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#### OPENING REMARKS AND PRESENTATION OF THE OBJECTIVES, WORKING METHODS AND AGENDA

1. **Ms Caroline Munier**,Focal Point for Emergencies, Living Heritage Entity, UNESCO, opened the meeting and welcomed the participants to the Expert Meeting on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Emergencies. She informed the participants that interpretation was available in English and French.
2. **Mr Tim Curtis, Secretary of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage**,welcomed the participants to this important meeting on behalf of the Director-General. This meeting is the result of work carried out within the framework of the Convention over the last three years. Mr Curtis took the opportunity to express gratitude to the People’s Republic of China for its financial support for the organization of the meeting. Over the past years, cultural heritage in all its forms has been increasingly affected by many different situations of emergencies. At the same time, cultural heritage has demonstrated the powerful role it can play for recovery, reconciliation and resilience. UNESCO has been progressively called on to respond to calls for assistance in such situations and has taken some important decisions in this regard, most notably in the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict[[1]](#footnote-1), unanimously adopted in 2015 by the 195 Member States of UNESCO. In this regard, the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage provides valuable tools for intervening in both the preparation and recovery phases of such situations. However, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies is not straightforward and raises some very specific and complex challenges. The meeting thus presented a forum to discuss and reflect on some of these issues to assist the governing bodies of the Convention to make informed decisions concerning guidelines for interventions in emergencies. In 2016, the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage examined an item dedicated to intangible cultural heritage in emergencies for the first time. At that time, the Committee recognized two dimensions: on the one hand, the effects of emergencies on the practice and transmission of living heritage, and on the other hand, the role of intangible cultural heritage as a tool for preparedness, resilience, reconciliation and recovery in emergencies. At that session, the Committee also expressed the need to obtain more knowledge and experience from concrete case studies and on-the-ground experiences. Consequently, the Secretariat conducted a number of activities in different contexts of conflict, displacement and natural disasters. Firstly, a small-scale survey was carried out on safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Syrian refugees, mainly in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as in Egypt, France, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Syria itself. The objective of this survey was to understand more about the dual role of intangible cultural heritage and communities in the context of displacement, i.e. how intangible cultural heritage had been lost, but also how communities were using intangible cultural heritage to deal with their displacement. The results of the survey were promising and hinted towards some methodological possibilities.
3. **Mr Tim Curtis** recalled that it was therefore decided to pilot a fully-fledged community-based needs identification in a specific situation, and this approach was tested in the province of North Kivu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, together with the UNESCO Kinshasa Office. This activity was coordinated by Ms Géraldine Chatelard and had a two-fold objective. First, to assess the needs in view of defining context-based safeguarding actions for the intangible cultural heritage in North Kivu within the framework of the Convention; and second, to feed the reflection of the Committee with a case study on a long-standing conflict and the large-scale internal displacements of populations. Concerning natural disasters, given the unpredictability of such emergencies, as well as the fact that research and literature is already available in this field, it was decided to first conduct desk studies to identify and conceptualize the key issues at stake. The Secretariat thus commissioned a desk study on the safeguarding and mobilising of intangible cultural heritage in the context of natural and human-induced hazards, supported by a number of case studies, which was undertaken by Mr Chris Ballard and Ms Meredith Wilson. Finally, the Secretariat continued to provide support for the preparation and implementation of specific emergency International Assistance requests that included requests from Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, Niger and Vanuatu, providing further examples.
4. **Mr Tim Curtis** reported that the examination of the results of this work in 2017, at the 12th session of the Committee in Jeju, Republic of Korea, pointed to a future direction that privileged the identification of needs by affected communities, and asked the Secretariat to continue work with this approach. Following this, UNESCO looked to identify and collect mapping and analysis of the different methodological approaches used worldwide with a view to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and mobilizing it as a tool for resilience and recovery. The Committee also encouraged the Secretariat to enhance awareness raising and capacity building on this issue, and to strengthen cooperation with relevant UN entities. Moreover, the Secretariat was currently working on capacity-building materials related to intangible cultural heritage inventorying and disaster risk management. The Secretariat also had the opportunity to organize a UN brainstorming meeting on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies in Beirut, Lebanon, in October 2018. A number of UN agencies participated, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), who recognized the relevance of intangible cultural heritage for their people-centred approach and called for cooperation with UNESCO in this field. At its 13th session in 2108 in Port Louis, Republic of Mauritius, the Committee decided that the time had come to define operational modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, and requested “that the Secretariat organize an individual expert meeting during the course of 2019 to conceptualize and transform the knowledge and experience acquired into methodological guidance for States Parties or for any other relevant national or international stakeholders.” This Expert Meeting was therefore convened at the request of the Committee to serve as a critical step towards producing a succinct and practical set of methodological guidelines to support the effective implementation of the 2003 Convention across a wide range of emergency contexts. According to UNESCO’s Rules and Procedures, this meeting is classified as a Category-6 Expert meeting, which means that experts participate in their private capacity and not as representatives of any government or organization. In addition, the results of the meeting is a collective outcome and not ascribed to any participant by name. The meeting was composed of 21 main experts from all the world’s regions and with specific expertise and/or experience from the field of intangible cultural heritage, as well as emergencies. Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard, who were both present, worked closely in the preparation of the meeting and helped moderate the discussions.
5. **Mr Tim Curtis** then spokeaboutObservers, adding that they would not be given the floor to speak unless authorized by the Chair. This included UNESCO category 2 centres in the field of intangible cultural heritage. Centres present included representatives from the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe from Sofia, Bulgaria, the Regional Research Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in West and Central Asia from Teheran, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI) from Japan, and the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Africa (CRESPIAF) from Algeria. The ICH-NGO Forum had also been invited to send one representative per region. Representatives from accredited NGOs for Europe, and Latin America and the Caribbean also attended. A number of individual requests for Observer status from certain States Parties had also been received and examined according to the Rules, and these included representatives from Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Philippines, Turkey and South Sudan. An expert from China was expected, but visa issues meant he was unable to attend.
6. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that the objective of the meeting was to explore methodological guidance for the implementation of the principles of the 2003 Convention in emergencies. The discussions over the two days would thus constantly refer back to potential proposals for concrete guidance, i.e. practical measures that can serve as guidance for actors in these situations. The first day was mainly dedicated to establishing the context and identifying the emerging issues, and was split into three main sessions. Session one provided the opportunity to recall the different frameworks operating. Session two would discuss the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in disaster and conflict situations, while identifying overlapping issues in disaster and conflict situations. Session three would explore issues around the use and involvement of intangible cultural heritage in humanitarian interventions where humanitarian agents are acting. Day one would conclude with defining the methodological guidance. Day two would be devoted to discussing operational principles, followed by operational modalities that could form the basis of recommendations for the Committee and, eventually, the General Assembly of States Parties to the 2003 Convention. The core idea of the meeting was thus to come to a common agreement on the underpinning principles for interventions related to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, as well as to define a series of operational modalities that should be action oriented. It was understood that each emergency context is specific and unique such that the aim was not to define an exhaustive list of actions, but rather to frame the core principles and actions that can then be adapted to specific local contexts. Mr Curtis explained that ‘emergency,’ in the context of the meeting, would refer to both conflict situations and its effects, including the displacement of refugees, as well as disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards, or so-called natural disasters. While these two forms of emergencies are often treated separately, the meeting would focus on areas of overlapping concern that are important for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The aim would be to seek broad safeguarding principles and methodologies that could be applied to almost all emergency situations. At a later stage, it would no doubt be important to identify specific methodologies for the different emergencies.
7. **Mr Tim Curtis** further explained that the meeting essentially sought to establish the first overall framework, which would become more refined and result in context-specific recommendations and methodologies over the years to come. The working document had been elaborated with the support of Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard, and it was hoped that the participants had had the opportunity to read the document, which presented some ideas of operational guidance. The conclusions of the Expert Meeting would serve as a basis to inform the Committee at its 14th session taking place from 9 to 14 December in Bogota, Colombia. The Committee may then wish to transmit these recommendations to the 8th session of the General Assembly, which will be held in June 2020, to approve the operational modalities for the implementation of the 2003 Convention in emergencies. Mr Curtis took the opportunity to remind the participants that only the General Assembly could grant the overarching mandate of approval to these kinds of modalities, including the Operational Directives, but only if the Committee decides to transmit the recommendations to the General Assembly.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

