

International Expert Meeting
Intangible Cultural Heritage: Priority Domains
for an International Convention
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 22-24 January 2002

FINAL REPORT
INTERNATIONAL JURY FOR THE PROCLAMATION
BY UNESCO
OF MASTERPIECES OF THE ORAL AND INTANGIBLE
HERITAGE OF HUMANITY
EXTRAORDINARY MEETING
(ELCHE, 21-23 SEPTEMBER 2001)

International Jury for the Proclamation by UNESCO of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity

Extraordinary meeting

(Elche, 21-23 September 2001)

FINAL REPORT

I. Introduction

An extraordinary session of the International Jury for the proclamation by UNESCO of the Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity was held in Elche (Spain) on 21-23 September 2001.

The extraordinary meeting was jointly organized by UNESCO Intangible Heritage Section, the municipality of Elche and the Generalitat of Valencia. The municipality of Elche, together with the Generalitat of Valencia, hosted and financed the costs of the extraordinary meeting of Elche.

The purpose of this meeting, which followed the inaugural Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity (Paris, 15-18 May 2001) and the International Round Table on “Intangible Cultural Heritage-Working definitions” (Turin, 14-17 March 2001), was (i) to clarify the definition of intangible cultural heritage stipulated in the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore and used for the first Proclamation ; and to harmonize it with the one proposed by the Turin expert meeting ; (ii) to define detailed selection criteria in view of the Second Proclamation procedure ; (iii) to address recommendations for the files which were not retained in May 2001 for the first Proclamation ; (iv) to improve the procedures of the jury meetings.

Twelve members of the International Jury attended the meeting (see List of Participants).

On arrival, participants received background working documents : Table of Agenda Items ; Annotated Agenda ; Draft on the detailed criteria for the selection of candidatures ; Comments of Jury members concerning the detailed criteria the revised Guide for the submission of candidatures; Rules of procedure of the International Jury ; Appendix A : Introduction by the Director-General of UNESCO to the debates of the 161st session of the Executive Board ; Appendix B : Extract of the oral report of the chairman of the Program and External Relations Commission (PX) at the 161st session of the Executive Board : Appendix C : Regulations relating to the proclamation by UNESCO of masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity ; Appendix D : Draft Report on the 1st Regular Session of the International Jury for the Proclamation (Paris, 15-18 May 2001) ; Appendix E : Summaries of the NGOs evaluation reports on the 13 candidatures to be resubmitted in 2003 ; Appendix F : summaries of the 13 action plans to be resubmitted in 2003.

Information documents were also distributed : List of jury members and of participants, 1989 Recommendation on the safeguarding of traditional culture and folklore, Final Report of the international Round Table on Intangible Cultural Heritage (14-17 March 2001, Turin).

I. Opening Session

The meeting was opened by the Mayor of Elche, Mr Diego Macia Antón, who welcomed the participants and gave the floor to the Sub-Secretary for Education and Culture of the Generalitat de Valencia, Ms Carmina Nacher.

In her address, Ms Nacher expressed the feelings of pride and satisfaction of the city of Elche and the province of Valencia over the recognition by UNESCO of the Mystery of Elche, a unique liturgical drama celebrated in Elche without interruption since the 15th century. The outstanding artistic and spiritual value of the Mystery of Elche should also serve as a source of inspiration and intercultural exchange for all peoples in the world, she emphasised.

The floor was then given to Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Assistant Director-General for Culture, who, on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO, thanked both the Ayuntamiento de Elche and the Generalitat de Valencia for hosting the Jury meeting and for their generous financial assistance. He pointed out that the Mystery of Elche is a living example of the oral and intangible heritage which expresses in a remarkable way the conception of the world rooted in the mediaeval period. He also mentioned that this extraordinary Jury meeting was organized in order to fulfil the request of UNESCO's Executive board for further in-depth reflection on the conceptual aspects of the intangible cultural heritage with a view to harmonizing the definition used for the Proclamation with that to be used in the legal instrument itself.

The Mayor of Elche thanked all the participants for having made this gathering possible and stressed the importance of the Jury meeting with regard to the opportunity that was given to the Jury members to synthesize the experience accumulated since the first proclamation of masterpieces and to make a significant step forward in the conception and definition of the forthcoming legal instrument for the definition of this program.

Agenda Item I: Adoption of the Agenda

The president of the jury, Mr Goytisolo, greeted the participants and declared the meeting open.

Representatives of the Elche Patronato took part in the discussion and presented the purpose of the Action Plan being foreseen for the safeguarding and promotion of the Elche Mystery. They reminded the jury that the Elche Mystery Play had been proclaimed national monument in 1931 and that a National Board of Trustees has been founded in 1948. However, due to the increasing modernization of the town of Elche and the rapid changing of the rural and linguistic context in the Valencia region, they pointed out that new means of protection and safeguarding needed to be implemented.

