalled that the Operational Directives did not distinguish a change of status from ‘national’ to ‘multinational’ and ‘multinational’ to ‘multinational +1’, i.e. it referred to the extension of an element, which included (as was seen in case of Japan) the extension of an element within a single country. The second point was that the procedure of an already inscribed multinational nomination was the same as for any nomination, i.e. regardless of the element, if one or more countries wished to join an already inscribed element, all the States Parties concerned, including those already inscribed and those that wished to join, would have to resubmit a new nomination. In particular, the file would have to define the element for the new communities and the communities of all the submitting States, as well as provide evidence of consent from *all* the communities concerned in the new submission. Similarly, the safeguarding measures should preferably, though not always, be elaborated for each submitting State, but also to some extent demonstrate coordinated efforts in this regard. Evidently, this could be quite complicated, particularly for elements such as Nowruz or falconry where they were multiple States, and in which the work carried out in the initial nomination would have to be repeated. However, some of the work, for example, the inscription in an inventory, would not need to be repeated, but the consent of the communities and the description of the element in the extended nomination would have to be carried out again. This was also be complicated by the fact that the Committee itself was refining the nature of evidence it wished to see on the different criteria over time. In the example of Nowruz, which was inscribed in 2009, the Secretary explained that at the time of its inscription there was little jurisprudence on the nature of the evidence of the inventory or the consent of communities, but with time these requirements had been specified. In this example, an extended nomination for Nowruz would require that the submitting States resubmit new forms of evidence of the inclusion in an inventory from those submitted in the initial nomination. The Secretary understood that Afghanistan had been trying for several years to join in an extended nomination of Nowruz, and this had indeed been a great challenge. Nevertheless, for the moment, the Operational Directives did not differentiate between an extended nomination and a first nomination. The Secretary recalled that Brazil had insisted on the consent of communities in the case of an enlarged nomination, including from the original nomination. It was considered fundamental that all communities agree to the extended nomination for which their consent must be sought for all the submitting States, including the original submitting States. Concluding, the Secretary concurred that a simplification of the Operational Directives would require changing the present guidelines.
28. The delegation of **Afghanistan** explained on this specific case there were five States Parties that were a veritable obstacle. So much so that some States had indicated that they would prefer to create a second Nowruz nomination. Nevertheless, it understood the concerns of Belgium that wished to understand the implication of ‘simplify’. The problem was that each time a new State wished to join, the nomination would have to be revised in its entirety from scratch, which was further complicated if the extension took place a few years after the initial inscription when many of the conditions might have changed. This obviously discouraged many States, with States indicating that it was better not to join. The delegation thus wished to highlight the urgency of the situation in the draft decision, and the need to find a solution without necessarily being specific, and hence the use of the word ‘simplify’. The delegation added that this would open the door to allow work to continue in the future to find a solution. It thus asked the Committee to open the door to a solution by providing some flexibility that will eventually lead to a solution on which all could agree.
29. The delegation of **Algeria** remarked that Afghanistan had been clear in its statement regarding the difficulties many States faced in the presentation of multinational nominations, and that the Secretary was well aware of the delegation’s concern and the problems with these files. The delegation acknowledged the Secretariat’s heavy workload, but it also wondered whether the Secretariat could work on presenting some ideas on how to move towards a solution in the sense of Afghanistan’s proposal.
30. In hoping to arrive at a consensus, the **Chairperson** proposed to replace ‘simplify’ with ‘improved’.
31. The delegation of **Afghanistan** thanked the Chairperson for his suggestion, adding that it was willing to accept the proposal.
32. The **Chairperson** asked whether there was support.
33. The delegation of **Brazil** believed that the procedure to join a multinational nomination should be put on the agenda of the Committee next session as a point for consideration so as to work on proposals. It suggested a working group to examine options for consideration by the Committee on possible amendments to the Operational Directives. The delegation explained that to have any concrete effect the issue could not be made as a general suggestion. It asked the Secretary to propose a more concrete formulation in this regard.
34. The **Chairperson** concurred that it was a good idea.
35. The **Secretary** replied that she did not have a formulation, as the Committee would first have to consider whether it accepted an extended nomination – initially submitted by one or more countries – as a new nomination or not, based on which the Committee could work. As it stood at the moment, the Operational Directives provided that a nomination is examined as new, even in the case of an extended nomination. The Secretary highlighted the case of Japan in its extended nomination, recalling that Japan had already inscribed the element but the Committee considered the nomination as new, as had always been the case so far. Thus, if the Committee did not wish to consider extended nominations in the same way as normal nominations, then it had to clearly express its position. For now, all nominations followed the same logic in that the communities concerned had to consent to the nomination, and so on. The Secretary therefore did not see how to simplify a procedure that was already established for all nominations.
36. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary whether the proposal of Brazil, initiated by Afghanistan, to include this point in the agenda of the Committee next session was reasonable in order to develop this issue in a more substantive way.
37. The **Secretary** agreed that it was a good idea the Committee discussed this issue at its next session as a separate item in the agenda.
38. The delegation of **Afghanistan** agreed with the proposal.
39. The **Chairperson** thus suggested deleting paragraph 6 as proposed by Afghanistan.
40. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** shared the concern expressed by Brazil, as it was not clear to whom the paragraph was addressed. After all, it was the Committee itself that had to decide on the directives before sending them to the General Assembly. Thus, any proposal of this nature should first be discussed so that the notion of ‘simplify’ was clear in terms of the direction the Committee wished to take. It agreed that the proposal by Brazil was good but that the discussion should not be limited to the sole question of multinational nominations. The delegation explained that in the course of the debates it was clear that there were several systemic issues that were problematic, with some countries even proposing working groups. It understood that the Secretariat did not currently have the means to support the creation of a working group, and therefore it proposed that these issues be discussed at the next Committee session, including recurrent problems such as criterion R.2. In this way, all these issues could be examined once and for all.
41. The **Chairperson** thanked Saint Lucia for its comment.
42. The delegation of **Latvia** agreed with the proposals to continue the debate on these issues, adding that the Committee should refer to the documents that had already been elaborated, namely the transversal issues document, so that it could reflect on the experience of the Committee over the years.
43. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee accepted the proposal by Brazil to broaden the scope, as suggested by Saint Lucia. Turning to the draft decision, the Chairperson proposed to delete paragraph 6, as proposed by Afghanistan, and turn to the new paragraph 7. With no comments or objections, it was duly adopted. The Chairperson then moved to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 8–15, were all duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 10 adopted.**
44. On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** expressed thanks to the Subsidiary Body for its serious and efficient work.
45. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body** wished to thank all the members of the Subsidiary Body for their outstanding work carried out in an exemplary atmosphere. Indeed, despite the occasional heated discussion, the experts always managed to find satisfactory solutions to all the nominations, which were approved unanimously with great professionalism. The Vice-Chair also thanked the Committee for the confidence it bestowed on the Subsidiary Body, and warmly thanked the Secretariat for its assistance, which greatly facilitated the Body’s work.

## ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA:

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2015 CYCLE

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/11*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-11-EN_.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 11*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Subsidiary Body and then turned to item 11.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the item was a direct consequence of the amendment of the Operational Directives, modified by the General Assembly at its fifth session in June 2014, which introduced an Evaluation Body on an experimental basis to carry out the evaluation of nominations for inscription on all four mechanisms of the Convention. The Evaluation Body is to be established in conformity with Article 8.3 of the Convention and is to be composed of 12 members: six qualified experts in the various fields of the intangible cultural heritage, representing six States Parties non-members to the Committee, and six accredited NGOs (among those accredited at the time of the composition of the Body). The Committee is to appoint the 12 members by taking into account equitable geographical representation and the various domains of intangible cultural heritage. The Committee is invited to adopt the terms of reference of this Body, as outlined in Annex 1 of document 11, including its mandate and duration of one year, as it would be renewed each year. The Committee is also invited to name the six experts and six accredited NGOs who will compose the Evaluation Body: two from each Electoral Group, one expert and one NGO. The Secretary recalled that – in accordance with the Operational Directives – the candidates had been proposed by States Parties, with the Chairperson of each Electoral Group tasked to send to the Secretariat up to three candidates for each category. The Secretariat had reminded all States Parties to the Convention of this new provision in the Operational Directives, inviting them to submit names of experts and to suggest accredited NGOs that could serve in the Evaluation Body and to transfer all nominations to the Chairpersons of the UNESCO Electoral Groups.
3. The **Secretary** further explained that the selection was made on the basis of a maximum of three candidates in each category from those sent to the Secretariat from each Electoral Group. It was recalled that the Secretariat also wrote to the Chairpersons of the Electoral Group, reminding them of the role entrusted to them in the Operational Directives to ensure that they receive and forward the candidatures to the Secretariat by the 13 October deadline. The candidates proposed from the each Electoral Group were outlined in Annex 2 with hyperlinks to the experts’ resumes and to the websites of the accreditated NGOs, which currently numbered 178. Once the 12 members of the Evaluation Body were selected, the Committee would be asked to establish a rotation system of the seats, as this was the first time the Evaluation Body would be established, so that three seats would be renewed every year, as provided in paragraph 28 of the Operational Directives. The Committee was therefore required to first to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body and then it had to select the 12 members and decide on the rotation plan.
4. The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed in the order outlined by the Secretary, informing the Committee that he had the opportunity to discuss these points with members of the Bureau who agreed that the most effective system in the selection of the new members of the Evaluation Body was to proceed by secret ballot. He also recalled that he had proposed this procedure during the information meeting organized on November 3 for members of the Committee who agreed. The Chairperson acknowledged that the Rules of Procedure of the Committee currently provided that elections were normally carried out with a show of hands (Rule 39.1) or by roll call (Rule 39.2), and that it did not provide for a secret ballot. However, as this was a general agreement, the Chairperson considered suspending the application of Rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure, and that the Committee proceed on the basis of Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly concerning the election of members of the Committee. The Chairperson would therefore suspend Rule 37 of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, as the members of the Body would not be elected by simple majority but by the highest number of votes. The Chairperson suggested that the Secretariat be asked to propose an amendment to the Rules of Procedure at the Committee’s next session in order to introduce a new provision for secret ballots. The Chairperson noted that the Committee agreed with this approach. Regarding the introduction of the rotation system, the Chairperson remarked that the Bureau also agreed that drawing lots would be the fastest and most equitable method. Before commencing with the practicalities of this method, if the Committee should so agree, the Chairperson proposed to begin with the examination of the Evaluation Body’s terms of reference, which were taken from paragraphs in the Operational Directives and the Rules of Procedure, as shown in Annex 1.
5. The **Chairperson** proceeded on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Having adopted all the paragraphs on the terms of reference, the Chairperson turned to the adoption of the terms in their entirety, which was duly adopted. He then asked the Secretary to shed some light on the procedure for the secret ballot.
6. The **Secretary** explained that the Secretariat would distribute to the Committee Members six ballots, one for each Electoral Group and an envelope. Each Committee member shall vote for the 12 members of the Evaluation Body, and not just for those from the group to which it belonged. The candidate receiving the highest number of votes in each category and in each Electoral Group would be elected. In the case of NGOs in Groups III and Group V(b), where there was only one candidate, the candidates would be declared elected without having to resort to a vote. Each ballot carried the names of all the candidates in the Group. Committee Members were thus invited to circle the names of the candidates for whom they wished to vote in the six ballots. As explained, for Group III and Group V(b), Members were not required to vote for the NGO, as there was only one candidate. Members were asked not to circle more names than the number of seats in the Electoral Group, otherwise, the vote would be considered invalid. Committee Members would then fold the ballot papers and place them in the envelope, sealing it without marking any name or country. The absence of a circle for a seat would also be considered an abstention for that seat. A 5-minute break would be called to allow Members to vote, followed by a roll call of Committee Members to the podium for the vote.
7. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that that this was a new era for the still young Convention, adding that the new Evaluation Body was being established for the first time and was thus a very important moment. The delegation seized this opportunity to renew its appreciation to all Members of the Committee and all the States Parties in the General Assembly that had made this possible, with special thanks to the delegation of Brazil that had facilitated and assisted in finding this solution during the Committee’s session in Baku. It also wished to thank the experts and NGOs that had served both in the Subsidiary Bodies and Consultative Bodies, and encouraged the new candidates to do as well as their predecessors. It also wished to remind the Committee that elected members would act impartially and in the interests of all States Parties and the Convention, calling upon the Members to carefully reflect on choosing the best candidates. It was also important to strike a good balance between, on the one hand, having experienced people within the Evaluation Body, and on the other, to ensure that new people were coming into the Evaluation Body with new energy and expertise. The delegation concluded by wishing all the candidates the best of luck.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** asked the Secretary to clarify the status of States Parties in the Evaluation Body if that country was elected to the Committee.
9. The **Secretary** recalled that the question had been raised at the time of adoption of the Operational Directives at the General Assembly in which it was decided that should a State Party wish to appoint an expert to the Evaluation Body who was elected on a 4-year mandate, then logically it should not serve in the Committee. However, if a State Party, by drawing lots, served only a 1-year term and the seat would be renewed, then the State Party could present its candidature to the Committee at its next election. Thus, the situation would depend on the mandates of the various experts appointed, but generally-speaking from the time an expert was mandated to serve in the Evaluation Body, its country should not run for election to the Committee as this would render the two positions incompatible.
10. The **Chairperson** asked for two volunteers to serve as tellers among the Members of the Committee. Saint Lucia and Hungary volunteered and were invited to join the podium. The Chairperson gave Members five minutes to circle the names of their preferred candidates.
11. After a five minute pause the **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to make the roll call so as to collect the ballots from each delegation.
12. The **Secretary** noted that the following Members had voted: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Greece, Hungary, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, Uganda, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Tunisia, Turkey, and Uruguay. The sole Member absent was Egypt. The Secretary called Egypt a second time, and the session was momentarily suspended in order to count the ballots.
13. Following the pause for counting, the **Chairperson** was pleased to announce that the ballots had been counted, and the results were as follows:
14. **Electoral Group I** –Ms Amelia Maria de Melo Frazão Moreira (Portugal): 12 votes (elected); Mr Henricus Smeets (Netherlands): 11 votes; Fundacion INATEL: 7 votes; Dutch Centre for Folklore and Intangible Heritage: 9 votes (elected); The Foundation for Traditional Music and Dance: 7 votes.
15. **Electoral Group II** –Ms Kristiina Porila (Estonia): 8 votes; L’ubica Vol’anská (Slovakia): 5 votes; Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia): 10 votes (elected); Czech Ethnological Society: 9 votes; International Council for Traditional Music (ICTM): 14 votes (elected).
16. **Electoral Group III** –MrCarlos Hernández Soto (Dominican Republic): 2 votes; Ms Celia B. Toppin (Barbados): 5 votes; Mr Victor Rago (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela): 16 votes (elected); Association of Friends of Brazilian Folk Art - Casa do Pontal Museum, as the sole NGO proposed, would also join the Evaluation Body.
17. **Electoral Group IV** –MsMasami Iwasaki (Japan): 14 votes (elected); Mr Nguyen Ti Hien (Viet Nam): 4 votes; Mr Siri Neng Buah (Malaysia): 5 votes; Oral Tradition Association: 0 votes; China Folklore Society: 13 votes (elected); Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation: 10 votes.
18. **Electoral Group V(a)** –Mr John Moogi Omare (Kenya): 10 votes; Mr Olabiyi Babalola Joseph Yai (Benin): 3 votes; Mr Sidi Traoré (Burkina Faso): 10 votes [it was noted that owing to the same number of votes, a second vote would be taken between Mr John Moogi Omare of Kenya and Mr Sidi Traoré of Burkina Faso]; Centre for Heritage Development in Africa (CHDA) : 8 votes ; Organisation pour la promotion des médecines traditionnelles (PROMETRA) : 6 votes ; The Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda: 9 votes (elected).
19. **Electoral Group V(a)** –Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco): 15 votes (elected); Ms Annie Tohmé Tabet (Lebanon): 5 votes; Mr Hani Hayajneh (Jordan): 2 votes. The Syria Trust for Development, as the sole NGO proposed, would also join the Evaluation Body.
20. The **Chairperson** congratulated the new Members of the Evaluation Body and thanked all the candidates whose applications were submitted to the Committee. The Committee would determine the term of office for each member in tomorrow’s session. The session was adjourned.

