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| **Summary**At its thirteenth session, the Committee established a consultative body responsible for the evaluation in 2019 of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and to the Representative List, proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 ([Decision 13.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/14)). This document constitutes the report of the Evaluation Body, which includes an overview of the 2019 cycle (Part A), observations and recommendations on working methods and a number of cross-cutting issues (Part B), an overview of recurring issues (Part C) and a draft decision for the Committee’s consideration (Part D).**Decision required:** paragraph 56 |

1. In conformity with paragraph 27 of the 2018 Operational Directives, the evaluation of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereinafter, ‘the Urgent Safeguarding List’) and on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereinafter, ‘the Representative List’), proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 is accomplished by a consultative body of the Committee established in accordance with Article 8.3 of the Convention, as well as Rule 20 of its Rules of Procedure, known as the ‘Evaluation Body’.
2. By its [Decision 13.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/14), the Committee established the present body at its thirteenth session (Port Louis, Republic of Mauritius, 26 November to 1 December 2018). The Evaluation Body is composed of six experts qualified in various fields of intangible cultural heritage representative of States Parties non-Members of the Committee and six accredited non-governmental organizations. As indicated in [Decision 9.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/11), a system of rotation among the seats was established, according to which the Committee reappointed nine continuing members and elected three new members – Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo (Italy), Ms Ľubica Voľanská (Slovakia) and the Association pour la sauvegarde des masques (ASAMA) – at its thirteenth session. They were elected by the Committee taking into consideration equitable geographical representation and their qualifications in various domains of intangible cultural heritage. The twelve members are:

**Expert representatives of States Parties non-Members of the Committee**

EG I: Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo (Italy)

EG II: Ms Ľubica Voľanská (Slovakia)

EG III: Ms Sonia Montecino Aguirre (Chile)

EG IV: Ms Hien Thi Nguyen (Viet Nam)

EG V(a): Mr John Moogi Omare (Kenya)

EG V(b): Mr Saeed Al Busaidi (Oman)

**Accredited non-governmental organizations**

EG I: Norsk Håndverksinstitutt / Norwegian Crafts Institute

EG II: Czech Ethnological Society

EG III: Erigaie Foundation

EG IV: Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation (CHF)

EG V(a): Association pour la sauvegarde des masques (ASAMA)

EG V(b): Egyptian Society for Folk Traditions

1. Following the submission of a report on its work to the fourteenth session of the Committee, the present Evaluation Body shall cease to exist. A new Evaluation Body will be established at the fourteenth session of the Committee, following the requirements described in [Decision 9.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/11).
2. The report of the Evaluation Body consists of five working documents, as follows:
3. The present document [LHE/19/14.COM/10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10-EN.docx) constitutes the general report of the Evaluation Body with an overview of all the 2019 files (Part A), general observations and recommendations on working methods and a number of cross-cutting issues (Part B), an overview of recurring issues in the 2019 cycle (Part C) and a draft decision for the Committee’s consideration (Part D);
4. Document [LHE/19/14.COM/10.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.a-EN.docx) concerns nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, as well as combined nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List together with requests for International Assistance to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the nominations with the inscription criteria as provided in Chapter l.1 of the Operational Directives, including an assessment of the viability of the element and of the feasibility and sufficiency of the safeguarding plan and the risks of it disappearing, as provided in paragraph 29 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List or to refer the nominations to the submitting State(s) for additional information. The document also includes an assessment of the conformity of the request for International Assistance with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.4 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to approve or not to approve the requests or to refer the requests to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
5. Document [LHE/19/14.COM/10.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.b-EN.docx) concerns nominations for inscription on the Representative List. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the nominations with the inscription criteria, as provided in Chapter l.2 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated elements on the Representative List or to refer the nominations to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
6. Document [LHE/19/14.COM/10.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.c-EN.docx) concerns proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the proposals with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.3 of the Operational Directives, as well as recommendations to the Committee to select or not to select the proposals or to refer the proposals to the submitting State(s) for additional information;
7. Document [LHE/19/14.COM/10.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.d-EN.docx) concerns a request for International Assistance greater than US$100,000. It includes an assessment of the conformity of the request with the selection criteria, as provided in Chapter l.4 of the Operational Directives, as well as a recommendation to the Committee to approve or not to approve the request or to refer the request to the submitting State for additional information.
8. The nominations, proposals and requests evaluated by the Evaluation Body are available on the website of the Convention at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/files-2019-under-process-00989>.

**A. Overview of the 2019 cycle**

1. The deadline for the submission of files for the 2019 cycle was 1April 2018 since the statutory deadline of 31 March 2018 (paragraph 54 of the Operational Directives) was a public holiday at the Headquarters of UNESCO. The Operational Directives provide that ‘The Committee determines two years beforehand, in accordance with the available resources and its capacity, the number of files that can be treated in the course of the two following cycles’ (paragraph 33). At its eleventh session in Addis Ababa (2016), the Committee determined that in the course of the 2019 cycle a total of fifty files could be treated for the Urgent Safeguarding List, Representative List, Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and International Assistance greater than US$100,000 ([Decision 11.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/12)).
2. Following the abovementioned [Decision 11.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/12) to have at least one file per submitting State processed over the two-year period 2018–2019 and applying the priorities set out in paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives, the Evaluation Body was informed that the Secretariat had treated a total of fifty-three files, as follows:

By level of priority:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Type of file** | **Number** |
| Decision 11.COM 12 | Files from States that did not have a file treated for the 2018 cycle | 38 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (i) | Files from States having no elements inscribed, good safeguarding practices selected or requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 approved | 2 |
| Nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List | 3 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (ii) | Multi-national files | 5 |
| Paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives – priority (iii) | Files from States having up to one element inscribed, good safeguarding practice selected or request for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 approved | 5 |
| **Total** |  | **53** |