Emphasis was laid on the role of the National Board of Trustees of the Mystery Play of Elche and on the Local Board of Management. It was reminded that these two bodies contributed to the creation of nine commissions overseeing the daily management of the Mystery Play. Representatives underlined that the proclamation should facilitate the coordination of the work engaged by these different responsible bodies

They mentioned the great fragility of the Elche Mystery Play and described the constraints with which the Mystery Play is confronted, e.g the increasing difficulty to maintain and replace the medieval machinery or to train young singers of high quality. They stressed that both a chapel master and a director of ceremony had been recently appointed, in order to enable tradition bearers to pass on the tradition to the younger generation. They enumerated the main lines of legal and administrative actions being contemplated by the Patronato, such as the collection of knowledge on the Play (database, archives of oral history deriving from interviews of singers and actors) and its dissemination among rural population, the opening of a music school and the creation of a council of experts.

Finally, representatives of the Patronato of Elche laid emphasis on the impact of the Proclamation of the Elche Mystery Play on the local community. The proclamation, they stated, triggered a considerable amount of interest among the local population for the preservation of its oral and intangible heritage, and therefore opened new perspectives of reflection and action. While preparing the candidature file, they could thus identify a certain number of crucial problems, and more particularly (i) the need to reinforce coordination among different entities involved in the preservation and promotion of the Mystery ; (ii) the necessity to take legal measures of protection ; (iii) the urgent task to study the impact of tourism on the Mystery Play.

Moreover, they mentioned that the Play was traditionally performed by the local population and that the proclamation would reinforce this tradition, as a testimony of a living cultural tradition. They also noticed that the proclamation raised a new interest for the Valencian language, which was quite vulnerable to the danger of disappearing in the last decades. Last, they noted that the proclamation would enable the Patronato to overcome the various challenges threatening the continuity of the Mystery Play.

Mr Bouchenaki expressed his warm regards to the Elche representatives. He recalled that the Convention on the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Paris, 1972), known as the World Heritage Convention, did not apply to the intangible heritage. He underlined that the new UNESCO resolution on the Masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity (November 1997) encouraged individuals, groups, institutions and organizations in order to make outstanding contributions to managing, preserving, protecting and promoting the oral and intangible heritage in question, in accordance with UNESCO's objectives. Similarly, he noted that this proclamation procedure seemed to succeed in raising awareness and pride among local population about their oral and intangible heritage. He added that one of the main objectives of the program was to find a good balance between the definition task, the promotion of the heritage and its conservation without alteration.

Ms Aikawa, Director of the Intangible Heritage Unit of UNESCO, welcomed the representatives of the Elche Patronato, thanked them for the thorough preparation of the Elche candidature file, and went on to explain each of the forthcoming agenda items, e.g the establishment of detailed selection criteria, the improvements in the evaluation and discussion procedure, the possible modifications to the rules of procedure, the adoption of the final report of the First session of the Extraordinary International Jury for the Proclamation (Paris, 15-17 may 2001) and of the Extraordinary Elche meeting (Elche, 21-23 september 2001).

Agenda Item 2 : Establishment of detailed selection criteria

Bearing in mind that the general criteria have been already approved by the Executive Board of UNESCO at its 155th session (155 EX/Decision 3.5.5), the International Jury, pursuant to paragraph 4 (b) of the Regulations governing the proclamation, sought to develop detailed criteria within the framework of the approved criteria.

1) Assessment of the new definition of the term “Intangible Cultural Heritage”, as developed by the Turin International Round Table.

In preamble to the discussion, the jury highlighted the need to debate over the notion of “oral and intangible heritage”, in order to harmonize its definition with the one that was introduced during the international expert meeting held in March 2001 in Turin (Italy), e.g : “peoples’ learned processes along with the knowledge, skills and creativity that inform and are developed by them, the products they create, and the resources, spaces and other aspects of social and natural context necessary to their sustainability; these processes provide living communities with a sense of continuity with previous generations and are important to cultural identity, as well as to the safeguarding of cultural diversity and creativity of humanity”.

This definition was submitted to the 161st session of the Executive Board and is due to be submitted to the 31st session of the General Conference. The reason why it was felt necessary to modify the old definition used in the 1989 Recommendation is to consider intangible cultural heritage as an ongoing process rather than an end-product.

The Jury members examined the new definition proposed in Turin for the Proclamation project. The outcome of the deliberation was the unanimous adoption of the proposed definition.

2) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to criterion 1

The jury debated over the general criterion 1, which refers to “its outstanding value as a masterpiece of the human creative genius”.

a) the notion of masterpiece

Jury members decided to elaborate a new definition of the key-word “masterpiece”. A tentative definition, based on the notion of the medieval European tradition of craftsmen’s guilds, was presented. It was agreed however that this problematic concept refers to the 19th century, western, elitist conception, and that its definition should be clarified and devoid of any underlying ideological or historical bias. Thus, participants insisted during the debates that the candidature files explain to whom and to what end the term applies, and why a specific community considers a masterpiece as such. Moreover, it was emphasized that this concept should be applicable to a majority of world cultures and reconciled with the concept of “living traditions”, e.g as a process including ongoing changes.

A new definition was drafted in french language : “ Partant du fait que toute culture peut être porteuse de chefs-d’œuvre et en dehors de toute référence historique et culturelle déterminée, le chef-d’œuvre - dans le domaine du patrimoine oral et immatériel de l’humanité - est conçu comme une manifestation culturelle originale, de valeur exceptionnelle, qui ne

saurait être mesurée à l'aune de quoi que ce soit d'extérieur et qui traduit la liberté d'expression et le génie créateur d'un peuple".

The jury adopted this draft as a new item 1 (a) applying to criterion 1.

b) The consistence with the ideals of UNESCO

Jury members discussed over the level of required convergence between the cultural masterpieces being considered and the ideals supported by UNESCO.

Participants supported the idea that masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage must be consistent with the ideals of UNESCO and, in particular, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Others mentioned the case of countries where traditions break the rules of human rights. Diversity, urged the participants, is respected only if it is respectful of human rights. It was thus stated that a candidature inducing the death of a human being or harmful to women, for example, is unacceptable. However, it was assumed that a cultural manifestation showing no evidence of women participation can be quite valuable or that an evolution is possible if some violent traditions are replaced by acts of symbolic nature.

Consequently, the jury adopted a draft mentioning that "All the spaces and forms of cultural expression qualifying for proclamation as "masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity" must be consistent with the ideals of UNESCO and, in particular, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948".

This draft was adopted as a new item 1 (b) applying to criterion 1.

c) Defining the domains covered by Oral and Intangible Heritage

Following the Executive Board's request to set out clear criteria and suggest priority domains to be covered by oral and intangible heritage, participants discussed over the possibility to single out priority domains.

(i) Giving out a specific range of domains to be covered

Some participants reminded the jury that the main goal of this Proclamation program was to promote cultural diversity. Therefore, they proposed to enlarge, rather than to limit, the scope of domains covered by oral and intangible heritage.

Others suggested to give out, every two years, a specific range of domains to be covered by the candidature files, noticing that it would enable the jury as well as the candidates to concentrate on some specific fields of interest.

A consensus emerged on a new text referring to the possibility for the Jury to identify certain fields of expression for specific consideration in each submission period, without any kind of exclusiveness.

This text mentions that "In the vast domain covered by the oral and intangible heritage of humanity (as defined in the Regulations relating to the Proclamation), the selection of masterpieces may include but not be limited to areas such as cultural events closely linked to languages, oral traditions, rituals, the performing arts and craft skills. To facilitate this process, the Jury may identify certain fields of expression for specific consideration in each submission period".

The jury adopted this draft as a new item 1 (c) applying to criterion 1.

(ii) Taking into account cultural expressions closely linked to languages

Participants found it necessary to determine to which extent files relating to languages could be considered within the framework of the proclamation project.

The international jury decided that languages, as such, could not be considered a masterpieces and, therefore, could not be eligible for the Proclamation. The jury supported the idea of selecting files on the basis of cultural manifestations or cultural expressions relating to languages, and not to languages themselves, which are innumerable. The protection of languages that are at risk of disappearing, it was suggested, should be done within a framework other than the “Proclamation of Masterpieces”.

The jury elaborated accordingly a new draft taking into account the possibility for cultural expressions closely linked to languages to be included in the scope of domains covered by the oral and intangible heritage of humanity. Also, in view of the problematic nature of candidature files relating to cultural manifestations in a very abstract and unspecific way, jury members suggested that a specific item, insisting on the necessity to define a clear defined corpus, be inserted in the draft.

Thus, a second draft was proposed. This draft mentions that “Languages, as such, will not be eligible for proclamation. For cultural expressions closely linked to languages to be considered for proclamation, the candidature has to demonstrate satisfaction of 3 requirements : 1) the proposed masterpiece is created as an oral expression (is originally oral before being transcribed) ; 2) the orality of the expression has been maintained to the present and continues to be a defining feature of the expression ; 3) The expression is presented as a clearly defined corpus of the orality concerned ; 4) the measures proposed in the action plan target the orality (oral and intangible dimensions) of the expression”.

This draft was also adopted as an item 1 (c) applying to criterion 1.

