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| **Summary**  This document concerns the periodic reports of States Parties submitted for the 2016 reporting cycle on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List. The annex of the document contains an overview of six such periodic reports as well as an abstract for each of them. The reports submitted by the States Parties are available online on the website of the Convention. At the request of the Committee, the overview provides a cumulative focus on measures taken by States Parties concerning the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in cultural and other policies.  **Decision required:** paragraph 6 |

1. Article 29 of the Convention provides that States Parties ‘shall submit to the Committee, observing the forms and periodicity to be defined by the Committee, reports on the legislative, regulatory and other measures taken for the implementation of this Convention’. Article 7 (f) stipulates that the Committee’s duties shall include to ‘examine […] the reports submitted by States Parties, and to summarize them for the General Assembly’. Based in part on those reports, the Committee then submits its own report to the General Assembly in compliance with Article 30 of the Convention.
2. The relevant guidelines for the submission of such periodic reports are laid out in Chapter V.1 of the Operational Directives for the Implementation of the Convention (paragraphs 151-159), while Chapter V.3 (paragraphs 165-167) describes their receipt and processing. Notably, the Secretariat, in conformity with paragraph 166, is to provide to the Committee an overview of all reports received within a cycle. This overview, which can also serve as the summary to be submitted by the Committee to the General Assembly, is included in the annex of this document together with the abstracts of all the reports submitted during the current cycle. The complete reports are available in English or French as submitted by the States Parties concerned on the [website of the Convention](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/periodic-reporting-00857)[[1]](#footnote-1).
3. As in past cycles, the Secretariat shared with reporting States a document entitled ‘[Additional guidance for completing Form ICH-10](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-10-2014-EN-additional_guidance.doc)’ in order to help States focus on appropriate issues. This document is based upon the experience of previous States Parties for the submission of their periodic reports and shows the most frequent challenges encountered when reporting.
4. Within the current reporting cycle the Committee continues to be confronted with a high number of States Parties whose reports are overdue: 31 States Parties, which represents 84% of the reports which were expected for this cycle, are one to five years late in the submission of their first periodic report. In order to try to solve this situation, the Committee included for the first time at its tenth session in 2015 in its decisions on periodic reporting ([Decision 10.COM 6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.a) and [Decision 10.COM 6.b](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.b)) an encouragement to States Parties to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations. In addition to that, the Secretariat has taken the following measures to help States in fulfilling their reporting obligation under the 2003 Convention:

* the webpage dedicated to periodic reporting has been further developed to present the situation of all States Parties vis-a-vis the submission of their periodic reports, with a possibility to filter by type of report, reporting status and Electoral Group;
* a separate webpage on periodic reports for every State Party has been created with the possibility not only to get information about current and future deadlines, but also to download personalized forms as well as instructions and additional guidance to fill them in;
* reminder letters were sent in May 2016 to all the States that have overdue reports with an updated version of the personalized form enclosed as an attachment;
* a briefing point on periodic reporting was held during the [sixth session of the General Assembly](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/6.ga) as a measure to raise awareness about reporting obligations;
* the ‘[Additional guidance for completing Form ICH-10](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ICH-10-2014-EN-additional_guidance.doc)’ is being updated and will be made available soon on the website of the Convention as a support tool for reporting States.

1. As mentioned in [document ITH/16/11.COM/6](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-16-11.COM-6-EN.docx), the Republic of Korea has generously offered a voluntary supplementary contribution in the amount of US$300,000 to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to help the Secretariat improve the periodic reporting mechanism of the Convention. Should the Committee approve the specific purpose of this contribution, it is expected that the Secretariat will be able to undertake measures to strengthen the visibility and implementation of this mechanism.
2. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 11.COM 9.a

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/16/11.COM/9.a,
2. Recalling Articles 7, 29 and 30 of the Convention concerning reports by the States Parties and Chapter V of the Operational Directives, as well as its [Decision 10.COM 6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.a),
3. Expresses its sincere appreciation to the six States Parties that duly submitted their periodic reports for the 2016 reporting cycle and requests the Secretariat to inform the States Parties concerned by the 2018 cycle at least nine months prior to the deadline of 15 December 2017 about the required submission of their periodic reports in either working language of the Committee or, if possible, in both languages, as well as in other languages;
4. Regrets that it was able to examine only six reports in the current reporting cycle and encourages the 31 States that have not yet submitted their reports to duly submit them at the earliest convenience and possibly by the deadline of 15 December 2016 to be examined at its twelfth session in 2017;
5. Recalls the importance of the reporting exercise and reiterates that States Parties are strongly encouraged to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations;
6. Further encourages States Parties to actively involve the communities in the preparation of their periodic reports and to include relevant information provided by concerned non-governmental organizations, research institutes and centres of expertise;
7. Welcomes with satisfaction the Overview and summaries of the 2016 reports as presented in the annex of document ITH/16/11.COM/9.a, appreciates the cumulative focus on measures taken by States Parties concerning the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in cultural and other policies, and invites the States Parties to widely disseminate the annex among all relevant stakeholders, including non-governmental organizations;
8. Takes note of the different experiences, challenges and lessons learned reported by States Parties in the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in cultural and other policies, and encourages all States Parties to take stock of these experiences as a source of inspiration for improving their own policy approach and methodology for intangible cultural heritage;
9. Invites States Parties to pay special attention to the issues related to gender and to include in their reports information on the role of gender within intangible cultural heritage practices;
10. Also requests the Secretariat to prepare an analysis with a cumulative focus on measures taken by States Parties to build and strengthen capacities in their territory for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage as well as an abstract for each report that will be presented in the 2017 cycle and to include them in the Overview and summaries of the 2017 reports;
11. Decides to submit to the General Assembly the ‘Overview and summaries of the 2016 reports of States Parties on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List’.

**ANNEX**

**Overview and summaries of the 2016 reports of States Parties  
on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status  
of elements inscribed on the Representative List**

1. **Introduction**
2. Periodic reporting offers an important means to assess the implementation of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage at the national level, report on different experiences by States Parties in safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage, examine the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereinafter ‘the Representative List’) and the possible impact of the inscription on their viability, update information about inventories of intangible cultural heritage and facilitate information exchange on policies and national institutional frameworks. As experienced in previous cycles, this exercise can also represent an important opportunity for States Parties to identify major challenges in implementing the Convention and define their own strategy to properly address them. Its relevance has already been underlined in the debates and decisions of both the General Assembly and the Intergovernmental Committee, especially through the decisions of the latter on this topic ([Decision 6.COM 6](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/6.COM/6) in 2011, [Decision 7.COM 6](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/7.COM/6) in 2012, [Decision 8.COM 6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/8.COM/6.a) in 2013, [Decision 9.COM 5.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/9.COM/5.a) in 2014 and [Decision 10.COM 6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.a) in 2015).
3. The periodic reporting process has seen five previous cycles (2011–2015). The overviews of all the reports submitted so far have already been submitted to the General Assembly, the last time being the overview of the 2014 and 2015 reporting cycles examined during the sixth session in May/June 2016 (Section V. of the [Report of the Committee to the General Assembly](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-16-6.GA-5-EN.docx)). At the request of the Committee this year the cumulative focus has been on measures taken by States Parties concerning the integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding in cultural and other policies. As in the past two years, the analysis covers not only the reports submitted for this reporting cycle but also the information submitted for previous cycles.
4. In 2015 the Secretariat prepared an abstract of each report submitted within that cycle as an attempt to make information more easily accessible to States Parties. The Committee at its tenth session welcomed this initiative and requested the Secretariat to continue this practice for the current reporting cycle. Once examined by the Committee, these abstracts will be published in the country profile of each State Party, which is accessible online on the website of the Convention together with the other 58 summaries of the reports submitted between 2011 and 2014 that have also been prepared by the Secretariat as requested by the Committee (paragraph 16 of [Decision 10.COM 6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/6.a)).