1. Twenty States[[1]](#footnote-1) that submitted files for the 2019 cycle could not see their files treated within the ceiling of fifty-three files in the 2019 cycle. Their files will be examined with priority in the 2020 cycle, following the principle of at least one file per submitting State during the two-year cycle ([Decision 13.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/15)).
2. The Secretariat processed each of the fifty-three files and contacted the submitting States in June 2018 about any further information required for the files to be considered as technically complete. Following this completeness check by the Secretariat, fifty-two files were considered as technically complete, whereas one file remained technically incomplete and consequently the Secretariat could not transmit it to the Evaluation Body.
3. A total of fifty-two files were completed by the submitting States in time for their evaluation by the Evaluation Body, as indicated below, including five multinational files, two files referred in a previous cycle, two files withdrawn by the submitting States prior to examination by the Committee and one file not inscribed in a previous cycle:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Urgent Safeguarding List | 4 |
| Urgent Safeguarding List combined with International Assistance | 2 |
| Representative List | 42 |
| Register of Good Safeguarding Practices | 3 |
| International Assistance  | 1 |
| **Total** | **52** |

1. The Evaluation Body met for the first time at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris on 28 February and 1 March 2019. After consultation, the Body elected Ms Sangmee Bak (Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation) to serve as its Chairperson, Mr Eivind Falk (Norwegian Crafts Institute) to serve as its Vice-Chairperson, and Mr Martín Andrade Pérez (Erigaie Foundation) to serve as its Rapporteur.
2. As was the case for preceding cycles, the Secretariat established a password-protected, dedicated website through which members could consult the documents of the meetings as well as the files to be evaluated, together with any accompanying documentation. An email distribution list facilitated communication among members of the Evaluation Body. Every member of the Body evaluated each file online and prepared an individual report on it explaining whether and how it responded to the applicable criteria.
3. The Evaluation Body met from 3 to 7 June 2019 to debate and reach a consensus on its recommendations on each criterion for every file as well as on cross-cutting issues. On this basis, the Rapporteur prepared draft decisions for each file, as well as general observations and recommendations by the Body. The Evaluation Body met again from 18 to 20 September 2019 to validate the draft decisions for each file and adopt its reports. The resulting draft decisions presented in the five respective reports thus represent the consensus of the Evaluation Body.
4. The 2019 cycle also included a new experimental procedure called ‘provisional upstream dialogue’. By its [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10), at its thirteenth session the Intergovernmental Committee requested that the Secretariat transmit any questions from the Evaluation Body concerning files submitted for the 2019 cycle to the States Parties concerned. This procedure was introduced in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention and as a way to improve the inscription process for nominations as part of the ‘early harvest package’. The Evaluation Body therefore applied this procedure when it considered that a short question and answer process with the submitting State might clarify whether the nomination meets the criterion concerned.
5. An information and exchange session was also held on 1 March 2019 in order to present States Parties with the provisional procedure and timetable proposed for the dialogue process, with regard to the evaluation of nominations in the 2019 cycle. In accordance with paragraph 55 of the Operational Directives and the timetable of the nomination cycle, which determines that the final evaluation of the Evaluation Body should be conducted during a meeting held between April and June, the reports of the Evaluation Body – namely, working documents [LHE/19/14.COM/10.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.a-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.b-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.c-EN.docx) and [LHE/19/14.COM/10.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.d-EN.docx) – present the Body’s recommendations for each nomination file, which were finalized during its June meeting. In addition to these documents and in accordance with the provisional dialogue process established for this cycle, the Evaluation Body is providing the Committee with a separate document ([LHE/19/14.COM/INF.10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.10-EN.docx)) that includes its opinion for the files concerned by dialogue, taking into account the answers provided by the submitting States. This temporary procedure was put in place for the 2019 cycle, pending the possible adoption of the amendments to the Operational Directives by the General Assembly at its eighth session in 2020, to allow for a dialogue mechanism between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States.
6. Out of the fifty-two files examined by the Evaluation Body in this cycle, a total of thirty-two files (61 per cent) are recommended for inscription, selection or approval, twelve files (23 per cent) are recommended for referral, two files (4 per cent) not recommended for inscription, and six files concerned by dialogue (12 per cent), as follows:
7. Compared to the previous cycle (2018), the number of files recommended for referral has decreased from 26 per cent to 23 per cent. However, the number of files recommended for inscription has also decreased from 70 per cent to 61 per cent, as 12 per cent of the files in this cycle were included in the dialogue process. Should the Committee decide to follow the positive opinion of the Evaluation Body for the files concerned by dialogue, the number of files to be inscribed would increase to 73 per cent in comparison to 70 per cent in the previous cycle.
8. Out of the fourteen files that were referred or not recommended for inscription, selection or approval, 79 per cent were referred or not recommended for inscription on multiple criteria, as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Urgent Safeguarding List** | **Representative List** | **Register of Good Safeguarding Practices** |
| **Number of files referred or not recommended on only one criterion** | 2 | 1 |  |
| **Number of files referred or not recommended on multiple criteria** | 1 | 9 | 1 |

1. Among the files that were referred or not recommended for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List or the Representative List, the recommendations of the Evaluation Body were based on issues concerning the following criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Number of files in which the criterion was referred or considered as not met** |
| U.1/R.1 | 3 |
| U.2 | - |
| R.2 | 8 |
| U.3 | 3 |
| R.3 | 8 |
| U.4/R.4 | 4 |
| U.5/R.5 | 2 |

1. **General observations and recommendations**
2. This part of the report explains the working methods of the Evaluation Body and outlines the main issues, observations and conclusions that arose during its work. Although some of these issues are recurrent, members of the Body discussed them with the utmost attention and due diligence.