In order to give additional guidance to future candidates, a participant proposed to add the following text, after the item 1 (c) : “The presentation of the candidature of a corpus of oral texts (oral literature) should be accompanied by a video of its performers, performance and performance contexts so that its artistic attributes manifested in its performance practices, including e.g. modes of expression, vocal techniques, gestures, movement expression and musical accompaniment, if any can be clearly seen where these are essential components of its modes of communication”.

This draft was adopted as a guideline applying to criterion 1 c) but not as a criteria.

The president of the international Jury, Mr Goytisolo, took good notice of the strong position taken by the jury on languages. He laid emphasis on the significance that should be given to the development by UNESCO of activities and programs raising international awareness about the world’s languages in danger of disappearing. The safeguarding of our world linguistic heritage remains essential, he stated. It was finally recommended that UNESCO should strengthen the existing project entitled *The Red Book on endangered languages* by creating a mechanism through which UNESCO notifies the member States on the state of the endangered languages in their country and proposes its intellectual, technical and financial assistance for their safeguarding activities.

d) Debate over the outstanding value of a masterpiece

(i) Jury members continued to debate over the general criterion 1, which highlights the “outstanding value as a masterpiece of the human creative genius”(general criterion 1).

It was pointed out that candidature files should demonstrate the outstanding value of a masterpiece in relation to other expressions within the same culture, but also to expressions of nearby related cultures and universally.

Thus, a new text was drafted, mentioning that “In order to prove its outstanding value as a masterpiece of the human creative genius, each candidature file presenting cultural spaces or forms of cultural expression must set out clear and sound arguments on the following points : “outstanding value to the community concerned and for the maintenance of cultural diversity to be demonstrated in relation to a) other expressions within the same culture/cultural group, b) the expressions of nearby related cultures, and c) universally”.

This draft was adopted as a new item d (i) applying to criterion 1.

ii) Jury members emphasized the necessity to set out, when possible, a clear link between the cultural spaces or forms of cultural expressions and their inscription within the artistic and creative concerns of the communities being considered.

Thus, participants issued a draft mentioning that the masterpiece should be an “original creation of the people or communities who are the custodians of the know-how and be deeply rooted in the people or communities concerned”.

This draft was adopted as a new item d (ii) applying to criterion 1.

iii) Jury members laid emphasis on the required specificity of the projects being submitted. It was largely admitted during the debates that candidature files, particularly in the case of multinational candidatures, should focus one particular type of outstanding cultural space or form of cultural expression.

A draft, mentioning that the masterpiece should be “a specific creation linked to a particular cultural space or form of cultural expression and not simply to a vast field of creation, such as a general musical creation of an instrument that is widely used, folk songs or dances of one or more countries without specifying the variations that exist from one place to another, or a set of cultural manifestations of a language spoken by an extensive community which already has the means of safeguarding its existence”.

This draft was adopted as a new item d (iii) applying to criterion 1.

3) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to General criterion 2

The general criterion 2, which mentions “its roots in the cultural tradition or cultural history of the community concerned”, was adopted without any further specification.

4) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to criterion 3

The jury discussed general criterion 3, which refers to “Its role as a means of affirming the cultural identity of the people and cultural communities concerned, its importance as a source of inspiration and intercultural exchanges and as a means of bringing people and communities close together, and its contemporary cultural and social role in the community concerned”.

The jury acknowledged the fact that Intangible Heritage may go through a constant, perhaps spontaneous, transformation process. Thus, it was stressed that “living traditions” undergo a recreation process, which is itself governed by the aesthetic, normative and cognitive sensibilities of the communities.

While helping the protection of traditional cultures and the preservation of intangible culture, participants maintained their desire not to impose restrictions on this evolution. Thus, it was generally agreed that an appropriate balance between the “permanent evolution” and the “traditional reference” aspects of the Oral and Intangible Heritage be maintained.

A draft was proposed, mentioning that “The fact that cultures are generally in a state of constant transformation must be taken into account. The cultural space or form of cultural expression could reflect the contemporary cultural and social life of the concerned people”.

This draft was adopted as a new item a) applying to criterion 3.

5) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to criterion 4

The general criterion 4, which mentions “its excellence in the application of the skill and technical qualities displayed”, was adopted without any further specification.

6) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to criterion 5

The Jury discussed general criterion 5, which refers to “Its value as a unique testimony of a living cultural tradition”.

The jury examined the extent to which a creation can embody a particular significance in the life and identity of a community.

Thus, a new draft was proposed, mentioning that the masterpiece should be “an outstanding creation in relation to the other cultural events of the same kind in its own country or elsewhere”.

This draft was adopted as a new item a) applying to criterion 5.