***Moderator: Ms Caroline Munier***

1. **Ms Caroline Munier** remarked on some minor errors that had slipped into the working document, but that it would be duly revised for publication at the end of the meeting. She also informed the participants that 23 experts had initially been invited, but that two experts Mr Richard Matsipa Kambale from the Democratic Republic of Congo and Mr Gang Zhu from the People’s Republic of China were unable to attend. The participants were then given two minutes to present themselves.
2. **Mr Lassana Cissé** is a former Director of Cultural Heritage from Mali. He oversaw emergency technical assistance for cultural heritage in Mali from 2013 to 2016.
3. **Ms** **Cristina Amescua Chávez** from Mexico is currently the UNESCO Chair in Research on Intangible Cultural Heritage and Cultural Diversity at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. She has conducted field research on intangible cultural heritage for about 10 years, although not necessarily with UNESCO on inscriptions. She has also worked with UNESCO and the International Social Science Council on a number of occasions.
4. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** from Senegal works as the Director of Cultural Heritage on tangible and intangible heritage, although intangible cultural heritage takes up most of his time. He has worked on intangible cultural heritage since 2003 when he arrived at the Ministry of Culture, and he has also worked on tangible cultural heritage for a few years for the purposes of inscription of several World Heritage properties. For the last five years, he has been concerned with intangible cultural heritage. He has worked on two inventories: one on traditional music and one on the national inventory, which was currently underway with assistance from the UNESCO Dakar Office. He has also participated in expert working groups, particularly in Chengdu, People’s Republic of China. He is a trained teacher and continues to lecture at Gaston Berger University in Saint-Louis, Senegal.
5. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** from Kenya is an archaeologist and former Emeritus Director-General of the National Museums of Kenya. He has practised heritage at all levels, and is currently consulting on most of UNESCO’s Culture Conventions. He is also a former Professor of Heritage Studies at the University of Mauritius. He attended the University of Florida in Gainesville and was once a Member of the 1972 World Heritage Committee. He lives partly in Mauritius, but mostly in Kenya.
6. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** currently works as the Dean of the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology at Yarmouk University in northern Jordan, which is located in Irbid, a city that is heavily influenced by Syrian refugees close to the Syrian and Jordanian borders. He did his PhD at the Free University in Berlin in 1998 in the Faculty of Cultural and Historical Studies. He works as a facilitator in the capacity-building programme and has conducted many workshops in the region for Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt and other Arab countries. He has published articles on intangible cultural heritage in Jordan and the Arab region, mostly in Arabic to raise awareness among communities about the importance of intangible cultural heritage. He spoke of how wedding ceremonies in Irbid, where he lives, were being influenced by Syrian wedding traditions with *aradas* (traditional celebratory performances) now taking place. This raises the issue of protecting not only the intangible cultural heritage of the refugees, but also the local intangible cultural heritage. He also works for the Ministry of Culture as a voluntary consultant in the field of intangible cultural heritage.
7. **Mr Juan Mayr Maldonado** from Colombia began his career as a photographer traveling through the country to discover nature and different cultures. He created a foundation in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, a microcosm of Colombia’s reality with indigenous people and with many kinds of ecosystems, but also with guerrillas, drug traffickers and internal war, which presented great challenges for development. He became the Minister of Environment of Colombia from 1998 to 2002. He then started working with different UN agencies concerned with biodiversity and linkages with cultural diversity. He later became the Ambassador of Colombia to Germany where his work was dedicated to institutional agreements in science and development. In the last two years, he has served as a peace negotiator with the ELN (*Ejercito de Liberación Nacional*) on behalf of the government. Currently, he is writing a book about the life experience of one of the elders of the Kogi culture.
8. **Mr Patricio López Beckett** is an anthropologist from Chile and a former Director of the Cultural Heritage Environment of the National Council of Arts. Currently, he works as an adviser and coordinator for intangible cultural heritage in Indigenous Affairs at the Undersecretariat of Cultural Heritage.
9. **Mr Jose Pontanares Canuday** fromthe Philippines is a social and cultural anthropologist. He is currently the Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the Ateneo de Manila University. He has been researching internal displacements in the southern part of the Philippines in a region called Mindanao for 15 years, although the conflict has been ongoing for the past 50 years. He noted that the more he studied armed conflict and its connection to natural disasters, the more he noted how intangible cultural heritage figured in the lives of the communities. Moreover, while some of the practices that he has studied are threatened, others are very much active and reflect the resilience and capacity of people to evolve intangible cultural heritage amidst emergencies.
10. **Ms Amel Zribi Hachana** from Tunisia is a lawyer and graduate of the National School of Administration of Tunisia. Following the events of 2011, she was appointed to temporarily manage the National Heritage Institute when the directors and the Director-General were dismissed at that time. It was an emergency situation, and she stayed in her post for nine months. When the situation improved, she returned to the Ministry of Culture to become the Director of Museums and Heritage. She was later appointed to the Department of Safeguarding and Enhancement of Heritage where she managed and planned the capacity-building workshops with the UNESCO Rabat office. She was also part of the Secretariat of the National Committee of Intangible Cultural Heritage at the Ministry level in 2014. In 2013, she wrote the national report on the targeted attacks of mausoleums and houses of worship throughout Tunisia in collaboration with various associations and NGOs. She was later appointed to the Cabinet of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and is now completing her thesis in legal linguistics.
11. **Mr Marc-Antoine Camp** works at Lucerne University in Switzerland as an ethnomusicologist where recent projects are being conducted with refugees, particularly unaccompanied minors. He has also been involved as an expert in the ratification and implementation of the 2003 Convention for the last 10 years on behalf of the Swiss government.
12. **Ms Blanche N’Guessan** is Director of Cultural Heritage in Côte d'Ivoire. She led the request for financial and international assistance from UNESCO to implement the inventory of intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding present in the territory.
13. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** from Lebanon is an anthropologist and a professor at St. Joseph University, Beirut. Since the beginning of her research career, and following 15 years of civil war, she has worked and published books on the subject of war and the way of life during war. After becoming an expert in the global network of facilitators, she oriented her research towards intangible cultural heritage and emergencies. In fact, she published an article on the consequences of the destruction of monuments and heritage sites caused by wars on intangible cultural heritage. She also carried out an evaluation for the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the intangible cultural heritage of the populations affected by the consequences of ethnic and religious conflicts in Syria and Iraq, which then led to research in Lebanon, Jordan and Iraqi Kurdistan. Currently, she is working with Syrian refugees in the suburbs of Beirut. She also works with NGOs that have become interested in the topic of intangible cultural heritage through her research.
14. **Mr Gamini Wijesuriya** from Sri Lanka was formerly the Director of Conservation in Sri Lanka, and also worked at International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM), mostly on World Heritage. He has directed the Living Heritage Sites programme that was launched in 2003, where there was no divide between tangible and intangible cultural heritage. He also worked on disaster risk management with UNESCO colleagues, particularly Mr Giovanni Boccardi. He has experience in dealing directly with two disasters. The first was the terrorist bombing of the Temple of the Sacred Tooth Relic in Sri Lanka, the first major World Heritage property to be directly targeted, and the second was the recent bombing of churches in Sri Lanka. He was of the view that the living memory embodied in intangible cultural heritage is targeted and not just the architecture. Thus, the recovery of intangible cultural heritage should come first. He gave the example of the 32-dish meal prepared every day for the Lord Buddha at the Temple of the Sacred Tooth Relic, which was the first thing that the community wanted to restore, not the buildings. Similarly, in churches, Christians started to re-enact the rituals. It is the intangible cultural heritage that is targeted in these disasters and emergencies, and therefore it is the intangible cultural heritage that must be recovered to build peace and reconciliation.
15. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** from Japan is a director and professor of the Center for Northeast Asian Studies in Tohoku University in Sendai, which was almost at the epicentre of the 2011 earthquake. The disaster changed his research topic and expanded his research area, and he is now particularly focused on intangible cultural heritage in the context of recovery. He is studying the rituals and indigenous knowledge of the community of rice farmers and fishermen in the area. He spoke of his pleasure to be able to exchange his research results and opinions on intangible cultural heritage, especially as his research was based on natural disasters.
16. **Mr Saša Srećković** from Serbia is a curator at the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade. He is engaged in the National Centre for Intangible Heritage around the different issues related to intangible cultural heritage and the promotion of ethnographic films. He has been involved with UNESCO as a facilitator of capacity-building workshops, and more recently he served as a Member of the Evaluation Body. His topic of special interest is sustainable development.
17. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** from South Sudan is an anthropologist, heritage consultant, musician, and culture activist for the last 18 years. He has been practising intangible cultural heritage in all fields. He is the founder of the Maale Heritage Development Foundation, which aims to create awareness of intangible cultural heritage in South Sudan by practising dances, traditional songs and drama. He was an internally displaced person (IDP) in South Sudan and has worked with the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) in Juba in IDP camps for the last five years. UNMISS provides psychosocial support to the communities through dance, songs and cinematic activities, and produced a film *Until the Morning Comes* that describes the country’s civil war since 2013. He is currently undertaking a Master’s programme on peace and development at the University of Juba. He spoke of his delight at being at UNESCO Headquarters.
18. **Mr Öcal Oğuz** from Turkey has been a professor of cultural anthropology at Ankara University since 2002. He has worked for the 2003 Convention, and was among the experts who drafted the text of the Convention. He subsequently became a Member of the Subsidiary Body for two years from 2008 to 2010 at the beginning of the Representative List. He is also the founder of the UNESCO Chair on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Formal and Informal Education. For the past eight years, communities, groups and individuals have been displaced from Syria and other countries and live in Turkey where there are almost six million displaced persons. He has personally worked on this issue and on the subject of borders with Turkey and Syria, as there are a number of cities affected. Turkey now has valuable experience with IDPs, as it monitors the situation vis-à-vis the Convention. He is also president of the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO, and there was currently a committee of experts at the National Commission on Intangible Cultural Heritage, including Ms Evrim Ölçer Özünel who was also present.
19. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** from Poland is an international relations scholar at the University of Warsaw. She began her work with UNESCO with the 1954 Hague Convention, and in 2003 in the tragic context of the war in Iraq. She was trained as a civil military expert and was among the first archaeologists who went with Polish troops to Iraq. Here she witnessed how training and awareness of protecting intangible cultural heritage during war is important. She pursued her research on intangible cultural heritage more than 10 years ago and has expertise on the implementation of the 2003 Convention in Poland. She had the opportunity to work in this context as an independent researcher, but also as a member of the official delegations of Poland to UNESCO during the 2003 Convention meetings, as well as a representative of an accredited NGO to the Convention. She is deputy president of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Council in Poland. Her greatest culture shock was when she joined the military as a trainer from 2009. She trained the Polish armed forces as well as NATO military police in intangible cultural heritage protection and cross-cultural awareness.
20. **Mr Richenel Ansano** from Curaçao is a cultural anthropologist who began working in heritage with the Netherlands Antilles National Commission in the 1990s. One of the things he noticed during his time there was that ‘heritage’ was defined very differently from the heritage promoted by the Dutch government. As a post colony of the Netherlands, he learned during those years how to reconcile being in the Caribbean and being part of a wider European state. Negotiating that reality was sometimes exercised in very difficult and creative ways. One of the things learned through that process is how small islands have very similar histories, and how they tend to diverge in the twentieth century with many issues of colonialism, independence and international alignments. These issues have greatly influenced how heritage has been managed on the islands, and there are also many issues covered by the Convention where concepts such as authenticity have to be reinterpreted in the field.
21. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** specializes in the history and social anthropology of the Middle East or countries of Arabic culture and language. Although she studied in France, she has lived in the Middle East for more than half her life, which she believes defines the way she approaches the question of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. She began to focus on social change in several parts of the Middle East; a region that is marked by issues of conflict and forced displacements. Consequently, this became one of her principal research topics. Her work straddles between academic and applied research. For many years she has worked as a consultant for humanitarian organizations working with refugees. She has been involved with UNESCO for several years in the reflection of the 2003 Convention, which links the issue of intangible cultural heritage and emergencies, specifically concerning issues of conflict and displacement.
22. **Mr Chris Ballard** trained as an archaeologist then as anthropologist, and now works as a historian at the Australian National University in Canberra. His focus is on indigenous and vernacular forms of bodily, oral and textual history, and he is fascinated by the way history is transmitted orally and bodily, and in ways that endure situations of both conflict and disasters. He has worked on conflict and disaster situations in West Papua, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu. He has been involved with the World Heritage Convention, and together with his wife, Ms Meredith Wilson, also a heritage professional, he has worked on the nomination of the World Heritage property in Vanuatu, Chief Roi Mata’s Domain, which he believes is the only World Heritage property entirely owned and managed by an indigenous community. The work was carried out with the community over 15 years so as to really understand what indigenous management would actually look like on the ground. He is also a facilitator in the global network of facilitators. He was grateful to Mr Curtis for the invitation to be involved in this process in his role as a researcher.
23. **Ms Caroline Munier** remarked that for practical reasons the room had been divided into English-speaking and French-speaking experts. Some presentations were only available in one language, and according to UNESCO rules, the Expert Meeting would be paperless for environmental reasons, although documents could be printed on demand.