**Working methods and overview of the 2016 periodic reports**

1. According to the Operational Directives and decisions adopted by the Intergovernmental Committee, on 15 December 2014 the Secretariat informed the 13 States Parties that had ratified the Convention in 2009 of the 15 December 2015 deadline for submission of their periodic reports. To these States should be added the 24 States that, for different reasons, did not submit their due reports in previous cycles. Of the total 37 States Parties expected to submit their periodic reports for examination during the 2016 cycle, only six submitted a report (Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia[[2]](#footnote-2), Greece, Panama and Ukraine).
2. The Secretariat registered these six reports and acknowledged their receipt. In accordance with Paragraph 165 of the Operational Directives, the Secretariat contacted those States Parties whose reports were incomplete and advised them on how to finalize them. All States were able to provide a final complete report.
3. Of the total of 31 States that are currently overdue with their reports, ten States are one year overdue, eight States are two years overdue, five States are three years overdue, seven States are four years overdue and finally one State is five years overdue. A summary of the global situation is presented in the table below:

| **State Party** | **Cycle Report Due** | **Year of examination** | **Additional Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Afghanistan | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| **Austria** | 2016 | **2016** | - |
| Bangladesh | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Barbados | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| **Bosnia and Herzegovina** | 2016 | **2016** | - |
| Chad | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| **Czechia** | 2016 | **2016** | - |
| Denmark | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Djibouti | 2014 | - | Three years overdue |
| Dominica | 2012 | - | Five years overdue |
| **Greece** | 2014 | **2016** | - |
| Grenada | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Guinea | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| Haiti | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Islamic Republic of Iran | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Lao People’s Democratic Republic | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Lebanon | 2014 | - | Three years overdue |
| Lesotho | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| Mauritania | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Montenegro | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Niger | 2014 | - | Three years overdue |
| **Panama** | 2011 | **2016** | - |
| Papua New Guinea | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| Paraguay | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Qatar | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| Republic of Moldova | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Saint Lucia | 2014 | - | Three years overdue |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Saudi Arabia | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| Sudan | 2015 | - | Two years overdue |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Togo | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| Tunisia | 2013 | - | Four years overdue |
| Uganda | 2016 | - | One year overdue |
| **Ukraine** | 2015 | **2016** | - |
| Yemen | 2014 | - | Three years overdue |

1. This is the sixth cycle of periodic reporting on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements of intangible cultural heritage inscribed on the Representative List. The six reports submitted for the current cycle accounted for a total of ten elements inscribed on the Representative List while none of the reporting States had elements inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereinafter ‘the Urgent Safeguarding List’) or programmes selected for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices.
2. **Overview of the framework for safeguarding and the measures taken  
   to implement the Convention during the 2016 reporting cycle**
3. **Institutional framework for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage**
4. The Ministry of Culture is the main **competent body** for implementing the 2003 Convention in Ukraine, Czechia and Greece. While the latter has established a specialist unit within the Ministry for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, the first two States Parties have tasked existing folklore institutes with this mandate. In Greece, an expert committee has also been established to advise on and undertake some implementation measures; in Panama, an Inter-Agency Council has been set up to coordinate ministerial actions and, in Ukraine, 11 regional commissions have been set up. Austria and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as expected of federal States, present a more complex picture: in Austria, the provincial governments have competence for implementation and the federal authority has passed overall responsibility for this to the Austrian Commission for UNESCO while federal Ministries are also involved in transversal areas. Bosnia and Herzegovina divides its activities into its two main geographical regions (Republic of Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina): in the first, the Ministry of Culture has responsibility, supported by a specialist Commission and the federal museum. In the second, the cantonal Ministries of Culture have overall competency for implementation and the Institute for Protection of Monuments undertakes research and documentation activities; it is noted that this complex arrangement results in museums, other cultural institutions and non-governmental organizations being the *de facto* implementing bodies on the ground.
5. A further noteworthy aspect of the arrangements described above is the direct involvement in Austria and Panama of Ministries other than the Ministry of Culture in implementing the Convention, including those active in areas concerning agriculture, forestry, health, bi-lingual education, the environment and its resources, indigenous affairs and social development; this demonstrates that some parties are now attempting to increase the **cross-sectoral cooperation of governmental bodies** in this field of policy-making and regulation.
6. With regard to **training in the management of intangible cultural heritage**, none of the reporting States Parties have, as yet, any specific body dedicated to this action. However, their implementing bodies, UNESCO Offices and National Commissions have all either financed or provided capacity-building activities on the 2003 Convention for government officials, university staff, researchers, practitioners, bearers, members of non-governmental organizations, local communities and others. In some cases, these are part of the global capacity-building strategy of UNESCO (in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Panama) while others (as in Austria, Greece, and Ukraine) are locally-inspired. These appear to primarily target the training of regional and local staff who are then able to disseminate their new knowledge and skills at the local level. Universities are also starting to incorporate teaching on intangible cultural heritage into their relevant courses and one dedicated course was recently established by the University of Vienna in Austria.
7. In the case of **documentation** related to intangible cultural heritage, the picture is mixed with Bosnia and Herzegovina (for the Republic of Srpska) and Greece making reference to a dedicated institution for collecting and/or holding documentation materials on intangible cultural heritage (such as the national museum or leading folklore institute) and, in Ukraine, a national cultural studies centre that also provides scientific and methodological support to the country’s implementing body. In Austria and Bosnia and Herzegovina (for the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina), a number of institutions that hold documentation on intangible cultural heritage are mentioned: in most cases central ethnographic or folklore institutes, folk centres, specialist archives and museums, but also cultural associations, centres associated with specific forms of heritage (e.g. traditional healing) and provincial level institutions within a federal State. The information held is mostly made accessible to the public and has been digitized for this purpose in Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Greece. It is reported by Panama that the instrument set up for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, namely the Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage Project, has the potential to become a dedicated documentation body. As reported by Panama, it appears that no comprehensive protocol for the collection and holding of related documentation is currently available and that in view of the number and variety of bodies involved in different countries, a variety of approaches are taken without any overarching methodology.
8. **Inventory-making**
9. Austria, Greece and Ukraine have all established a single **national-level** **inventory**. Bosnia and Herzegovina has two Preliminary Lists according to its two main geographical divisions; the list for the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is constantly updated with the cooperation of cantonal authorities and two cantons have also begun their own provincial-level inventorying processes. Czechia has established a national list of intangible heritage elements and a second one of bearers who are exponents of crafts and other traditions and who transmit their skills and know-how inter-generationally. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia and Ukraine there are also regional or cantonal-level lists where the elements may later be added to the national inventory. Panama has not yet established a comprehensive inventory, but has five descriptive Directories of intangible cultural heritage (three related to ethnic groups and two to specific elements); it is notable that, in the case of described elements, bearer communities are requesting capacity-building for documenting and safeguard their intangible cultural heritage.
10. The **organizational principles** applied include the five domains of the Convention (Austria, Czechia, and Greece), according to different communities and ethnic groups (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and the exponents of the heritage (Czechia, for its second national list). The **inscription criteria** include: the definition of intangible cultural heritage according to Article 2 of the Convention (Austria, Bosnia Herzegovina, Greece and Ukraine), the fields of the nomination form for the Representative List (Austria), the viability of the element (Bosnia and Herzegovina and Czechia), the inter-generational continuity of the element (Czechia) and the active desire of the bearers to safeguard the element (Greece).
11. Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Greece explicitly mention that the **viability** of the element is taken into account as a condition for its inclusion on their inventories (in Bosnia and Herzegovina as a listing criterion and, in Greece, future as well as current viability). Inventories are updated at different periodicities: continuously in Bosnia and Herzegovina, regularly in Czechia (every seven years for the documentation) and every five years in Greece. Ukraine was developing the updating method for this at the time of reporting. Most reports refer to different efforts to ensure **community involvement**in the inventorying process, generally requiring that their consent be shown and, as in Austria and Greece, using a bottom-up approach in which the initiative for inventorying an element comes from the community who may be given expert support at a later stage for the preparation of a nomination file for UNESCO’s Lists. Bosnia and Herzegovina also mentions the involvement of non-governmental organizations in the nomination process, and Greece refers to information meetings held by the implementing body for bearers, cultural associations, museums, municipal authorities, trade unions, independent researchers and others for this purpose. Ukraine has also prepared methodological guidelines for the preparation and use of inventory forms.
12. **Safeguarding measures at the national level**