***Working methods***

1. **Evaluation of the content of the files, rather than the element itself**. As an initial remark, it is important to note that the Evaluation Body based its evaluations on an analysis of the information included in the nomination files, and not on a direct assessment of the value of the element or project as such. As has been the practice in the past, the Evaluation Body did not make assumptions about any missing details, relying only on the information provided, and strictly followed the criteria defined in the Operational Directives. It did, however, observe that, in certain cases, information external to the nomination file could have allowed for a more informed assessment of whether the file responds to the criteria concerned.
2. **Neutrality of the members of the Evaluation Body**. To ensure neutrality and equity, and as has been the custom in the past, members of the Evaluation Body did not evaluate any files submitted by their country of nationality or the country in which the non-governmental organization they represent is located. Such members also did not take part in the discussions about the file or in the drafting of the recommendation. This was the case for eleven of the fifty-two files evaluated in this cycle, including one multinational file for which two members did not participate in the evaluation.
3. **Consistency of the evaluation within and across files in this cycle.** Evaluations were made on a criterion-by-criterion basis, while also paying attention to the consistency of the file as a whole and to the placement of information in the appropriate sections of the file. Furthermore, the Evaluation Body treated all the files equally, ensuring consistency between them and in the recommendations to States Parties. The Body paid particular attention to criteria R.2 and U.5/R.5, which present a number of problems, as mentioned below; these criteria were evaluated as uniformly as possible across all the files.
4. **Consistency with previous decisions of the Committee.** The Evaluation Body also took into account previous decisions of the Committee, as well as the experiences of previous Bodies to maintain consistency with evaluations from previous cycles. In this cycle, despite the changes made to the nomination form, the Body remained consistent with the recommendations for criterion R.2 from previous years and did not recommend that files be referred based on this criterion only or on the periodicity of updating of the inventories, as far as criteria U.5/R.5 are concerned.
5. **Use of the referral option**. As in the past, the referral option was applied when the information provided in the file was considered to be not sufficient or missing, while a recommendation not to inscribe was made when the information was deemed inadequate or did not meet the criteria. In both cases, the Body has indicated the reasons for its recommendation, pointing out the nature of the missing information or the specific reasons why the criteria were not met. The Evaluation Body wishes to emphasize the importance of the referral option as a tool for improving the quality of files. All such cases are published on the website of the Convention and can thus be used as a reference by submitting States for upcoming files.
6. **Previously referred files**. Five files that the Body recommended for referral or not to inscribe/select in previous cycles were resubmitted for this cycle. Two of these files had been improved: ‘*Seperu folkdance and associated practices*’, from Botswana, and ‘*Celestinian forgiveness celebration*’, from Italy. These two files followed the recommendations of the Committee after a substantial revision of the file, which took over a year. However, other files included few changes or only changes to the wording and did not take into account the recommendations of the Committee. Certain States resubmitted the files in the cycle immediately following their examination by the Committee, which only gave them three months to review the information and apply the recommendations. In the future, the Evaluation Body recommends that States Parties assess the recommendations carefully, allowing enough time to apply them, and that they try to avoid resubmitting the file in the immediately subsequent cycle without significant revisions.
7. **Combined mechanism for a nomination for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and a request for International Assistance**. During this cycle, the Body evaluated two files that used this combined mechanism. Both the nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the requests for International Assistance to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan were recommended for referral by the Evaluation Body. As was the case with the examination of the first combined nomination in the 2016 cycle, the Body first concluded its evaluation of the nomination for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List before then proceeding with its assessment of the request for International Assistance.
	* **Conclusions and recommendations for the combined mechanism.** While evaluating the combined files, the Body questioned whether its approach – to first conclude its evaluation of the nomination before then evaluating the request for International Assistance – was the most pertinent. Considering that a different set of conclusions could be drawn for the combined cases – ranging from a positive or negative recommendation for both mechanisms to a positive recommendation for only one of the mechanisms –, it was difficult for the Body to determine the most appropriate evaluation modality in these cases. For example, the Body questioned whether the request for International Assistance should be examined if the nomination for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List had already been recommended for referral, especially if this was based on criterion U.3 in relation to the development and implementation of a safeguarding plan. Lastly, the Body observed that Form ICH-01bis for the combined mechanism is quite complex and not easy to fill in. It considered that the application process requires considerable effort for States Parties, while it did not seem as effective as expected in terms of its results. The Body therefore agreed that further reflection and review should be undertaken on the adequacy, pertinence and effectiveness of the combined mechanism before continuing to use it in future cycles.
8. **Provisional upstream dialogue**. As mentioned in paragraphs 14 and 15, a process of provisional upstream dialogue was introduced in this cycle, for the first time and on an experimental basis. During its second meeting in June 2019, the Evaluation Body agreed on which files might benefit from the dialogue process and drafted specific questions addressed to the States Parties concerned. The Secretariat sent the questions to the States Parties in writing on 12 June 2019, giving them one month to provide a concrete answer by 12 July 2019, in both English and French. On 11 July 2019, the Secretariat made the States Parties’ responses available to the members of the Evaluation Body through a dedicated interface of the Convention. Based on these answers, the members of the Evaluation Body formed their individual opinions on the criteria concerned. The Body then met for its third meeting from 18 to 20 September 2019 to decide whether, based on the information in the files and the answers provided by the submitting States, the criteria could be considered to be satisfied. During that meeting, the Body reached its collective opinions on the relevant criteria for the nominations concerned by the dialogue process (Document [LHE/19/14.COM/INF.10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.10-EN.docx)).
	* **Cases in which the upstream dialogue process was applied**. The Body chose to focus on specific questions that might resolve issues raised within the file and that could ultimately allow the Committee to decide whether the nominated element should be inscribed or referred. Not all the files recommended for referral were included in the dialogue process. The process was mainly applied for files containing minor issues or a confusing statement that could potentially be clarified through a simple question and answer exchange with the submitting State, requesting a short answer of maximum 200 words. In that regard, the process was not used with a view to the nomination file being rewritten. Equally, the answer provided should not contradict the information in the file and should only serve to clarify and support the issues that were specifically raised by the Body.
	* **Criteria concerned by the dialogue process**. The dialogue process was applied in six cases: in five cases, the Body sent one question while in one case it sent two. Five of the questions related to the safeguarding plan (U.3) or safeguarding measures (R.3) and two related to community participation and consent in the nomination process (U.4/R.4). During this cycle, and to be consistent with other decisions of the Committee, no files were referred solely based on criterion R.2 or on the updating mechanisms for the inventories. As such, the questions sent to the States Parties concerned did not address these issues because a dialogue process would not have changed the Evaluation Body’s recommendation.
	* **Results of the dialogue process and overall conclusions**.For all six files concerned by the dialogue process, the Evaluation Body reached a positive opinion, being satisfied with the answer(s) provided by the State Party. As an initial experience, the overall process and its results allowed the Evaluation Body to feel much more comfortable about its draft recommendations for the six files concerned and about the evaluation process as a whole. The Body felt that, as a result of this process, no files would be referred in this cycle due to minor aspects. When an element was referred or not recommended for inscription, it was because the file contained substantial issues that could not be resolved through a simple clarification with the submitting State or without involving a more in-depth consultation process with the communities concerned.
	* **General comments about the upstream dialogue process during this cycle**.Overall, the provisional dialogue process was a positive experience for the Body and it is expected to bring about improvements not only in the evaluation process but in the listing process more generally. Furthermore, it gives the Evaluation Body more confidence in its work and benefits the States Parties and communities concerned. Nevertheless, the dialogue process creates additional work for the members of the Evaluation Body, which is difficult to manage given the Body’s existing workload. Even if it required less time than expected, in many cases the Body had to re-examine the whole file in order to reach a pertinent opinion about the answers provided. The Body also observed that, due to the short deadlines and time restrictions, the answers seemed to have been provided by government authorities or researchers, with less input from the communities themselves, with the exception of one case. Ideally, the communities should be at the centre of the process, but the Body understands that there are time limits due to the timeframe of the evaluation cycle. Finally, the Body concluded that the quality of the answers provided by the States Parties depended on the quality of the questions addressed to them. When evaluating the answers, the Body found that some questions were not specific enough, meaning that States had greater difficulty providing a specific answer. As an important recommendation for future cycles, the questions from the Body need to be as clear and specific as possible to facilitate its work and to avoid any misunderstandings by the States Parties.
	* **Final recommendation about the upstream dialogue process**. The Evaluation Body recommends that the Committee propose some amendments to the Operational Directives in order to allow the Body to change its recommendations for files concerned by the dialogue process during the September meeting. For files not concerned by dialogue, however, the Evaluation Body should continue to follow the existing evaluation procedure and timetable set out in the Operational Directives and should finalize its evaluation during a meeting held between April and June. If not, there is a high risk that the evaluation will not be completed by the September meeting. The Body therefore recommends that the Committee and the General Assembly make the necessary adjustments to the Operational Directives to this effect.