#### SESSION 1: FRAMEWORKS

***Moderator: Mr Tim Curtis***

1. **Mr Tim Curtis**,informed the Meeting that Ms Caroline Munier, Ms Fumiko Ohinata, Mr Chris Ballard and Ms Géraldine Chatelard had put together the excellent working document, and he wished to acknowledge their tireless work behind the scenes, as well as the Secretariat for its organizational work. He would moderate the first session that would set out the UNESCO frameworks, which would begin with the presentation by Ms Fumiko Ohinata.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata**,Head of the Programme Management Unit within the Living Heritage Entity that serves as the Secretariat for the 2003 Convention, was happy to see all the participants gathered for this Expert Meeting, which renewed the sense of what UNESCO under the Convention was trying to achieve. Although this is a normative instrument that is played out at the international level, of course it has to be nourished by national experiences. Ms Fumiko Ohinata introduced the UNESCO frameworks for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, which corresponds to paragraphs 6-11 of section II of the working document. She would first present the UNESCO context, which would be followed by the current provisions under the 2003 Convention to ascertain the framework currently under operation in the context of emergencies. There was thus a number of texts that were important in terms of their normative, policy and operational nature, and she began by looking at the two General Conference Resolutions, adding that it was not an easy task as the document highlighted many points and was the outcome of long negotiations. The first Resolution pertained to the strategy document, Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict adopted in 2015. This Strategy takes stock of a number of emerging facts, such as the growing number of deliberate attacks being made on cultural heritage as a weapon of war, or that populations affected by conflict are increasingly deprived of their cultural rights. Also, the Strategy makes the interesting point that it is important to protect cultural heritage and diversity during conflict, particularly to break the cycle of violence, and that attacks on culture contribute to more hatred or sectarianism and the fragmentation of society, fuelling constant instability and conflict. The Strategy draws the conclusion that a new approach is urgently required at both international and national levels, with a strong link between the protection of cultural heritage and diversity on the one hand, and humanitarian action, peace-building processes and security policies on the other hand.
3. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that two years later in 2017, this Strategy was complemented by an Addendum[[2]](#footnote-2) concerning emergencies associated with disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards. This Addendum takes stock of issues, such as the exponential rise of reported disasters across the globe that has caused widespread damage to culture. It also appreciates the complementary role of culture in disasters. Thus, culture is a key consideration in risk prevention and, at the same time, a contributing factor in enhancing resilience. This Addendum also takes into account recent developments at the international level, particularly the endorsement by the UN General Assembly of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction[[3]](#footnote-3) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, among others. The Strategy and the Addendum must be considered as a package because taken together they have set a policy for the reinforcement of UNESCO's action for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in situations of emergency, including natural disasters. They provide the operational definition of emergencies as covering both armed conflict and disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards. In other words, this is the approach taken by this Expert Meeting in looking at both and seeking an overlapping area in line with UNESCO’s approach. This also sets objectives for UNESCO and is accompanied by a set of priority actions. The Strategy, in particular, calls for cooperation and collaboration across the fields of culture with a variety of sectors intervening in emergencies.
4. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** outlined how these policies fit within the 2003 Convention and its Operational Directives, as well as the provisions to consider when thinking about intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. One of the starting points is Article 11 of the text of the Convention, which states that States Parties have the obligation to “take the necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage present in its territory,” which applies in all contexts, including emergencies. In addition, Article 15 of the Convention states that when safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, States Parties must “ensure the widest possible participation of communities […]”. There are of course other provisions that are important to consider, but these two are the main starting points. Emergencies are mentioned specifically in the Operational Directives of the 2003 Convention in relation to International Assistance. In this regard, the mechanism has granted emergency assistance requests to Colombia, Côte d’Ivoire, Mali, Niger and Vanuatu. Paragraph 50 of the Operational Directives considers an emergency to occur, “when a State Party cannot overcome on its own any circumstance due to calamity, natural disaster, armed conflict, serious epidemic or any other natural or human event that has severe consequences for the intangible cultural heritage as well as communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals who are the bearers of this heritage.” However, this is a list of conditions under which International Assistance may be granted, rather than strategic guidance to States Parties or other stakeholders on how to deal with safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. Paragraph 32 of the Operational Directives indicates another means of responding to certain situations of extreme emergency concerning nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. Under this provision, if an element is considered to be in extreme urgency then it may be proposed for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The State Party in the territory on which this element is enacted, or any other State or advisory body or the communities concerned can propose a nomination. However, even though the provision exists, it has never been applied in the history of the Convention.
5. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** recalled thatthe Committee at its tenth session in 2015 adopted a new chapter of the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level. This chapter includes provisions related to the contribution of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in the context of natural disasters and climate change, and also the mobilization of intangible cultural heritage and its bearers for the prevention of disputes, peaceful conflict resolution, and the restoration of peace and security. Thus, the subject appears from the perspective of sustainable development. At the same time, in 2015, the Committee endorsed a set of 12 ethical principles[[4]](#footnote-4) for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Paragraph 5 states, “access of communities, groups and individuals to the instruments, objects, artefacts, cultural and natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage should be ensured, including in situations of armed conflict.” Thus, on the one hand, UNESCO-wide policies adopted by the General Conference provide a general approach, and on the other hand, the Convention specifically refers to the emerging points where ICH in emergencies are dealt with, but not in a strategic, holistic or operational way for the time being. Hence, the purpose of this meeting, as requested by the Committee.
6. **Mr Tim Curtis**, thanked Ms Fumiko Ohinata for the very important overview and background on which the work would be based. For the sake of clarification, he reminded the participants that the purpose of this Expert Meeting and of the Convention was not to solely consider the intangible cultural heritage elements inscribed on the UNESCO Lists. Over the next two days, the participants should focus on intangible cultural heritage in general, whether inscribed or not. Mr Curtis then invited Ms Chatelard to present the other relevant international instruments and standards outside of the 2003 Convention that were also related to the discussion.
7. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** recalled that the preamble of the Convention refers to all treaties or international instruments relative to the protection of children’s and women’s rights and, in general, to the protection of human rights. Indeed, paragraph 1 in Article 2 states that, “For the purposes of this Convention, consideration will be given solely to such intangible cultural heritage as is compatible with existing international human rights instruments, as well as with the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and of sustainable development.” In effect, this sentence summarizes all the principles of international law with which the Convention aligns. This does not necessarily mean that the Convention excludes elements from its definition of intangible cultural heritage that are not aligned with these instruments, but it does exclude these elements from its safeguarding mandate. This is true in general, but is particularly important in emergencies. Thus, the Convention makes it mandatory to consider all these treaties. Perhaps more importantly, with regard to the issue of intangible cultural heritage and emergencies, existing international instruments and principles on refugees do not outline the way in which States and all concerned actors and stakeholders must organize and consider the situation of internally displaced persons. Moreover, these situations are frequent in the case of conflicts and natural disasters. Indeed, the Operational Directives recall that it is an obligation for States Parties to the Convention to protect or to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage on their territory, including for internally displaced persons or persons from neighbouring countries. There are two international texts that are particularly important in the case of armed conflict. First, the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict[[5]](#footnote-5). Although there is no mention of the 2003 Convention or its Operational Directives, there may in fact be some synergies with the 1954 Convention in that it deals specifically with the protection of cultural property during armed conflict, but it can also be applied to places, spaces and collections of archives or objects related to intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the 1954 Hague Convention is relevant to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in times of armed conflict.
8. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** thenintroduced the second important international text, which is the landmark UN Security Council Resolution 2347 (2017)[[6]](#footnote-6), which is exclusively concerned with cultural heritage. It condemns the destruction, looting and trafficking of cultural property in times of conflict, particularly by armed non-State groups with links to the financing of terrorism. It recognizes the fact that damage to cultural heritage hampers post-conflict reconciliation and development. It also recognizes that cultural heritage is often a symbol of unity and identity for communities in areas affected by conflict. Although it does not specifically refer to intangible cultural heritage, it is concerned with the value conferred to intangible cultural heritage by the communities and persons concerned. Thus, there are also links in the Resolution with the protection of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies relative to the 2003 Convention. Finally, it was also important to note that, in addition to the legal international instruments, which are often important for the protection of intangible and tangible cultural heritage in emergencies, it is the standards of donors that frame the way international aid is constituted. These standards are thus becoming increasingly important, for example, with regard to indigenous peoples. Although the issue of culture is not yet apparent in these standards, it is important to perhaps also think about how donors could integrate cultural issues into their funding policies for projects that enable countries and communities to recover from emergencies.
9. **Mr Tim Curtis** opened the floor to the experts for questions or comments.
10. **Mr** **George** **Abungu** thanked the experts for the enlightening presentations, and asked whether it was stated that no State Party had ever nominated an element to the Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding List.
11. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that there were two Lists under the Convention: the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List. Unlike the World Heritage Convention in which a property goes from one list to another should it encounter conservation issues, with the 2003 Convention a State Party can select either of the Lists at the time of inscription. Currently, there are more inscriptions on the Representative List than on the Urgent Safeguarding List. In order to determine whether an element ought to be placed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, there are criteria U.1-U.5, but there is one last criterion, U.6[[7]](#footnote-7) that has never been used, which inscribes elements in extreme emergency situations.
12. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that this mechanism was foreseen to allow a proposed element to bypass the normal 18-month delay that would involve going through the Evaluation Body and the Committee. Thus, in cases of extreme urgency, an element may be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List without the normal process of evaluation and inscription. However, this mechanism has never been triggered.
13. As a follow up to the reply, **Mr** **George** **Abungu** wished to know whether the Secretariat or other entities were in a position to act proactively in situations where the State Party or the communities concerned were unable to act and engineer an emergency process. Mr Abungu spoke of climate change in which events were occurring that had never previously happened. For example, Cyclone Idai had hit Southern Africa, hitting Mozambique twice on its way to Malawi and Zimbabwe. Malawi is one of the most active States Parties to the Convention, and Mr Abungu wondered whether any requests had come from the region, especially from Mozambique that had suffered serious devastation. What is the role of the Secretariat and UNESCO in being proactive and implementing actions in such situations? Are they empowered to act on their own?
14. **Mr Tim Curtis** replied that that the Secretariat was in fact currently discussing with colleagues in the UNESCO Maputo Office about intervention in Mozambique. He explained that 60 per cent of the Fund of the Convention is specifically reserved for the International Assistance mechanism, and urgent requests for International Assistance can be fast-tracked in situations of emergencies for approval by the Bureau. International Assistance requests, if they are over US$100,000, normally have to be processed through the Committee, entailing a process and timeline that is similar to an inscription. Requests in emergency situations can, however, be activated and approved by the Bureau in a couple of months or less. There is also a separate UNESCO Emergency Fund, which can also be called upon in cases of intervention on intangible cultural heritage. However, requests still have to be made, either from the Field Office of the country concerned, or another party affected by the disaster. The purpose of the Expert Meeting was, therefore, to have clearer guidance on the modalities in the different stages of intervention, as it was found that the most difficult aspects to assess were the real needs on the ground, especially in the case of dispersed communities. Thus, mechanisms were already in place to provide financial assistance in emergency situations. The difficulty occurs in enabling the requests and to make sure the requests keep coming, for which it is important to identify the community. But how do we identify the community? What are the modalities? These were the types of questions to be discussed during the Expert Meeting. The Urgent Safeguarding List is a general list of elements that require urgent safeguarding, and the idea is not to adhere solely to inscribed elements in these situations of emergencies. The Representative List or the Urgent Safeguarding List were not exhaustive lists of intangible cultural heritage, nor did they represent the best or most outstanding intangible cultural heritage. In this regard, the Convention seeks to safeguard all intangible cultural heritage. Thus, it was perhaps unnecessary to activate the listing mechanism, at least in the immediate term when the important thing is to activate financial resources to enable intervention in those situations. Concerning climate change, of course a hurricane remains a hurricane whether it is triggered by climate change or not; it is the frequency and scale of these events that are changing.
15. **Mr Gamini Wijesuriya** wondered whether other mechanisms—other than those mentioned in the working document—could be considered to obtain an exhaustive list. He noted in particular UNESCO’s strategy concerning disaster risk management in World Heritage properties. UNESCO has an Emergency Fund for disasters, and Blue Shield International is also working on the same topic, which was adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO. ICCROM, which was created by UNESCO, also has references to recent methodological approaches that were developed in the event of conflict—not just armed conflict. There were also a couple of UNESCO Chairs on this subject. Thus, Mr Wijesuriya wondered whether these new methodological approaches could be expanded on.
16. **Ms Amel Zribi Hachana** noted in the working document that operational modalities may also refer to the prevention of danger or urgency. In this way, could the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in emergency situations finance these modalities or these kinds of interventions to prevent emergencies from occurring, i.e. that are not in a real emergency situation?
17. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** explained that all these mechanisms had been taken into consideration, but the idea behind the working document was to be as concise as possible. Indeed, a whole list of operational frameworks exist that address the issue of cultural heritage in emergencies. The working document was instead focused on international legal instruments and standards for which international law was reviewed. Ms Chatelard conceded that there are indeed many different frameworks, including the ones just mentioned, as well as others that had been considered, but they were not deemed extremely useful for the collective thinking on operationalizing the Convention in emergency situations.
18. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** noted that the question was whether UNESCO had resource possibilities that could finance preventive work as there are many things that could be done in this regard. Paragraph 50 of the Operational Directives was recalled in which it currently gives a shopping list of situations where emergency International Assistance can be granted. It is nonetheless debatable, as States have to find themselves in an insurmountable situation, meaning they have to demonstrate that they cannot act themselves. Thus, the fact that preventive work can enter the sphere of the International Assistance emergency mechanism is slightly debatable. Nevertheless, it did not mean that the definition cannot be changed. The Expert Meeting could arrive at this conclusion, and the Committee and the General Assembly could concur and move towards enlarging the definition of the mechanism of emergency International Assistance. Currently, it was thought that UNESCO’s Heritage Emergency Fund could certainly help finance that kind of work on preventive measures.
19. **Mr Tim Curtis** added that States Parties can apply to establish preventive measures using ICH under the normal International Assistance mechanism, i.e. it does not have to be considered as an emergency. In that sense, there are multiple possibilities, even if they are identified under specific emergency provisions.
20. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** remarked that Ms Ohinata’s presentation recalled the visit by the former Director-General of UNESCO to one of the IDP camps in South Sudan in 2014. Mr Chioh wondered about the extent of modalities and the means in place to protect cultural heritage during emergencies. Are they moral, practical or written? Will either the State Party or UNESCO enforce this protection during the crisis situation?
21. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** thanked Ms Chatelard for highlighting the UN Resolution 2347 (2017), which in fact recalls the 2003 Convention and the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, among others. However, there is no direct reference to attacks against intangible cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the Resolution deplores the destruction of religious sites and artefacts, as well as looting and smuggling of cultural property from archaeological sites, museums, libraries, archives and other sites. This is in line with the UNESCO Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage[[8]](#footnote-8). Although it recognized cultural heritage as a component of cultural identity, linking the destruction of heritage with possible adverse consequences of human rights, it refers heavily to the Hague Convention and the additional protocols of the Geneva Conventions, which are concerned exclusively with the protection of *tangible* manifestations of cultural heritage during armed conflict. However, the link between tangible and intangible cultural heritage should be underlined, as an attack on one is often associated with an attack on the other. For example, the destruction of a cultural site may in turn challenge the right to religious freedom and worship, which amount to the intimidation of a population. In fact, a number of points in these frameworks can be recalled in the case of intangible cultural heritage.
22. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that the Secretariat convened this Expert Meeting to essentially work out these modalities. Indeed, there are many frameworks that exist and that have been debated, such as the 1954 Convention and the UN Security Council Resolutions, whether in the context of the Committee or the General Assembly. The Committee has already deemed intangible cultural heritage as important in situations of conflict, and thus there was no need to argue for introducing intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations. The purpose of the Expert Meeting was *how* to intervene. Where are the points of entry? What are the principles and modalities? The discussion should bear in mind the broad number of different situations that exist, such as internal conflict, cross-border conflict, hurricanes, floods, drought, civil unrest, and so on. The Expert Meeting should therefore seek to define broad principles and modalities that can encompass these types of situations for further discussion by the Committee. Mr Curtis added that every year there are new situations dealing with more context-specific issues. Thus, the principles would allow to engage: i) with the UN system; and ii) across other heritage and cultural work taking place in UNESCO, as despite the importance of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, there was little current know-how and experience on the subject.
23. **Mr Tim Curtis** proposed to move to the subsequent session to consider concrete examples.