7) Debate over the detailed criteria applying to criterion 6

The Jury discussed general criterion 6, which refers to “The risk of its disappearing due either to the lack of means for safeguarding and protecting it or to processes of rapid change, or to urbanization, or to acculturation”.

Jury members debated whether, faced to the danger of disappearance, all cultural manifestations were at risk or if it should be necessary to single out languages. It was thus argued that languages are particularly at risk, but that so are many ritual music languages, systems of knowledge, celebrations, etc. Participants discussed the equal risks of disappearance and distortion encountered by all cultural manifestations.

Taking these different aspects into account, a new draft was proposed, mentioning that “ The nomination of cultural expressions linked to languages in particular for Proclamation must satisfy criterion 6. The distortion process forms part of the disappearance process”.

This draft was adopted as a new item a) applying to criterion 6.

Agenda Item 3 : Discussion on the Structure of the Action Plan

The action plan was reformulated on the basis of paragraph 6 (b) of the Regulations.

Jury members underlined that a ten-year action plan was an unrealistic aim. Participants agreed on the necessity to make the action plans more specific and a greater part of the criteria for the selection. It was also stressed that this action plan should be carefully targeted and budgeted so that its implementation and outcomes can be monitored later on.

Finally, the proposal to have action plans elaborated “for a minimum of five years”, instead of ten years, was adopted.

Agenda item 4 : Participation of the communities and the creators-actors

Jury members addressed the issue of the candidature file preparation and of the action plan implementation. All participants underlined the utmost importance of the communities' participation.

(i) Concerning the preparation of the candidature files, Jury members suggested to insist on the « capacity » rather than the « competency » of the boards responsible for the implementation of the actions plans. This proposal was adopted.

(ii) Concerning the implementation of the action plan, Jury members suggested to underline the continuing compliance of the masterpieces being considered with the six general criteria. Participants mentioned that all cultures undergo an internal process of change and evolution and consequently, and that a balance needs to be maintained between “staying authentic” and “evolving in compliance with the modern society”.

Consequently, a new draft was proposed : “ The expression “remains unchanged in the future” (in paragraph 6 (b) of the Regulations) refers to the continuing compliance of the masterpieces with the six general criteria. This is to be done through the maintaining of the framework and conditions that enable the cultural space or form of cultural expression to develop its full potential. It does not imply any prohibition of spontaneous and natural evolution of the cultural space or form of cultural expression concerned”.

This proposal was adopted as a new item B-3 to the Participation of the communities and the creators-actors.

Agenda item 5 : Improvement in the evaluation procedure

Concrete proposals to improve submission files, evaluation and deliberation procedure were put forward.

(i) A new specific form for multinational candidatures

The jury discussed over the possibility to establish a form specific to multinational candidatures. Thus, participants first pointed out that this multinational feature was one of the main qualities of this UNESCO program and therefore should be more strengthened.

However, in light of the First Proclamation experience, participants underlined the great difficulties in processing multinational candidatures. They suggested therefore that the UNESCO Secretariat should ensure that, in the case of a multinational candidature, all countries involved actively support the preparation of the file.

It is necessary, they stressed, to understand the level of co-ordination being established. Thus, the jury recommended that a specific form for multinational candidatures be established.

(ii) A reassessment of the role of the NGOs

The jury examined the question of enlarging the list of NGOs to whom evaluations are entrusted. Two suggestions were made during the discussion : to establish a database of knowledgeable NGOs, as well as a public bidding procedure.

Jury members also pointed out two different requirements that needed to be more conciliated during the evaluation procedure : e.g., that candidature files should be prepared as much as possible by persons belonging to the community concerned but also, that many communities still needed external guidance and assistance.

It was underscored that giving a broader spectrum to the evaluating mechanism would be taken into account in the future as much as possible.

Finally, the jury expressed two wishes for the upcoming Second Proclamation : first, NGO evaluators shall keep in mind the existing general criteria when assessing the files ; and second, Jury members will have to be informed of the proposed choice of NGOs prior to the final selection of NGOs.

(iii) Improving discussion procedures during Jury meetings

Two main issues were addressed during this discussion.

First, the debates focused on the length of the video presentations during the examination of candidature files. It was suggested to reduce the length of the videos to 10 minutes maximum, instead of 15 minutes. This proposal was adopted. Particular emphasis was also laid upon the fact that the commercial-orientated overtone of the videos, which was often observed during the First Proclamation, should be avoided in the future.

It was specified that guidelines for the preparation of videos could be drafted and sent to the Jury members. If approved, they could then be handed out by the UNESCO Secretariat to Member States.