***General comments***

1. **Linguistic quality of the files**. As has been the case in previous cycles, many nomination files presented linguistic problems, including unclear and imprecise language, poor translations, typographical errors and grammatical mistakes. It is important to recall that the quality of writing of files, or of their translation, is important to ensure the element is well-understood, not only by the Evaluation Body but by anyone that reads the file when it is available on the website of the Convention. Furthermore, nomination files are an important tool for promoting and presenting elements of intangible cultural heritage at all levels and, as such, it is important that their quality is as high as possible. The Evaluation Body also encourages submitting States to avoid the unnecessary use of acronyms in nomination files. There were cases in this cycle in which the members of the Body had difficulty ascertaining the meaning of some acronyms.
2. **Use of inappropriate language**. States Parties are reminded to avoid the use of language that refers to the uniqueness, exceptionality and immutability of elements of intangible cultural heritage. In this cycle, expressions such as ‘unique’ and ‘prestige’ were used in some files. Additionally, many files still refer to the ‘preservation’ of an element instead of its safeguarding, which goes against the living and dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage. Furthermore, some files used terms to describe the ‘integrity’ or ‘authenticity’ of an element, which is contrary to the principles and spirit of the Convention.
3. **Titles of elements**. As in previous cycles, the titles of the elements were a source of discussion during the meetings of the Evaluation Body. As the first presentation of an element, titles must be carefully formulated and must give a clear idea of the nature of the element. The Body noted that certain titles were very general and suggested a common, widespread element that could exist anywhere. Other titles use generic terms to define the element, which generate confusion instead of providing a clear idea of its nature. At the same time, some titles are overly long and descriptive, which makes them confusing. Another issue is the mismatch between the title and the content of the nomination file. Some titles do not correspond to the description of the element or only indicate certain specific areas or communities, while the file clearly suggests that the element covers a wide range of communities or areas. Finally, although the inclusion of a location or the name of a particular community may help determine the nature of an element, the Evaluation Body recommends avoiding references to exclusiveness, ownership or geographic origin in the title of elements. In the spirit of improving and clarifying some files, the Body requested that the Secretariat encourage three States Parties to modify the titles of their elements to ensure that they adequately reflect the content of the file. In the three cases concerned, the submitting States agreed to modify the titles of their files.
4. **Multinational nominations**. Five multinational nomination files were evaluated in this cycle. The Evaluation Body recognizes the complexity of preparing such files and commends the efforts made by the States Parties to achieve this. One of the files was nominated by fourteen countries with a diverse range of policies, actors and institutions related to intangible cultural heritage, which is a challenge in itself. While the Body is aware that uniformity of information is difficult in such cases, it applied the same evaluation parameters as for nominations from a single submitting State. The Evaluation Body questioned whether to inscribe elements for some States and not for others when a criterion is clearly satisfied for certain States but not as clearly for others.
	* **Collaboration between States**. It is important to recall that multinational files must be the expression of collaboration between States, following the principles of international cooperation and the promotion of mutual understanding among States. In this sense, it is important that nominations be prepared collaboratively, with a focus on interaction and the sharing of information about the element. Furthermore, States Parties should strive to present balanced files, with an equal share of information from each country.
	* **Collaboration between communities*.*** Multinational nominations must demonstrate agreement not only between States but also between all the communities concerned regarding the shared nature of the proposed element and their commitment to the multinational character of the nomination. Despite the difficulties involved, such nominations should avoid top-down approaches and demonstrate active community participation, which should be balanced for all the States concerned.
	* **Joint safeguarding measures**. While recognizing the specificity of each State, safeguarding measures in such cases should include joint measures to safeguard the element as a shared element that can create ties between different communities and countries.
	* **The possibility of extended nominations**. The Evaluation Body notes the interest of other States in joining these multinational nominations and invites the submitting States to consider working towards the possibility of extended nominations in these cases.
5. **Good examples.** The Evaluation Body is pleased to recommend some nominations from this cycle as good examples:
6. ***International Assistance***

‘*Capacity building for stakeholders involved in safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage in Burkina Faso*’, proposed by Burkina Faso, is a very well-structured project that is intended to reinforce the capacities of a wide group of local stakeholders at the national level.

1. ***Register of Good Safeguarding Practices***

‘*Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building*’, proposed by Colombia, is a good programme for developing countries and post-conflict countries where intangible cultural heritage could contribute to the sustainable livelihood of communities and serve as a model for peacebuilding.

‘*Biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela*’, proposed by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, sheds light on the fundamental role of communities in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. It also demonstrates the key role that intangible cultural heritage plays in relation to sustainable development and protecting the environment.