*[Friday, 28 November, morning session]*

## ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA (Cont.):

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2015 CYCLE

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning, noting that the Committee was behind schedule. The Chairperson appealed to Members to focus on the essence of the debates. He recalled the election for the new Evaluation Body in which Group V(a) resulted in an equal number of votes for Mr John Moogi Omare and Mr Sidi Traore. The Committee was therefore obliged to conduct a new vote to decide between the two candidates by following the same procedure as yesterday. The Chairperson invited the two tellers to join the podium, and gave Members five minutes to decide on their candidate before casting their vote.
2. Following the five minute pause, the **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to make the roll call to collect the ballots from each Committee Member.
3. The **Secretary** noted that the following Members had voted: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Greece, Hungary, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, Uganda, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Tunisia, Turkey, and Uruguay.
4. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the item 5.a, while the votes were counted.

## ITEM 5.a OF THE AGENDA (Cont.):

EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION AND ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS INSCRIBED ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/5.a*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-5.a-EN_.doc)

[*27 reports*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00707)

**Decision** *9.COM 5.a*

1. The **Chairperson** recalled that the debate on this item had commenced on the first day of the present session, but was suspended in order to allow time for discussions to take place between the States Parties concerned, which unfortunately were unsuccessful. The Chairperson remarked that the Committee should consider how this situation could be avoided in the future, adding that the periodic reports should not be a source of tension between States Parties. It was the Committee’s responsibility to do its utmost to prevent these tensions and situations. It was noted that the Secretariat would propose a mechanism in this regard. The Chairperson recalled that during the initial debate on Monday, the Committee had raised some questions, inviting the Secretary to respond.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that the debate on Monday had raised two main issues, namely, that States Parties were unable to submit their periodic reports on time, as required by the Convention, and that something had to be done to remedy this situation.The Secretary attempted to examine the possible reasons why this might be so. She surmised that the communication channels might be ineffective. The Secretary explained that notification letters were sent by the Secretariat 12 months before the reports were due to the Permanent Delegations of the States Parties concerned who were tasked to send the letters to the persons responsible for drafting the reports. However, occasionally the letters did not reach the desired recipient or bureau. It was recalled that a few years ago these letters were sent to the ministries in charge of relations with UNESCO, often ministries of education, but the problem of transmission was the same. For the time being, she did see any solution. Another impediment to the reporting process lay in the fact that it required a significant investment in time and resources, and that in a number of cases, there were insufficiently trained human resources to respond to the questions in the report. On top of which, States Parties wished to provide a rich and detailed account of their work in implementing the Convention in the presentation of their report to the Committee, even though the Committee was not judging their work but only sought to be informed on the State Party’s progress. Hence, the reluctance of States Parties to respond. Capacity-building was expected to improve this situation, but it was a long-term solution. In addition, States Parties had trouble understanding the requirements in the form. Consequently, the Secretariat had devised an *aide-mémoire,* similar to those for nominations, to facilitate the process. The Secretariat also provided assistance in the form of individualized feedback to help States Parties understand how they could improve their reports. With regard to the second issue, namely, how could the Committee help to encourage States Parties to submit their reports on time, it was noted that the Committee, in its decisions, encouraged States to submit their reports in a timely manner, but that the results were rather modest. The Committee could also impose conditions, for example, propose that States Parties could not submit nominations if they had not submitted their reports, as an incentive. It had been suggested at one point that category 2 centres might be able to help States Parties prepare their reports, whose role was quite clear for example in the World Heritage regional reports. At the level of the individual State reports, it was agreed that perhaps category 2 centres could help and provide support, but still, it remained a national responsibility.
3. On the issue of tensions caused by some reports, the **Secretary** explained that it was the first time this year that the Secretariat had received correspondence from one State Party concerning a periodic report of another State Party. It was noted that there was nothing in the current texts or in Committee decisions to guide the Secretariat on how to react, unlike for nominations to the Lists that had a mechanism in place to deal with such correspondence. The Secretary recalled that the Committee adopted its Decision 7.COM 15 in Paris in 2012 that provided the procedure for treating correspondence: i) correspondence is received; ii) it is transmitted to the submitting State concerned by the correspondence; and iii) the submitting State responds. All the correspondence is made available to the advisory bodies, as well as the Committee, if it received within specific deadlines. This would then lead the Committee and the advisory body to make a judgment on the nomination based on the potential problems it posed, not only for the submitting States but to the communities, civil society associations, and so on. However, this mechanism did not exist for periodic reports. The Secretariat therefore proposed to include a paragraph in the draft decision, which would provide a dedicated mechanism for treating and processing correspondence of this nature for the Committee’s next session, while applying *mutatis mutandis* the current procedure in place for nominations in case further correspondence was received on other periodic reports during the year.
4. Noting that the Committee had already debated the reports, the **Chairperson** proposed to go directly to the adoption of the draft decision, starting with the proposal by the Secretariat.
5. The **Secretary** presented the amendment in a new paragraph 5, which read: ‘Decides to apply to periodic reports, *mutatis mutandis*, the guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from the public or other concerned parties with regard to nominations, as found in Decision 7.COM 15, and further requests the Secretariat to propose for its examination at its tenth session guidelines specifically applicable to periodic reports.’
6. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment.
7. The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the amendment by the Secretary, followed by the adoption of the draft decision as a whole.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** had a proposal to be added at the end of the decision, which read: ‘Requests the States Parties to work with the Secretariat to cleanse their documents from language inconsistent with the UN and Convention terminology and invites all States Parties to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work and resubmit their periodic reports if it is not submitted in accordance with this principle.’
9. The delegation of **Latvia** wished to return to one aspect of the general debate in the new paragraph 14, and which specifically concerned paragraph 97 on page 27 of the [overview document](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-5.a-EN_.doc), to delete the word ‘disadvantaged’ with regard to urban communities. It added that raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage was an issue not only for rural development but also for urban environments, and thus would be glad if the Committee could leave this conclusion more open to all kinds of urban communities.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** also submitted an amendment in paragraph 7, now the new paragraph 8, to enlarge the idea of communities, groups and if applicable individuals.
11. The **Chairperson** wished to begin with the amendment by Turkey, which the Secretary read out, as previously cited.
12. The delegation of **Greece** expressed its full agreement with the amendment by Turkey, but it had a reservation in the use of the word ‘cleanse’, which had negative connotations, and suggested using ‘withdraw’ instead.
13. The delegation of **Afghanistan** supported the proposal by Turkey. However, it wished to include the notion of ‘the spirit’, which would read, ‘language inconsistent with the spirit of the UN and Convention terminology’, as it was the spirit, aims and objectives that were important.
14. The delegation of **Brazil** associated with the remarks by Greece and Afghanistan, adding that it also had a problem with ‘cleanse’. It also suggested different wording to the proposed text, which would read: ‘Requests States Parties to work with the Secretariat in order to remove from their periodic reports any language inconsistent with UN resolutions and the spirit of the 2003 Convention.’ The delegation proposed the use of ‘spirit’ in the context of the spirit of the Convention. It also asked the Secretary whether it was necessary that States Parties ‘resubmit their periodic reports’, suggesting instead to delete this part of the sentence, as it appeared too harsh, unless the Secretary thought otherwise.
15. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** followed the same direction as Brazil, questioning whether this principle would be applied to future reports or applied retroactively. With regard to the text, ‘pursue this principle in their future work and resubmit their periodic reports if it is not submitted in accordance with this principle’, the delegation believed that this principle must apply to future reports and not be retroactive.
16. The **Chairperson** concurred that this would only apply to future submissions.
17. The delegation of **Algeria** supported the proposal by Brazil to delete the last part of the sentence, adding that if States Parties worked beforehand with the Secretariat, the periodic reports should not contain any elements that were not in the spirit of the Convention.
18. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** joined the two previous amendments.
19. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the pertinent amendment by Brazil.
20. The **Secretary** presented the amended text, which read: ‘Requests States Parties to work with the Secretariat in order to remove from their periodic reports any language inconsistent with UN resolutions and the spirit of the 2003 Convention, and invites all States Parties to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work.’
21. The delegation of **Brazil** asked Turkey for its reasoning behind the use of ‘UN resolutions’, adding that it was not certain that this was the correct terminology, suggesting that it might be UN Charter or UN principles.
22. The delegation of **Afghanistan** felt that ‘UN resolutions’ was too precise, as it was not certain whether they conformed to the general spirit, and suggested replacing it with ‘UN statutes’. At the same time, the delegation found ‘and the spirit of the Convention’ to be repetitive, as this was contained in the mention of ‘Convention’, adding that it had proposed the use of ‘spirit’ earlier in relation to the United Nations, not the Convention.
23. The delegation of **Turkey** replied that it wished to make reference to established UN terminology, but would accept resolutions.
24. The **Secretary** presented the revised amendment, which read: ‘Requests States Parties to work with the Secretariat in order to remove from their periodic reports any language inconsistent with UN resolutions and the spirit of the 2003 Convention, and invites all States Parties to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work.’ Returning to the question posed by Brazil, the Secretary explained that by applying this principle, the Secretariat should be able to successfully resolve these issues when they occurred, but if they persisted, it would nonetheless bring them to the attention of the Committee.
25. The delegation of **Latvia** remarked that as this paragraph concerned future periodic reports, the word ‘remove’ could replace ‘avoid’, as the State Party would avoid inappropriate wording even before writing its report, and as such would not need to remove such wording.
