



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

Sector for Culture
Division of Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage
Intangible Cultural Heritage Section

Paris, France
18 May 2007

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE EXPERT MEETING ON

**THE LISTS ESTABLISHED IN THE 2003
CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF
THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

New Delhi, India

2 to 4 April 2007

Intangible Cultural Heritage Section
Division of Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage
UNESCO
1, Rue Miollis
75732 PARIS cedex 15
Tel.: +33 (0)1 45 68 42 52
Fax: +33 (0)1 45 68 57 52
<http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich>

Introduction and purpose of the meeting:

From 2 to 4 April 2007, the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO organized an "Expert Meeting on the Lists Established in the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage". The meeting took place at the Ashok Hotel in New Delhi following an invitation extended by the Indian delegation during the first session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (IGC, or the Committee), Algiers 18-19 November 2007. The meeting was made possible with the generous support of the Government of India, supplemented by a contribution from the Government of Norway through its UNESCO/Norway funds-in-trust cooperation (FIT). The meeting also benefited from the logistical support and facilitation of the Ministry of Culture of India and UNESCO's New Delhi Office.

The purpose of this category VI meeting was to invite experts to discuss a number of matters of fundamental importance related to the two lists to be established under the 2003 Convention, as well as examine and debate draft inscription criteria for those lists. Of the 30 experts, most were nationals of States Parties to the Convention, and 13 came from States Members of the IGC; the majority of experts were nominated by their respective States, but a sizeable number were identified by the Secretariat itself in order to ensure equitable geographic representation and a breadth of expertise and experience. The invited experts participated in their personal capacities as experts in intangible cultural heritage (ICH) rather than as representatives of their respective States.

The debates and results of the India meeting were intended to assist the Secretariat and the Committee in their work on the elaboration of criteria for inscription of ICH elements on the two lists of the Convention, sharpening arguments in favour of and opposed to several possibilities concerning the nature of the lists and the relation between them. The experts were asked to discuss alternatives and to present the strongest possible arguments in favour of opposite positions in order to facilitate the preparation of draft documents by the Secretariat for presentation to the Committee at its coming sessions in China and Japan.

Chronology (see Annex II):

The meeting was opened on the morning of Monday, 2 April 2007, during an official ceremony that received wide media coverage. Opening remarks were offered by H.E. Ms Ambika Soni, Minister for Tourism and Culture, preceded by Ms Minja Yang, Director of the UNESCO New Delhi office, and followed by Ms Kapila Vatsyayan, a leading expert on Indian dance and architecture.

The first session was chaired by Mr K. Jayakumar, Joint Secretary of the Indian Ministry of Culture; during that session the Secretariat informed the group of experts of the expectations for the meeting, the proposed agenda and subjects of the sessions, as well as the current situation of the Convention (number of ratifications, calendar of the statutory meetings, background information on the Convention's history, etc.). Rieks Smeets, Chief of UNESCO's Intangible Cultural Heritage Section, took this opportunity to thank the Government of India for having made this meeting possible, and the Norwegian FIT for financial support to facilitate the participation of experts from developing countries.

For the afternoon of the first day, the experts split up into two working groups, both assigned to discuss, and later present arguments on, two specific subjects respectively. Both sets of topics had been presented in the meeting's background document (see Annex I).

The first group, chaired by Mr Chérif Khaznadar, was asked to discuss primarily the relation between the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (RL) and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (USL); whether these should operate independently, or if one should be subsidiary to the other; also, if an element may be inscribed on both lists simultaneously; as well as the modalities of removal

from the USL, or the transfer from the USL to the RL, if safeguarding measures had yielded satisfactory results.

The second group, chaired by Mr Philippe La Hausse de Lalouviere, was assigned to debate several questions related to the RL, in particular the notion and meaning of "Representativeness", the appropriateness of having either a shorter, more selective list or a longer and less selective one, as well as the possibility and usefulness of having terms of limited duration for ICH inscribed on the RL.

Both groups presented summary reports during the following plenary session (Monday afternoon), chaired by Ms Maria Cecilia Londres Fonseca. Rapporteur for the first group was Ms Claudine-Augée Angoué; for the second group, Mr Marc Jacobs. The main points raised by the two working groups are reflected below in the outline of the general tendencies expressed by the experts.