The second issue raised was the deliberation procedure, which follows the video presentations. It was decided that it was unnecessary to have the NGOs give an oral reading of all the different candidature files. Even though representatives or practitioners of the community concerned can be requested to come and answer to questions (cf. Regulations relating to the Proclamation of Masterpieces, article 4-c of the evaluation procedure), participants underlined that having someone from an NGO able to provide guidance and clarification remained fundamental.

Thus, the proposal to allow 15 minutes for both deliberation and questions to NGOs was approved.

(iv) Modifying the rules of procedure of the Jury

The discussion addressed the issue of voting procedures. It was decided that a majority of 2/3 would be from now on requested in the case of a vote concerning a candidature. Article 5- d of the rules of procedure was amended accordingly.

Agenda Item 6 : Recommendations for the revising of candidature files that were not retained

The International Jury examined the 13 candidatures that were not proclaimed as “Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity” in May 2001.

The purpose of this discussion was to bring out relevant and common principles able to explain the postponement during the First Proclamation of 13 candidatures and to provide countries with a detailed guidance as to how certain candidature files may need to be reformulated.

After a study of the 13 postponed candidatures, common denominators, such as the lack of emphasis on a specific cultural manifestation, the scarcity of information available, the

absence of a reliable action plan or of a detailed conservation scheme, the inability to put forward an effective agency responsible for the implementation of a safeguarding and promotion Plan, emerged and became apparent.

The Jury decided to make two kind of recommendations : a) resubmission subsequent to revisions ; b) submission of a new file.

The discussion on the postponed candidatures was based on the already-existing criteria set out in the implementation guide for the First Proclamation. However, it was enacted that for those candidates who are given the opportunity to resubmit their candidature files, they should improve their files in compliance with the new detailed criteria established during the Elche meeting. It was also pointed out by jury members that the invitation to submit a revised or a new file does not guarantee any future acceptance and rules out any preparatory assistance.

1) Resubmission with revision

(i) The candidature file presented by **Portugal** (“The Cultural Space of the Empires of the Holy Spirit of the Azores”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. Jury members acknowledged the exceptional ethical and social quality of the project but outlined some inadequacy in the file :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii). Thus, jury members asked for more evidence concerning the outstanding value of the cultural expression in relation to other expressions of nearby related cultures, and the specificity of the cultural expression. Participants asserted, among others, that there are many similar cultural expressions in the Iberian Peninsula, and that the candidature file has not addressed this question appropriately.
- b) the non compliance with criteria 6. Participants argued that the dangers of disappearance of the Cultural Space of the Empires of the Holy Spirit of the Azores mentioned in the file are not specified and that no direct threat seems to be envisaged.
- c) the video presentation : participants questioned the quality of the videotape, which was not able to cast light on the peculiar and outstanding aspects of the cultural expression presented.

Consequently, the jury recommended a resubmission of the file in compliance with criteria 1-d (i), 1-d (iii) and 6, and a revision of the video presentation.

(ii) The candidature file presented by **Colombia** (“Holy week in Popayan”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. Jury members considered this file to be similar to the one submitted by Portugal. Thus, they outlined some comparable inadequacy in the file:

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii). Jury members questioned the outstanding value of the cultural expression in relation to other expressions of nearby related cultures, and the specificity of the cultural expression. Thus, jury members underlined that other similar manifestations exist in Colombia as well as in Latin America.
- b) the action plan. Jury members asked for some clarifications regarding the measures being foreseen in order to guarantee a high level in the artistic production. The promotion of tourism, which is mentioned in the action plan in order to help the safeguarding of the Holy week, was put into question. Thus, participants argued that, concerning the

enhancement of the artistic quality of the Holy Week by tourism, an accurate justification needed to be provided to jury members.

Consequently, the Jury decided to recommend the resubmission of the file, requesting Colombia to reformulate the purpose and the core of its candidature file, taking into account criteria 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii).

(iii) The candidature file presented by **Latvia** (“Latvian Songs”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. The jury voiced three main interrogations concerning:

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii). The jury questioned the outstanding value of the cultural expression in relation to other expressions of nearby related cultures, and the specificity of the cultural expression. Jury members, stressing the importance of this candidature as an element of the cultural identity of the two Baltic countries, Latvia and Lithuania, mentioned that the candidature file presented by Latvia should be a multinational one. It was also mentioned that all parties should demonstrate their active involvement in the future implementation of an action plan.
- b) the scope of the file. The jury mentioned that the file needed to be improved by defining more precisely the type of cultural expression proposed. One possible suggestion stemming from the jury was to select a specific corpus from this large selection of songs that could reflect a phase in the history of languages.
- c) the video presentation. Jury members suggested that a new videotape, taking into account the above mentioned comments, be redone.

Consequently, the Jury recommended a resubmission of the file in compliance with criteria 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii), and a revision of the video presentation.