1. ***Representative List – Overall files***

‘*Transhumance, the seasonal droving of livestock along migratory routes in the Mediterranean and in the Alps*’, proposed by Austria, Greece and Italy, is a multinational file that testifies to the interconnectedness of remote communities thanks to intangible cultural heritage and to active networking among communities in the preparation of the nomination and in the overall safeguarding of the element.

‘*Alpinism*’, proposed by France, Italy and Switzerland, is a multinational file that testifies to active networking among communities in the preparation of the nomination and in the overall safeguarding of the element.

‘*‘Hatajo de Negritos’ and ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ from the Peruvian south-central coastline*’, proposed by Peru, includes a very clear identification of the element and well-organized safeguarding measures.

1. ***Representative List – Specific aspects***

‘*Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular festival*’, proposed by Belgium, and ‘*Byzantine chant*’, proposed by Cyprus and Greece, could serve as good examples of how the inscription of an element on the Representative List can contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the significance of intangible cultural heritage.

‘*Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão*’, proposed by Brazil, and ‘*Gnawa*’, proposed by Morocco, provide evidence of community consent in a personalized rather than standardized format, notably through the use of video.

‘*Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs*’, proposed by Mongolia, is an element that shows how the nomadic pastoral use of land can be a way of achieving environmental protection and sustainability.

‘*Winter festivities, Carnival of Podence*’, proposed by Portugal, shows how a small community can take responsibility for its intangible cultural heritage through a fully community-based approach and how gender roles evolve in response to social and economic changes.

‘*Practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah*’, proposed by the Syrian Arabic Republic, is a nomination file that underlines the importance of traditional knowledge concerning nature and the universe and offers a positive example of the role of intangible cultural heritage as a tool for sustainable development.

‘*Traditional Turkish archery*’, proposed by Turkey, is a nomination file which includes a video that reflects all the key aspects of the element and allows viewers to understand the element in detail.