The sessions on the second day, Tuesday, 3 April 2007, were entirely dedicated to the discussion of draft criteria for inscription on the lists. The morning session was chaired by Ms Sudha Gopalakrishnan; the afternoon session, by Mr Laurier Turgeon. For this purpose, a working draft document was distributed to the experts on Monday, presenting a preliminary version of the draft criteria and explanatory instructions (document available for consultation at: http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=EN&meeting_id=00070). That proposal had been prepared by the Secretariat, following the debates at the first session of the IGC in Algiers last November, and reflecting written comments received subsequently from 31 States Parties in response to decision 1.COM.7 of the Committee.

The session on the last day, Wednesday, 4 April 2007, chaired by Mr Toshiyuki Kono, was devoted to the presentation of oral reports by the previous day's Rapporteurs (Ms Kristin Kuutma and Mr Ahmed Skounti, for the morning and afternoon sessions, respectively), as well as summary discussions and closure of the meeting.

Discussions:

The meeting was characterized by rich and far-reaching discussions that have clarified a number of possible arguments and positions that may be presented to the IGC during its first extraordinary session in Chengdu, China, in May 2007. The meeting was not intended to reach consensus or offer shared recommendations; in that respect it fulfilled its mission completely, offering lively debate and sharpening certain irreconcilable positions on a number of questions. Experts disagreed in an open and friendly spirit, some bringing to bear their long-term engagement with the drafting of the Convention in 2002 and 2003, and others bringing fresh perspectives and new insights. Although the experts did not make consolidated recommendations, a number of tendencies became apparent through the course of the discussions. In view of the fact that experts were speaking in their personal capacities and that no consensus recommendations were adopted, experts are not identified below with their respective comments or suggestions.

I. Relations between the RL and the USL:

- Two independent lists of equal importance and status: The first break-out group largely agreed that both lists should operate independently from one another. In this context, both lists should be treated equally, with neither being subsidiary to the other, and both receiving equal consideration. Experts were particularly concerned that inscription on the USL not be perceived in any way as a negative sanction or punitive measure, by contrast to the experience of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. In plenary session, experts also raised the concern that the two lists not be divided into one list (RL) for rich countries and one list (USL) for poor countries, recalling that in all countries, ICH might face challenges that leave an element in need of urgent safeguarding. Several experts noted that while it might be expected

that inscription on the RL would be more popular or more highly desired by many States Parties, for those experts the USL is more central to the overall purposes of the Convention (safeguarding of ICH) and should thus be the focus of particular attention.

- Two different but related sets of criteria: The debates also indicated the tendency among the experts that two overlapping but distinct sets of criteria should be developed for the two lists. Such a separation of criteria means that an ICH element may well be inscribed on one list, although it does not satisfy the criteria of the other. Each list has a distinct purpose that should be reflected in its criteria, and the criteria relevant to one purpose should not restrict inscription on the other list. An item proposed for urgent safeguarding need not be “representative”; an item proposed for the Representative List might not require urgent safeguarding, for example.
- Possible communication or mobility, but no automatic transfer from one list to the other: Most experts agreed that the independence and equal status of the two lists did not preclude the possibility of communication between them (i.e., an element moving from one to the other), to the extent that a given element met the respective criteria of the two lists. Some experts suggested the possibility that elements would be inscribed first on the RL, then certain of them would be selected as in need of urgent safeguarding and added to or moved to the USL; this idea found some support but did not carry the day. The suggestion was also offered, but not embraced, that listing on the USL was a preliminary to listing on the RL. The prevalent view of the experts was that neither list was preliminary or prior to the other. They generally agreed that, following successful safeguarding of an ICH element inscribed on the USL, no automatic transfer to the RL should occur. But in this regard, some experts recommended that the IGC may want to discuss either a streamlined procedure facilitating transfer to the RL (provided of course that the ICH concerned complies with the RL's criteria), or a more elaborate procedure that would imply an entirely new submission for inscription.
- Possible inscriptions of ICH simultaneously on both lists, or single nomination for both lists: The first working group favourably considered the possibility that an ICH element might be inscribed simultaneously on both the RL and USL if the element fulfilled the respective criteria established for both lists. Once effectively safeguarded, it might leave the USL without losing its place on the RL. Some experts suggested that a single nomination would be submitted, then considered simultaneously for both lists or directed by the Committee to the list for which it was considered most appropriate.