#### SESSION 2: INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN EMERGENCIES

***Moderators: Mr Chris Ballard and Ms Géraldine Chatelard***

1. Introducing session 2, **Mr Chris Ballard** remarked that this session will continue to provide the background needed to move onto the more substantive discussion to follow over the next two days. He explained that Ms Geraldine Chatelard and himself had to process a considerable amount of material to arrive at the very broad general statements that were made in the working document. He added that nobody is expert on all forms of disaster or all forms of conflict, and thus they welcomed additional commentary and observations. The goal of this exercise was to produce a general model that would work for emergencies at large despite the challenging task ahead, as disasters and conflicts by and large are treated differently and are very different in many ways. Thus, trying to generate a general model that encompasses both aspects is in many ways the biggest challenge. At short notice, it was decided to invite two experts, Mr Hiroki Takakura and Mr Lassana Cissé, to speak on their experiences with disasters and conflict to provide further reflection on these issues, while taking advantage of the expertise present.
2. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** works as a social anthropologist. His original research focused on the Russian arctic and climate change, and human adaptation in cold environments. He studied the indigenous knowledge of reindeer herders in Russia, and he also recently worked on climate change, particularly on permafrost and permaculture. As with many other social scientists in disaster research, the 2011 Japan earthquake had expanded his research topics and field. The Miyagi prefecture appointed him to lead commissioned projects on tsunami-affected intangible cultural heritage. In his presentation, he reviewed the project and related activities, and considered the role of intangible cultural heritage in disaster risk reduction. The issue was to understand how local traditions, indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage could contribute towards strengthening community resilience. In this regard, he would suggest some methodological approaches. The Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami caused catastrophic damage to almost 1,000 km of coastal area of northeastern Japan with ongoing damage created by the explosion of Fuskushima daiichi, a nuclear power plant. One of the characteristics of the Tōhoku earthquake disaster was the physical and/or emotional loss felt by communities in these rural areas. The temporary, continuous and repeated evacuations had the effect of changing social relations, whether slightly or drastically. The policy measures soon after the disaster were related to the maintenance and support of individual life. Mr Takakura explained that it is indeed difficult to insist on the importance of cultural heritage or culture conservation at the very early stages of a disaster. However, once emergency conditions are overcome, the quality of life for the survivors is an important consideration for the policymaker. The aim of the project was to collect local memories of performing arts, traditional festivals and other forms of intangible cultural heritage in the tsunami region prior to the tsunami, soon after it happened, and later in the ongoing processes of reconstruction. Mr Takakura faced a dilemma at the start of the project in that he should have gone onsite to the disaster area because of his expertise as an anthropologist, but as he had no established or personal connections to the place it was psychologically and physically difficult to visit the site.
3. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** further explained that the survey was conducted from November 2011 to March 2013 over a period of 16 months. The prefecture government prepared a list of intangible cultural heritage in 23 local, coastal communities. Almost 30 researchers and students participated in this project. The method resulted in the documentation of interview responses that were recorded, collected and sorted by district. The surveys were conducted over 152 days from interviews with approximately 120 persons. In total, almost 1,000 pages and 250 photographs were taken. The documentation is already edited and the information is already available for public use in the online database. It was said that some people might doubt the urgency of safeguarding the cultural heritage and argue that priorities such as health, infrastructure and employment should be emphasized. This critique is only partially true. Mr Takakura completely understood that the urgency should rest with physical security and medical care immediately following a disaster, as these are critical for the life of the survivors. However, livelihoods are part of an integrated whole, which is more than the mere sum of these functions. The survivors need to view their own livelihood in its entirety. Mr Takakura then projected a short ethnographic film.