26. The **Chairperson** turned to the latest amendment proposed by Latvia for adoption.
27. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the first part of the amended paragraph, but it was still in favour of resubmitting the periodic reports.
28. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** remarked that with the amendment by Latvia, States Parties would be required to work with the Secretariat to avoid incompatible language in their periodic reports.
29. The **Secretary** presented the revised amendment, which read: ‘Requests States Parties to work with the Secretariat in order to avoid in their periodic reports any language inconsistent with UN resolutions and the 2003 Convention, and invites all States Parties to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work.’ It was noted thatTurkey wished to maintain the text, ‘and resubmit their periodic reports if it is not submitted in accordance with this principle’, whereas Brazil proposed its deletion.
30. The delegation of **Turkey** did not agree with Latvia’s suggested wording ‘avoid’, as it changed the context of the paragraph entirely.
31. The **Chairperson** understood that Turkey agreed to Brazil’s proposal to delete the last part of the sentence, and to maintain ‘remove’, which was duly adopted.
32. The delegation of **Turkey** clearly stated that it wished to maintain ‘resubmit’.
33. The **Secretary** noted that the adopted decision had deleted ‘avoid’, proposed by Latvia, and maintained ‘remove’, proposed by Turkey.
34. The delegation of **Greece** wished to retain the last part of the sentence deleted by Brazil, because the submitting State Party should always keep in mind to draft the reports in line with UN resolutions and the principles of the Convention and its language, which were already known to the States Parties. Thus, if a State Party submitted a report that was incompatible with this principle, then it would have to revise and resubmit it.
35. Considering the Secretary’s response, the delegation of **Brazil** felt that it was a matter of employing a lighter tone in the paragraph, particularly as working with the Secretariat would help remove any inconsistent language from the periodic reports. Thus, it was enough to invite States Parties to pursue this principle in their future work, as the Secretariat examined the periodic reports, with the State Party effectively resubmitting its report. Otherwise, ‘invites all States Parties to meticulously pursue’ should be deleted, and after the ‘2003 Convention’, it should read, ‘requests all States Parties to resubmit their periodic reports if it’s not submitted [...]’. The delegation explained that there were two approaches: either the Committee *invited* States Parties to pursue this principle, or it *requested* States Parties to resubmit their periodic reports. Moreover, the delegation felt that the latter approach might create problems in the future as it opened a way for States Parties to start questioning each other’s reports, more than would be desirable. Thus, it preferred a lighter language that was more in line with the spirit of the Convention, dialogue and cooperation. In addition, if Members States wished to keep ‘resubmit’, then it should be consistent in that it ‘requests States Parties to resubmit’, and not ‘invites all States Parties’.
36. The delegation of **Afghanistan** spoke of its concern that the Committee in its own resolution appeared to reproach States Parties of not respecting the spirit of the United Nations, which in its opinion was conflictual and inelegant. The delegation believed that the proposal by Latvia, in the use of ‘avoid’ was more appropriate in a legal sense, and less confrontational than ‘remove’, even though the result was the same. The delegation explained that ‘avoid’ implied that the State Party should not undertake in the first place, while ‘remove’ suggested that the State Party first wrote inappropriate text before removing it. The objective was to avoid employing conflictual terminologies from the outset, which might create tension. It therefore supported ‘avoid’, not least because ‘removes’ imposed additional work on the Secretariat, in addition to the unnecessary negotiations that would follow. Moreover, States Parties represented governments and State entities at international level, and they recognized the meaning behind resolutions. It was noted that Algeria also supported the proposal by Brazil.
37. The delegation of **Turkey** understood perfectly the essence of being elegant, but being fair at an inter-State level on a UN platform was also very important. The delegation explained that it was not against any State Party or side, but rather it was trying to continue in the same vein of success that had been achieved with the help of the Secretariat in the spirit of collaboration and mutual adaptation. It commended all the States Parties, countries and neighbours that had made very special efforts to accommodate each other to bring about qualitative, positive change. The delegation further explained that it was maintaining the solid position of the Organization and at a high level of mutual accommodation vis-à-vis other practices. It therefore proposed to insert an additional word ‘retroactively’, so that it would read, ‘to remove from their periodic reports retroactively’, considering it an elegant contribution in line with the suggestion by Afghanistan.
38. The delegation of **Egypt** remarked that it preferred ‘UN Charter’ instead of ‘resolutions’, as it considered that States Parties abide by the Charter of the United Nations.
39. The delegation of **Brazil** remarked that the Committee could not adopt a decision that would be retroactive, not only would it create a precedent but was likely to be unacceptable in juridical terms. Understanding that Turkey sought stronger language, the delegation suggested ‘invites and further requests all States Parties to pursue meticulously’, though it insisted that it was uncomfortable in accepting the idea of resubmitting periodic reports, as it did not want to open a Pandora’s box where a State questioned another State’s report, forcing it to resubmit, creating tension and crisis rather than dialogue and cooperation.
40. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** remarked that there was a lot of merit in the remarks made by Brazil and Afghanistan, adding that these were periodic reports, meaning that they would be resubmitted again. They would thus go through the mechanism that was proposed by the Secretariat in paragraph 5, as well as the paragraph in question. Consequently, with the different cycles of periodic reporting, as States Parties reported more than once, the reports would be submitted through these mechanisms and thus not contain any language that is inconsistent with the UN Charter and the spirit of the Convention.
41. The delegation of **Tunisia** spoke of the need to use language that respected the spirit and Charter of the United Nations, and thus preferred to use the term ‘avoid’ as it carried a degree of flexibility and was elegant and appropriate in this context. As for the principle of retroactivity, the delegation felt that it would raise added problems.
42. The **Chairperson** noted that there were several opinions on the paragraph, and suggested making a decision on the proposal by Brazil to delete the last sentence. The Chairperson sought support from the Committee.
43. The delegation of **Turkey** made reference to paragraph 17 of Decision 8.COM 6.8, which reminds States Parties to take particular care in their periodic reports to avoid characterizing the practices and actions within other States, including expressions that might inadvertently diminish mutual respect among communities or impede intercultural dialogue. The delegation remarked that this was a starting point for those reports submitted that inadvertently contained language inconsistent with UN terminology and the Convention. It believed that the Committee had a legal decision on which to act and, accordingly, any reports containing inconsistent language could be resubmitted.
44. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey for its opinion, reiterating that he sought support for the proposal by Brazil to delete the last sentence proposed by Turkey, asking the Members to raise their nameplates.
45. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked the Chairperson to repeat his request.
46. Repeating the request, the **Secretary** sought support for the deletion of the paragraph on resubmitting periodic reports that were not submitted in accordance with this principle.
47. The **Chairperson** noted that there was strong support for the deletion of the sentence.
48. The delegation of **Turkey** requested a vote count, adding that there was not a majority in favour of the deletion.
49. The **Chairperson** remarked that it was not in a voting procedure, but that Turkey could request a vote under the Rules of Procedure.
50. The delegation of **Turkey** sought a vote on the issue.
51. The delegation of **Brazil** felt that in this case the Committee should respect Turkey, adding that it had nothing against the idea of counting the Members of the Committee in favour of or against the amendment.
52. The **Chairperson** agreed and asked to see who was in favour of the proposal by Brazil to delete the paragraph.
53. The **Secretary** counted the following Members who were in favour of the proposal by Brazil. *For*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Latvia, Tunisia, Uganda, Peru and Uruguay. *Against*: Turkey, Greece and Kyrgyzstan. *Abstentions*: India, Hungary and Mongolia. Thus, 15 Members were for the deletion, with 3 against, and 3 abstentions.
54. As a result of the vote, the **Chairperson** pronounced the final sentence deleted.
55. The **Chairperson** turned to the proposal by Latvia to replace ‘remove’ with ‘avoid’ in the amendment by Brazil. For the sake of transparency, the Chairperson asked that the same voting procedure be applied.
56. The **Secretary** counted the following Members who were in favour of the proposal by Latvia: *For:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Côte d’Ivoire, Latvia, Kyrgyzstan, Tunisia, Saint Lucia, Republic of Korea, and Peru. *Against*: Congo, Greece, Uganda, and Turkey. *Abstentions*: Bulgaria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Hungary, India, Nigeria, Namibia, Mongolia, and Uruguay. Thus, 10 Members were in favour, with 4 against, and 9 abstentions.
57. As a result of the vote, the **Chairperson** pronounced adopted the proposal by Latvia. He then turned to the proposal by Egypt to replace ‘UN resolutions’ with ‘UN Charter’, and suggest avoiding a vote, as this amendment was of a different nature. The Chairperson asked whether any Members of the Committee opposed the proposal.
58. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to return to the use of the word ‘retroactively’, adding that since ‘remove’ had been deleted; there was no need to retain ‘retroactively’.
59. The **Chairperson** recalled that Brazil also called for the deletion of the word ‘retroactively’, adding that this decision would be taken following the decision of the use of ‘UN Charter’ in place of ‘UN resolutions’. With no objections, the decision to use UN Charter was adopted. The Chairperson then moved to the question of ‘retroactivity’.
60. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** supported the proposal by Brazil, adding that ‘retroactively’ was redundant with the deletion of the final sentence.
61. For the sake of transparency, the **Chairperson** called for a vote on this proposal, asking the Committee Members to show its support for the deletion of ‘retroactivity’.
62. The **Secretary** noted the following Members of the Committee in favour of deleting ‘retroactively’. *For*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Mongolia, Latvia, Tunisia, Saint Lucia, Republic of Korea, Peru, and Uruguay. *Against*: Turkey. *Abstentions*: Kyrgyzstan, India, Hungary, and Greece. Thus, 16 Members were in favour, with 1 against, and 4 abstentions.
63. As a result of the vote, the **Chairperson** deleted ‘retroactively’ from the paragraph.
64. The **Secretary** returned to the paragraph, noting a slight divergence in the beginning of the second sentence. The paragraph currently read as follows, ‘Requests States Parties to work with the Secretariat in order to avoid in their periodic reports any language inconsistent with the UN Charter and the 2003 Convention’, then either ‘further requests’ or ‘invites’ ‘all States Parties to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work’.
65. The delegation of **Afghanistan** wished to replace ‘and’ with ‘as well as’ between ‘UN Charter’ and the ‘Convention’, adding that it was better legal language.
66. The **Chairperson** noted the remark.
67. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** wondered whether it was worth repeating ‘States Parties’ twice and suggested replacing the second ‘invites the States Parties’ with ‘invites them’.
68. Noting the remark, the **Chairperson** turned to the final issue between ‘requests’ and ‘invites’, seeking consensus with the word ‘invite’. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, **Chairperson declared adopted Decision 9.COM 5.a.**

## ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA (Cont.):

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2015 CYCLE

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the election results, inviting the tellers to return to the podium. The Chairperson then announced the vote count. Mr John Moogi Omare from Kenya: 11 votes, and Mr Sidi Traore from Burkina Faso: 13 votes. Mr Sidi Traore was therefore declared elected. The Chairperson congratulated the elected Members of the Evaluation Body and at the same time thanked all the candidates. The Chairperson asked the tellers to remain on the podium, as the term of office of each Member now had to be determined. He invited the Secretary to provide information on the rotation system.
2. The **Secretary** explained that in accordance with the Operational Directives, the Committee was called to set up a rotation system that provided for the renewal of three of the twelve Members of the Evaluation Body at each session, with the term of office of each seat not exceeding four years. As this was the first Evaluation Body, the Committee was called to determine the three seats that would serve for a period of four years, the three seats for a period of three years, the three seats for a period of two years, and finally, the three seats for a period of one year. The rotation system was implemented so that the Evaluation Body could benefit from a continuous renewal, as well as continuity in the Body and institutional memory. Following this logic, it seemed beneficial that each Electoral Group had one member with some experience in an advisory capacity, and one member who would be newly associated with the Body’s work in each new cycle. Having studied the different options, the Secretariat had reached a fair and balanced proposal that would occur in two stages. The first step was to determine six mandates, one for each Electoral Group, each comprising one expert and one NGO with a different termed mandate. There were thus six different plans, each totalling five years: i) Plan A – one year for the expert and four years for the NGO; ii) Plan B – two years for the expert and three for the NGO; iii) Plan C – three years for the expert and two years for the NGO; iv) Plan D – four years for the expert and one year for the NGO; v) Plan E – two years for the expert and three years for the NGO; and vi) Plan F – four years for the expert and one year for the NGO. The Secretary further explained that from next year, each vacant seat would be filled for a period of four years, adding that this was the first introduction of the rotation system, and thus the Committee had to identify which Electoral Group would have to give up a seat for a shorter period than four years. Nevertheless, the initial distribution ensured that each plan had a balanced mix of mandates with each Electoral Group beginning with a cumulative total of five years split between experts and NGOs. The Secretariat sought to achieve a balance within each plan and believed that no plan was more advantageous than another. Once the Committee agreed to the proposal, the second stage consisted of matching each plan to a particular Electoral Group by drawing lots, which seemed to be the easiest and fairest way. Moreover, this method was practised in the United Nations system in such cases, and occurred in the renewal of the first members of the Committee. Six envelopes would be placed inside an urn, one for each Electoral Group, and the first envelope drawn would be associated with Plan A, the second with Plan B, and so on, until all the envelopes had been drawn, and each Electoral Group was matched with a plan. The tellers would place the envelopes in the urn and select the envelopes.
3. The **Secretary** called out the results. Plan A: Group V(a). Plan B: Group IV. Plan C: Group V(b). Plan D: Group I. Plan E: Group III. Plan F: Group II. The Secretary explained the result. Electoral Group V(a) had Plan A: a one-year term for the expert and a four-year term for the NGO. Electoral Group IV had Plan B: a two-year term for the expert and a three-year term for the NGO. Electoral Group V(b) had Plan C: a three-year term for the expert and a two-year term for the NGO. Electoral Group I had Plan D: a four-year term for the expert and a one-year term for the NGO. Electoral Group III had Plan E: a two-year term for the expert and a three-year term for the NGO. Electoral Group II had Plan F: a four-year term for the expert and a one-year term for the NGO.
4. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Members of the Evaluation Body and their mandates were now known, and he proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1-4 were duly adopted.
5. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to propose an amendment as a new paragraph 5, which read: ‘Takes note of the fact that not all Electoral Groups proposed more than 1 NGO, thus limiting its freedom of choice to define the composition of the Evaluation Body’, as well as a new paragraph at the end of the draft decision, which read: ‘Decides that the Operational Directives should be revised to include the necessity to send at least two and up to three candidatures for both experts and NGOs, and requests the Secretariat to propose a draft text of amendments reflecting that decision to its tenth session’. The delegation understood that this was the first time the Evaluation Body was established, and it wanted to take the opportunity to congratulate the newly elected members and thank the Secretariat for its meticulous mathematical proposal on the renewal, albeit it required fine-tuning to make it fully harmonious. With regard to the candidates, the delegation noted that some Electoral Groups did not offer a choice, making it difficult for the Committee to fully express itself, particularly as it was decided in Baku and in the General Assembly that the spirit of decision was in having a choice. It therefore proposed to take note of the fact that not all Electoral Groups proposed more than one NGO, thus limiting the freedom of choice to define the position of the Evaluation Body. In a later paragraph, the delegation proposed to amend the Operational Directives to ask States Parties to bring forward at least two, and up to three candidates, for both NGOs and experts. It accepted that in some cases there were not enough accredited NGOs; however, it felt that more work was needed to inform NGOs that they could contribute so that they were made fully aware that this possibility existed. Moreover, as new Operational Directives would only come into effect within a few years, at least not before 2016, it surmised that there would be more NGOs in the future.
6. The delegation of **Latvia** supported paragraph 5 as presented by Belgium concerning the presentation of NGOs in the current election. It wished to congratulate the newly elected experts and NGOs to the Evaluation Body. It also wished to draw the Committee’s attention to some general conclusions from the election procedure of the Evaluation Body. Firstly concerning the choice of NGOs, the delegation believed that the Committee should reflect on the pre-selection process within the Electoral Groups and the selection presented to the Committee. Within the framework of the current procedure, the delegation encouraged Member States to ensure that all accredited NGOs with registered headquarters within their territory be made aware of the pre-selection process and the responsibilities of the Evaluation Body. It also noted that there was growing activity within the NGO Forum, and believed that its role as a communication platform might be considered both by the Member States and by the Forum itself. With regard to the choice of experts and the examination of the different candidacies, the delegation remarked on the considerable disparities in the CVs and how the experiences were presented. It thus proposed that the Secretariat consider elaborating a common CV form for presenting expert candidates that provided a synthesis of the most relevant information. Finally, the delegation observed that the current candidacies comprised experts and NGO representatives that had previously served in a consultative capacity. The delegation associated with the remarks previously expressed by Belgium that it was important to bring new experts to the examination process of nominations and proposals. As such, it proposed that these aspects be taken into account when selecting experts, reiterating that the Committee should broaden as much as possible the involvement of different experts. With regard to the point raised on a common CV form, the delegation suggested that this aspect, i.e. whether an expert had previously served the Committee, should be taken into account. It concluded by encouraging the newly elected Members in their duties in the Evaluation Body.
7. The delegation of **Brazil** also noted that Electoral Groups III and V(b) had presented only one NGO to the Committee in this election, though not because they were looking for a clean slate but actually because this was the only option available. There was thus a lack of accredited NGOs in some regions. In the case of Group III, it did have more than three NGOs available, but it sought to have an NGO with a broader view of intangible cultural heritage, rather than a specialization. For instance, there were four NGOs from Brazil, but three were specialized in Indian culture, while one NGO presented a much broader perspective on intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, it had not received any submissions from other NGOs in the region, despite consultations, because for whatever reason they were unavailable. In the case of Group V(b), it only had three accredited NGOs; one was leaving the Consultative Body, one was unavailable to participate, leaving only one NGO available for the task. Thus, it was not really a clean slate, but rather a lack of options that occurred. The delegation therefore felt that a wiser suggestion would be to encourage greater efforts in terms of broadening the participation of NGOs in the accreditation of NGOs to UNESCO, adding that it was too early to amend the Operational Directives. It suggested waiting at least one more election so as to better reflect on the issue. However, the Committee could – in the draft decision – invite all Electoral Groups to present more than one candidate so as to avoid a similar situation in the future.
8. The **Chairperson** wondered whether the Committee was ready to adopt the proposal by Belgium.
9. The delegation of **Brazil** accepted paragraph 5, but felt that it was too early to request amendments to the Operational Directives.
10. The delegation of **Algeria** supported the comments made by Brazil, adding that it would like to delete ‘limiting its freedom of choice’, explaining that the Electoral Groups did not limit the freedom of choice of any group, but that they found themselves in a situation with only one option. The delegation therefore proposed: ‘Takes note of the fact that not all Electoral Groups were able to propose more than one non-governmental organization thus limiting its choice to define the composition of the Evaluation Body.’
11. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria for its constructive proposal.
12. The delegation of **Belgium** acknowledged the comments by Brazil on the difficulty to put forward more candidates, as well as the comments by Algeria. It suggested that instead of ‘thus limiting its freedom’, as this might seem as if the Electoral Groups were trying to ‘limit’, which of course was not the case, to use, ‘which limited’, as it was the situation itself that limited the choice of the Committee. It also wished to avoid any connotation that it was the Electoral Groups that did this in a voluntary manner, adding that it understood the reasons why this situation came about.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for its proposal, adding that it was very important to maintain the spirit of the concern raised by Brazil and Algeria.
14. The delegation of **Egypt** remarked that on a procedural level, and at the request of the Secretariat, the National Commissions submitted the names of experts and NGOs, however, occasionally the Chairpersons of the National Commissions found it difficult to fulfil their role adequately. The delegation surmised that perhaps they had problems providing information to the NGOs, adding that it was difficult at times to communicate with them or the requests were not received. Bearing in mind that accredited NGOs were well known to the Secretariat, the delegation wondered whether it could assist by submitting information to the NGOs, and perhaps the NGOs could channel this through their State, or even go directly to the Secretariat. This would provide a chance for a greater number of NGOs to participate, increasing their involvement in the process.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Egypt for its comment, turning to the amended paragraph.
16. The delegation of **Tunisia** supported Algeria’s proposal, adding that several regional groups only submitted one candidature owing to a lack of accredited NGOs to the Convention. Moreover, the Committee’s decision did not specify a minimum but a maximum number of potential of candidates. The situation therefore forced the Committee to reflect on the imbalance between the different regional groups in terms of the under-representation of NGOs. Additionally, it may encourage Member States to submit nominations from their NGOs to the Convention.
17. The **Chairperson** noted a consensus to the latest changes in paragraph 5, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 6.
18. The delegation of **Brazil** commented on the language of the paragraph just adopted, but accepted that it was too late to change it.
19. The **Chairperson** turned to the following paragraphs 6–8, and with no objections, they were duly adopted.He then turned to paragraph 9.
20. The delegation of **Brazil** reiterated that it was too early to request another change to the Operational Directives, as it required greater reflection. However, it suggested to include a paragraph requesting the Secretariat to pursue the efforts of accreditation of more NGOs, as the problem lay in the fact that there were not enough accredited NGOs, which limited the choices of Electoral Groups to propose NGOs. Thus, efforts were needed to broaden the number of NGOs working with the Convention. The delegation understood the good intention behind Belgium’s amendment, to avoid a clean slate with the new rule; however certain Electoral Groups could face a situation in which they would not be able to follow the new rule because we did not have enough accredited NGOs available.
21. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the remarks by Brazil that it was important to activate the accreditation of NGOs so as to ensure that there was a consistent number of NGOs in the regional groups. However, it also saw the merit of Belgium’s proposal because it was a fact that all regional groups have more than two NGOs such that there would at least be a choice. This way, the Committee could make choices with a rotation of new NGOs instead of working with the same ones, which was important as every group had at least two NGOs. Thus, there was no problem with the amendment by Belgium.
22. The delegation of **Algeria** endorsed the comments by Brazil and Saint Lucia in that the reality on the ground must also be appreciated. It understood Belgium’s explanation that the two amendments were related in that now that the paragraph was adopted it should find its way into the Operational Directives. However, there was a danger that the rule, if adopted in the Operational Directives, might not be applied and the Committee would find itself in the same situation where there were not enough NGOs represented. The delegation explained that in Electoral Group V(b) and in Algeria there were currently no registered NGOs working in intangible cultural heritage: a fairly new field and still in its infancy. Thus, what would happen if there were not enough NGOs to present? The delegation hoped that the Committee would take this into consideration.
23. The delegation of **Bulgaria** agreed with the reasoning of Saint Lucia and also the proposal by Belgium, adding that if the Committee agreed on this text now, then the amendment would only be incorporated into the Operational Directives in 2016 and applied in 2017, i.e. three years from now. In the meantime, Member States would be in a position to propose NGOs for accreditation and thus change the current landscape.
24. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** found the amendment very interesting; however, it only fully understood its rationale following the explanation given by Belgium. The delegation thus wished to add a small phrase, ‘in order to ensure rotation’, which would help in understanding the reason for the amendment.
25. The delegation of **Tunisia** also found the amendment very interesting, but that it did not take into account the reality of the current situation in some regional groups, including its own. The delegation explained that of the 21 countries in its Electoral Group, there were only three NGOs, and not all three met the requirements to participate in the Evaluation Body. It therefore believed that the best way forward was to reflect on how to encourage States Parties and Electoral Groups to increase the number of accredited NGOs to the Convention, after which the amendment could be applied.
26. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to read the proposed amended text.
27. The **Secretary** presented the amendment, which read: ‘Decides, in order to ensure rotation, that the Operational Directives should be revised to include the necessity to send at least two and up to three candidatures for both experts and NGOs, and requests the Secretariat to propose a draft text of amendments reflecting that decision to its tenth session’.
28. The **Chairperson** sought support for the amendment by Belgium butnoted that there was not broad support, reverting to the original wording.
29. The delegation of **Belgium** accepted the consensus and the deletion of the amendment. However, it also wished to maintain the idea, thus proposing: ‘Encourages States Parties to propose more than one candidate from both NGOs and experts’, adding that it would understand if States were in a situation in which it was not possible.
30. The **Chairperson** noted that the initial amendment was not accepted, but Belgium was welcome to make a new amendment.
31. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed the amendment in paragraph 6, which would read: ‘Encourages States Parties to send at least two candidates for both NGOs and experts to the Secretariat through their Electoral Groups.’
32. The delegation of **Brazil** and **Latvia** supported the proposal.
33. Noting a general consensus, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of Belgium’s proposal in paragraph 6, which was duly adopted. Having adopted all the paragraphs, and with no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the Chairperson **declared Decision 9.COM 11 adopted.**
34. The **Representative of the NGOs** very much welcomed the new Evaluation Body and congratulated the elected members. On behalf of the NGOs, she expressed appreciation of these important roles of NGOs and experts within the new Evaluation Body. Nevertheless, the NGO Forum sought further clarification and transparency on the nomination procedures of experts and NGOs to the Evaluation Body, in particular, for NGOs operating in an international capacity, and for those NGOs operating in non-States Party countries. She also welcomed more information on the opportunities for NGOs to participate actively in the mechanisms of the Convention. The NGO Forum considered the discussion by the Committee concerning future criteria and procedures for proposals and elections to be important, which took into account all stakeholders involved.

## ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA:

NUMBER OF FILES SUBMITTED FOR THE 2015 CYCLE AND NUMBER OF FILES THAT CAN BE TREATED IN THE 2016 AND 2017 CYCLES

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/12*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-12-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 12*

1. The **Chairperson** then moved to agenda item 12, inviting the Secretary to take the floor.
2. The **Secretary** explained that document 12 addressed two issues: i) the experience of the implementation of Decision 8.COM 10 for nominations to the 2015 cycle, whose number was set at 50; and ii) the Committee’s decision on the number of files to be processed in the 2016 and 2017 cycles, knowing that the 2015 cycle began in March 2014 with the nominations received already being treated.With regard to the 2015 cycle, the Secretary recalled that the Committee decided to set this number to 50 nominations, and had also decided in its decision that efforts be made to treat at least one nomination file per country during the 2015–2016 biennium. By 31 March 2014, there were 218 admissible nomination files for the 2015 cycle, of which 56 new nominations and 162 nominations that constituted the backlog, i.e. files submitted in the previous cycle but were not yet processed due to progressive limitations on the number of nominations.As a result, States submitting multiple files were asked to prioritize their nominations. The 50 nomination files were thus treated in accordance with the priorities established in paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives. Priority was granted to submitting States with no inscribed elements, no Best Safeguarding Practice selected, no International Assistance of more than US$25,000 granted. The second priority comprised multinational files, and the third priority comprised the remaining nomination files in descending order of the number of inscriptions, i.e. the States with only one inscription would be considered first, followed by those with two inscriptions, three inscriptions, and so on. It was noted that document 12 provided a summary of the implementation of these priorities, which were as follows: the first 14 files treated from the 50 files submitted came from States with no inscriptions to date, of which two were multinational files and nine were nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, which were not necessarily submitted by non-represented States as, owing to their urgent status, these nominations were granted priority regardless of the number of State inscriptions.
3. The **Secretary** further explained that the second priority comprised seven multinational files, which was in addition to the two multinational files where at least one of the submitting States did not have an inscription, and which was therefore included in the first category of non-represented States. Thus, there were seven multinational files in the second category, which together totalled 30 nomination files. The remaining files was counted from the ascending order of the number of elements previously inscribed, with the ceiling of 50 nominations reached with the nomination from Indonesia, i.e. States that had seven inscribed elements to date. There were therefore 11 States Parties whose nominations did not receive priority in the current cycle; however, they would receive priority in the 2016 cycle thanks to the decision in Baku. Thus, there were already 11 nominations in the 2016 cycle. The Secretary wished to inform the Committee of significant delays in processing the 50 nominations, explaining that the 50 accompanying letters requesting additional information should have been finalized by 30 June 2014, but there were 20 nominations yet to complete. The Secretariat would do its utmost to catch up; as it was clear that the new Evaluation Body would require assistance and that the nominations had to be ready, especially as some States would resubmit revised nominations. Document 12 also included a table in paragraph 9 that compared the files submitted to previous sessions of the Committee and those expected in the coming sessions. It was noted that the tenth session would be particularly full, given the evaluation of applications for accreditation of NGOs, which were not treated this year, as well as the review of the NGO accreditations already granted that must be reviewed every four years. With regard to the cycle 2016–2017, the Committee was called upon to confirm the overall number of nominations to be treated in 2016, and to decide – as was done last year, and every year – a figure for the two years. As this was done in Baku for the 2015 cycle and the cycle in 2016, the Committee, a year later, had to confirm the figure for the 2016 cycle, and set the figure for 2017, while taking into consideration the current context at UNESCO and the Secretariat in particular. Finally, paragraph 7 of the draft decision contained the text of Decision 8 COM 10, i.e. it confirmed the principle that at least one file per submitting State be treated in the period of two years, that is to say from 2016 to 2017.
4. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
5. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its sincere appreciation of all the work carried out by the Secretariat, and it admired the quality and professionalism it experienced every day. Concerning the renewal of relations with NGOs, as outlined in the document, the delegation asked the Secretariat how it would cope with the 97 upcoming reports from NGOs for the year 2015, followed by the 59 reports in 2017.
6. The **Secretary** replied that it would be the subject of agenda item 14, as this item covered the accreditation and evaluation of NGOs.
7. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–10 were duly adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 12 adopted.**

## ITEM 13.a OF THE AGENDA:

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES ON PERIODIC REPORTING**

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.a*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.a-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.a*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to agenda item 13. It was noted that there were eight sub-items identified 13.a to 13.h, and the Committee would start with 13.a.
2. **Mr Proschan** explained that the item arose from the evaluation conducted last year by the Internal Oversight Service, which called for revisions in the Operational Directives concerning periodic reporting. The Committee then took up the IOS recommendations in Decision 8.COM 5.c.1, Decision 8.COM 6.a and Decision 8.COM 14.b, which focused on making the reports more impact-oriented and results-oriented rather than narratives of different activities. It also gave greater prominence in the reporting to questions of policy and legislation at the national level, and complemented the reports by including information provided by relevant NGOs. The revisions proposed to chapter 5 of the Operational Directives, included in the Annex to document 13.a, therefore drew upon the specific language of the Convention and the Committee’s decisions last year, and clarified several of the existing Directives on periodic reporting that were vague. In several cases, the previous versions used language that took a short cut rather than repeating precisely the language of the Convention, and so the Secretariat attempted to hew the specific language of the Convention itself, clarifying the directives that abbreviated or shortened things in a way that might not be clear. Minor revisions were also proposed in paragraphs 152, 161 and 169 of the Operational Directives to echo the language used elsewhere in the Directives concerning the nomination forms and NGO accreditation forms, trying to copy similar language whenever referring to the forms used for different purposes.
3. **Mr Proschan** further explained that paragraph 166 proposed to reflect the current practice for the Committee’s working documents, which were made available online for public consultation and by the Committee and other States Parties as they were received. In the case of the periodic reports, they were online generally four to six months prior to the Committee meeting in order to draw attention to them and bring about care, which was suggested in the Committee’s decisions during the present session regarding correspondence and possible alterations in the text to ensure conformity with the spirit and letter of the Convention and of the UN Charter and its resolutions. In the initial document presented, the Secretariat had proposed to delete paragraph 167. However, based on the Committee’s discussions earlier in the morning, the Secretariat proposed to keep the paragraph unchanged for now to allow time for this new process of correspondence and mediation to take effect. The Secretariat effectively retracted its previous suggestion to delete paragraph 167. The Committee was also reminded that it had requested the Secretariat to revise the periodic reporting forms, along the same lines as reflected in paragraph 168. The Secretariat had thus prepared revised forms that would be finalized immediately after the present session to reflect other comments that might be introduced at this time, which would be sent to all the States concerned with the 2016 cycle on 15 December 2014. It was noted that some 40 or 50 States were required to submit reports in the coming year, so that on 15 December they would all receive the reports according to the Committee’s initial view of the draft directives being presented.
4. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to review the following notions included in the amendments to the Operational Directives. Firstly, the delegation referred to the notion of concrete measures put in place at the national level cited in paragraph 151, explaining that the term ‘national’ was perhaps too restrictive to some States Parties, just as the concept of general policy – repeated in paragraph 153(b)i – could refer to national policy and therefore might not necessarily reflect the working methodology applied by States Parties with regard to diversity on the ground.Thus, the delegation wished to delete these notions of general and national policy. Also in paragraph 151, the delegation questioned the feasibility of measuring long-term impacts and results of the concrete measures put in place. Finally, it commented on the scope of the term ‘gender’ used in paragraph 157(a) and paragraph 162, adding that it could apply in a masculine or feminine sense, but it could also include children, as was shown in the present session, and thus provide a wider scope in a spirit of equal opportunity for all individuals involved in intangible cultural heritage. The question of gender thus reinforced the idea of the widest possible participation of communities, groups and individuals, and therefore should be moved to the main text of paragraph 157.
5. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. He began with Belgium’s amendment in paragraph 151 of the Operational Directives, and with no comments or objections, it was duly adopted. He then moved to paragraph 152.
6. Regarding the ICH-10 form, the delegation of **Belgium** explained that there were some sections in the form that didn’t allow for elaboration on specific issues, namely, in section B, the measures taken to implement the Convention: B.1.a, the competent bodies for safeguarding; B.1.b, institutions for training; and B.1.c, documentation institutions. It was noted that these three sections had been limited in the current version to 250 words, and the delegation wished to have more space to help elaborate on the issues.
7. The **Chairperson** concurred that it was a good suggestion, but first turned to the adoption of paragraph 152, which was duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 153 with the amendment by Belgium, and with no objections, it was duly adopted. He then turned to paragraphs 154, 155, 157, 160 and 161, which were duly adopted. Then paragraph 162, with the proposal by Belgium.
8. The delegation of **Afghanistan** sought clarification in the paragraph where it was cited ‘roles and responsibilities of gender’, adding that the role of gender was understandable but the responsibilities of gender in practice did not seem clear.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** concurred thatit was not clear and thus proposed to delete ‘responsibilities of gender’.
10. The **Chairperson** then returned to amended paragraph162, which was duly adopted. Then paragraphs 166, 167 and 168, which were duly adopted.
11. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 13.a adopted**.