II. The Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity:

- Purposes of the list: While not agreeing fully on how “representativeness” should be conceived, the experts emphasized the triple objectives of the Representative List: to ensure better visibility, increase awareness, and encourage dialogue that respects cultural diversity. Each objective alone might lead to a slightly different view of how “representative” should be understood, so experts encouraged considering the list's multiple purposes holistically rather than allowing any one to dominate. Better visibility might best be promoted by a shorter list, for instance, while encouraging dialogue might better be promoted by a longer, more inclusive list. Many experts consequently advocated considering the three objectives simultaneously, so as to achieve a balanced view.
- Why would—and why *should*—a community or State wish to see an element inscribed? Experts discussed the interests of States and communities in seeing one of “their” elements inscribed, emphasizing that nominated heritage is likely to be

something of strong symbolic value to the nominating States. This was seen as both positive and negative, enhancing the importance of inscription and the value of the list on the one hand but also increasing the risk of politicization of the nomination/inscription process on the other. Acknowledging the likelihood that nominating States would prioritize elements of strong symbolic value also recalled to experts the risk that the list would somehow reintroduce a notion of outstanding universal value, coming to be seen as a showcase for items that represent nation-state identities. While recognizing the multiple reasons why a State *would* wish to see an element inscribed, the experts also pointed to why in their view a State *ought* to nominate an element: in order to contribute to the purposes of the list and the international cooperation in safeguarding that underlies the Convention. States should, in the view of several experts, be encouraged to consider how inscription of a given element might benefit the Convention and the list, in addition to how it would benefit the community and State.

- Multi-national nominations should be especially encouraged, several experts noted, in part as a means of mitigating the risk of over-politicization but even more as a way to encourage dialogue. Especially interesting to some experts was the way in which multi-national nominations might help to draw attention to similarity and difference within a given element. Diverse forms of heritage might share a common name across national boundaries, for instance, and a multi-national nomination could emphasize not only what is common among the forms but also what is specific to each, thereby encouraging dialogue across national and cultural borders. This could also counter-balance any tendency toward competitiveness. Consideration of variation within a given element also enriched the sense of “representative”, in the view of several experts, moving it away from notions of typicality or outstanding value and toward a recognition of the nature of ICH as embodying similarity and difference.
- Representative of versus representative for: When discussing the representative nature of the list some experts wished to emphasize what the elements would be representative *of* (for instance the ICH of a community, State or region, or a specific domain of ICH); other experts wanted the list rather to bring together elements that would be representative *for* ensuring the goals of the RL (as noted above). In the first sense, experts also mentioned that any element might be representative *of* different things at the same time: a geographical region, a community and/or State, a given ICH domain or another parameter; the representativeness of the list as a whole would consist in its character as a set of “stratified samples” of ICH. This representativeness would be expected to prevail as a natural result of selecting examples stratified along different lines (geography, domain, etc.). One expert emphasized that such multi-dimensional representativeness (or lack thereof) would only be apparent over time; the Committee might therefore wish to examine the list periodically to ascertain whether there was over-representation or under-representation along any line, and might then take action to invite nominations of under-represented elements or defer nominations of over-represented elements.
- Nature of the list: The second group expressed itself in favour of a short, dynamic, and rotating list with inscription for fixed durations. This would allow for better management of the list and a more balanced visibility, and would maintain the focus on new proposals for inscription. It would permit many countries, groups, and/or communities to get a chance to present their intangible cultural heritage and would reinforce the idea that hierarchies between cultures or ICH must be avoided. Using preset, fixed terms to take things off the list would also reduce the necessity of making difficult qualitative decisions about items to be de-listed, which was seen as requiring extensive and perhaps wasteful use of resources and leading potentially to politicization. Some experts suggested that the solution of a short dynamic list would reflect the evolving nature of ICH: it would not be frozen by putting it on a list forever,

but it would be recognized for a given time, during which it may change more or less. This best reflects the cultural dynamics of ICH, in the view of many of the experts.

Although working group two was almost unanimous in its view of the Representative List as short, dynamic and rotating, when they reported to the plenary a number of counterarguments were raised and discussed. Some experts argued that removal from the list—even if it were automatic, at the end of a fixed term—would be negatively perceived by the concerned communities and States. Some of those counterarguments had already been anticipated by the working group itself, in trying to outline the pros and cons of a shorter or longer list. One alternative would be a very long list with a low threshold, few criteria, and items inscribed perpetually on the list. The advantage would be that a lot of countries, groups and communities and a great deal of variety would be on the list, hence encouraging the possibility of dialogue and reflecting cultural diversity. This alternative would, however, have disadvantages for visibility (especially in the long term; as the list grows and grows, the impact decreases exponentially) and would be disadvantageous for newcomers.