*[Film projection]*

1. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** then spoke of the *shishimai* ritual dance performed in Iwaki city Fukushima Prefecture that takes place every four years at the local Shinto shrine. It involves three types of masked persons who dance to the local Shinto gods in the hope of a rich harvest and prosperity. The youth-men association and the executive member of the Ujiko, a parishioner of the local Shinto shrine, undertake the leading role to organize and manage the ritual. In particular, members of the youth-men association prepare the tools, and training takes place for two weeks at the house of the youth-men. The year 2011 was an event year, and despite the disaster, the local community performed the dance because they wanted to continue the ritual. From his fieldwork, Mr Takakura was surprised at how active the local organizations were. The youth-men association displayed an amazing level of integration among the community members, and also displayed well-organized collaboration with Shinto parishioners. It was believed that the *shishimai* conferred to people a sense of community or heightened sociality and innovation of everyday life.
2. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** explained that people after a disaster face unknown difficulties. They need to deal with those difficulties under different circumstances and changed neighbourhoods. They experience a series of unknown routines and unfamiliar events during the evacuation phase. Hence, it is intangible cultural heritage that confers to the survivors a sense of local historical and geographical identity, and a sense of routine and social integration, which certainly existed among them before the disaster and needs to exist post-disaster. Culture formulates the way of interacting with one’s livelihood and contributes to the quality of life for survivors. From research experience, intangible cultural heritage could be a critical node for recovering livelihoods in a post-disaster setting. Coincidentally, most social scientists started to engage with disaster research. However, the researcher needs to establish a relationship with the government or public authorities to research intangible cultural heritage conservation in emergencies. Research activities should be standardized in terms of organization, field survey and documentation. Many anthropologists tend to have an individualistic approach to research, but time pressures in emergencies call for all-important standardization. Research on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies is important to enhance the quality of life and alleviate the suffering of the communities concerned. Culture provides people with a sense of routine life, which is greater than its plural functions. In particular, intangible cultural heritage provides ways to communicate and innovate against unfamiliar difficulties arising from disasters and related policies.
3. **Mr Chris Ballard** opened the floor for questions on Mr Takakura’s presentation.
4. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** thanked Mr Takakura for the presentation, noting that the situation faced related to a natural disaster, not a manmade one. Mr Chioh wished to hear more about the challenges faced during the fieldwork and about the lessons learned during the research, particularly with respect to the neighbouring communities.
5. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** explained that most anthropologists undertake fieldwork on an individual basis, but in this case, he had to organize almost 30 members for the field survey, which was challenging. Ordinarily, anthropologists engage with the people under study during the fieldwork; however, in this case, there was a need to develop both the relationships and carry out the research, which was both very challenging and learning.
6. **Mr Chris Ballard** introduced Mr Lassana Cissé who would make a presentation on the broad topic of conflict with reference to Mali in the Sahel.
7. **Mr Lassana Cissé** began by thanking the organizers and the Secretariat for this important meeting. As a heritage professional, he hoped to provide answers to some of the concerns raised. From 1994 to 2013, he was the manager of a World Heritage property, the Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons), which is one of the largest in Africa, covering 4,000 km2, and where ICH is as dense and important as the tangible heritage. In 2013, he was brought back to Bamako to become the Director of National Heritage where he managed the cultural heritage of Mali under the conflict situation, which had begun in 2012. In addition, Mr Cissé had experience in the neighbouring countries of Mali, such as Niger, on concrete cases of ICH within the context of conflict. The security crisis in Mali began in January 2012; the worst that Mali had seen since 1960. The crisis was born of a conflict triggered by a Tuareg rebellion in the north of the country, which was followed by the occupation of the northern regions by Islamist terrorist groups, such as Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) and the Movement for the Unity of Jihad in West Africa (MUJAO). This crisis is responsible for the destruction of a number of cultural heritage properties, and the armed conflict gradually developed and established itself in other Sahelian countries, including Burkina Faso and Niger. It was already present in Niger but to a different degree after the war in Libya, as Gaddafi had 2,000 Tuaregs in his Islamic legion.
8. **Mr Lassana Cissé** referred to a map of the area to the north, and the towns of Gao and Timbuktu that are World Heritage properties, and Djenné, which is also a World Heritage Property (Old Towns of Djenné). The Dogon country is a little north of Djenné on the side of Burkina Faso. The conflict started in the north, but is currently found in this area. Since 2012, the security crisis has affected the intangible cultural heritage of communities and ethnolinguistic groups in the northern and central regions. The knowledge and know-how in the fields of constructive cultures, architecture, traditional craftsmanship, clothing traditions and adornments of women have been affected, as well as the traditional agrarian and pastoral festivals. The consequences of the conflict include the destruction of cultural, movable and immovable property (as intangible heritage is inextricably linked to tangible heritage, and moreover precedes it), ancient manuscripts, and the looting and trafficking of art objects. These are all affected by the phenomenon of looting and trafficking in cultural objects, particularly manuscripts. With regard to the adornments of women, due to the occupation of the Islamists it is now forbidden for women to have braids or be adorned with traditional ornaments. There are intangible cultural heritage elements that have been singularly affected by the armed conflict in the occupied northern areas. In Gao, for example, when MUJAO arrived they set up their headquarters at the Sahel Museum; a large building whose work had just been completed and had yet to be inaugurated. On their arrival they destroyed, ransacked and burned the musical instruments of the regional orchestra of Gao, and banned the transmission of songs, music and other tales on local radio. A journalist was even severely molested for violating the ban, and young men were forbidden to play football. In Timbuktu, Ansar Dine (another militant Islamist group) installed its base at the Institute of Higher Studies of Islamic Research where manuscripts are stored. These manuscripts were subsequently burned. Fortunately, some manuscripts on which researchers had been working had been stored elsewhere. Ansar Dine, the movement created by Iyad in collusion with AQIM, imposed the veil on women, and ritual ceremonies and popular cultural events were banned, as well as baptisms and wedding ceremonies.
9. **Mr Lassana Cissé** explained that the annual maintenance of the monumental mud-buildings in Djenné, the Tomb of the Askia in Gao and in Timbuktu mosques had come to a halt. However, prior to this conflict, the cultural values and expressions of the different communities were harmoniously integrated. To the north, the communities of Tuaregs, Songhaïs and Peuls[[9]](#footnote-9), and in the centre, the Dogons, Peuls, Bozo and others all lived in harmony, which continued this way towards the end of the nineteenth century when colonization began. The French arrived in 1883 in Bandiagara and pacified the region. Previously, the region was occupied by the Fulani Empire of Massina and the Toucouleur Empire of El-Hajj Umar Tall, who had declared a Holy War from the valley of Senegal and who arrived in this area, but were defeated by the Fulani. The Fulani are diverse. In Mali and elsewhere, there is the Fulani Empire of Massina and the Toucouleurs. Toucouleur is, in fact, a French deformation of the word Tekrour from where these people originated, which is a region in the lower valley of the Senegal River towards St. Louis. El-Hajj Umar Tall came from this region and he launched a *jihad* from 1842. Even though the Fulani of Massina were Islamized, conflict ensued as King Bambara, who they conquered, came to confide in the Fulani, which El-Hajj Umar Tall did not accept as he wanted to decapitate the king at any cost. That is how the conflict first erupted between the two Fulani groups. In terms of intangible practices, there exists a tradition of masks. In terms of integration, the Dogon incorporated cultural values, for example, by magnifying the beauty of the Fulani women, adorning them with masks that were specifically designed for this purpose. In the Dogon plateau and in the cliffs, for the sake of cohesion, the Fulani often participated in the organization of large funerals, which are non-Muslim ritual festivals. The Fulani offer help because of the huge expense of these ceremonies and they bring goods in kind. In this region, there is also the Cultural Space of the Yaaral and Degal, which is an element inscribed on the Representative List since 2008. It is a huge celebration that mobilizes many people. This pastoral festival consists of organizing the transhumance during the rainy season. When the waters rise, the animals move towards the dry Senó Plain towards Bandiagara at the border with Burkina Faso where they spend three months of the rainy season. The same pastoral festival is celebrated on the return trip, so it is a dual-event. All the ethnolinguistic groups participate, the Dogons and their flocks, which they entrust to the Fulani, as well as other ethnic groups. Unfortunately, however, this gathering is now disbanded as a result of the conflict because the Fulani leader, Amadou Koufa, is connected with the jihadists in the north who they used to implicate the Fulani in the conflict. Now the Fulani are considered jihadists, even though these different groups lived together harmoniously for a long time.
10. **Mr Lassana Cissé** further explained that pastoralism for the Fulani, of which one of the strongest expressions are the festivities of the Yaaral and Degal, has been seriously affected. The festival has not taken place since 2015 and the situation has worsened, meaning that it is no longer possible. The agrarian and funerary rites of the Dogon were also greatly affected by the conflict, as it is also during the arrival of the rainy season (in May–June) that the very important agrarian ‘sowing festival’ takes place. It consists of ritual ceremonies and the mixing of seeds that are given by the Hogon, who is a supreme leader in a Dogon village. Everyone receives a small share to mix with their own seeds to sow. The ‘feast of understanding’ takes place after the harvest, but it has ceased because of the residual insecurity. Another important element is the Fulani language, which—in this area in central Mali—is a vector of unity and cohesion. The Fulani language is considered to be the intercommunal language between the Dogon and the Fulani, even within Dogon communities. There are at least 70 dialects in Dogon. As mountain people, they often do not understand each other, so these communities use the Peul language to communicate. Now, with the creation of the Dogon militia, called Dana Amassagou, which in Dogon means ‘hunter under the protection of God,’ the militia are forbidden to speak Peul. For example, if passengers in a vehicle are stopped between Mopti on the way to the border with Burkina Faso or to the Senó Plain and they speak Peul, they are executed. This is the gravity of the situation. People now speak Bambara or Bamanankan. If a person does not speak Dogon, then they must speak Bamanankan. Thus, since 2012 and the start of the crisis, the Peul language has been affected in Dogon country because it is considered the vehicular language of propaganda by the jihadist group led by the preacher, Amadou Koufa. The massacres committed here have been in retaliation to attacks originally perpetrated by jihadist individuals. The Fulani not only affects Mali, Senegal and Guinea, the Fulani also comprises 60 million people in Africa, from Sudan, Niger, northern Burkina Faso, Senegal, Cameroon, Nigeria, especially Sokoto in Dogon country where English speakers are arrested and where people are executed, even when they have identity cards from Niger not Nigeria.