## ITEM 13.c OF THE AGENDA:

**REFLECTION ON THE REFERRAL OPTION FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY**

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/13.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-13.c-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 13.c*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 13.c, giving the floor to the Secretary.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that in June 2012, the General Assembly invited the Committee to reflect on the experience gained in the implementation of the referral option that was introduced in 2010 only for the Representative List. At its seventh and eighth sessions in 2012 and 2013, the Committee considered two options: keep the existing Operational Directives, requesting that the Subsidiary Body continue to make a coherent and limited use of the referral option, or delete the referral option and paragraph 37 of the Operational Directives, i.e. remove the 4-year waiting period following a decision not to inscribe. Thus, either an element was inscribed or the submitting State could return with a revised nomination already in the subsequent cycle if the element was not inscribed. During discussions at its eighth session, several Members of the Committee were in favour of maintaining the referral option, while emphasizing that one of the objectives of the referral was to avoid disappointment among the communities, and that a ‘no’ was more severe than a referral. The referral option was therefore considered as a simpler way to reject a nomination when based on a lack of technical detail or essential information. Many Members stressed however that Decision 7.COM 11, recalling the instruction to use the referral option only when there was a lack of technical details, had not defined ‘technical details’, which led to different interpretations within the Subsidiary Body and the Committee. The Committee finally decided not to recommend amendments to the Operational Directives at that time and to continue its reflection. It was noted that this was the fourth year that the referral option was in place. Document 13.c included a table that summarized the trends of the Subsidiary Body in its choice between the three options, namely, inscription, non-inscription and referral. The Secretary remarked that the Rapporteur of the Subsidiary Body in its 2014 report, made earlier in the week, had pointed out that when the submitting State had correctly demonstrated that a criterion had been met, it was easy for Members to unanimously confer a ‘yes’. Conversely, when all the Members had agreed that they could not confer a ‘yes’, long debates were needed to decide whether the nomination should be referred due to a lack of technical detail, or conferred a ‘no’ due to a lack of crucial information that prevented the Body from determining that the criterion could be satisfied. The fact that a recommendation ‘not to inscribe’ was clearly a huge disappointment to the State and the communities concerned, the Subsidiary Body concluded that the referral option might be the only alternative to an inscription of an element, without engaging the Committee to a later inscription. It was considered that the most important thing was to explain the reasons behind non-inscription at that stage, whether for technical or more fundamental reasons. The Subsidiary Body also pointed out that the period of four years, in case of non-inscription, would thus be unnecessary and recommended its removal. The draft decision reflected the Body’s suggestion to only keep two options: the inscription of an element on the Representative List, or the referral of the nomination to the submitting State, while eliminating the 4-year period. It thus requested the Secretariat to propose an amendment text that reflected the Committee’s decision in this regard, based on the discussions that would ensue in the present debate. Moreover, it seemed appropriate to the Subsidiary Body (now the new Evaluation Body) that all the mechanisms should be subject to the same number of options, whatever the decision of the Committee.
3. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
4. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** believed that the process of examining nominations rather than evaluating cultural heritage *per se* and the results of a technical examination showed the various levels of maturity of submitted nominations for inscription on the Representative List. The delegation surmised that the Subsidiary Body could find that a nomination required at least four more years to be improved upon to meet the criteria for inscription, or it might deem from the outset that the nomination was incompatible with the Convention’s purpose. The delegation believed that in such cases, the ‘not to inscribe’ option had value and thus should remain in the system. Nevertheless, the Committee should pay special attention to the side effects that a ‘not to inscribe’ decision brought to the bearer communities, as this could give the communities a wrong impression that their cultural heritage was not worth inscribing, even though the decision was a result of the technical examination of the submitted files, not the heritage *per se*. However, the delegation also believed that eliminating the ‘not-to-inscribe’ option was an excessive measure, adding that instead the Committee should minimize the side effects of this option. For this, it was necessary to introduce a new wording to replace ‘not to inscribe’. It was noted that some Members had suggested that the withdrawal of nominations that received a recommendation ‘not-to-inscribe’ could undermine the value of such decisions. However, it maintained that the draft decision served as a good signal for submitting States in their work to resubmit their nomination in the future. Considering all these aspects, the delegation felt, as in the World Heritage context, that it could be worth rephrasing the option ‘not to inscribe’, as well as considering ‘referral for better preparation of the file’.
5. The delegation of **Namibia** remarked that the referral option was challenging in many ways in that it was only applied to the Representative List in cases where the level of technical detail had been identified. However, the definition of ‘lack of technical detail’ was not clearly defined, as indicated in paragraph 4. Furthermore, when the referral option was introduced during the 2011–2012 cycle, it was an addition to two clear-cut concepts, namely, ‘to inscribe’ or ‘not to inscribe’. There was a view that the referral option was a softer ‘no’. The delegation added that States Parties submitted their nominations with the hope of inscription, and a soft ‘no’ was not at all consoling. In fact, in the way it was applied, the referral option had the same effect as a non-inscription. In addition, there was the 4-year waiting period during which time a file that was recommended ‘not to inscribe’ could not be resubmitted. Nevertheless, the delegation supported the draft decision.
6. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** understood from the draft decision that it proposed that the Committee could no longer decide that an element could not be inscribed, and it questioned whether that was a reasonable decision. The delegation wished to know whether the draft decision implied that a State Party could continue referring its nomination indefinitely in the case of a referral. It was clear that there were instances when the element could not be inscribed, i.e. if there were issues of human rights, or if the element was not intangible heritage. It thus suggested enlarging the notion of referral, adding that a nomination could be referred when it could not be inscribed immediately because of missing information, whether substantial or technical, and that it could come back in a year. It agreed with the abolition of the 4-year period, while the referral option would be enlarged to all nomination files that could not be inscribed immediately for one reason or another. In this way, the ‘no’ would be retained in a very reduced scope and applied only when the element cannot be inscribed, adding that a referral in this case was not fair to the State Party or the communities. The State should thus refrain from submitting these kinds of elements.
7. The delegation of **India** tended to support the recommendations by the Subsidiary Body when evaluating files. It had noted that the Subsidiary Body found it more difficult to choose between ‘no’ and the referral option, adding that more time was spent on deciding between a ‘no’ and a referral than between a ‘yes’ and ‘no’. It also noted the importance of the Body’s recommendations to the State Party on the missing information, technical or substantive, which helped the submitting State rework its nomination or decide not to submit its nomination. The delegation strongly felt that the 4-year period for resubmission was unnecessary and should be avoided. It thus agreed with the draft decision, adding that it could go along with a proposal in the nomenclature, which was not a big issue.
8. The delegation of **Egypt** fully agreed with Saint Lucia and India that the 4-year waiting period should be discontinued, or the Committee should find an acceptable alternative solution. For example, it could ask the submitting State to provide missing information and in this way it could choose the option of postponing for one year.
9. The delegation of **Brazil** believed that there was a large consensus that the Committee should get rid of the 4-year rule, especially as States Parties could withdraw their nominations before they reached the Committee, so it was never fully applied. Considering the proposal to simplify the decision to two options: inscription or referral, the delegation tended to agree with Saint Lucia that it was good to have three options, and be able to confer a ‘no’. The delegation felt that if the Evaluation Body had problems deciding whether the nomination was a referral or a ‘no’, it should expect the Committee to make the final decision to confirm the decision either way. Thus, it was good to have the three options, with the Evaluation Body tasked to make comments on the criteria, which was the most important thing, as these helped the Committee decide whether the nomination was a resounding ‘no’ or a referral. The delegation reiterated that it had doubts on whether it would be helpful to get rid of the ‘no’, as otherwise these nominations would continue to be resubmitted.
10. The Chairperson opened the floor to **Norway** as anobserver.
11. The delegation of **Norway** conveyed that it had followed the day’s debate with great interest and believed that the matter at hand was of much broader significance than merely the question of referral or non-inscription. Referring to the discussions that had taken place during the present session, the delegation believed that a wider reflection was needed on the principles relating to the Committee’s treatment of the files and, not least, the common understanding of the Convention. These principles should be kept in mind and adhered to in a consistent manner, which was necessary for the credibility of the Convention and for the very safeguarding of intangible heritage. Thus it was indeed a time for reflection, and it hoped to have the opportunity to discuss this further at the next General Assembly.
12. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** wished to draw attention to the opinions of its members within its Electoral Group IV who did not agree with the draft decision and preferred to have three options. In addition, Kyrgyzstan, as Member of the Subsidiary Body, spoke of how difficult the evaluation process was and therefore felt that it was much better to have three options that included the referral.
13. As member of the Subsidiary Body this year, the delegation of **Latvia**, clarified that the work conducted was mainly based on the decision that was taken by the Committee at its seventh session, which stated that the referral option should only be adopted in cases concerning technical detail. Thus, the wording should be maintained, as the Evaluation Body working this year would take that decision into consideration. Referring to the point by Saint Lucia, and its own experience, the delegation believed that the referral option could be applied to much broader cases, i.e. not only with regard to technical details, as this was something that the Secretariat already dealt with, but also more substantively. Thus, it supported broadening the referral option, while considering that there might be cases, i.e. with regard to human rights, or when a nomination did not constitute intangible cultural heritage, that the Committee could be in a position to also adopt a negative decision.
14. As a member of the Subsidiary Body, the delegation of **Greece** also reflected on the treatment of the files, adding that the present discussion was very fruitful and a step forward on this issue. The delegation remarked that over the last two or three years, the Committee was concerned about the definition of a referral, whereas today it was more concerned about the definition of a ‘no’ and its meaning, which it felt was a better starting point for reflection. The delegation referred to the remarks by Saint Lucia on the case for a ‘no’, which was also somehow mentioned in the draft decision, i.e. that a ‘no’ should be applied in cases where the element proposed did not constitute intangible cultural heritage, or when it violated basic human rights. The delegation felt that this scenario was a better place to reflect and redefine the cases where the referral and ‘no’ was applied. It was therefore happy that the discussion took this direction, which was more fruitful than previous discussions on the referral option.
15. Noting the general consensus, the **Secretary** summarized that the Committee wished to see the removal of the 4-year waiting period, to maintain the ‘no’ option, and to enlarge the application of the referral, on the understanding that the Committee had the freedom to move from one category to another. The Secretary also noted that there was an agreement, including among members of the Subsidiary Body who had initially proposed to only keep the referral, to accept that a ‘no’ could be applied in some cases, albeit exceptionally. The Secretary therefore suggested proposing amendments to the draft decision that reflected the consensus.
16. The **Chairperson** proposed to review the amendments proposed by the Secretary later in the day, and thus moved to agenda item 14.
17. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** believed that Latvia’s comments should be taken into consideration in that the scope and nature of the referral should be considered thoroughly.

## ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA:

**ACCREDITATION AND EVALUATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/14*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-14-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 14*

1. Thanking Kyrgyzstan for its comment, the **Chairperson** moved to agenda item 14, inviting Mr Proschan to provide information on this item.
2. **Mr Proschan** recalled that Article 9 of the Convention provided that the Committee shall propose to the General Assembly the accreditation of Non-Governmental Organizations to act in an advisory capacity to the Committee. To date 178 such organizations have been accredited. At the present time, the Secretariat had 31 active requests for accreditation that were submitted either in 2014 or unfinished from 2013. Due to the limited capacity of the Secretariat, it was unable to treat those requests in a timely manner. It therefore proposed to present those requests together with those received next year to the Committee in 2015. The Secretariat wished to reassure NGOs and the Committee that this delay would in no way affect the actual accreditation process, as the NGOs must be accredited by the General Assembly that would meet in June of 2016. The Committee could perhaps adopt, as a regular practice, to examine accreditations only in odd-numbered years, immediately preceding the meetings of the General Assembly in even-numbered years, thereby reducing the duration and the agenda of Committee meetings, as welcomed in Decision 8.COM 5.c.2. The draft decision suggested that the Committee might wish to invite the Secretariat to prepare a revision to the Operational Directives to reflect those changes. The second issue within this item concerned the review of the first 97 NGOs accredited in 2010, which was the subject of resolution 3.GA 7. Paragraph 94 of the Operational Directives foresaw that every four years, the Committee reviewed the contribution of the advisory organizations and its relations with it, taking into account the perspective of the NGO concerned. Mr Proschan recalled that in conformity with Decision 7.COM 16.b, the Secretariat had prepared a draft review form, which had been presented to the Committee at its eighth session. That form was subsequently amended by the Secretariat to take into consideration the Committee’s debates during its eighth session and was accordingly sent to the 97 NGOs that were subject to the first round of renewal on 22 October 2014. The NGOs were required to return the request for the reports to the Secretariat by 15 January 2015. The Secretariat would therefore analyse those reports and submit recommendations to the Committee in 2015 with regard to maintaining or terminating the relations with that first set of 97 NGOs. The draft decision therefore asked the Committee to take note of the present circumstances and, if it so wished, to move towards regularizing the examination of the accreditation only in odd-numbered years. It also asked to take note of the procedure and schedule for the review of the first 97 NGOs.
3. The delegation of **Namibia** remarked that it was aware that non-governmental partners were very important stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention, although in some cases, NGOs had different approaches to the government in conducting their business. However, it was clear, especially in Namibia, that all were on the same page when it came to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. With that in mind, it congratulated the NGOs that were accredited during the fifth session of the General Assembly this year. However, in light of the decision taken earlier on the presentation of NGOs for the Evaluation Body, the delegation was of the view that more needed to be done to ensure that NGOs partners in the under-represented regions also gained the necessary skills and competences to be accredited. This plea went to both the Secretariat and the Member States. One way of doing this could be through the creation of peer-to-peer platforms for sharing information and experiences. The delegation supported the proposal by the Secretariat for the Committee to examine NGO accreditation only in odd-numbered sessions, but it was sceptical of the impact it would have on the work of the Secretariat, as this would not necessarily reduce the number of requests submitted for examination.
4. With no further comments, and with no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision 9.COM 14 adopted.** The Chairperson gave the floor to the representative of the NGOs.
5. On behalf of the NGO Forum, the **Representative** looked forward to the first round of evaluations of the 97 NGOs accredited in 2010. However, the NGO Forum regretted the deferral of new accreditations, reiterating that accreditation strengthened the capacity of NGOs to contribute to the implementation of the Convention in the world. The NGO Forum was likened to a broom in that the more brushes it contained, the more effective it would be. The addition of new NGOs would therefore help achieve the objectives common to all, as was recalled in the debates of agenda item 11 [Establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2015 cycle]. Furthermore, the NGO Forum had discussed and shared experiences on the evaluation process of NGOs and felt that an interesting option could be the organization of capacity-building training session on the accreditation process, which could be organized at the regional scale. Finally, given the international reach of the NGO Forum, it hoped that consideration be given to NGOs that worked in conflict zones and other difficult regions. This perspective would amplify the work of NGOs because ‘one hand can certainly make noise but one hand cannot clap’.

## ITEM 13.c OF THE AGENDA (Cont.):

REFLECTION ON THE REFERRAL OPTION FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Representative for his comments, and returned to the unfinished agenda item 13.c, giving the floor to the Secretary.
2. The **Secretary** presented the proposed amendment in paragraph 6, which read: ‘Decides that the referral option should be extended to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding’. In this way, all the mechanisms would be treated equally. Paragraph 7 would remain unchanged, as the Committee agreed that the amendment should include the deletion of paragraph 37, and the elimination of the 4-year waiting period. Paragraph 8, would read: ‘Requests the Secretariat to propose a draft text of amendments to the Operational Directives accordingly concerning the points in the present decision and reflecting its debates during the present session, for examination by the Committee at its tenth session.’ Thus, the draft decision would maintain the instruction to the Evaluation Body in paragraph 9, which would read: ‘Considers that the referral option should be used in the case of information lacking in a nomination, whether it be of a technical or substantial nature’, which enlarged the notion of referral while maintaining the existing ‘no’. The Operational Directives reflecting these changes would be proposed at the Committee’s tenth session.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections in paragraphs 1–5, they were duly adopted. Paragraph 6, with the amendment by the Secretariat, was duly adopted. Paragraphs 7–10 were also pronounced adopted. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 13.c adopted.**
4. The **Secretary** made a couple of announcements on the meetings of the NGO working group and the information session on capacity-building for Electoral Groups I and II.
5. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session.

*[Friday, 28 November, afternoon session]*

## ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA:

ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 18, explaining that the Secretariat had compiled the decisions adopted during the session, paper copies of which were available to the Committee Members. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that it would now adopt the decisions so that the Secretariat could incorporate them into the Committee’s report. The Chairperson proposed a short break so that Members could check the decisions in case there were any technical errors.

*[30-minute pause]*

1. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for any observations on the decisions. Noting that there were no comments, the **Chairperson declared the decisions approved**, adding that the final linguistic versions would be published online by the Secretariat in the next two weeks.

## ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA:

DATE AND VENUE OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/15*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-15-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 15*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 15 and the date and venue of the tenth session of the Committee. It was noted that the Secretariat had received a proposal from Namibia to host the Committee session in Namibia in 2015.
2. The delegation of **Namibia** remarked that it was indeed a happy moment for the people of Namibia and the delegation, and it was humbled and honoured by the confidence bestowed upon the country to host the tenth session of the Committee in 2015. At its independence in March 1990, Namibia, as a young nation, recommitted itself to support UNESCO programmes in many aspects, including the implementation of the 2003 Convention, so as to ensure that cultural heritage, both intangible and tangible, were safeguarded and passed on to future generations through appropriate mechanisms. Although Namibia is rich in intangible cultural heritage, it was still facing the challenge of documenting and compiling its inventory. Hosting of the Committee would enlighten and broaden the country’s understanding of the programmes and activities of this important Convention. It was noted that the country was large in size (824,000 km2) but small in terms of population (2.2 million). This was exactly why it was looking forward to welcoming everyone to the tenth session of the Committee, adding that 2015 was a special year for Namibia, as it would celebrate its nation’s silver anniversary. Delegates would thus encounter a vibrant, colourful and diverse nation on the move. On behalf of the government and the people of Namibia, the delegation thanked the Committee for entrusting it to host its tenth session.

*[Video projection of Namibia]*

1. The **Chairperson** assumed that the Committee would accept Namibia’s generous offer by acclamation. The Chairperson proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. He took the opportunity to thank Namibia once again for its generous decision. However, before adopting the decision, the Chairperson asked the Secretary to provide some information on the dates of the next meeting.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that in 2015 the General Conference of UNESCO would be held from 3–18 November. Thus, to allow time between the end of the General Conference and the start of the Committee session, and in consultation with the Director-General and the Namibian authorities, the Secretariat proposed to hold the tenth Committee session from 30 November to 4 December 2015. The Secretary further informed the Committee that the parallel meetings of the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Second Protocol were scheduled from 7–11 December, and the Committee meeting of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions from 14–16 December. In addition, the Climate Change Conference (COP21) would be held in Paris from 30 November to  11 December. The Secretariat inserted the proposed dates in the draft decision.
3. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 15 adopted.**

## ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA:

ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

**Document** [*ITH/14/9.COM/16*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-14-9.COM-16-EN.doc)

**Decision** *9.COM 16*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the next item on the agenda and the election of the members of the Bureau, inviting the Secretary to provide some information.
2. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that in accordance with Rule 12 and Rule 13 of its Rules of Procedure, the Committee shall elect its Bureau comprising the Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairs and a Rapporteur. The Bureau shall remain in office until the end of the next ordinary session of the Committee. Following Rule 13.4, the Committee shall take due account of the need to ensure equitable geographical representation and, as far as possible, a balance between the various domains of intangible cultural heritage.
3. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to propose a Chairperson, noting the tradition would extend the invitation to Namibia by acclamation.
4. The delegation of **Nigeria** proposed Namibia, adding that it was an honour to propose Ms Trudie Amulungu as the Chairperson of the tenth session.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Nigeria for its proposal, adding that the Committee wasdelighted to welcome Ms Trudie Amulungu as Chairperson of the next Committee session. He then asked the Committee for nominations for the role of Rapporteur.
6. The **Secretary** remarked that nobody ever wished to become the Rapporteur. She therefore reassured the Electoral Groups that an Electoral Group could choose a Vice-Chair who could also assume the role of Rapporteur, as was the case of Latvia this year. The Rapporteur was responsible for checking the decisions taken every day and ensuring that the Secretariat had correctly transcribed these decisions as adopted by the Committee.
7. The **Chairperson** wished to first ask the Committee to propose the Vice-Chairs.
8. The delegation of **Afghanistan** proposed India to the position of Vice-Chair.
9. The delegation of **Turkey** congratulated Namibia as host of the next Committee session, adding that it nominated Belgium as Vice-Chair of Group I.
10. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** congratulated Namibia for chairing the Committee’s tenth session and proposed Nigeria as Vice-Chair for Group V(a).
11. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary for some remarks.
12. The **Secretary** recalled that the Rules of Procedure stipulated that the Bureau should be composed in a geographically equitable manner. This implied that one Group could not have two seats, as Group V(a) already had the Chairperson’s seat.
13. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked Namibia, a young country that had generously agreed to host the next session. In the name of Electoral Group V(b), the delegation proposed Tunisia as Vice-Chair.
14. On behalf of Group III, the delegation of **Saint Lucia** proposed Brazil as Vice-Chair.
15. The delegation of **Latvia** congratulated the newly elected Chairperson and Namibia for hosting the next Committee session. It proposed Hungary from Electoral Group II as Vice-Chair.
16. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members to suggest a Rapporteur among its proposed Vice-Chairs, as had been the case for Latvia.
17. The **Secretary** wondered whether Latvia wished to explain the role of Rapporteur from its own experience. She made clear that the Rapporteur was not responsible for writing the draft decisions, which was the task of the Secretariat. The question therefore was whether one of the Vice-Chairs or one of the Electoral Groups wished to accept the role of Rapporteur. The Secretary explained that a Vice-Chair could also take on the role of Rapporteur, as had been the case for Latvia, which meant that one Electoral Group would represent two seats. Alternatively, another delegation could volunteer for the role so as to remain within a geographically equitable system.
18. The delegation of **Egypt** volunteered to serve as Rapporteur.
19. Thanking Egypt, the **Chairperson** noted that there was a consensus and proposed to elect the candidates by acclamation. The Chairperson took note of the Vice-Chairpersons: India, Belgium, Tunisia and Brazil with Egypt serving as Rapporteur. With no objections to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 9.COM 16 adopted**.

## ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA:

OTHER BUSINESS

1. The **Chairperson** presented the next item on other business, opening the floor.However, with no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson moved to the closure of the session.