- An honorary space for ICH inscribed on the RL: The idea to limit the duration of inscription was supported by most experts with the express condition that any ICH element whose term had expired should remain in a roll of honour, archive, “repertoire”, or honorary space. Such a solution would allow new elements to enter the list with no dishonour to those whose terms had ended. Once having been recognized by UNESCO, the forms or elements of ICH would not lose the status of having been selected or having passed the window of inclusion and international attention, but this event would be remembered, documented and publicized in the honorary space, even while new elements took their places on the list.
- A safeguarding plan or management plan for elements on the RL: The experts considered it important that proposals for inscription on the RL should be accompanied by a plan that would at a minimum aim to ensure that the condition of the element at the time of inscription was not weakened or threatened by the increased attention that listing might bring. Strong exposure will inevitably have effects, potentially including negative effects (e.g., destroying or endangering the heritage by too many tourists or commercialization, folklorization, political appropriation or exploitation), as the 1972 Convention has shown in some cases. How would a community be engaged actively in preserving its heritage from such potential risks? The plan was envisioned by many as a “light” plan as contrasted to more comprehensive safeguarding action plans to be submitted with proposals for inscription on the USL, where a programme of active intervention would be appropriate.

III. Other issues:

- In view of the shared consensus that the two lists were of equal status, several experts noted that the format of presentation of the draft criteria they received (in which the USL criteria referred for brevity’s sake to the RL criteria) was inconsistent with that sentiment, and suggested that each set be presented independently and in full. They further noted that issues related to the Representative List had already been debated by the Committee, and recommended that the Urgent Safeguarding List should be considered first by the Committee at its extraordinary session so it could bring its fresh attention to the topic. Experts also recommended that the document to be presented to the Committee should not present separate sets of criteria for cases of “normal” urgency and cases of extreme urgency as the draft document had done; there should instead be a single set of criteria, perhaps with some procedural alternatives or flexibility built into it for cases of extreme urgency.

- While welcoming the consideration of Articles 16 and 17 in their equality and complementarity, several experts noted that this consideration was still incomplete and that Article 18 warrants equal attention. Article 18, in calling for the periodic selection and promotion of safeguarding programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention, offers an important complement, in those experts' view, to the lists of Articles 16 and 17. Some experts noted that programmes, projects and activities under Article 18 might not be limited to one identified element of heritage, nor restricted to a single State, but might instead open up exciting possibilities for international cooperation at the sub-regional, regional or global level. A safeguarding project or programme might bring together similar phenomena from distant places, for example, and offer opportunities for practical international cooperation that transcended the interests of one or more States Parties (assuming that such interests might more directly motivate their nominations for the two lists).
- Viability and sustainability of ICH: Several experts took exception to the Convention's concern with the viability of ICH, understanding "viability" as referring in their view to its status only at a given moment. Rather, they suggested, the concern should be for the sustainability of ICH, the possibilities for its future continuation. In this view, safeguarding was aimed not so much at ensuring momentary viability as at reducing or mitigating future risks and challenges. Thus an element in relatively good health nevertheless needs a safeguarding plan to enhance its future sustainability. At the same time, experts cautioned against a view of safeguarding as salvage or rescue. Viewing safeguarding instead as aimed at increasing the sustainability of ICH was, for those experts, closer to the spirit of the Convention.
- Ethical concerns need to be more fully considered, in the view of several experts, as interventions in this area increase. With States, NGOs, experts, communities and UNESCO all taking action in safeguarding ICH, it becomes increasingly important to develop ethical norms or codes of conduct for actors involved at all levels of safeguarding ICH. This was particularly relevant to the elaboration of safeguarding plans together with communities, groups or individuals, and to such communities' active involvement in and consent to nominations.

Experts also had a number of additional practical suggestions to improve the quality and presentation of the draft criteria. As a consequence of the rich and productive discussions in New Delhi, the Secretariat undertook comprehensive revision and reformulation of the draft criteria to be presented to the IGC, clarifying a number of points that had been confusing to the experts and reducing the length and complexity of the draft document.