11. **Mr Lassana Cissé** remarked on the extreme complexity of the conflict, adding that the Fulani had unwittingly become stigmatized even though in reality not all Fulani are jihadists. For example, the village of Ogossagou is inhabited by both Fulani and Dogon. Ogossagou is a Dogon name, which means ‘the will of the chief Hogon.’ The Fulani neighbourhood was recently attacked and almost the entire Fulani population of 170 people were massacred. Once a symbol of unity between communities, the Peul language has now become a distinctive marker associated with jihadists, with any Peul speaker now likened to a terrorist. In situations of emergency, intangible cultural heritage includes both upstream and downstream practices in the prevention and resolution of certain conflicts. In the case of the Dogon, Mr Cissé recalled his on-site visit in 2012 when the conflict had started in the north and had reached the northern part of Dogon country. Here, the populations celebrated all the funerals that had not been celebrated for ten years. They believed that by doing so, the conflict would not reach them. They suddenly organized these ceremonies called *dama*. Another example came about after the reconstruction of the mausoleums that were destroyed in Timbuktu. The reparation and purification ceremonies that took place before the handing over of the keys of the reconstructed mausoleums were manifested in prayers. Before the work even began on the reconstruction of the mausoleums, a ritual burial ceremony of the seeds of seven cereals (grains of sand, wheat, rice, millet, sorghum, beans, maize and cotton) took place in a tradition that is deeply rooted in the constructive cultures of Timbuktu masons. The ceremony of re-sacralization is preceded by a collective prayer to ensure the smooth running of the work. This ceremony took place in 2016 in the great Djinguereber Mosque of Timbuktu.
12. **Mr Lassana Cissé** spoke of one of his personal concerns, which is the role of humanitarians in safeguarding cultural heritage in emergencies that he believed do not play a major role, as they do not take into account the heritage dimension in conflict management. This was particularly highlighted as armed conflict leads to the displacement of populations within and beyond these violent territories, and those who are displaced end up ‘superimposing’ on each other and on other cultures and populations, which need to be managed. Refugees and IDPs experience a loss of identity as they are cut off from their context and milieu. Territories inherited from colonization in Africa are marked by both ecological and cultural boundaries. Mr Cissé evoked the case of Burkina Faso. The Séno region, which means ‘sand’ in Peul, is a fertile sandy plain that extends to the other side of Burkina Faso where Fulani reside. The case of the cultural space of Sosso-Bala, an ICH element, was also cited. It concerns the Mandingue community, not only in Guinea, there are also two villages that share the guardianship of the Sosso-Bala; one in Mali and one in Guinea, both of which are Mandingue communities. The management of refugee camps by humanitarian organizations, such as UNHCR, the Red Cross and charitable NGOs, must necessarily consider the cultural dimension to ensure the harmonious existence of these communities living in camps. In addition to health care and nutrition, intangible cultural heritage plays an important role in the survival and coexistence of refugees. It is therefore necessary to identify and recognize the elements of intangible cultural heritage during times of conflict, especially in refugee camps or sites where they settle. As refugees and IDPs move, they also displace their knowledge, know-how, languages, cultural traditions and cult practices. It is these elements of intangible cultural heritage at these sites that will contribute to improving living conditions in emergency situations. The diversity of cultural expressions can be best managed by assisting the urgent safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage elements, such as arts and crafts, tales and narratives, or evenings of cultural performances in the case of the displacement of large crowds of people from various walks of life.
13. **Mr Lassana Cissé** spokeof the need for a systematic inventory, as well as the urgent safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage elements on sites with refugees and IDPs. As previously mentioned, these communities superimpose on other cultures, or they could be an addition or assimilated, which is also possible. For that reason, an inventory would be useful as it would enable the communities concerned to live their heritage, while safeguarding it for future post-conflict generations. The Convention needs to develop a strategic plan to establish inventories on a case-by-case basis involving humanitarian organizations that can take ownership in terms of their efficient management of humanitarian aid. Mr Cissé spoke of his own experience in Agadez, Niger, in July 2018. The EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa supported an extremely interesting programme of an Italian NGO International Committee for the Development of Peoples (CISP) who carry out a remarkable job with women artisans, but also young people who want to take to the sea because Agadez is a stopping point for all the young people of sub-Saharan Africa, such as Senegal, Mali, Côte d’Ivoire, who wish to emigrate and are stranded at the border. CISP developed a programme around both tangible and intangible cultural heritage, such as arts and crafts, as well as a restoration project of the old historic centre of Agadez, which was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2013, in a project called Employment for the Heritage of Agadez (EPA). An inventory made it possible to identify the different communities and cultures, and to appreciate their role in the organization of the inhabited space in which communities live together in peaceful coexistence within the camps and sites of the displaced. Thus, there is a need to develop and support cultural programmes for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage elements. In Diffa, for example, an area concerned by conflict because of Boko Haram, the communities use their knowledge and know-how to realize constructions in local materials. In Agadez, as previously mentioned, the programme supports arts and crafts, and programmes are also undertaken in other camps in Gao (Mali), Burkina Faso, Niger and Mauritania, wherever IDP camps have been set up. Not only does it allow people to safeguard their knowledge, it also gives them something to do, as initiating animated evenings for the benefit of women and young people makes people very happy. Communities have knowledge and beliefs and use intangible practices to develop forms of resilience during times of conflict. As the saying goes, “a man does not live on bread or millet alone.” People have to live their culture.
14. **Mr Lassana Cissé** thengave theexample of the manuscripts in Timbuktu and how they were exfiltrated. The headquarters of the Islamists was in the centre of the city where the manuscripts were kept. But the people developed a strategy to rescue the manuscripts by removing them from their steel boxes, which were under surveillance and checked every morning. Nevertheless, people took them out of their boxes and placed them in canisters for evacuation to the south. This showed how communities are always developing strategies in a form of resilience. Similar practices also exist for organizing resistance in times of conflict. During wars, even today, deities are invoked to deter conflict, and ritual ceremonies are organized to solicit the help of ancestors. In Dogon country, for example, the community believes that ancestors watch over them, but for that to continue, ties must not be broken and ceremonies and sacrifices have to be performed. Even soldiers on the ground possess grigris or talismans around their necks or bodies to protect them, as do their leaders at the highest echelons. Words, songs, stories and poems are powerful means of resilience and existence for some communities. People use these elements to overcome nostalgia, for example. Conflicts impact intangible cultural heritage and related industries, and affect a growing number of people, which is why intangible cultural heritage is an integral part of the recovery of communities in times of conflict, especially post-conflict. The Expert Meeting should thus consider developing an integrated management approach for the protection of communities and the intangible values they embody. Given the current magnitude and complexity of conflicts in the Sahel, particularly in Mali, it was thus necessary to develop strategic guidelines to develop best practices by promoting awareness, recognition and respect for the diversity of intangible cultural heritage elements. There was a need to develop planning tools to formulate specific plans and projects for the safeguarding and sustainability of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, given the escalation of conflicts at the heart of some communities causing the exponential rise in displaced persons. From January 2018 to date, the number of displaced persons has increased by 360 per cent as the conflict has spread southwards. There is enormous pressure for urgent intervention to help these displaced people to safeguard their heritage through a methodical inventory and fieldwork to valorize intangible cultural heritage at the level of the makeshift camps to reinforce resilience capacities.
15. **Mr Chris Ballard** thanked Mr Cissé for his excellent but alarming presentation, opening the floor for comments.
16. **Ms Amel Hachana Zribi** noted that Mr Cissé suggested that to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of displaced communities, a systematic inventory or a ‘methodical inventory’ must be taken. But who would conduct this work? It was indicated that humanitarian aid could contribute to this operation. It is recognized, however, that an inventory is rather a technical operation, even though it can be simplified. Nevertheless, in an emergency, who would carry out this work?
17. **Mr Lassana Cissé** explained that to undertake a systematic or methodical inventory of intangible cultural heritage did not require technicians. Humanitarian workers could be trained to undertake this work by familiarizing themselves with the 2003 Convention, while learning methods of inventory, especially as there are simple tools available. The objective is to identify, study and make known the elements of intangible cultural heritage and how they are used, as well as the modalities of coexistence between communities. In the case of Mali, humanitarian workers of the UNHCR or the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) could be trained to obtain basic data and knowledge of intangible cultural heritage so that this work can be carried out by communities themselves in the camps, not least because there will be bearers of knowledge, know-how, storytellers, singers and so on who will be able to easily record their intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the work is not as technically complicated as one would believe.
18. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** identified with the presentation by Mr Cissé in that in Africa—and it was possibly valid elsewhere—historical sites, monuments and places of memory of tangible heritage could only be explained through its relationship with its intangible elements, through which it confers meaning. This is the case of the Bassari cultural landscape in Senegal, which was inscribed as World Heritage in 2012. Mr Cissé had evaluated the site at the time when he was working with the Dogon who historically were always forced to live in refuge, high on the hills and cliffs. This was exactly the same situation in Bassari country where the people fled the raids of slave traders at the time, which was followed by the arrival of the Fulani who tried to convert them to Islam. The Bassari thus took refuge in the caves, as did the Bedik community who also took to the Bandafassi cliffs, and other small ethnic groups who followed the same path and inhabited the high grounds to escape. Today, they have descended the cliffs to cultivate, but the historic villages are still on the peaks of the hills where all the cultural rites and rituals are performed. This is the cultural landscape that had been inscribed. This landscape would not have been classified without this interaction between people and nature, as well as the cultural values expressed in the life of these ethnic minorities. The Fulani, who stayed and settled there, eventually reclaimed the cultural values of their ancestors, becoming almost animist. They also borrowed many of the rites from the Bassari and the Bedik. In this case, heritage almost reconciled them, at least they experienced a form of integration. Nevertheless, unwanted fundamentalism—as experienced in Mali with Islamism—may cause their disintegration. Certainly, in Mali, had it not been for Islamism and the terrorist movement, the relationship between the Fulani and Dogon would still be intact.
19. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** then gave another example of Casamance in Senegal, from where the speaker originates. It is located in the south by Guinea-Bissau and has experienced a separatist movement since 1981-82. When the conflict started, the so-called Casamance independence rebels took refuge in the sacred forests so as to imbue themselves with invincibility, as it was said to confer material strength. However, the soldiers of the army who were fighting them thought that by attacking the sacred forests, their possibilities of resistance would also be wiped out. Consequently, almost all the sacred groves have been shelled and destroyed, together with many of the cultural values related to them. Despite this, the conflict in Casamance is not often talked about, but it nonetheless continues to exist in a more latent form. Mr Guissé spoke of a situation that had just occurred the previous day involving children who were apprehended by the rebels, and soldiers who managed to escape an ambush. So these were the issues that had to be addressed. If an inventory had been made of the sacred groves prior to the conflict, it would have lessened the problem. At least there would be documentation and a record of the rituals that would have prevented the loss of this intangible cultural heritage. Today, the situation rendered the inventorying difficult and impossible in some areas that remain inaccessible. In addition, people have been silenced. Mr Guissé recalled his time teaching at a local school in which students would disappear from one semester to the next. Some had taken to the bush, others had families affected by the conflict such that schooling was interrupted. For the last two years of his time at the school working as a pedagogical adviser, Mr Guissé initiated a cultural programme in which students were asked to anonymously write short stories, theatre plays, paint and draw, and they produced extraordinary, meaningful work. It was quickly understood that the students were recounting their actual existence and experiences. Thus, it was important to conduct such cultural programmes in conflict zones in high schools, schools and villages to identify and understand these forms of resilience through these cultural expressions.
20. **Mr Jose Pontanares Canuday** thanked both speakers for their interesting presentations. He turned to Mr Takakura’s point about livelihoods as being a key element in recovery. He drew parallels to his ongoing work in the field in the southern Philippines where livelihood initiatives had helped the local communities recover, not only in developing heritage, but also in uplifting their lives in the midst of conflict. He therefore wondered about possible interventions with regard to livelihoods as a means of protecting intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
21. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** agreed with the point raised that livelihoods is key to recovery. In Japan’s case, intangible cultural heritage is one aspect of their lives and by promoting intangible cultural heritage the communities will take the initiative to recover. However, some people do not believe in the power of intangible cultural heritage, preferring instead to focus on employment or health in the first instance. Thus, in terms of recovery policy, the Japanese government intervened to first improve the health and economic situation on the ground. Nevertheless, intervening in intangible cultural heritage would promote local initiatives.
22. **Mr Jose Pontanares Canuday** asked whether the development of economic and market value chains could be one possible area of intervention that can be enacted in emergencies, particularly in communities devastated by war and disasters. Was it thus possible to tap into economic resources as a possible area of intervention?
23. On the economic potential of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, **Mr Hiroki Takakura** spoke of how the community had organized some events on intangible cultural heritage, which also involved others from the outside. Aspects of intangible cultural heritage dedicated to local tourism was also considered important in an emergency context, as it provided a means of income and a source of financial support to the local community.
24. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** thanked the speakers for their interesting and constructive interventions. She turned to Mr Cissé to ask about the content of the inventory. Should the inventory be composed of intangible cultural heritage practised by the communities after the disaster or conflict? Or should it be an inventory of memory, i.e. of what previously existed, as practised in Japan? In both cases, how can intangible cultural heritage be safeguarded given that it is itself subject to radical change, impoverishment and the displacement of communities?
25. **Mr Lassana Cissé** explained that people who have been displaced in camps or refugee sites by conflict or by other phenomena, such as immigration, leave an area to settle in another place or even in another country. Thus, the displaced persons must coexist with the host populations. Nevertheless, they leave with the values and elements of intangible cultural heritage that they consider important and vital to safeguard. The content of the inventory must therefore—first and foremost—be comprised of the intangible cultural heritage that the communities bring to the camps to enable them to survive. The inventory is not about listing all elements of memory or intangible cultural heritage, rather it should focus on what is fundamental to the communities, which they consider essential to safeguard and transmit. Mr Cissé gave an example of the Fulani who are traditionally known as herders, but they are also known as great poets. Fulani herders led their flocks from the villages to the flooded zone of the interior deltas of Niger. Today, they no longer have herds, but they have become nostalgic. They sing and recite poetry from their time as herders when they sang to find courage in the bush. They composed a lot of poetry and had different castes playing instruments to accompany these poems. These were the kinds of elements that should be targeted in the inventory, as these recordings could benefit people living in camps. Often different ethnic groups, such as the Fulani, Dogon or Bozo cohabit the same camp, which was more disadvantageous than advantageous as there is often a conflict of cultural interests. Still, the inventory would reflect the reality of the displacement and thus concern specific elements in this particular context.
26. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** agreed on the importance of preparing a concrete inventory. The process of obtaining information and doing interviews, whereby the local people could be questioned about the kind of elements they wished to include in the inventory, was a very important aspect for the recovering community.
27. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** noted that Ms Takakura had mentioned ‘standardization’ several times in his presentation and wondered whether this referred to the standardization of safeguarding measures, in which case would these measures be applied to communities or imposed by anthropologists or governments, given the fact that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage should be conducted with the involvement of communities.
28. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** explained that his use of ‘standardization’ came from an anthropological perspective and research approach. However, in terms of emergencies, he suggested from experience that it would be better to prepare for an emergency in advance through prior discussions with governments and scholars as to the kind of standardized evaluation that would be required for intangible cultural heritage.
29. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** believed this to be a crucial issue that should be tackled during the Expert Meeting, i.e. should standards or standardization be applied to promote intangible cultural heritage during emergencies or not, as this was contrary to the Convention if applied without consultation with the communities. Mr Hayajneh then asked Mr Cissé about inventorying intangible cultural heritage in contexts where kinship networks and identity constructions do not exist, especially in refugee camps. In conducting an inventory, how could the transmission of intangible cultural heritage be guaranteed?
30. **Mr Lassana Cissé** explained that any community that is displaced will carry with it their own values and identity in the form of beliefs, arts and crafts, and so on, which are universally practised everywhere. People have always experimented using their hands, whether they find themselves in a normal situation or not. Women, for example, braid or comb their hair; they need to do things to be themselves. The inventory, therefore, must contain elements of utilitarian practice, which are not necessarily the elements one defines as heritage and which are considered as belonging to the past. So what constitutes the elements of this heritage? It is not only about the loss of identity, it is also about understanding the methods to be applied to make one exist in the cultural context in which one finds oneself at the risk of losing those values, notwithstanding that there are many people in these camps who are nostalgic of their homelands and of cultural practices in general.
31. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** spoke of families being uprooted from their homes and where, in refugee or IDP camps, parents are split up, or children find themselves alone. In this situation, values and norms change, whether positive or negative. In addition, globalization issues felt in the world reach these communities when they are uprooted. He thus wondered to what extent changes occurred in these communities and how they affected the community?
32. **Mr Lassana Cissé** agreed that displacement brought about change in the context of the new realities being confronted, naturally and culturally. Moreover, a community that is displaced cannot and should not confine itself, which would only speed up the process of disappearance, adding that wars and conflict trigger processes that destroy socio-cultural frameworks. He spoke of his own family background as an example. His grandfather is Fulani from Fouta-Djallon in Guinea. He ended up in Kayes in western Mali where he got married. He wished to return home to Guinea, but he was unable to because of El-Hajj Umar Tall, who had started the Holy War in 1842 in the Senegal River Valley that had led to the displacement. Mr Cissé’s mother is originally Fulani, but her father no longer speaks Peul but Khassonké, a dialectal variant of Maninka. Mr Cissé’s father, who is Soninké, from the region of Guidimaka had lost his language and culture. Thus, the processes of change are inevitable to a certain respect, just as globalization is inevitable even without displacement or conflict as a phenomenon that spreads information and communication technologies. Nevertheless, one must look to what is essential.
33. **Mr Chris Ballard** thanked the presenters for launching into the detail, complexity and urgency of the challenge faced in dealing with these issues.
34. **Mr Tim Curtis** adjourned the morning session.