13. **Research** on intangible cultural heritage is undertaken by all the reporting States Parties at varying levels and with some different objectives. In two cases, this is still at its early stages with the development of a roster of specialists capable of conducting targeted research and the establishment of relevant postgraduate courses to build up the research base in Panama, and the creation of methodological manuals on documentation, collection and safeguarding of elements and a glossary of key terms in Ukraine. This latter approach demonstrates that, in a number of countries, intangible cultural heritage is still relatively unknown as a subject of research. In Austria and Czechia, the focus of research is not so much on understanding intangible cultural heritage as on the impacts of ratification of the 2003 Convention in general as well as of the inclusion of elements in inventories and international lists. In Bosnia and Herzegovina and Greece, in contrast, the focus of research projects appears to be more on specific elements (in some cases for nominations to be included in the national inventory or list) and they are of a more descriptive character. Funding for research is generally provided by the Ministry of Culture, the implementing agency or scientific institutions themselves. Beyond the cultural authorities, research institutes and universities, research is also being conducted by independent researchers, non-governmental organizations and private institutions.
14. **Promotion and awareness-raising** about intangible cultural heritage continue to be important safeguarding actions, as in Panama, and this is often conducted through media outlets, festivals, fairs, information meetings, public award ceremonies, press, conferences, seminars, round-tables and European Heritage Days (as reported by Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Greece, Panama and Ukraine). Information concerning intangible cultural heritage elements seems to be fairly readily available to the general public (predominantly through dedicated websites but also through printed media, TV and radio) and there is no mention of the bearer communities opposing such sharing of information. Target groups (mentioned by Austria and Greece) for such information include bearer and local communities (all ages and sexes), independent researchers, research institutions, museum staff, tourism organisations and students with the aim not only of promoting the Convention and raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage, but also of developing facilitator networks at the local level. Folk festivals and holding traditional events in their original setting are seen as a means of promoting intangible cultural heritage (in Czechia and Panama) while local and open-air museums in Czechia are also regarded as having important potential in this regard. In Panama, postage stamps featuring intangible cultural heritage elements have been issued and, in Czechia, special brands (including one that brings together 250 crafts persons) have been developed as a promotional measure.
15. **Educational programmes** are another common approach to safeguarding, both formal and non-formal. In terms of formal education, it is both directly included as a subject in the school curriculum (Czechia, Greece, Panama and Ukraine) at primary and secondary levels and may be associated with a specific element, such as the music of shadow puppets in Greece. Such element-specific education may also be provided according to the locality, with children in Konij (Bosnia and Herzegovina) being taught traditional wood-carving skills. Otherwise, intangible cultural heritage is incorporated into pre-existing subjects, such as history, music and arts in Austria and Bosnia and Herzegovina and offered as an extra-curricular subject through school clubs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for example, and by bearers’ cultural associations in Panama, Greece and Ukraine. In Czechia, a manual has been prepared for teachers as guidance to introducing intangible cultural heritage into the classroom. University courses on intangible cultural heritage are now in the process of being developed in Czechia and Panama.
16. **Non-formal education** as a means of transmitting knowledge is closely inter-twined with social structures; cultural associations (often comprising bearers) play a central role in this transmission, either spontaneously or with the encouragement and support of the implementing bodies. Fairs, festivals, cultural centres and youth centres are all seen as privileged spaces which provide a non-formal setting for young people and other visitors to learn about intangible cultural heritage elements. It is noted that indigenous communities and their authorities give particular importance to tradition-holders teaching children about intangible cultural heritage. Education in the communities has included teaching midwives traditional birthing techniques in Austria and the popularity of informal transmission in the community in Bosnia and Herzegovina has led to a plan to establish regional intangible cultural heritage centres in four local museums. Apprenticeship has seen a decline in Austria and the authorities are making efforts to ensure the traditional transmission of crafts skills. Education for the protection of natural spaces and places of memory associated with intangible cultural heritage has been mentioned by Greece in relation to sacred groves and in Ukraine as part of tourist educational programmes.
17. **Bilateral, subregional, regional and international cooperation**
18. In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, a number of common approaches can be identified. First, there is generally a high level of cooperation with neighbouring countries (mostly on a sub-regional basis) at both governmental and expert levels. One example given is the ETNOFOLK project covering four central European countries (including Austria and Czechia) with a multilingual website linking documentation on various databases. Networking among experts is now increasingly being seen, either as a spontaneous move or encouraged by governmental actions such as hosting regional conferences aimed at identifying common challenges and the responses to them (Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Greece and Ukraine).
19. **Shared intangible cultural heritage elements** continue to provide an important basis for bilateral, sub-regional and regional cooperation and the mole (Panama), Mediterranean Diet (Greece) and Falconry (Austria and Czechia) elements are all mentioned as examples. It is noted that multinational nominations have also provided opportunities for bearers, non-governmental organizations and experts to develop and maintain trans-frontier networks (e.g. for timber crafts in Austria or dry-stone construction in Greece). Two category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO (based in Bulgaria and Peru) are mentioned by Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Czechia, Greece and Panama as playing an important role in facilitating the sharing of experiences, in particular through holding expert meetings and conferences but also as a forum for discussion and identification of common regional strategies. UNESCO Field Offices are also mentioned as key partners that provide support, in particular by organising capacity-building activities and as a further channel for communication, while UNESCO and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) have both participated in an international congress in Panama.
20. **Integration of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding into cultural and other policies: an in-depth study**
21. **General remarks**
22. States Parties are implementing the Conventionwithin a great variety of contexts, with differences related to political structures, social realities, geographical and environmental factors and other issues. Federal states, such as Argentina and the United Arab Emirates face a particular challenge in building a coherent and evenly spread institutional approach to intangible cultural heritage safeguarding given their distinct levels of government. As a consequence, there are a wide variety of responses to the challenges of implementing the Convention at the national level. If we look at the national policy environment, we can observe that intangible cultural heritage has become a priority line of action within the national development planning in several States Parties over the past ten years or so. The previous five reporting cycles showed that almost 75% of the reporting States had established some kind of new policy on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding, and many of them reported on its integration also into other policy areas. Some others had or were developing new legislation (Argentina, Georgia, Luxemburg, Monaco and the United Arab Emirates) which implies some policy framework is in place.
23. Both the diversity of approaches towards policy-making for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and the degree to which this is being devolved to decentralized political levels (as in Flanders, in particular) are characteristic aspects of the implementation of the Convention in a number of States Parties. This decentralized focus, as well as the cross-cutting nature of intangible cultural heritage, has had significant implications for the ways in which States Parties address its safeguarding. The experiences detailed below suggest that it is extremely difficult to confine intangible cultural heritage-related policies within a strictly cultural framework.
24. In some, although few, cases such as Brazil, intangible cultural heritage has been well-integrated into other policy areas, such as the environment, social development, agriculture, genetic resource management and local economic development. This has been formalized in one or two countries into **inter-agency initiatives**, as in Brazil and Panama, commonly between Ministries of culture, education, social development, indigenous affairs, environment, agriculture, tourism and health (e.g. providing micro-credit loans to rural women or marketing and promoting traditional handicrafts and organizing festivals). However, this type of cross-sectoral arrangement remains very challenging in many countries with different systems.
25. Another important aspect of policy making related to intangible cultural heritage has been its **devolution to regional and municipal authorities being tasked with policy making**. This has often taken place as part of a broader regional and local (social and economic) development strategy, whereby the strategy taken for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage has been explicitly married to local development initiatives, as in Greece. Fostering interdisciplinary collaborations over traditional knowledge relating to natural resources and hazards in Austria and finding new approaches towards sustainable resource management and supporting small cultural tourism enterprises in Morocco are some of the examples reported. The devolving of policy-making has also had the effect of allowing local communities, cultural associations and other non-governmental bodies to become more closely involved in the process. This approach also reflects the fact that, for a number of countries in different regions, intangible cultural heritage represents an important vehicle for inter-cultural dialogue between various ethnic groups (in Mexico and Peru, for example) and a means of improving the visibility and status of ethnic minorities, as in Armenia. Policies may implicate intangible cultural heritage as a basis for identity and, as in Guatemala, aim to strengthen social cohesion through recognizing and valuing the diversity expressed in this heritage.
26. Intangible cultural heritage is commonly seen as a social and economic as well as a cultural resource and it is recognised that intangible cultural heritage elements can be pivotal in achieving **economic growth and sustainable development**. In Nigeria, cultural industries have been established by the central Government and handed over to regional and local governments in order to create an enabling environment for intangible cultural heritage elements to be learnt and practised. Handicrafts (often allied with tourism) are regarded by many countries as a strategic entry point for their importance as an economic activity as well as their social and cultural meanings. Policies often seek to combine the mixed cultural and economic character of this heritage and may, as in the Philippines, promote intangible cultural heritage both across the different ethno-linguistic and economic groups. Other economic-based or oriented policy approaches include making partnerships with the **private sector** (in Spain and Turkey) in order to increase public access to cultural services, as well as harnessing infrastructural development for intangible cultural heritage and its potential to contribute generally towards development programmes.
27. **Cultural policies**
28. The following are **common priorities** in implementing the Convention as expressed by States Parties in the 2011-2016 reporting cycles:

* The identification and inventorying of intangible cultural heritage is considered by most States Parties as integral to safeguarding.
* Awareness-raising about and the promotion of intangible cultural heritage are also leading priorities, often aligned with formal and non-formal educational programmes.
* Research and documentation continue to be important activities, contributing to identification and safeguarding measures.
* Education (formal and non-formal) and training are viewed as a means of capacity building, promotion and transmission of intangible cultural heritage, with bearer communities directly involved to a larger or lesser degree.
* The recognition and/or support of ‘Living Human Treasures’ (leading exponents of intangible cultural heritage elements) is a popular approach employed in several States Parties (e.g. Cambodia, Cote d’Ivoire and Turkey).

1. In some States Parties, developing cultural policies for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage has led to a deep consideration of fundamental concepts, including the notions of ‘safeguarding’ and ‘intangible cultural heritage’, as in France, and seeking to develop **new methodological approaches** and criteria for identification and safeguarding. The approaches created tend to represent a mix of existing methods and new ones specific to the requirements of intangible cultural heritage. This aspect of heritage has required most States Parties to provide a methodological framework for the actions of the public administration, private bodies and society in general, an approach which is well-developed in the case of Spain. Iceland, for instance, has not yet developed a specific policy framework, relying on an existing legislative framework, but the vast majority of States Parties have developed some form of policy approach.
2. In some countries, such as Luxemburg, policy-making has been exclusively or mainly targeted towards nationally and/or internationally inscribed elements. Intangible cultural heritage has also provided multi-ethnic States with an opportunity to raise the profile of minority heritage elements and to give a prominent role to inter-ethnic and inter-cultural diversity in their cultural policy-making, as in Peru, especially with regard to indigenous communities; in Hungary, a strong emphasis is also given to the intangible cultural heritage of the Hungarian communities abroad. Cultural policies related to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage may be perceived as protecting a national cultural identity in the face of other, dominant cultural influences (e.g. Mongolia) and frequently focus on intangible heritage associated with minority, often indigenous, languages, as in Guatemala and Zimbabwe. There is also an attempt to create a close **integration between education and culture**, especially for children, in all areas of cultural policy-making. Sometimes, this may be achieved through the broad participation of the Ministry of Education (possibly with other Ministries), governmental and academic institutions, civil society associations and individual experts and aimed not only at education but also at the transmission of cultural traditions among younger and school-aged children.
3. The focus of cultural policies has also shifted to some degree such that efforts to implement the Convention have moved from simply determining the cultural values and ensuring their viability towards the people themselves who maintain the culture. This leads to policies in which **citizens participate as fundamental actors in the process**, moving from being the object of policies to being the main subjects in them. Despite this general shift in focus, some policy approaches still tend to be built primarily around ethnographic research and place a great emphasis on documentation and recording rather than on enhancing the social and cultural dimensions of intangible cultural heritage in the community.
4. It is worth pointing out that States Parties have also sought to include intangible cultural heritage in cultural policy-making with regard to **issues not explicitly addressed in the text of the Convention**. A case in point is given by policies developed for the promotion of indigenous and minority languages as a form of intangible cultural heritage per se (going beyond the approach of the Convention that refers to ‘oral expressions and language as a vehicle for intangible cultural heritage’) and religious heritage as in Peru and Zimbabwe, respectively. A further area in which many States Parties, including the Seychelles, have established policies (and legislation) relates to providing intellectual property protection for the artistic creations and traditional knowledge that constitute intangible cultural heritage. Some States also include elements within their definition of ‘intangible cultural heritage’ that may no longer be practised or whose transmission has been interrupted (as in Belarus).
5. **Other policy-making areas**
6. A significant aspect of the policy-making associated with intangible cultural heritage safeguarding is its integration into other, predominantly development-oriented, areas of government action beyond the culture sector. In this way, cultural development can be seen as part of an **integrated approach towards achieving sustainable development** and better living standards, especially for marginalized communities. For example, Panama has instituted a national dialogue in order to contribute to socio-cultural, economic, political, spiritual and operational development while, in Norway, a number of institutions and organizations receive public funding for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. A few States Parties, in particular Brazil, have taken a rather broad approach in which this is incorporated into several policy-making areas (such as environmental protection, tourism and health) and have even created specific inter-ministerial structures for this purpose. This approach responds well to the procedural requirement to strengthen cooperation between different branches of Government in line with goals of sustainable development.
7. Harnessing intangible cultural heritage for development is seen in a prominent place and is now included in some **States Parties’ national development strategies** (as in Bulgaria and Mongolia) where it may be regarded as a driver for sustainable development at the community and/or regional levels. Hence, a major policy priority in implementing the Convention is now finding potential synergies between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. One example of this is the project in Austria for networking between tourism experts and local communities to create a strategy for sustainable tourism built around intangible cultural heritage. Another example is a Cultural Guards Training Programme in Honduras that has been offered for park rangers which focuses on intangible cultural heritage but also provides employment in a disadvantaged region as well as environmental protection.
8. Measures for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage are commonly allied with **rural development policies**. This has been achieved by providing funding to rural communities and small towns and villages with intangible cultural heritage elements (in Belarus, Cyprus and Hungary). Related actions include encouraging rural communities to practise and show-case their intangible cultural heritage in festivals and fairs and, in Lithuania, safeguarding the rights of farmers and rural communities through creating a database of traditional agricultural and other products. In general, the potential contribution that intangible cultural heritage can make to local economies, especially through handicraft production and tourism, is a basis for rural development policy-making in many countries. It is notable that the strong focus on rural heritage does not yet appear to have been matched by policies seeking to harness the potential of intangible cultural heritage for urban regeneration and social cohesion.
9. As one of the main pillars of sustainable development, its **economic development potential** has been the focus of many countries’ intangible cultural heritage policy-making. Approaches have included supporting the production, distribution and marketing of the products of craft industries (e.g. in Turkey) and training artisans in market trends, product design, packaging and market access (e.g. in Pakistan). Turkey has incorporated intangible cultural heritage into certificated vocational education initiatives (for handicraft skills, food preparation, agriculture, interior design, fashion and textile design etc.) for a variety of social groups. In Armenia, these initiatives also include vulnerable persons and people with disabilities.
10. Some policy approaches, as in Cote d’Ivoire and Switzerland, demonstrate a strong appreciation of the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and the natural environment and its resources. In this context, the importance of traditional knowledge relating to natural resources and hazards and finding **new approaches towards sustainable resource management** can be a safeguarding policy priority. This may be expressed, for example, through the safeguarding of traditional knowledge of medicinal plants in Panama and a focus on the traditional ecological knowledge held by pastoralists and nomads in Mongolia. Other schemes include programmes for revitalizing traditional crafts and identifying intangible cultural heritage in national parks (in Switzerland) and encouraging rural communities to demonstrate and practise their heritage. Efforts made by some States Parties (e.g. Lithuania) to build databases of traditional agricultural products suggest that the economic value of these is also seen as an important aspect of their safeguarding.
11. The potential of intangible cultural heritage to contribute to **social and community development policies** has also been recognized in countries such as Cote d’Ivoire, where intangible cultural heritage is an important social resource in such varied fields as traditional medicine, agriculture and metallurgy. Relevant initiatives have included encouraging social participation, and one community development project in the Syrian Arab Republic has been built around using intangible cultural heritage towards the socio-economic development of the local community. Generally speaking, community participation is recognized as a procedural principle for policy-making and implementation related to intangible cultural heritage, although the degree of direct involvement is variable.
12. In addition, intangible cultural heritage plays a central role in **resolving social conflicts and creating social harmony**, as noted by Kyrgyzstan. Methods of conflict prevention and resolution that are traditionally used by different ethnic groups that have been living on the same territory for many centuries are recognized in Burkina Faso and valued as intangible cultural heritage. State authorities may even rely upon bearers of intangible cultural heritage, such as the griots (masters of words) of West Africa, and religious leaders to mediate in conflicts between the State, civil society and unions or to resolve conflicts between neighbouring communities over natural resources.
13. **Community involvement** plays a central role in the implementation of the Convention. For civil society organizations to be able to actively participate in driving policy development as well as implementing actions, an open and dialogue-oriented governance system is required. Areas in which community involvement has been evidenced in particular are community-based educational, training and promotional activities and involving community members in identifying, inventorying, researching and documenting intangible cultural heritage. One means of achieving this in Cyprus has been to encourage communities to submit concrete safeguarding plans and proposals for funding (e.g. to hold festivals, buy equipment) and to prioritize funding to communities with recognized intangible cultural heritage. In Panama, it has been encouraged by establishing dialogue with groups and communities, as well as civil society bodies (cultural associations and non-governmental organizations, in particular).
14. **Non-governmental organizations** have been seen to provide a useful bridge between State authorities and intangible heritage bearers (both in dialogue but also in undertaking implementing actions). Interestingly, these organizations are now often a repository of knowledge and expertise that allows them to provide support and advice to both sides, namely governmental authorities and communities. In countries with dedicated Ministries or Agencies for Indigenous Affairs, these can also play an important bridging role between the cultural agencies and indigenous communities, as seen in Brazil.
15. **General comments and conclusions**
16. In the current periodic reporting cycle only six reports were received and this covers only a small percentage of States Parties to the Convention (approximately 3.5%). However, this exercise reveals itself to be once again useful and indispensable to take stock of the progress made by reporting States in implementing the Convention at the national level, also in light of the past experiences of other States Parties.
17. The new Chapter VI of the Operational Directives on Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level was adopted by the General Assembly at its sixth session in May/June 2016. In the future, a reflection on possible ways for States Parties to report on the contribution of their measures to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and to sustainable development would be advisable, especially in the context of the role of culture in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Agenda 2030.
18. **Abstracts of reports**
    * + 1. **AUSTRIA**

Austria, which ratified the 2003 Convention in 2009, is a federal State with a number of **competent bodies** operating at different governmental levels. The governments of the nine Länder (provinces) have competence for implementing the 2003 Convention, with the Federal Chancellery playing a coordinating role: it has entrusted the Austrian National Commission to UNESCO (ÖUK) with the overall implementation of the Convention, which established an Advisory Panel for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2009. The Federal Ministries of Health and of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management are also involved in transversal safeguarding actions. Hence, effective vertical and horizontal coordination are crucial.