Annexes:

- I. Background paper
- II. Agenda
- III. List of participants (Experts, Observers, Secretariat members)
- IV. Draft criteria that were presented to the experts for their consideration (available for consultation at: http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=EN&meeting_id=00070)

Introduction

The 2003 [Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage](#) entered into force on 20 April 2006, and by the end of February 2007 had been ratified by 75 States. The General Assembly of States Parties, the sovereign body of the Convention, at its [first meeting in June 2006](#) requested the Convention's other statutory body, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, to prepare a number of operational directives for the implementation of the Convention ([Resolution 1.GA 7A](#)). Among these operational directives, the Convention calls upon the Committee to “draw up and submit to the General Assembly for approval the criteria for the establishment, updating and publication” of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (the “Representative List”) (Article 16) and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (the “Urgent Safeguarding List”) (Article 17). The Committee and the Secretariat attach the highest priority to the preparation of criteria and other directives for those two lists, in anticipation of being able to begin inscribing new elements as early as possible.

At its [first session in Algiers in November 2006](#), the Intergovernmental Committee discussed a [set of draft criteria](#) for inscription on the Representative List and several general issues relating both to that list and the Urgent Safeguarding List. In its [Decision 1.COM 7](#), the Committee “encourage[d] States Parties to the Convention to submit to the Secretariat comments on abovementioned document before 31 January 2007”, and “request[ed] the Director-General to submit to it at its next session a proposal for a set of criteria for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity which takes into account the suggestions and ideas which emanated from the debates at its first session, and the comments received by the Secretariat”. Subsequent to the Algiers meeting, the Secretariat received written comments from 31 States Parties before the established deadline, of which 29 specifically addressed the two lists and their criteria. Those [comments](#), as they were submitted by the States Parties, may be consulted at the Convention website. A [document synthesizing the comments](#) of the States Parties has been prepared for the Committee.

Basing its work upon the discussions of the Committee and the written comments of the States Parties, the Secretariat has since elaborated revised draft criteria for the Representative List, for consideration by the Intergovernmental Committee at its extraordinary session in Chengdu, China (23-27 May 2007). At that meeting the Committee will also be asked to consider, for the first time, draft criteria for the Urgent Safeguarding List. In preparing those sets of criteria, the Secretariat relied heavily upon the opinions of experts at two recent meetings convened by UNESCO. The first meeting, [Criteria for inscription on the lists established by the Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage](#), was organized by UNESCO on 5-6 December 2005, in Paris. The draft criteria previously considered by the Committee in Algiers were largely the outcome of that expert meeting. The second meeting, co-organized with the Asia/Pacific Centre for UNESCO, [Community Involvement in Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage](#), was held in Tokyo from 13 to 15 March 2006. It dealt specifically with the subject of community involvement in inventory making and in the submission of intangible cultural heritage (“ICH”) for listing under the Convention.

The present expert meeting

The perspectives and opinions expressed at the two previous expert meetings provided a solid foundation upon which the Secretariat could rely in preparing first drafts of the criteria requested by the General Assembly and Committee. At the same time, it has become

apparent that there are a number of fundamental matters that the Committee may need to decide, simultaneous with or even prior to finalizing the inscription criteria, that have not yet been the subject of focused discussion by experts. These fundamental decisions about the nature and modus operandi of each list and the relations between them will doubtless have implications for the specific criteria and the form they will ultimately take.

The present expert meeting is intended to assist the Secretariat to respond to the Committee to facilitate its work on these matters. The experts will be asked to discuss a number of alternatives and to present the strongest possible arguments in favour of each (and in opposition to its contrary or contraries)—to in a sense rehearse or anticipate some of the issues that will come before the Committee. The experts are not asked to offer a unified recommendation or consensus position on any issue, but to frame as clearly as possible the alternative positions and their anticipated arguments and counter-arguments, so that the Committee may choose among alternatives, or meld them into a desirable alloy. (Should there be certain issues on which a clear consensus emerges among the experts, such will be reported, but that is not the primary objective of the present meeting.)

In the first day of the meeting (2 April 2007), experts will be divided into two groups, each assigned a general topic and set of related issues. Within each group, experts will be asked to begin developing position papers outlining alternative possibilities. A plenary session that afternoon will discuss summaries of the discussions of the two working groups; these will then be prepared in written form for a review by the experts in plenary on the third and final morning of the meeting (4 April 2007).