***Thematic Issues***

1. **Shared heritage.** As in previous years, the Evaluation Body assessed similar elements nominated for possible inscription by different countries, as well as elements similar to ones inscribed in the past by other States Parties. The Body wishes to reiterate that the inscription of an element on the Lists does not imply exclusivity or ownership. On the contrary, one of the purposes of the Lists is to encourage dialogue that respects cultural diversity and to promote intangible cultural heritage as a way of approaching each other and working together. As the Body recognizes the right of every State Party to nominate an element within its territory even if it is practised elsewhere, it was not influenced in its evaluations by the existence of similar elements. However, as the Committee has consistently encouraged States Parties to work together, the Evaluation Body wishes to reiterate this invitation to consider working towards the possibility of extended nominations. This year, for example, two different nominations were submitted for similar elements. While one is recommended for inscription and the other is not, this difference in recommendations is not intended to reflect a judgement on the elements themselves, but rather reflects a difference in the quality of the files submitted.
2. **Ownership, exclusivity and geographic origin.** The Evaluation Body recalls that the inscription of an element on the Representative List or on the Urgent Safeguarding List does not imply ownership over or the exclusivity of an element of intangible cultural heritage and does not mean that other States cannot nominate similar elements practised on their territory. The inscription of an element on either of the Lists does not represent a means either to reinforce geographic origin or the geographic indication of an element or to exclude other States. On the contrary, the Body wishes to stress that many elements are shared across different countries and are not restricted to specific communities.
3. **The definition of intangible cultural heritage.** The broad range of intangible cultural heritage is demonstrated by the diversity of practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and skills inscribed on the Lists of the Convention, which currently number almost five hundred. As such, the Lists themselves provide a definition of intangible cultural heritage, which is enlarged every year through new inscriptions. While the Evaluation Body welcomes a rich diversity of elements, it encourages States Parties to define the elements they nominate in a clear manner, both in terms of the description of the element and the title. For some nomination files in this cycle, the Evaluation Body found that certain components within the element were clearly intangible cultural heritage while others were not, which made it impossible to conclude that the entire element could be defined as intangible cultural heritage. While recognizing the open definition of intangible cultural heritage provided by the Convention, the Body wishes to reiterate that this does not mean that any cultural element can be included on the Lists.Furthermore, several cases under this cycle provided an opportunity to discuss the complex relations between the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the promotion of cultural goods, services and industries. While these two approaches are not necessarily always mutually exclusive, an emphasis on the promotion of cultural goods, services and industries rather than on the safeguarding of living heritage is not in line with the spirit of the Convention.
4. **Intangible cultural heritage and economic development.** In many cases, elements of intangible cultural heritage are directly linked to economic activities, either as part of a productive chain, in the case of crafts, or as a tourist attraction, spectacle or other source of income for the communities concerned. While this link is not a problem in itself, many issues can arise as a result of it. The Evaluation Body noted the following such issues during this cycle:
	* **Safeguarding measures**. In some cases, the Body found that the safeguarding plans or safeguarding measures presented were primarily directed at preserving and reinforcing the economic aspect of an element, overlooking its social functions and cultural meanings. Conversely, other files did not include any measures to address this aspect, even though it was defined as one of the problems with the element. It is important to ensure a reasonable balance between the different kinds of measures required, while always prioritizing the safeguarding of the social functions and cultural meanings of the element.
	* **The over-commercialization of an element**. The commercialization of an element cannot be described as positive or negative per se. Elements such as crafts or musical practices include a commercial aspect that can provide the communities concerned with a source of income, but which can also be the strongest threat to the element. While various nomination files mentioned this aspect, others overlooked the problem. Furthermore, many nomination files included measures to address the risk of over-commercialization while others lacked any such measures. The Evaluation Body wishes to reiterate the importance of this issue and invites all submitting States to recognize this threat and include corresponding measures.
	* **The distinction between a ‘product’ and the ‘practice’ of an element**. In the case of crafts, it is important to recall the difference between a ‘product’ and a ‘practice’. Some files described the use and decorative functions of the product rather than the cultural meanings and social functions of the practices, knowledge and skills related to the element. While the former aspects are important, nomination files should concentrate on the cultural meanings and social functions of the element and the safeguarding measures should be focused on them.
	* **Tourism**. Many issues related to tourism appeared in this cycle. Even if it can provide an important source of income for communities when well-handled, the management of tourism is one of the main challenges for elements of intangible cultural heritage. In many files, tourism was an important part of the safeguarding plan, while in others there were no measures directed at preventing the potential impact of excessive tourism. The Evaluation Body wishes to recall the importance of considering the risks of the potential decontextualization and jeopardization of an element as a result of tourism, as well as the need for its adequate monitoring. Moreover, the Body expressed major concerns about some files that focus on the promotion of a place as a tourist destination as well as others that highlight the potential for increased visibility and tourism following the inscription of the element. The Body raised special concerns about a file that explicitly mentions a form of the element that would be revived after its inscription in order to promote tourism, along with another file that explains how the element would change after inscription to adapt to tourists’ wishes. To deal with these issues, the Evaluation Body welcomes safeguarding measures with the potential to raise awareness about the impact of tourism, such as the code of good practices proposed in ‘*Celestinian forgiveness celebration*’, submitted by Italy.
	* **Labels and brands**. The Evaluation Body wishes to recall that the inscription of an element on the Representative List does not confer a special ‘brand’ or ‘label’ upon a practice or product, as in the case of crafts. The Body raised particular concerns about references to ‘branded’ art forms as a result of the inscription of the element and about the inclusion of safeguarding measures relating to Controlled Designation of Origin.
5. **The definition and nature of the communities, groups and individuals concerned**. The Evaluation Body recalls the importance of clearly defining the communities, groups or individuals concerned with elements of intangible cultural heritage. In some cases, the files did not clearly specify whether the community was a group of persons living in a particular geographic area or the practitioners of the element. In other files, the community was associated with a specific private organization or a group of professionals related to an element. In these cases, the evaluation of the files proved problematic due to the ambiguous nature of the community concerned. The definition of the community should also include a detailed description of the gender dimension, with a clear identification of the roles of men and women as well as letters of consent from practitioners of different genders. The Evaluation Body was concerned by the absence of letters of consent from female members in some files that described the broad participation of women and girls in the practice.
6. **The persistence of top-down approaches**. As in previous cycles, some nomination files described the use of a top-down approach in the nomination process. Some cases correspond to ‘national’ elements, which are recognized by the entire population of a country as part of their intangible cultural heritage. In these cases, the States Parties asserted that the entire population appreciates the element or participated in the process of its nomination, but without including any proof of this. The methodology used to ensure this participation needs to be explained. In other cases, inadequate methodologies were used, such as undertaking a survey to obtain information about the element. There were also cases in which the process was initiated by the government and the community did not actively participate but merely approved information presented to it by external researchers. The Evaluation Body invites States Parties to avoid such approaches and to guarantee wider community participation from the beginning of the process, with members of the community being directly involved in the preparation of the nomination file.
7. **Intangible cultural heritage and sports.** As in previous cycles, some nominations relate to traditional sports. Although these can be categorized as social practices, the Evaluation Body reiterates the importance of the distinction between traditional sports and professional sports. The Body has followed the definition of a traditional sport as an expression of intangible cultural heritage when it is community-based, has a clear cultural meaning and is constantly transmitted across generations. The Body further recalls that the professionalization of traditional sports could undermine their value as intangible cultural heritage. Furthermore, in the case of sports that include the use of weapons, it is important to establish exactly how they are used within the practice, to ensure that they do not promote violence or conflict within communities or between them.
8. **Relationship between tangible and intangible cultural heritage**. Several of the elements nominated for possible inscription were closely related to physical spaces, such as shrines, historic centres or cultural spaces. The Evaluation Body welcomes the focus on this connection but reiterates the importance of keeping in mind that the inscription of an element on one of the Lists does not mean that the related site is also inscribed on that List. At the same time, as it is not possible to safeguard these elements without protecting the associated site, the safeguarding measures or safeguarding plan should include or complement measures directed at protecting the site itself. In this sense, the Evaluation Body commends the nomination file ‘*Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular festival*’, submitted by Belgium, as it demonstrates the close link between tangible and intangible heritage in an urban context, particularly in a World Heritage property, and proposes safeguarding measures that complement the management plan for the site.
9. **Relationship between intangible cultural heritage and environmental sustainability.** Some nomination files highlight the role of intangible cultural heritage in terms of environmental protection and sustainability. Even if the Evaluation Body welcomes such files, it is important that they propose a balance between the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the protection of nature. This year, the Body evaluated a number of files with a strong focus on the protection of nature. One of these files did not include measures to safeguard the social functions and cultural meanings of the element, which led to a recommendation for referral.