Thus far, no specific body has been established for **training** in intangible cultural heritage management but both federal Ministries and provincial governments have financed activities of institutions that carry out training and capacity-building activities at Länder level are planned. The University of Vienna now also offers ethnography and anthropology students courses in intangible cultural heritage. Museums and archives **document** different aspects of intangible cultural heritage and there are also specific centres for documenting traditional and complementary healing methods and musical cultural heritage. ÖUK has also established a website on Austria’s intangible cultural heritage that is freely accessible.

ÖUK maintains the **National Inventory** (launched in 2010) which is compiled through a bottom-up process with the Advisory Panel meeting twice a year to evaluate nominations. The inventory is structured according to the five domains of intangible cultural heritage identified by the 2003 Convention and can also be searched according to province or date of inclusion. The criteria for inclusion closely follow Article 2.1 of the Convention, with certain additions such as that the element should not be misused for political purposes or exploited solely for touristic or economic aims; in addition, elements must not have been revived and must have been directly transmitted from one generation to the next without any long interruption. The inscription form is based on the nomination form for the Representative List of the Convention and the viability of the element and risk factors are also taken into account; applicants are encouraged to mention safeguarding actions undertaken. Evidence of the widest possible involvement and informed consent of communities, groups and concerned individuals is also required and they are encouraged to propose elements for inscription. Non-governmental organizations often provide support to communities in completing their nominations. The inventory is available through an online database, which is regularly updated, and also in published format.

In terms of **research**, a broad survey was conducted in 2013-2015 to identify the impacts of the inclusion of elements in the National Inventory, as well as to keep contact with the bearers. The results of this survey show that inscription leads to greater visibility of the elements and increased respect for intangible heritage generally. Federal agencies have also supported research in intangible cultural heritage (e.g. on tourism or traditional healing) and ÖUK has initiated with the Chamber of Commerce a project on traditional craftsmanship as an economic factor. Furthermore, a university-based research project is on the cultural sustainability of agricultural and artisanal practices for cultivating and processing crops. Generally speaking, research studies tend to focus on the impacts of ratification of the Convention or of inclusion of elements in the National Inventory.

An important **policy** aspect of intangible cultural heritage in Austria is the potential it has for promoting cultural diversity and inclusivity and, in particular, increasing recognition for linguistic minorities. The relationship between intangible cultural heritage and tourism is another focal area of ÖUK’s activities and this has received great interest from public authorities. A joint project of ÖUK and the national Tourist Office in 2011 was aimed at creating a platform for networking between tourism experts and local communities to create a strategy for sustainable tourism. Interestingly, most communities regard tourism as a positive force to increase the visibility of their intangible cultural heritage. Another policy priority is the importance of traditional knowledge relating to natural resources and hazards and interdisciplinary collaborations in this area are fostered to find new approaches towards sustainable resource management. Several elements on the National Inventory are linked to natural spaces (e.g. charcoal burning, pitch extraction and traditional seed cultivation).

Various committees and working groups have been established to initiate **awareness-raising** projects, especially in relation to intangible cultural heritage and natural hazards and resources (e.g. the Federal Ministries of Health and of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management have established three working groups related to intangible cultural heritage and forests). In addition, the provincial government of Upper Austria organized a series of events and exhibitions in 2015 to highlight intangible cultural heritage and that of Burgenland promoted intangible cultural heritage through a 44-episode TV series. Information related to intangible cultural heritage is disseminated both through the ÖUK online platform and through print media (leaflets, brochures, handbooks etc.) and TV and radio report regularly on intangible cultural heritage, especially at the regional level. Information meetings and events for adults (on the Convention and its implementation and national priorities) have raised public awareness of intangible cultural heritage and related issues. Representatives from ÖUK participate in festivals, press conferences, public award ceremonies and local community meetings and many festivals and other events are held to this end. A number of informative events have been held aimed at special target groups (representatives from the Länder, tourism organizations, minority groups or students) to enhance the number of local facilitators and to raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage. Several open-air museums in Austria document and preserve materials associated with culture, the way-of-life of communities, folk architecture and so on.

Intangible cultural heritage as a subject has not been included formally in the school curriculum, but the topic is integrated into various subjects (e.g. local history, music, arts and crafts) and some elements from the National Inventory are also included in **educational programmes**. Intangible cultural heritage is also a theme of meetings of the UNESCO Associated Schools and, in a nationwide project on ‘Cultural Heritage: Tradition and Future’, over 2100 pupils from 59 schools learned about intangible cultural heritage among other subjects. Education and training in the communities included a conference for midwives in 2009 focusing on traditional knowledge and methods. **Non-formal means of knowledge transfer** are still popular as evidenced by the unbroken popularity of folk culture events and the number of centres for craftsmanship offering educational programmes and training is rising. In cooperation with schools and universities, many centres (involving communities of craftsmen and women) offer lectures, courses, weekend and summer schools as well as postgraduate training for adults. Despite quality vocational training, numbers of apprentices have been steadily declining and so Austria puts strong efforts on ensuring the viability of traditional craftsmanship. The Austrian Falconry Association has also established a Falconry Academy which offers theoretical and practical courses two or three times a year.

In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, ÖUK enjoys a high level of exchange with national commissions from neighbouring countries. Through its online platform, intangible cultural heritage programme specialists from all over Europe exchange experience, good practices but also recurring challenges. Austria has participated in various workshops, informative events or expert meetings on inventorying and advised Germany on its ratification of the Convention (2011-2013) through an intense exchange of experience and good practice. Austria is also active in the South-East European Experts Network on Intangible Cultural Heritage (e.g. the inclusion of the language of the Roma minority in the National Inventory presented as a good practice) and its representatives have attended several international expert workshops and conferences for sharing information and advice. Austria organized an international workshop on the implementation of the 2003 Convention in 2013 with experts from Croatia, Czechia, Germany, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland, addressing national approaches to implementation and thematic priorities with a view to further cooperative ventures (particularly with regard to multilateral, cross-border nominations and projects). Multinational nominations and other information-exchange mechanisms have helped practitioners (communities, non-governmental organizations, associations and experts) develop and maintain transnational and trans-border networks (e.g. between European timber craftsmen and –women).

Austria has **three elements inscribed on the Representative List**. The *Falconry, a living heritage* (with United Arab Emirates, Belgium, Czechia, France, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain and Syrian Arab Republic, inscribed in 2012) is a multi-dimensional element in that it consists of knowledge about birds of prey, the natural environment, linguistic and artistic expressions as well as traditional craftsmanship. As a multinational inscription, it has encouraged falconers from different countries to gather and engage in an intercultural exchange of knowledge. The *Schemenlaufen, the Carnival of Imst, Austria* (inscribed also in 2012) is socially significant since it unifies the local population and has also provided newcomers to the town with a means for integration. It also contains a number of cultural practices, expressions, knowledge and skills (mask-making, building carnival floats, storytelling and dance). Perceived threats to the element include replacing traditional performances with new technologies and the impacts of tourism; the House of Fasnacht (a museum and archive dedicated to the element) plays a central role in safeguarding as a meeting point and cultural centre, for staging performances, transmission activities to local schools and a local documentation centre. *The Classical Horsemanship and the High School of the Spanish Riding School Vienna* element (inscribed in 2015) is not reported on in this cycle.

* + - 1. **BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

Bosnia and Herzegovina, which became a State Party to the 2003 Convention in 2009, comprises two political entities, namely the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBH), which consists of ten cantons, and the Republic of Srpska (RoS). The latter has competence over cultural heritage matters while the ten cantons of the FBH also enjoy competency over cultural heritage under their constitutional law. The **legislation** of the FBH for cultural and natural heritage, especially the draft Law on the Protection and Use of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage, is being brought into line with the 2003 Convention, while the cultural heritage legislation of two of six cantons that have enacted such legislation follows the Convention. In RoS, the overall **competent body** is the Ministry of Education and Culture which established a Commission for the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2011; the Museum of RoS has also set up a Department for Intangible Cultural Heritage. In FBH, the Department of Scientific Research within the Institute for Protection of Monuments is engaged in research, identification and documentation activities and the cantonal Ministries of Education, Science, Culture and Sports have competency in the field of heritage for their own cantons. The *de facto* bodies conducting safeguarding actions on the ground are museums and other cultural institutions established by municipalities, municipal councils and non-governmental organizations. In addition, the Bosnia and Herzegovina branch of the International Council of Organizations of Folklore Festivals and Folk Arts (CIOFF) also plays an important role in promoting intangible cultural heritage in the country.

Although there is no dedicated body for **training** in intangible cultural heritage management, the Ministry of Civil Affairs and the National Commission of Bosnia and Herzegovina for UNESCO have organized, with the support of the UNESCO Antenna Office in Sarajevo, a training workshop on various aspects of safeguarding for representatives of government, the NGO sector and public institutions. In RoS, **documentation** is collected and held in the Department for Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Museum and access to this data is open to the general public. For FBH, the federal Ministry of Culture and Sports keeps and updates the register of intangible cultural heritage while documentation institutions operate at the cantonal level (through museums, the Sarajevo Music Academy and a cantonal Ministry). The Society for the Digitization of Traditional Culture is also active in making relevant records and documents digitally available.