The first group will examine the relation between the two lists. Considering the respective purposes of the two lists and their distinct identities in the Convention (Articles 16 and 17):

- What should be the relation between the two lists? Should the lists be non-communicating and operate independently? Should they operate interdependently? Should one be subsidiary to the other? For instance, among other possibilities, could an element be inscribed simultaneously on both lists, or should the element be exclusively on one or the other, moving between them as or when conditions warrant? Or should an element, once inscribed on one list, not be considered for the other?
- Should elements that are in need of urgent safeguarding be inscribed only on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and the Representative List be restricted to elements that are healthier or more viable, less in need of safeguarding or not in need of safeguarding?
- When safeguarding has been (or is being) effectively implemented, such that an element is determined to be no longer “in need of urgent safeguarding”, what should occur (such as, for instance, removing it from the Urgent Safeguarding List and/or transferring it to the Representative List)?

The second group will focus more specifically on the nature of the Representative List. Considering that the purposes of this list are *to ensure better visibility of the intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its significance, and to encourage dialogue which respects cultural diversity*:

- How should “representative” be understood in Article 16 of the Convention? In one view the list as a whole is representative of human creativity and the diversity of heritage elements in the world. In another view, the element inscribed on the list is a sample or example of a larger class of elements; a selected element thus stands for a larger number of similar elements that could just as well have been inscribed. In a third view, representation implies some determination of typicality, a finding that the

element selected is characteristic of the class of elements to which it belongs. And in yet another view, the element is considered to represent the culture or community of which it is an expression. Should elements be selected on quantitative or extrinsic (e.g. distributional or geographic) grounds, or on more qualitative grounds such as typicality or expressiveness?

- Should the Representative List be shorter and more selective, or longer and less selective? What are the respective advantages and disadvantages of a shorter or longer list, particularly with respect to the purpose of the List?
- Would the purposes of the Representative List be served better by a) inscription of elements for indefinite terms (resulting in an ever-growing list); or b) inscription of elements for a fixed term, resulting in a list of limited size whose members rotate, or c) allocation of slots to States Parties, who may inscribe elements for terms of their choosing, rotating or not?

In its second day (3 April), the expert meeting will examine in greater detail proposals for the revised draft criteria that will come before the Committee in Chengdu. In plenary session, the experts will consider the proposed criteria, with particular reference to the implications for each criterion of possible decisions the Committee might make with regard to the larger questions discussed the previous day. For instance, if the Committee were to choose that the two lists be mutually independent, would the criterion addressing “representativeness” be applied only to the Representative List and not to the Urgent Safeguarding List? If the Committee were to choose to allocate slots on the Representative List to States Parties, how would criteria be revised accordingly? If the Committee were to choose to make the Urgent Safeguarding List effectively subsidiary to the Representative List, which criteria would require revision? The experts will be asked to anticipate the possible consequences of different choices that will face the Committee, so that the Committee’s decisions can be informed by the experts’ explorations of their implications and entailments.

On the morning of the third day (4 April 2007), experts will review the four written position papers drafted by its members. A final summary discussion will review the work of the preceding two days. It is not expected that the experts will agree on a single “recommendation” or “declaration” at the conclusion of the meeting—rather, the position papers prepared and agreed by them will be made available to the Committee as informational documents.

Experts are reminded that under the [Regulations for the general classification of the various categories of meetings convened by UNESCO](#), as adopted by the General Conference, members of an expert committee “*shall serve in a private capacity and will not be considered to be representatives of their respective governments*”. Observers are also welcome to “*follow the proceedings of these meetings*”, according to those same Regulations, but are requested to inform the Secretariat in advance of their intention to attend. The Secretariat will prepare a report of the outcomes of the meeting.

Monday, 2 April 2007—Some fundamental questions about the lists

- 9:30 **Registration**
- 10:00–10:30 **Inaugural Ceremony**
 Presided by H.E. Ms Ambika Soni, Minister for Tourism and Culture
- 10:30–10:45 **TEA BREAK**
- 10:45–11:30 **Introduction and objectives of the meeting**
- 11:30–13:00 **Break-out sessions, by groups**
- 13:00–14:15 **LUNCH**
- 14:30–16:00 **Continuation and conclusion of break-out sessions, by groups**
- 16:00–16:15 **TEA BREAK**
- 16:15–18:00 **Groups present oral reports for discussion**
- 18:30 **Cultural programme**
- 20:00 **Dinner**