***Issues related to the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List***

1. **Links between criteria**. Nomination files for both Lists should be coherent, consistent documents, presenting relevant information for each criterion, without contradictions and with a clear presentation of the element. The Evaluation Body identified a number of issues that made some nomination files contradictory or unclear.
	* **The definition of the element.** While a definition of the element is provided under criteria U.1/R.1, this should be consistent throughout the whole file. Furthermore, special attention should be paid to the relation between criteria R.1 and R.2, because if the element is not well-defined, it is impossible to assess how its inscription could contribute to the purpose of the Representative List. Particular attention should also be paid to the relation between criteria U.1 and U.2, because without a clear definition of the element it is not possible to assess the threats that it faces. Furthermore, if the element is not well-defined, the Body could question whether the communities gave their informed consent for the inscription of an element that was itself unclear, establishing an important link between criteria U.1/R.1 and criteria U.4/R.4.
	* **The definition and involvement of the communities, groups or individuals concerned.** The definition provided for criteria U.1/R.1 gives an idea of the bearer communities. This creates a link with criteria U.4/R.4, where they are more clearly defined. In some cases, however, contradictory information is provided for different criteria. It is important that the definition of the community be consistent with the definition provided for U.4/R.4. Furthermore, the communities that provided their consent should correspond to the description given in U.4/R.4 and in the other sections of the file. Moreover, the community’s involvement in the safeguarding plans or measures needs to be clearly explained under criteria U.3/R.3.
	* **Definition of the threats to an element.** The safeguarding plan for elements nominated for possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List (U.3) should be consistent with the threats defined under criterion U.2. If this is not the case, the safeguarding plan will be considered to be insufficient. This is also the case when the threats listed are so general as to render it impossible to propose specific safeguarding measures.
	* **National inventories and the definition of elements as intangible cultural heritage.** The fact that an element is included on a national inventory, as per U.5/R.5, and is thus recognized as intangible cultural heritage at the national level, does not necessarily mean that it can be considered as intangible cultural heritage as defined by the Convention. Some countries may have a broader definition of intangible cultural heritage, which may not be in line with Article 2 of the Convention and may therefore not meet the requirements under U.1/R.1.
2. **The domains of intangible cultural heritage**. In some cases, the description of the element provided for criteria U.1/R.1 is not consistent with the domains of intangible cultural heritage presented in the file. The Evaluation Body invites States Parties to pay special attention to indicating the correct domains, which must correspond with the element.
3. **Safeguarding plans and safeguarding measures**. As stated in the Operational Directives, there is a clear distinction between U.3 and R.3. While nomination files for the Urgent Safeguarding List require a plan with a specific budget and timeline, such details are not required for safeguarding measures in files for the Representative List. The measures must nonetheless be concrete and feasible. There were also cases in which files included a safeguarding plan for the nomination of an element for inscription on the Representative List; the Evaluation Body welcomes such an initiative. Another recurrent issue is the confusion between objectives and activities in relation to criterion U.3. The Evaluation Body wishes to reiterate that objectives are the medium-term effects achieved as a result of the implementation of the plan, whereas activities are the key actions undertaken to achieve the expected results.
4. **Importance of community consent**. The form, number and nature of community consent to the nomination were recurrent concerns for the Evaluation Body. As in previous cycles, it was difficult to establish whether the number of letters of consent provided for a nomination was sufficient. In certain cases, some of the communities that had signed the letters of consent were not mentioned in the file, while in others some of the communities described had not provided any form of consent. The Evaluation Body invites States Parties to be consistent in this regard and to include signed letters or other forms of consent from the bearers of the element. In some cases, nomination files described a process that included workshops and different activities in relation to community consent, but without any proof of such activities. Although the Evaluation Body was relatively flexible on this point, it invites States Parties to include letters or other forms of consent related to these activities. In some other files, the States Parties included letters of consent but did not describe the process undertaken to obtain them. Moreover, the use of standardized letters of consent is strongly discouraged, though the Evaluation Body did not recommend that nomination files be referred based on this alone. Many nomination files use this methodology, which does not always demonstrate the active participation of the community. The Evaluation Body also invites States Parties to pay special attention to the content and translation of letters or other forms of consent. In some cases, the information presented in the letters or other forms of consent did not correspond to the information provided in the file, for instance with the Representative List being mentioned instead of the Urgent Safeguarding List or a different name being given for the element. Finally, the Evaluation Body welcomes different and innovative forms of consent such as the use of videos or consultations via the radio to reach a wider community.
5. **Communities and their representatives**. Another recurrent issue related to the representativeness of the people who participated in the process and signed the letters of consent. As already noted, the definition of the community concerned is sometimes unclear and nomination files presented a diverse understanding of the concept, which is not precisely defined by the Convention. In some exceptional cases, the diversity of the members of the Evaluation Body proved helpful for taking into account the local complexities of individual elements. For example, in certain cases the chief of a tribe or the head of a troupe could be considered as the only possible representative of the community authorized to provide consent on their behalf. However, it was unclear whether this could also apply to the mayor of a municipality, an elected authority or a school principal, for example. As it is difficult to assess the nature of the community concerned without knowledge of the context, the Evaluation Body recommended that a nomination file be referred only in the case of an evident top-down approach, a significant lack of coherence between the file and the letters of consent or a clear lack of community participation.
6. **The credibility of the inventories affects the credibility of the Lists**. Very few nomination files fully satisfied criteria U.5/R.5 in the sense that it is not always clear how they contribute to safeguarding. This demonstrates a lack of respect for and acknowledgement of the obligation or pertinence of inventories, which is clearly set out in Article 12 of the Convention and is the only safeguarding measure addressed by a specific article. The Evaluation Body invites the Committee to undertake significant measures to underline the importance of inventories with a view to safeguarding and to determine the future approach to criteria U.5/R.5, so as to guarantee the continued credibility of the Lists and the Convention.

***Specific comments related to the Urgent Safeguarding List***

1. **Identification of threats (criteria U.2 and U.3)**. The Evaluation Body wishes to highlight the importance of identifying threats to an element in a specific manner, except when it comes to threats that are beyond the control of the community and that represent global risks such as climate change, globalization or the lack of employment. In these cases, the Evaluation Body recommends that measures be proposed to mitigate these threats without necessarily addressing them. While the Body discussed whether elements could be considered to be in need of urgent safeguarding when they have a large number of practitioners, it recognized that there can be other risk factors in such cases. These include the lack of materials, in the case of crafts, or the lack of natural resources in general.
2. **Safeguarding plan (criterion U.3)**. Safeguarding plans should address the situation of an element as a whole rather than a specific aspect of it. Particularly for the Urgent Safeguarding List, it is important to define specific safeguarding measures rather than generalized ones, as was the case for some files in this cycle.
3. **Community involvement in the safeguarding plans (criterion U.3)**. Some nomination files for the Urgent Safeguarding List suggested the use of a top-down approach, lacking clear links between the proposed plans and the communities concerned. Sometimes, more importance was given to the promotion of an element than to its safeguarding by the communities concerned. The Evaluation Body encourages States Parties to place the communities concerned at the centre of the safeguarding plans, from the proposal of the plan to its implementation.

***Specific comments related to the Representative List***

1. **The definition of an element (criterion R.1)**. Very few nomination files were recommended for referral as a result of the evaluation of criterion R.1. In the case of the nomination of an element that was not deemed to be a living tradition, the Evaluation Body recommends that the element be nominated for possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Evaluation Body also expressed concerns about files that focused on the commercial aspects of the element, which is strongly discouraged.
2. **The difficulty of assessing criterion R.2**. As in previous cycles, there is evidently still a misunderstanding of criterion R.2, despite the improvements made to the nomination form. Many files continue to address the increased visibility of the element itself rather than the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Therefore, the Evaluation Body decided to take into account all the information provided in Section 2 of the form in order to assess whether the file fulfills this criterion in general, rather than focusing on whether the State Party had properly responded to each sub-question. Consistently with previous cycles, the Evaluation Body recognizes that criterion R.2 is the only one which comes from a perspective that is external to the communities and took the difficult decision not to refer files based on this criterion only. In light of these concerns, the Body recommends that the Committee engage in an overall review of this criterion, in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms and in order to improve and guarantee the credibility of these mechanisms.
3. **Overview of recurring issues in the 2019 cycle**
4. **Positive aspects**. Based on its evaluation of the fifty-two files in the present cycle, the Evaluation Body wishes to highlight several positive aspects that have already been mentioned in previous decisions and working documents of the Committee, as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issues** | **Most recent reference decisions or documents of the Committee** |
| Benefits of the referral option | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 7) |
| Importance of multinational nominations and the need to further encourage nominations of elements of shared intangible cultural heritage  | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 10) |
| Contribution of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 21) |
| Continuing trend of nominations relating to sports and related safeguarding efforts on practices enacted by a local community in a non-professional environment | [Document ITH/17/12.COM/11](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM-11-EN.docx) (paragraph 32) |