**Inventorying** is also an activity conducted separately at the level of the RoS and FBH. In the former, the Department for Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Museum has established the Preliminary List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Srpska which is organized according to communities and groups and the territorial scope of RoS. Its main criteria are the viability of the element and inter-generational continuity of the practice, even if the numbers of bearers may be fewer than previously. The Preliminary List can be consulted by members of the public and a summary version is available also on official websites. Elements for inscriptions are proposed by community members who complete inventory forms with the help of museum experts who forward these to the Department for Intangible Cultural Heritage; since a large number of non-governmental organizations are associated with elements, they also are involved in the inventorying process. In FBH, the Federal Ministry maintains the Preliminary List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Federation which uses inscription criteria based on the 2003 Convention as set out in the inventory questionnaire filled out by those wishing to propose an element for inscription. The inventory is continuously updated in coordination with the competent cantonal authorities and on the basis of initiatives by non-governmental organizations; it is available on the Federal Ministry website. The cultural communities of inscribed elements are reported to be actively involved in their identification, definition and documenting. Two cantons have also put in place initiatives for inventorying on the cantonal level.

Information on other **safeguarding measures** is mostly given for RoS. Here, regulations were adopted in 2014 for maintaining a Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Republic. In terms of research, the Ministries of Energy and of Education and Culture jointly funded a project on ‘Old Crafts of Republic of Srpska’ (2007-11) and its publication in which the skills, knowledge and mastery of 13 crafts were recorded. As for **promotional activities**, in the Republic of Srpska postage stamps related to intangible cultural heritage were created between 2013 and 2015, traditional events are held in the original locations of elements and all local communities promote their elements through electronic and print media. One CIOFF folk festival is held annually in RoS. In FBH, the Federal Ministry supports two CIOFF certified folk festivals and has included intangible cultural heritage in the European Heritage Days programme and conferences, with round tables, exhibitions etc. that have been held to promote this heritage. Throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Association of Croatian Amateur Cultural Clubs in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UHAKUD) co-organizes a number of cultural events and has also developed a system for the safeguarding, reassessment and transmission of elements and for mapping and informal education. It also organizes workshops, seminars, folklore parades, craft fairs etc.

Among **educational programmes** conducted in RoS, school clubs on Zmijanje embroidery have been set up in elementary schools for the transmission of this element while a humanitarian/cultural association has organized two Schools on Zmijanje embroidery for women in local communities. This informal approach to transmission within the community is recognized by both communities and the state authorities and, in the future, the creation of regional centres of intangible cultural heritage in four museums is foreseen. In FBH, students in the Academy of Fine Arts in Sarajevo have been trained by the local community of woodcarvers from Konijc while, in Konijc Secondary School, education and training in woodcarving has been included in the curriculum from 2015-6. At the cantonal level, the transmission of knowledge and skills to young people and others is through educational programmes offered in schools and community centres, or organized by cultural associations of bearers. In West Herzegovina Canton, one of the measures of the Development Strategy (2014-2020) is the management of cultural, natural and intangible heritage and includes educating the public about this heritage, training on its safeguarding and media promotion among others.

In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina organized a visit to the Republic of Croatia to learn from experience gained in inventorying and other safeguarding best practices. Representatives of the Ministry also regularly participate in meetings of the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe (a category 2 centre in Sofia). Between 2006 and 2011, the Ministry of Education and Culture and the Institute for the Protection of Cultural, Historic and Natural Heritage of the Republic of Srpska hosted six regional conferences on integrative protection, which included presentations on safeguarding and documenting intangible cultural heritage. In terms of networking, there is continuous cooperation with Ministries, museums and other public institutions in the region for the exchange of experiences and expertise. In addition, UHAKUD in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the support of the federal Ministry of Tourism and Environment, held an international folklorists’ congress in 2010 aimed at sharing knowledge and best practices related to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage between regional experts and developing common programmes for implementing the 2003 Convention.

At the time of reporting, Bosnia and Herzegovina had **one element inscribed on the Representative List**, *Zmijanje embroidery*, inscribed in 2014. The bearers of this element are women who, as individuals and members of youth and women’s associations practise and safeguard the element. In addition to mother-to-daughter modes of transmission, there is both formal education and non-formal training of girls in clubs. Since inscription, local communities have increased the scope of their safeguarding activities and new local communities have become involved; the Museum of Srpska plays a significant role in such activities (e.g. exhibitions and other promotional actions) and there is also regular contact between the Ministry of Education and Culture and bearers through the museum who report to the Ministry officials on the state of the element, their problems and activities taken.

* + - 1. **cZECHia**

Czechia became a State Party in 2009. The Ministry of Culture (MoC), the main **competent body**, has designated the National Institute of Folk Culture (NIFC) to implement it, along with specialised units set up in a museum of each region. There is no specific institution for **training in intangible cultural heritage management**, but the NIFC offers some specialised seminars and training courses for leaders of ensembles, teachers and others. In addition to these bodies, **documentation** on intangible cultural heritage is also collected and held by state agencies, such as the National Institute of Folk Culture and the National Heritage Institute; various museums curate ethnographic collections and/or systematically document elements of intangible cultural heritage. Public access to these collections is facilitated through websites, presentation in exhibitions and workshops, libraries (including digital ones) and the digitisation of documents (e.g. for the ‘eSbírky’ Europeana project).

For **inventorying** intangible cultural heritage, there are two national lists: (1) the List of the Intangible Heritage of Traditional Folk Art (National List, since 2008) and (2) the Bearers of Folk Crafts and Traditions List (Bearers List, since 2001). Both are managed by the NIFC. Regional departments of NIFC also draw up lists of intangible cultural heritage at the regional level which act as indicative lists for future inscription on the National List. The National List is organised according to the five domains of the 2003 Convention and criteria for inscription include that the element is living and transmitted from generation to generation. Documentation on the elements inscribed is updated every seven years, the state of viability is assessed and recommendations made for improved safeguarding where needed. This List is published on the MoC website and regularly updated. Elements for inscription may be proposed by any person related to its locality and evaluated by the National Council on the basis of two expert reports. Bearers often initiate nominations for inscription, as well as regional departments of the NIFC, and the nominations are usually prepared jointly with communities and bearers, including safeguarding measures, and their free and informed consent must be provided. The Czech Ethnological Society (an accredited non-governmental organization under the 2003 Convention) plays an important role in identifying and defining elements of intangible cultural heritage. The Bearers List includes the names of persons (five may be nominated annually) who are exponents of traditional crafts and who ensure the continuity of their skills and know-how through inter-generational transmission. Inscribed tradition bearers are presented on a website managed by NIFC and their work promoted through two DVDs and a publication. They may be proposed by any person associated with their locality to the NIFC which evaluates proposals and forwards them to an expert advisory committee of the MoC. Both lists reflect the viability of the inscribed elements.

With regard to other **safeguarding measures**, elements have traditionally been safeguarded by associations (e.g. related to social or annual events), presented to the local media as appropriate. Access to elements is not restricted and information provided by bearers is publicly available; for this, several websites have been set up by state organizations which are linked to the communities and information is posted with their consent. In terms of policies, intangible cultural heritage has been included in the National Cultural Policy (2009-2014) and the Strategy for More Efficient Conservation of Traditional Folk Culture (2004-2010) has been the main policy tool for implementing the Convention; similar strategic instruments have been adopted by regional governments.

Scientific **research and publishing** activities have been focused on safeguarding projects and state support is provided for specialized publications on ethnography and the conservation of intangible cultural heritage (identification, documentation, inventorying and archiving) and research related to nominations for the National List. Local and regional publications (e.g. of song collections) also represent an important aspect of safeguarding as do publications of university research institutes (e.g. manuals on methodology). Many studies and rescue research projects on folk architecture also have a direct impact on safeguarding traditional craft and construction techniques. Between 2011 and 2015, NIFC financed two major projects for a programme of applied research and development of national cultural identity, namely: on the techniques of traditional clay architecture in Moravia and the regional context of the Middle Danube region; and using the Geographical information system (GIS) for mapping traditional folk culture. Public access to this information is through the Geographical information system for traditional folk culture (GISTraLiK) website, which has provided free public access since 2015.

**Educational programmes** on regional intangible cultural heritage are offered in primary and secondary school curricula and there are also elementary art schools that focus on folklore. NIFC issued a manual in 2015 to provide guidance for teachers on integrating intangible cultural heritage into school curricula and also organizes lectures in primary schools. Universities that teach ethnology, anthropology and historical sciences also provide some courses related to intangible cultural heritage and there is one specialized course on ‘UNESCO and Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’. In addition, a number of courses are held to enhance the capacity of the scientific community, such as in the use of electronic resources (such as GIS) in ethnology. Extra-curricular activities, such as the ‘Our Daily Bread project’ that introduces children to the process of bread-making and courses on folk dances and songs, also encourage young people to develop an interest in intangible cultural heritage; such non-formal educational activities are well-established in Czechia. The National Information and Consulting Centre for Culture (NIPOS), a research agency, also holds specialized seminars and training programmes for children, young people and adults using both modern and traditional methods.