Tuesday, 3 April 2007—Discussion of proposals to be presented to the IGC

- 9:00–11:00 **Criteria for inscription on the Lists**
- 11:00–11:15 **TEA BREAK**
- 11:15–13:00 **Criteria for inscription on the Lists, continued**
- 13:00–14:15 **LUNCH**
- 14:30–16:00 **Criteria for inscription on the Lists, continued**
- 16:00–16:15 **TEA BREAK**
- 16:00–18:00 **Monitoring procedures and criteria for updating the two lists**
- 19:00 **Cultural Programme**
- 20:00 **Dinner**

Wednesday, 4 April 2007—Review and conclusion

- 9:00–10:45 **Review of position papers/documents of working groups**
- 10:45–11:00 **TEA BREAK**
- 11:00–12:00 **Summary discussion and closure of the meeting**
- 12:00–13:00 **LUNCH**
- 13:30 **Excursion departs by bus for Qtab Minr, Red Fort, and Humayun Tomb**
(return to hotel by 18:30)

ANNEX III–LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Experts

Ms Claudine-Augée ANGOUÉ

Conseillère technique
Ministère de la Culture
B.P. 1007
Libreville
GABON

Mr Antonio ARANTES

Professor
Avenida Higienópolis 111 ap.63
01238-001 São Paulo
BRAZIL

Mr Egil BAKKA

Director, Professor
Norwegian Council for Traditional Music and Dance &
Norwegian University for Science and Technology
Rff-Sentret, Dragvoll
7491 Trondheim
NORWAY

Ms Irina BALOTESCU

Assistante conseillère
Ministère de la Culture et des Cultes
Rue de Kiseleff, 30
O.P. 33
Bucarest 011347
ROUMANIE

Mr Omozuanvbo Joseph EBOREIME

Director-General
16 Cotonou Crescents, Wuse zone 6
Abuja
NIGERIA

Mr László FELFÖLDI

President, European Folklore Institute
Rákóczi u. 15.
H-6772 Deszk
HUNGARY

Ms Maria Cecilia Londres FONSECA

Membre du conseil consultatif du patrimoine culturel
Av. Atlantica 1572
Apt. 1201
22021-000 Rio de Janeiro
BRÉSIL

Mr GAO Bingzhong

Professor
Lan Qi Ying #5-303
Haidian District
Beijing 100084
CHINA

Mr Slimane HACHI

Professeur, Directeur de recherches
CNRPAH
3 rue F.D. Roosevelt
Alger
ALGERIE

Mr Carlos HERNÁNDEZ SOTO

Social Anthropologist - Director
Museo del Hombre Dominicano
Calle Pedro Henríquez Ureña
Plaza de la Cultura
Santo Domingo
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr Marc JACOBS

Prof. dr. // director VCV
Gallaitstraat 76, b 2
BE 1030 Brussel
BELGIUM

Ms Aika JHA

Director in charge of UNESCO, SAARC, Anthropology,
Archives and Libraries of India
Ministry of Culture
319 'C' Shastri Bhawan
New Delhi - 110001
INDIA

Mr Elias KESROUANI

Prof. Dr. Directeur du Departement de Musicologie
Notre-Dame University
Zouk Mosbeh
LIBAN

Mr Chérif KHAZNADAR

Directeur, Maison des Cultures du Monde
150 Boulevard de Magenta
75010 Paris
FRANCE

Mr Toshiyuki KONO

Professor of Law
Faculty of Law, Kyushu University 23
812-8581 Fukuoka
JAPAN

Ms Kristin KUUTMA

Doctor, Associate Professor
University of Tartu
Linda 5-6
10411 Tallinn
ESTONIA

Mr Philippe LA HAUSSE DE LALOUVIERE

Heritage Researcher (& General Manager)
New Maurifoods Ltd,
Pont Fer
Phoenix
MAURITIUS

Ms LE Thi Minh Ly

Deputy Director, Department of Cultural Heritage,
Ministry of Culture and Information
51 Ngo Quyen Street
Hanoi
VIET NAM

Mr Jesus Antonio MACHUCA RAMIREZ

Researcher, Institut National d'Anthropologie et
Histoire Mexique
Direccion de Etnologia y Antropologia Social
Ex-Convento del Carmen
No. 4 +6, Avenue Revolution
San Angel
MEXICO

Mr Thabo MANETSI

Manager (Living Heritage)
South African Heritage Resources Agency
111 Harrington Street
Cape Town, 8001
SOUTH AFRICA