## ITEM 19 OF THE AGENDA:

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture for his closing remarks.
2. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr Alfredo Pérez de Armiñán, reminded the Committee that it was his first time attending some of the sessions of the Committee as Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO. He was impressed by the commitment shown by the Members of the Committee, the States Parties, the participating NGOs, and all the participants. He took the opportunity to congratulate the Chairperson, Don Manuel Rodríguez Cuadros, for his fine and very prudent leadership in guiding the Committee’s debates. He also congratulated the Namibian Ambassador for her appointment as Chairperson of the next session, and the Egyptian delegate for his election as Rapporteur. The issues discussed by the Committee made it clear, again and again, that intangible heritage was one of the most cherished expressions of humanity. The Assistant Director-General for Culture remarked that we all shared some expression of intangible cultural heritage, as defined by the Convention, and everyone present played a role in making sure that such heritage was kept alive and enjoyed by communities and passed on to future generations. He renewed his firm conviction that more efforts should be concentrated on enhancing national capacities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, cautioning the States Parties on the danger of feverishly listing intangible heritage. Inscriptions on the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List were of course an important part of the international mechanism of the Convention; however, there was a risk that success in implementing the Convention would be defined by the number of elements inscribed. He insisted that success in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage had little to do with elements inscribed on the two Lists. Our shared responsibility was to make sure that each State Party, whether developing country or not, was endowed with an adequate institutional set-up and expertise for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Greater attention should therefore be paid to enhancing national capacities for establishing or revising policies and legislations in favour of intangible heritage, encouraging communities to identify, document and inventory their intangible cultural heritage as well as to undertake specific safeguarding activities. In this sense, the lists that mattered under the Convention were the inventories. A good inventory was one that was elaborated with the widest possible participation of communities and gave an informative overview in terms of the definition of the element and the communities concerned, and that had an efficient mechanism in place to update it on a regular basis.
3. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** further remarked that the Operational Directives clearly indicated that inventories could take a diverse form according to the situation specific to each State Party, but each State Party had the obligation to elaborate one or more inventories so as to build a solid foundation for long-term safeguarding. He also stressed the complementarity of the 2003 Convention with other normative instruments of UNESCO. Each Convention of UNESCO in the field of culture of course had its own scope and specificities. However, culture and cultural heritage were indivisible with numerous links between built heritage, natural heritage, intangible heritage, movable cultural heritage and expressions of creativity. The ADG understood that there was still a long way to go to ensure a holistic approach to safeguarding and conserving the diverse forms of heritage and creativity. As Assistant Director-General for Culture, he would spare no effort in encouraging more cooperation between the 2003 Convention, the 1972 Convention, and the 2005 Convention along with UNESCO’s other conventions in the field of culture. In this regard, the 70th anniversary of UNESCO in 2015 would be a good occasion to deepen reflection on the larger implications of the 2003 Convention in the context of development and its links with other conventions. In particular, UNESCO was planning to organize a meeting of the chairpersons of the different cultural conventions to exchange valuable experiences and views. Needless to say, contributions from States Parties, permanent delegations, individual experts, NGOs and other stakeholders would be solicited as the intellectual development of the 2003 Convention and the other cultural conventions depended largely on the combined efforts to grasp different aspects of safeguarding. The Assistant Director-General for Culture concluded by thanking the delegates once again for their participation and cooperation, adding that he looked forward to seeing everyone next year in Namibia.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for Culture for his words and for sharing his enthusiasm for the work of the Committee. The Chairperson concurred with his remarks, adding that the Committee should not lose sight of the fact that every decision by the Committee encompassed communities, groups and individuals for whom the viability and continuity of intangible cultural heritage was of paramount importance. The Chairperson opened the floor for final comments from Members of the Committee or observers.
5. The delegation of **Brazil** wished to thank the interpreters, the Secretariat, and especially the Chairperson for his excellent conduct of the Committee’s business. It was honoured to have GRULAC (Latin American and Caribbean Group) chairing this excellent meeting.
6. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** strongly agreed with the remarks by Brazil, congratulating the Chairperson for the way he conducted the work, as well as the Secretariat for the quality of the services offered. It was very pleased to be working with the current team and was proud that Africa would be hosting the next Committee meeting, congratulating Namibia.
7. The delegation of **Egypt** remarked that it was one of the oldest Members on the Committee but each session brought new experiences and lessons with added progress and professionalism. The delegation commended the Secretariat for its excellent work, especially the Secretary, for which she deserved a round of applause. [Applause.] The delegation was grateful for her excellent leadership whose smile always facilitated the procedure, despite the heavy workload. It congratulated Namibia for hosting the next meeting and hoped that the delegates would have the opportunity to see the country, and not just the conference centre and the hotel, particularly as the video had beautifully depicted Namibia’s varied nature and culture.
8. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to thank the Committee and the Chairperson for the skill, flair and wisdom of his chairmanship. It also thanked the Secretariat for the quality of preparations, as was common for all the other sessions, as well as all the Members of the Committee for the quality of their work. The delegation congratulated Namibia for hosting the tenth session of the Committee.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** remarked that words of thanks might seem a little ritualized, but for the delegations that had spoken it was not the case. The delegation offered its genuine thanks to the Chairperson for the consistent but flexible way he conducted the proceedings, remaining steady at the helm while remarkably supported by the Secretariat whose dedication was boundless, especially the Secretary, despite the increasingly difficult circumstances. The delegation thanked the Committee and all the Vice-Chairs for the joy of spending this year together, as well as pleasure and honour to continue the adventure in Namibia. The delegation thanked all the delegations for their participation in the debates, which were occasionally heated but characterized by great mutual consideration and the desire to continue working together. Finally, it thanked the interpreters, electricians and others who worked behind the scenes.
10. The delegation of **India** joined the speakers in congratulating the Chairperson on his excellent leadership throughout the meeting. It also congratulated Namibia for hosting the next meeting and for its chairmanship. Particular gratitude was expressed to the Secretary and her team for organizing the meeting in such a smooth manner.
11. The delegation of **Zambia** congratulated the Chairperson on the effective manner in which he conducted the meeting. It also wished to thank the Secretariat for a job well done that was conducted in a professional manner. The delegation congratulated Namibia for hosting the next Committee session, adding that it offered its support as a neighbour. It also congratulated the newly elected members of the Bureau. As an observer, the delegation spoke of how it had learned a lot from the deliberations and the decisions, assuring the Committee that it would return home to share the knowledge with fellow members of the national ICH committee, which would make its work a little easier.
12. The delegation of **Afghanistan** remarked that it had forgotten its formalities in omitting to thank Namibia for the role it would play in the implementation of the Convention. The delegation spoke of the Chairperson’s conduct as an example of good organization, noting the very balanced and consistent way of collaboration among the Committee Members. It was also grateful for the opportunity to experience first hand the work of the Secretariat, headed by the Secretary, as well as the members of the Consultative Body and Subsidiary Body. The delegation was now familiar with how decisions were taken, which would offer encouragement in its own bid to inscribe an element in 2015. It spoke of its experience of having truly witnessed the workings of UNESCO, adding that its five days spent there was truly dedicated to one of the main missions of UNESCO, and it was delighted to have been involved. Finally, the delegation thanked the Secretary, Mr Proschan and the Secretariat for the time spent together and for the presence of the Assistant Director-General for Culture.
13. The delegation of **Czech Republic** joined its voice in praising the Chairperson for leading this meeting in an efficient manner. It thanked the Secretariat for the perfectly prepared meeting and congratulated the Committee on its wise decisions, as well as those countries whose elements were inscribed on the Lists. The delegation was very happy to witness the amazing improvement made by States Parties in their nominations, noting that there were several examples of elements that were successfully inscribed after a referral in previous cycles. It considered this to be a great success enabled by the wise use of the referral option, which gave States Parties the opportunity to improve their files so they could represent the Convention with dignity and serve as examples of good practice. The delegation wished Namibia success in the organization of next year’s session, as well as all countries working on intangible cultural heritage in their respective countries.
14. The delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that the session had enabled it to raise several issues about the Convention and the challenges for intangible cultural heritage. It spoke of how the work had been led with wisdom that allowed the Committee to reach a consensus in a very clear-cut manner. It therefore wished to thank the Chairperson, as well as the Secretariat for its ceaseless efforts. Finally, it thanked the interpreters and Namibia for hosting the next session.
15. The delegation of **Latvia** sincerely appreciated the role of extensive debate at the international level experienced during its years within the Committee. It also wished to highlight the significance of the local and national levels in the implementation of the Convention, adding that it believed that these were worth exploring and strengthening. The delegation expressed its appreciation for the continuous debate on the involvement of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention worldwide. It thanked the Chairperson for his commitment in leading the debates and the Committee Members for the exchange of opinions and for reaching common decisions. Finally, it assured the Committee that its duties as a Rapporteur as well as the Vice-Chair of the present session reaffirmed its deep appreciation of all the work carried out by the Secretariat under the thoughtful guidance of the Secretary. This served to reaffirm its commitment to the work of the Committee, and it looked forward to the debates and decisions to be taken during the next session in Namibia.
16. The delegation of **Congo** thanked and congratulated the Chairperson for the excellent conduct of his work. It also thanked the Secretary and the Secretariat for the good preparation and smooth running of the Committee’s work. It warmly congratulated Namibia for chairing and organizing the tenth session of the Committee on African soil. Finally, it thanked the members of the Committee, wishing everyone a good trip home, and it wished the Assistant Director-General a good start and every success in his new mission.
17. The delegation of **Hungary** joined the previous speakers in congratulating the Chairperson, the Secretary and the Secretariat for their effective and hard work. It thanked Namibia for hosting and chairing the next session.
18. The delegation of **Turkey** echoed the remarks of the previous speakers in congratulating the Chairperson on his excellent leadership and the smooth conduct of the meeting in conformity with the spirit of UNESCO’s mandate. It believed that the Committee’s deliberations had contributed to the effective implementation of the Convention, an important component of cooperation within UNESCO. It also thanked the Secretariat for the preparations, and congratulated all the Committee members for the smooth conduct of the meeting. Finally, it congratulated Namibia for hosting the next Committee meeting.
19. The delegation of **Republic of Korea** thanked the Chairperson for his excellent leadership, joining the other delegations in congratulating Namibia. It also commended the Secretariat for the smooth organization of this meeting, offering encouragement ahead of more hard work at the next session. The delegation added that it was more than ready to assist the Secretariat. Finally, it addressed special thanks to Egypt for taking its responsibility as Rapporteur seriously.
20. The delegation of **Uganda** joined the previous speakers to congratulate the Chairperson for the good work achieved with his entire team that led to a very successful meeting. It also congratulated the Secretariat, not only for organizing the meeting, but also for all the technical support they always offered to States Parties, without whom serious challenges would be raised as far as implementation of the Convention was concerned. It also wished to thank the advisory bodies for their work on the numerous files, without whom the Committee would have been unable to effectively discuss and come up with decisions. It congratulated all the Committee members for the wonderful debates, the exchanges, and for its support in the implementation of the Convention. The delegation congratulated Namibia for accepting to host the Committee’s tenth session, adding that it looked forward to going to Namibia to experience and enjoy its intangible cultural heritage. Finally, it congratulated the elected experts and the NGOs for the enormous challenge they face, which no doubt they would handle very well.
21. **Mr Frank Proschan** remarked that it was not normally the case that the Secretariat would offer its remarks at this time, but he took advantage of the fact that this would be the last time he would represent the Secretariat. Mr Proschan wished to add his own words of thanks and gratitude to the team who had worked on the Convention during his eight-year tenure. He explained that he had come to UNESCO in 2006 when the Convention had 32 States Parties, today there were 161, and there were no elements on any Lists, today there were several hundred. In that same time, the Secretariat had gone from 12 professional positions to 8, with the Secretary sharing the difficulties that this presented to those who were trying to cover the work of 18 people with a staff of eight. As stewards and masters of the Convention, Mr Proschan hoped that the States Parties would show one-tenth of the degree of commitment and responsibility that he had seen from colleagues day-to-day over the last eight years. He wished to add his voice of thanks to those he had worked beside, particularly, Ms Cécile Duvelle, and her predecessor Mr Rieks Smeets, under whose direct supervision he had worked.
22. The **Chairperson** thanked everyone for their kind words and he congratulated the Committee and all the delegates for the excellent results achieved during this session whose success was the result of their dedication in the spirit of cooperation. He thanked the Bureau members who had assisted him during this session and the 12 months that preceded it. He took the opportunity to thank the Secretary and all the members of her team for the excellent preparation of the session. Before concluding the meeting, he wished to thank the interpreters for their patience, as well as the room clerks and other technical staff for providing the very favourable working conditions. The Chairperson wished everyone a safe return before **officially declaring the ninth session of the Committee closed.**
1. . More information available [here](http://www.ichcap.org/eng/html/04_01_01.php?mode=view&code_confr=E0000082). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) comprises the governments of seven original members: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. . Commemoration feast of the finding of the True Holy Cross of Christ] [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. . There are 162 States Parties to the Convention [as of 15 May 2015]. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. . 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its two Protocols; 1970 Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property; 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage; 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage; and 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. . International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region under the auspices of UNESCO. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)