For **raising awareness of and promoting** intangible cultural heritage, the Czech branch of the International Council of Organizations of Folklore Festivals and Folk Arts (CIOFF) plays an important role thanks in particular to the large number folklore festivals organized throughout the year. Also, many regional and open-air museums hold special events to introduce visitors to traditional festive events, customs and crafts. The promotion of elements is also supported through brand names such as Manufaktura, a nationwide brand that includes 250 crafts persons and small businesses, and LUTA, a shop that sells products made from natural materials by traditional methods. The mass media also play a crucial role in promoting intangible cultural heritage and there are a number of dedicated TV and radio programmes.

Involvement in multinational nominations to the Representative List is an important form of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, and Czechia joined the Falconry element in 2012 and cooperates closely with Slovakia and other members of the International Institute of Falconry. In 2013, it also took part in discussions over the intangible cultural heritage in Central Europe aimed at exchanging experiences (e.g. on the impacts of inscription) and planning potential multinational nominations. Regional cooperation is also achieved through the ETNOFOLK project (covering Austria, Czechia, Hungary and Slovenia) to develop a multilingual website linking the databases of ethnological institutions and presenting digitized documentation. For networking, NIFC supports cooperation with overseas institutions active in the field of intangible cultural heritage and is examining the use of open-air museums (with Austria, Poland, Hungary, Romania and Germany) and organized an exchange of 80 staff with two Norwegian museums. NIFC is also a member of several international non-governmental organizations.

Czechia has **four elements inscribed on the Representative List**. The *Slovácko Verbuňk, recruit dances* element inscribed in 2008 has been revitalized in places where it had faced disappearance; women and girls now also take part in this traditionally male performance in some areas and both bearers and rural young people play central roles in its safeguarding, as well as folk dance ensembles. Despite increased visibility following inscription and efforts to promote it, the rural character of the element and the relatively high cost of the associated tangible objects both challenge its future viability. Since its inscription in 2010, the *Shrovetide door-to-door processions and masks in the villages of the Hlineko area* has been revived in three villages and more people follow the main procession. The local museum plays an important coordinating role in safeguarding, organizing processions and liaising with bearers, villages and local governmental authorities. Concerning the *Ride of the Kings in the south-east of the Czech Republic* (inscribed in 2011), concerns exist about a tendency to demonstrate the ride outside its natural environment and, thus, without its original meaning. *Falconry, a living heritage* (inscribed with United Arab Emirates, Austria, Belgium, France, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Morocco, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic in 2012) encompasses biological knowledge about birds of prey and associated environmental know-how. Possible threats to this element in the future include negative impacts on the environment and its natural resources and changes in farming methods; hence, the Ministry of Agriculture is a lead governmental agency involved in its safeguarding.

* + - 1. **GREECE**

Greece has been a State Party to the 2003 Convention since 2007. The **main body** for implementing the Convention is the Directorate of Modern Cultural Assets and Intangible Cultural Heritage (MCA&ICH) of the Ministry of Culture and Sports and, in 2012, a National Scientific Committee for the Implementation of the Convention was also established. The Law for the Protection of Antiquities and Cultural Heritage in General (2002) provides an overall framework for the safeguarding and management of heritage including living heritage.

There are no specific **training** courses in intangible cultural heritage management, but a number of universities and other higher educational institutions are starting to incorporate the subject into their teaching (in a variety of disciplines) and the Directorate of MCA&ICH has held discussions with university staff, researchers and postgraduate students on these questions. In addition, the Directorate has also organized a capacity-building seminar for over 40 employees of the Ministry who are involved in the implementation of the Convention. **Documentation** is held by the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre, the Academy of Athens (folklore materials, musical recordings, photographs and audio-visual records) and a number of other institutes, folklore and cultural associations, specialist museums and so on. Some of these archival collections are digitized and made available to the general public.

Greece has established an **inventory** known as the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage which is maintained by the Directorate of MCA&ICH and organized according to the five domains described in the 2003 Convention. The main criterion for inclusion is the active desire of the bearers to safeguard the element and that it should fulfil the requirements to be intangible cultural heritage under the 2003 Convention. Viability is taken into account since only elements that are still practised are included and threats to future viability are considered. A special inventory form has been developed which adapts the 2003 Convention to the Greek context, and includes such fields as spaces and means of performance/enactment and the associated material elements. Each entry should be updated every five years through an open call to the bearer community. Bearers are expected to initiate inscriptions to the inventory and are supported by experts in this process; the Directorate of MCA&ICH organizes information meetings for bearers, cultural associations, museums, municipal authorities, trade-unions, independent researchers and others for this purpose. As a consequence, non-governmental organizations are active also in these efforts.

A major **policy** priority in implementing the Convention in Greece is to find possible synergies between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, especially in rural and isolated communities. Local and civil society actors are becoming more aware that their heritage deserves to be safeguarded as part of structured planning, and the case of wooden shipbuilding involved a working group which coordinated various public and civil society actors in a coherent safeguarding plan. As for other **safeguarding measures**, several initiatives for research into intangible cultural heritage safeguarding have been put in place such as the creation of a database for Greek Shadow Theatre containing rich content. A number of research-based institutions are involved in such research while some of these projects were conducted by independent researchers, non-governmental organizations, private bodies, cultural institutions and museums. In many cases, an Internet database open to the general public is an output of the project. Most communities are ready to share information on their heritage; nevertheless, bearers are also aware of the dangers from excessive publicity (leading to trivialization), tourism and pseudo-folkloric performances at public events.

**Educational, awareness-raising and informational programmes** aimed at the general public include a series of information meetings held by the Directorate of MCA&ICH. These include smaller meetings for community members, independent researchers, research institutions and museums as well as larger, regional ones: in 2015, around 150 people from various cultural associations of the Epirus region attended an information meeting. Outcomes of such meetings can include inventorying a particular element or series of elements or holding conferences. In 2015, the Directorate of MCA&ICH collaborated with the Athens Ethnofest (ethnographic festival) to foster discourse on intangible cultural heritage among young film makers and scientists. Within communities, local museums are often a key factor for safeguarding local identity and interacting with local communities. An example of a formal educational programme was ‘Greek Music through Shadow Theatre’ developed by the Directorate of MCA&ICH and the Museum of Greek Folk Art and Popular Musical Instruments, along with a puppeteer, which was targeted at 5-12-year-old school pupils. The Directorate plans to collaborate with the UNESCO Venice Office and the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe (category 2 centre based in Sofia, Bulgaria) to conduct capacity-building workshops for bearers and local communities.

**Non-formal means of transmitting knowledge** are closely intertwined with social structures and several cultural associations maintain traditional transmission systems for music, dance, pottery-making, embroidery and other elements. Education for the protection of natural spaces and places of memory necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage includes work relating to the sacred groves of Epirus in which the value of these sites for local people and biodiversity is studied.

In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, documentation on shared intangible cultural heritage is found on the website on the Mediterranean Diet to which information is regularly uploaded. Greece also participates in regional cooperation through the category 2 centre in Sofia and the South-East European Experts Network on Intangible Cultural Heritage (organized by the category 2 centre in Sofia and the UNESCO Venice Office). Meetings of this network played a crucial role in involving Greek experts in implementing the Convention and provide an important forum for the exchange of information and best practices. Greece has also collaborated with the Republic of Cyprus and the International Scientific Society for Interdisciplinary Studies in Drystone Walling to establish an international network of experts in dry-stone constructions and the art of dry-stone walling.

Greece has **two** **elements inscribed on the Representative List**. The *Mediterranean Diet* is a multinational one (inscribed in 2013 with Cyprus, Croatia, Spain, Italy, Morocco and Portugal) which is multidimensional, encompassing not only traditional cultivation and nutrition, but also philosophy, symbolism, social institutions, local customs and other cultural aspects. The central role played by women in practising, transmitting and safeguarding this element is clear and its inscription has served to strengthen local cultural identity, positively impact biological diversity and promote intercultural dialogue: the local community association is now active in a Pan-European grouping of emblematic communities for the element. Much of the safeguarding is focused on education (especially for school-age children) and promotion through local events. The *Know-how of cultivating mastic on the island of Chios* (inscribed in 2014) is an element that involves both sexes and all age groups either as family groups or as co-workers, although this traditional form of agricultural production is now often carried out by immigrants to Chios who are trained in it by elderly bearers. The Mastic Growers’ Association acts as a go-between for the growers with the market and a non-exclusive committee comprising this and other associations, the regional authority, the local municipality, a university, the Piraeus Bank Foundation and others now oversees its safeguarding. Planned measures include establishing a Centre for Mastic Safeguarding in the local museums, to undertake research, educational and promotional activities.