Ms Soledad MUJICA

Expert in Research and Promotion of Peruvian
Intangible Culture
José de la Torre Ugarte 155, dpto. 501
Miraflores
Lima 18
PERU

H.E. Ms Bhaswati MUKHERJEE

Ambassador and Permanent Representative of India to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
FRANCE

H.E. Mr Ghassan NSEIR

Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Syria to
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
FRANCE

Mr Ocal OGUZ

Professeur, Membre du Comité du PCI
Gazi Universitesi Fen Ed. Fak. Turk Halkbilimi Bolumu
Teknikokullar
Ankara
TURQUIE

Mr Yadollah PARMOUN

Faculty Member and Head of Dialectology Research
Department
Languages and Dialects Research Department
Iranian Cultural Heritage, Handicrafts, and Tourism
Organization (ICHHTO)
Azadi Ave. & Yadegar-e Emam Exp. way Cross-roads
Tehran
IRAN

Ms Mila SANTOVA

Directeur de l'Institut de Folklore - Academie bulgare
des Sciences
ul. acad. G. Bontchev, bl. 6
Sofia 1113
BULGARIE

Mr Ahmed SKOUNTI

Anthropologue, enseignant chercheur, Institut national
des sciences de l'archéologie et du patrimoine
(INSAP), Ministère de la Culture, Morocco
Antenne de l'INSAP, Délégation de la Culture
6, rue Ibn Hanbal, Guéliz
40000 Marrakech
MAROC

Mr Laurier TURGEON

Professeur titulaire
Maison du Canada
31 boulevard Jourdan
75014 Paris
FRANCE

Mr Tvrtko ZEBEC

Dr. sc., senior scientific researcher
Ratkajev prolaz 2
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA

Observers

Mr Kishor K. BASA

Director, National Museum of Mankind
Indira Gandhi Rashtriya Manav Sangrahalay
Shamla Hills
Bhopal 462013
INDIA

Mr Kwang-nam KIM

Executive Director, Establishment Initiative for the
Intangible Heritage Centre for Asia-Pacific (EIIHCAP)
EIIHCAP, National Palace Museum Annex
1-57, Sejongno Jongno-gu
Seoul
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

H.E. Mr Seiichi KONDO

Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Japan to
UNESCO
148, rue de l'Universite
75007 Paris
FRANCE

Mr Shigeyuki MIYATA

Director, Department of Intangible Cultural Heritage
Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural
Properties, Japan
13-43 Ueno-Park
Taito-ku
Tokyo 110-8713
JAPAN

Ms Hiroko MORIYAMA

Officer, Multilateral Cooperation Division, Ministry of
Foreign Affairs
2-2-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyod-ku
Tokyo 100-8919
JAPAN

Mr Hirotugu SAITO

Chief Senior Specialist for Cultural Properties
Traditional Culture Division, Agency for Cultural Affairs
Marunouchi 2-5-1,
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100-8959
JAPAN

Mr Tsunashige SHIOTORI

Second Secretary
Permanent Delegation of Japan to UNESCO
148, rue de l'Université
75007 Paris
FRANCE

Ms Shanta Serbjeet SINGH

Chairperson
APPAN (Asia-Pacific Performing Arts Network)
C 51, Gulmohar Park
New Delhi - 110049
INDIA

UNESCO Secretariat

Intangible Cultural Heritage Section:

Mr Riëks SMEETS

Chief
Intangible Cultural Heritage Section
Division of Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 Paris cedex 15
FRANCE

Mr Frank PROSCHAN

Programme Specialist
Intangible Cultural Heritage Section
Division of Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 Paris cedex 15
FRANCE

Mr David STEHL

Assistant Programme Specialist
Intangible Cultural Heritage Section
Division of Cultural Objects and Intangible Heritage
UNESCO
1, rue Miollis
75732 Paris cedex 15
FRANCE

Ms Noriko AIKAWA

*Observer (Advisor to the Assistant
Director-General for Culture)*
41 rue Dauphine
75006 Paris
FRANCE

Field Office/New Delhi:

Ms Minja YANG

Director of UNESCO Office in New Delhi (India) and
UNESCO Representative to India, Bangladesh,
Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal and Sri Lanka
UNESCO House
B-5/29, Safdarjung Enclave
New Delhi – 110 029
INDIA

Ms Moe CHIBA

Programme Specialist for Culture
UNESCO New Delhi
UNESCO House
B-5/29 Safdarjung Enclave
New Delhi – 110 029
INDIA