1. **Recurring challenges**. The Evaluation Body would also like to point out that it identified a number of challenges faced by submitting States, to which previous decisions and working documents of the Committee have already referred on several occasions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issues** | **Most recent reference decisions or documents of the Committee** |
| Use of inappropriate expressions or vocabulary that are not in line with the Convention in nomination files and titles of elements | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 6) |
| Lack of coherence between information provided under different criteria for inscription in nomination files | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 14) |
| Confusion between inscriptions on the Lists and the establishment of a system of ownership, exclusivity and geographical origin  | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 9) |
| Confusion between the different purposes and criteria of the 2003 Convention and other programmes and Conventions of UNESCO | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 9) |
| Possible negative impacts of over-commercialization and increased tourism | [Decision 12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/11) (paragraph 13) |
| Lack of attention to gender considerations and the diversity of gender roles in the enactment and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage | [Decision 8.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/8) (paragraph 8) |
| Concerns linked to a top-down approach to the development of safeguarding plans and the preparation of nominations | [Decision 11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10) (paragraph 19) |
| Uncertainty regarding the representativeness of the communities | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 12) |
| Concerns regarding inventories | [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) (paragraph 13) |
| Concerns about the professionalization of traditional sports undermining their status as intangible cultural heritage | [Document ITH/18/13.COM/10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10-EN.docx) (paragraph 42) |

1. **Draft Decision**
2. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 14.COM 10

The Committee,

1. Recalling Chapter I of the Operational Directives,
2. Having examined documents [LHE/19/14.COM/10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.a-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.b-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.c-EN.docx), [LHE/19/14.COM/10.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.d-EN.docx) and [LHE/19/14.COM/INF.10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.10-EN.docx), as well as the files submitted by the respective States Parties,
3. Expresses its satisfaction with the work of the Evaluation Body, thanks its members for the quality of the present report and appreciates the assistance of the Secretariat to facilitate the work of the Evaluation Body;
4. Congratulates, in particular, those submitting States that presented nominations that could serve as good examples for future nominations;
5. Reaffirms its concerns about the limited number of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and of proposals for selection on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and encourages States Parties to pay special attention to these two mechanisms of the Convention;
6. Further appreciates the observations and recommendations made by the Evaluation Body concerning its work for the 2019 cycle, recognizes that many of the issues raised in its previous decisions continue to prevail in the 2019 cycle, as summarized in paragraphs 54 and 55 of the present report, and reiterates its invitation to States Parties to the Convention to address these issues when submitting future nominations;
7. Takes note of the ‘provisional upstream dialogue’ process that was introduced on an experimental basis for the evaluation of nominations in the 2019 cycle and the Evaluation Body’s opinions concerning the six nominations for which the dialogue process was used, as presented in document [LHE/19/14.COM/INF.10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.10-EN.docx), and further takes note of the Evaluation Body’s observations and recommendations regarding the provisional dialogue process, including the proposed amendments to the Operational Directives as presented in document [LHE/19/14.COM/14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-14-EN.docx);
8. Underlines the importance of providing a clear identification and definition of the element in question as well as of the communities, groups and individuals that consider such an element to be part of their intangible cultural heritage and reminds States Parties to be consistent in the information they provide throughout their files and to recognize the crucial importance of the links between the different criteria for inscription;
9. Acknowledges the continued difficulties and challenges encountered by the Evaluation Body in evaluating criterion R.2, despite the changes made to Section 2 of Form ICH-02, and reaffirms the need to undertake a review of the formulation of this criterion in relation to the purpose of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms;
10. Calls the attention of States Parties to the need to undertake significant measures to develop inventories with a view to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, while recognizing the right of each State Party to draw up inventories in a manner geared to its own situation, as stipulated in Article 12.1 of the Convention, and stressesthe importance of regularly updating inventorieswith the participation of the communities concerned, as a key safeguarding measure to be reflected in nominations;
11. Commends the States Parties that demonstrated close collaboration in the preparation of multinational nominations, in line with the principles of international cooperation and the promotion of mutual understanding of the Convention, also appreciates the efforts of these States Parties to develop joint measures to safeguard elements as shared elements that could create ties between different communities, and further encourages States Parties with similar elements to work together towards the submission of multinational nominations or extended nominations at the international level;
12. Takes note with appreciation of the growing number of nominations that demonstrate the contribution of living heritage to environmental sustainability, yet draws the attention of States Parties to the fact that proposed safeguarding measures that include environmental protection need to also focus on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, including the social functions and cultural meanings of the element concerned;
13. Further reminds States Parties that, while recognizing theeconomic opportunities presented by certain elements of intangible cultural heritage, it is important to prioritize the safeguarding of their social functions and cultural meanings and to clearly distinguish these from the branding or labelling of a product, and welcomes safeguarding measures that address the risk of the potential decontextualization and jeopardization of an element as a result of over-commercialization;
14. Reiterates its concern that top-down approaches persist in many nomination processes and also encourages States Parties to guarantee the widest and most active community participation possible in the development and implementation of safeguarding plans and measures;
15. Further recognizes the recurring challenges that the Evaluation Body encounters in its evaluations, encourages the participation of experts and non-governmental organizations in the global reflection on the listing mechanisms, having served on past and present evaluation bodies, and welcomes their experience and expertise in this regard.
1. . Algeria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Croatia, Czechia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, France, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malawi, Mexico, Oman, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Spain, United Arab Emirates. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)