(iv) The candidature file presented by **Malawi** (“Nyau Cult”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. The jury voiced three main interrogations concerning :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (i). The jury put into question the outstanding value of the cultural expression in relation to other expressions of nearby related cultures. Thus, the jury mentioned that the cultural manifestation of Nyau is a common tradition shared by other countries, such as Zambia, and that this candidature should be presented as a multinational candidature.
- b) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (iii). Interrogations were expressed on the specificity of the cultural expression. It was stressed during the discussion that it is not always clear from the reading of the file which aspect of the tradition is being promoted and that this aspect should be clarified.
- c) the action plan : the jury asked for further clarification on the aspects of the oral traditions foreseen to be protected in the action plan (i.e. dances, myths, traditional music, theatrical acts, ritual events, etc.). Also, clarification on the identity of the agency responsible for the implementation of the action plan at the local, regional, national or international level, was requested.
- d) the secret and public aspects of the Nyau cult : jury members asked for more information concerning this specific point.

Consequently, the Jury recommended to resubmit the candidature file for the next proclamation in compliance with criteria 1-d (i) and 1-d (iii), with a reformulation of the action plan.

(v) The candidature file presented by **Mozambique** (“Oral literature in Yao and Nyungwe Languages”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. Thus, the jury voiced in particular two main interrogations concerning :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (iii). Jury members questioned the specificity of the file. The jury stated that languages as such cannot be eligible for the Proclamation and that the domains covered by the Yao and Nyungwe oral literature are too broad. Thus, jury members suggested that the corpus be more focused on some particular and outstanding aspects of the selected oral literature.
- b) the non compliance with criterion 6. The jury asked for more evidence concerning the outlined risk of disappearance and argued that the fragility of the transmission process, if established, needed to be more detailed.

Consequently, Mozambique was invited to resubmit its candidature file in compliance with criteria 1-d (iii) and 6.

(vi) The candidature file presented by **Yemen** (“Sana’a songs”) was not retained but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. Thus, the jury asked the candidature file to provide further guidance concerning :

- a) the link between the consumption of Qat and the outstanding value of Sana’a songs. The jury considered that the consumption of Qat could be considered as offending UNESCO ideals and that its social relevance, within the cultural context of the Sana’a songs, should be clarified.
- b) the plan of action : participants urged the candidature file to reformulate the means being contemplated in order to salvage the artistic excellence of the Sana’a songs.
- c) the video presentation : jury members suggested that a new videotape, taking into account the above mentioned comments, be redone.

Consequently, **Yemen** was asked to resubmit the candidature file, taking into account the above mentioned comments.

(vii) The multinational candidature file presented by **Argentina and Uruguay** (“Tango”) was not retained, but the jury recommended that the application be reconsidered subsequent to revisions and re-submission. Thus, the jury asked the candidature file to provide further guidance concerning :

- a) the specificity of the cultural expression. Jury members emphasized the necessity to determine a particular type of Tango eligible for Proclamation. Considering that the tango has developed in various ways in different latitudes, the focus on one specific tango repertoire (« transcultural », or « historical », for example) was encouraged.
- b) the action plan. The jury recommended that the application define more specifically the community concerned by the measures taken in the action plan, as well as the role accorded to the bearers of the heritage.

Consequently, Argentina and Uruguay were invited to resubmit their candidature file, in compliance with criterion 1-d (iii), with reformulation of an adequate Action Plan.

2) New submission

(viii) The candidature file presented by **Eritrea** (“Decision-making process in the traditional Legal culture of Eritrea - Southern and Central Highlands”) was not retained, due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1 (a). Thus, the jury questioned the consistency of the file with UNESCO ideals, noting that capital punishment, together with female genital mutilation, are not explicitly sanctioned nor ruled out in Eritrean customary law.
- b) the lack of information in the field of public policy. Jury members underlined that the problem of equity for minority (non-Tigrinyan) communities was not fully addressed.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO.

(ix) The candidature file presented by **Ethiopia** (“The Gada Age-grading System”) was not retained, due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with with criterion 1 (a). The jury expressed doubts over the consistency of the file with UNESCO ideals. Jury members questioned, among others, the moral purposes and the conflict-reducing capacities of the Gada system. Thus, they emphasized that no clarification has been provided concerning customs like the discarding of unwanted children, infanticide, or ritual killings of people from non-Boran groups.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO.