* + - 1. **PANAMA**

Panama became a Party to the 2003 Convention in 2004 and has no elements inscribed as yet on any of the lists. In terms of **competent bodies**, the Ministry of Commerce and Industries (MICI) is the main body acting through its Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage Project (or ‘Safeguarding Project’, located in the intellectual property General Directorate). The Vice-Ministry of Indigenous Affairs of the Ministry of Social Development has also prepared an inter-agency development plan, including intangible heritage with such areas as health, education and ecology; in addition, the establishment of an Inter-agency Council for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage was proposed in early 2016. The General Directorate of Handicrafts also runs a register of artisans and has a register of craft practices by region. The Department of Bi-lingual Education (under the Ministry of Education) is recording and revitalizing oral traditions and strengthening the country’s seven indigenous languages. The Art and Culture Centre of that Ministry is also involved in **training** regional coordinators to disseminate cultural programmes and conduct outreach in outlying areas and the Safeguarding Project staff have been trained by UNESCO to teach researchers and community members about the 2003 Convention, using documentation sheets and audio-visual technologies. Beyond this, there is no institution formally involved in training for intangible heritage management, although post-graduate university courses in relevant areas are planned.

No specific institution as yet exists for **documentation** and a need is also reported in order to develop a comprehensive protocol for this. The possibility of the Safeguarding Project becoming a permanent body for this and other safeguarding actions is being explored. In addition, the state radio and TV company and the Experimental University Film Group hold audio-visual records that can be made accessible.

Up until now, no comprehensive **inventory** of Panama’s intangible cultural heritage has been developed, although five Directories of different aspects of the intangible heritage exist: two related to specific ethnic groups and three for specific elements. These have been made by the Safeguarding Project and in cooperation with General Congresses of indigenous groups, as well as foundations and cultural associations related to the elements. An inventory database has been established which allows for cross-referencing by geographical location (GPS) and the five domains of the 2003 Convention. Audio-visual recording is only carried out in areas chosen by the communities and all documentation must be approved by their Indigenous Congress. The general format is that of a descriptive Directory in which the names of holders, transmitters and/or the element are given. In all cases of described elements, the communities are demanding up-skilling to be able to be more involved in documenting and safeguarding, and community leaders are identified for cooperation.

The focus of several other **safeguarding measures** is on promotion and training, through media outreach, fairs and training seminars, with the aim of raising awareness of the notion of intangible cultural heritage. Training workshops are planned in 2016 for 77 municipalities, ten regional offices of the Ministry (MICI), ten regional offices of the National Institute of Culture and 14 school regions of the Ministry of Education. In order to create a cadre of specialists and develop targeted research studies, two universities are preparing graduate courses focused on intangible cultural heritage and they will cooperate with the Safeguarding Project. Providing access to information on elements is undertaken through a journal of the MICI which includes information on the 2003 Convention, elements and other matters related to living heritage, and it is distributed among the cultural communities and in local libraries. The site database network, with updated information on GPS locations and information on communities has also been made available.

**Formal educational programmes** already include teaching on customs and cultural diversity (the distinct cultural expressions are recognized under Panamanian law). As **non-formal teaching**, the National Institute of Culture and the Handicrafts Directorate of MICI also hold craft classes for indigenous and local communities, with demonstrators who teach young people. Some independent community-based associations also teach dances, music and songs to young people while the General Congresses (for indigenous culture) assess the condition of elements and take measures to ensure the motivation of children to learn about them. Within indigenous communities, the Congresses recommend that arts and crafts (*molas*, basket-weaving etc.) be taught by older tradition-holders. In addition, fairs and festivals provide non-formal spaces in which young people and other visitors learn through audio-visual materials, competitions and traditional processes. Awareness about the importance of the environment and its resources for the intangible heritage is raised by the Safeguarding Project that disseminates information materials in communities and makes recordings of knowledge holders on the need to preserve the natural pharmacy and conserve natural resources; endangered plant species are being conserved in plots and the authorities cooperate with coastal communities to protect species through customs and traditions.

In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, the UNESCO Office in San José, which includes Panama in its cluster, organized a capacity-building workshop in 2015 and MICI held an international congress on intangible cultural heritage that same year in cooperation with Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, UNESCO and WIPO, which has led to the development of a network of regional contacts for intangible heritage safeguarding. Also in 2015, specialists on the *mole* in Colombia and Panama met to analyze the feasibility of this cottage industry and the means of protecting it through intellectual property rights; documentaries and a video capsule on this element in Panama have been sent to Colombia in order to exchange information on this shared heritage, verify common elements and their variations over time. Lastly, Panama is preparing to become a member of the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Latin America (CRESPIAL, a category 2 centre in Peru) in order to develop its international cooperation, exchange experiences and initiate staff training.

Panama has **no element inscribed on the Representative List**.

* + - 1. **UKRAINE**

Ukraine became a State Party to the 2003 Convention in 2008. The **competent body** for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies under the Ministry of Culture. There are also 11 regional commissions which, among other things, develop Regional Records of intangible cultural heritage. In terms of overall **policy**, recording and disseminating intangible cultural heritage is a priority defined in the long-term strategy for cultural development developed in 2015 as an important means of preserving and strengthening national identity and ensuring cultural rights.

As regards **training in intangible cultural heritage management**, no specific institution or training course as yet exists but a national conference held in December 2015 proposed that from 2016 relevant training courses for specialists be set up in higher and specialized educational institutions. The main body responsible for **documentation** is the Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies, which is responsible for providing scientific and methodological support for implementing the 2003 Convention. Other relevant bodies include the National Center for Folk Culture ‘Ivan Honchar Museum’ and the M. T. Rylsky Institute of Art, Folklore Studies and Ethnology.

The **inventorying** of Ukraine’s intangible cultural heritage is undertaken in the National Record which, at the time of reporting, contained five elements as well as in regional lists whose elements can later be incorporated into the National Record. Methodological recommendations on the preparation and use of inventory forms were developed in 2015, including an online version of the Record. The criteria for inclusion follow the terms of Article 2 of the 2003 Convention. The method for up-dating the inventory is reported as being developed. As for community involvement and the participation of non-governmental organizations in identifying and defining elements for inventorying, regional Creative Centres, regional civil organizations and universities with a specialization in folklore and related studies are also engaged to the process of identifying and defining elements of intangible cultural heritage for their inclusion in the Record.

Other **safeguarding measures** include a series of awards and incentives for bearers, researchers and others involved in various aspects of safeguarding, such as regional and national prizes and state grants awarded to leading figures in culture and art. Thus far, no specific scientific or technical studies have been undertaken on intangible cultural heritage and its elements, although methodological manuals have been prepared for the documentation, collection and conservation of elements as well as a glossary of key terms.

A number of **educational programmes** have been developed at different levels and there are currently a pre-school programme on ‘Ukrainian Environment’, school programmes in relevant arts and high-school programmes in folklore. The curricula of specialized art schools (aesthetic education) also contain relevant courses. The aforementioned 2015 national conference also recommended the introduction of curricula in folklore at higher education in order to create more specialists in the field as well as the adoption of a comprehensive research budget for intangible cultural heritage in folklore research. The Centre for Children and Youth also offers programmes in vocal music, decorative arts, choreography, crafts, circus arts etc. **Capacity building** in the intangible cultural heritage field has been undertaken through the popularization of the cultural practices by the National Center of Folk Culture ‘Ivan Honchar Museum’ and through regional activities such as folk festivals, ethnographic and arts fairs, exhibitions, and special holidays (e.g. the Reshetylivka Spring in the Poltava Region). The Ukrainian Center for Cultural Studies also organized a number of workshops, seminars and training seminars for different communities and groups on aspects of the 2003 Convention and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. More informal methods of transmission occur through workshops held during ethnographic and cultural events (fairs, festivals, master classes etc.). The Centre for Children and Youth also organizes tourist educational programmes that include education on the protection of natural spaces and places of memory important for intangible cultural heritage.

In terms of **bilateral, sub-regional, regional and international cooperation**, discussions have been held with Belarus, Lithuania, Poland and Romania, over common intangible cultural heritage elements in order to develop general and interdisciplinary approaches. Joint events (seminars, conferences) for the study and promotion of Ukrainian intangible cultural heritage elements in cooperation with the Ukrainian communities abroad are also being considered. In addition, cooperation and exchange of experience are established with the experts from Lithuania, Georgia, Azerbaijan and the Republic of Moldova and a training workshop on ‘Intangible cultural heritage Ukraine, Lithuania, Azerbaijan’ was held in Ukraine in 2015.

Ukraine has **one element inscribed on the Representative List**, namely *Petrykivka decorative painting as a phenomenon of the Ukrainian ornamental folk art*, which was inscribed in 2013. This decorative art constantly innovates through new combinations of forms and symbols and through the use of new media such that they are now used in body art by young people following the popularization that has accompanied inscription. Leading exponents of the art play a central role in its continued viability, promotion and transmission and safeguarding measures include an annual festival, media coverage, both formal and non-formal education in schools, lectures and workshops.

1. <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/periodic-reporting-00857> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The new official short name ‘Czechia’ has been used in the document pursuant to a formal request of the Czech Republic and a communication sent by the UN Protocol on 17 May 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)