(x) The candidature file presented by **Cuba** (“Cuba Festivities of San Juan de los Remedios”) was not retained, due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 2. Thus, jury members underscored that the Festivities of San Juan de los Remedios are only partially rooted in the cultural tradition or in the cultural history of the community concerned. They mentioned, among others, that these festivities lay a particular emphasis on the people of Hispanic descent and do not take into consideration the mixed people of Afro-Caribbean descent, who stand in majority.
- b) the non compliance with criteria 1-d (i). Jury members underlined that the outstanding value of the Festivities, in relation to other nearby related expressions, was not characterized. Thus, no reports or comments were made in the candidature application concerning the difference or similarity between the Festivities of San Juan de los Remedios and other forms of similar cultural spaces, such as The Red and Blue Factions of Majagua, The French Tumba of Guantanamo or the Santiago Festival.
- c) the lack of information and documentation for the evaluation of the candidature file. Information concerning the Parrandas within the Latin American and Caribbean context of carnivalesco events, or the risk of disappearance of the Parrandas, was not provided.

Furthermore, jury members noted that the candidature form lacks specific information on the implementation, the organizational structure and the budget of the action plan.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO.

(xi) The candidature presented by **Ouganda** (« Luganda language ») was not retained due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with criteria 1-d (iii). Thus, the jury noted that the file has not selected any specific corpus and that the cultural manifestation being presented stands on a much too broad and abstract basis.
- b) the non compliance with criterion 6. The jury underlined that the language being considered is a majority language and is therefore not in danger of disappearance.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO.

(xii) The **multinational candidature** file presented by Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico and Nicaragua (“The music of **Marimba**”) was not retained due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with criteria 1-d (iii). Jury members outlined the lack of specificity of the candidature file
- b) the absence of information available from half of the countries involved in the project.
- c) the sustainability of the action plan. The jury underlined, among others, the lack of a strong coordinative able force to drive the project’s implementation. It was thus noted that institutional sponsors in several nations had not been identified.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate(s) to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO in an individual or collective way, and on the condition that they focus on one specific and outstanding manifestation of the Marimba music. Moreover, in this case of a candidature involving numerous countries, the jury stressed that the project’s specificity and the ability to implement an Action Plan with efficiency had to be ensured.

(xiii) The multinational candidature file presented by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, **Paraguay** and Uruguay (“The **Guarani Cultural universe**”) was not retained due to fundamental drawbacks in the file. The jury listed in particular :

- a) the non compliance with criterion 1-d (iii). The lack of specificity was thus outlined by the jury, as it appears that the Guarani universe goes far beyond the ethnic Guarani groups.
- b) the sustainability of the action plan. The jury questioned the capacity to implement a concrete Action Plan and highlighted the absence of a recognized supra regional institution taking responsibility of the heritage concerned in all the five countries involved. It was also noted that indications on financing, such as a provisional budget, are totally insufficient.

Consequently, the jury invited the candidate(s) to submit other forms of cultural heritage for consideration by UNESCO, in an individual or collective manner, and focusing on one

particular aspect of any type of outstanding cultural manifestation of the Guarani cultural universe.

Agenda item 7 : adoption of reports

(i) Participants adopted unanimously the draft report of the 1st Regular Session (15-18 May 2001).

(ii) Participants adopted unanimously the draft report of the Extraordinary Elche Meeting (21-23 May 2001).

Conclusion

Members of the International Jury noted that the new established detailed criteria, set within the framework of the general criteria (as defined in paragraph 6 of the Regulation relating to the Proclamation of Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage), together with the practical recommendations for the files that were not retained during the first proclamation, would help governments, non governmental organizations and local communities to submit appropriate and accurate candidature files for the second Proclamation.

Thus, it was agreed that the new detailed criteria are to be inserted in the revised Implementation Guide for the preparation of candidature files, in view of the second Proclamation (in May 2003).

Mr Juan Goytisolo, president of the jury, delivered the closing remarks, thanking all of the participants for their fruitful and constructive contributions to the extraordinary Elche meeting.

Annex

- Table of Agenda Items
- Annotated Agenda
- Draft on the detailed criteria for the selection of candidatures
- Comments of Jury members concerning the detailed criteria the revised Guide for the submission of candidatures
- Rules of procedure of the International Jury
- Appendix A : Introduction by the Director-General of UNESCO to the debates of the 161st session of the Executive Board
- Appendix B : Extract of the oral report of the chairman of the Program and External Relations Commission (PX) at the 161st session of the Executive Board
- Appendix C : Regulations relating to the proclamation by UNESCO of masterpieces of the oral and intangible heritage of humanity
- Appendix D : Draft Report on the 1st Regular Session of the International Jury for the Proclamation (Paris, 15-18 May 2001)
- Appendix E : Summaries of the NGOs evaluation reports on the 13 candidatures to be resubmitted in 2003
- Appendix F : summaries of the 13 action plans to be resubmitted in 2003.
- List of Jury members and of participants

-1989 Recommendation on the safeguarding of traditional culture and folklore
-Final Report of the international Round Table on Intangible Cultural Heritage (14-17 March 2001, Turin).