*[Tuesday 21 May, afternoon session]*

#### SESSION 3: INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND EXISTING OPERATIONAL MODALITIES

***Moderator: Ms Géraldine Chatelard***

1. **Mr Tim Curtis** welcomed everyone back, inviting Mr Chris Ballard to continue.
2. **Mr Chris Ballard** continued from the discussion in the previous session on how to identify issues of overlap, i.e. areas of communality between disasters and conflicts? What can be said about this category of emergency that is meaningful? One of the arguments is that all disasters and conflicts are particular and unique, especially with respect to intangible cultural heritage, which is already individual and specific. But it is almost impossible to say something general that is meaningful about emergencies as a category. However, looking at the material consulted, Ms Géraldine Chatelard and Mr Ballard agreed that there are certain kinds of areas in which there is overlap between disasters and conflicts. The question is to decipher the outcomes, measures and challenges that might be common to both disasters and conflicts. One of them is the dual role of intangible cultural heritage in all kinds of emergencies, where emergencies pose a threat or have an effect on the practice and the transmission of intangible cultural heritage. On the one hand, intangible cultural heritage has a role to play in certain situations—not all—in mitigating the impact of conflict or disaster. ICH is also a source of resilience and recovery in the moment of the event, after the event, and in preparation of an emergency. Thus, this dual role has an overlapping area. The next, however, is sadly negative in that little is known about intangible cultural heritage outcomes over the longer term, such as the particular impact of different kinds of emergencies on the transmission or viability of intangible cultural heritage. It is not understood, for instance, the effect of different kinds of disasters on intangible cultural heritage transmission or viability, let alone in areas of conflict. Thus, the common feature is the sheer lack of knowledge, case material and analysis of cases. The economic costs of impact to intangible cultural heritage is not understood. How does one, not necessarily monetize, but at least find ways to assess the economic impact of all kinds of emergency? This is an entirely negative area in which both disasters and conflicts have a common theme.
3. **Mr Chris Ballard** then turned to the question of understanding intangible cultural heritage elements in their broader social and cultural contexts, which is another negative in a sense. What is seen occurring in relation to intangible cultural heritage in almost all contexts of emergency is a failure to grasp the broader social and cultural contexts, and to grasp them in the longer term as they unfold. Thus, intangible cultural heritage is understood in the moment of the emergency or in its aftermath, and understood largely in static terms and as isolated elements that can be grasped, tabulated, identified, named and addressed. There is also the risk common to intangible cultural heritage in all situations of emergency, whether humanitarian or disasters, the temptation to extract intangible cultural heritage for instrumental purposes. For example, by taking a ceremony or a disaster mitigation practice and generalizing it by applying it or instrumentalizing it elsewhere. Often that risks decontextualizing that element from all the contexts that actually make it both meaningful and functional. Slightly more controversially is the idea that emergencies, disasters and conflicts can potentially be creative contexts for intangible cultural heritage. If nothing else, they often provide opportunities for reflection on intangible cultural heritage. Mr Ballard spoke of how a 15-year average cyclone, for example, provides an opportunity for people in certain communities to think about intangible cultural heritage, to understand that planting traditional cyclone crops does not work, or that the system of leadership might not be coping with the disaster. These are the kinds of spaces that open up for reflection on the longer-term duration and lives of intangible cultural heritage practices. There is also the idea that emergencies are potentially creative, i.e. that new forms of intangible cultural heritage emerge or that old forms of intangible cultural heritage are transformed, or remade to fit the purpose, which is important to understand. These are not static elements that somehow have to be preserved from pre-emergency to post-emergency. Things will happen to intangible cultural heritage in the context of an emergency that are entirely meaningful and authentic.
4. In terms of these overlapping issues, **Mr Chris Ballard** spoke of the enhanced threat to all forms of intangible cultural heritage under all kinds of emergencies in the current unfolding climate crisis. Thus, whether disaster or conflict, threats to intangible cultural heritage and the challenges posed to communities will be exacerbated by changing climatic conditions, which is predictable. It is very difficult to precisely predict conflicts or disasters, but one can predict climate change and that conditions are going to get increasingly complicated and difficult. There are also areas where there are no overlapping issues, which deal with incompatible, incommensurable fields of disasters and conflicts, and trying to think of them under a single category of emergency. However, these areas are open to contestation and counter examples can be considered for each of them. With regard to disasters, what makes them different from conflicts is to understand that disasters are mutually constitutive of culture in most regions, i.e. communities experiencing a recurrent form of natural disaster will have formed their culture in response to that. Mr Ballard recalled someone asking recently, when did El Niño droughts become a disaster? The response came back that the communities had dealt with these for centuries, but they are somehow now termed disasters. This was therefore an adaptation of intangible cultural heritage to recurrent hazards. They are not predictable, i.e. one cannot say with certainty which year they are going to happen, but culture is formed with a whole series of expectations and mitigation measures in place. However, this does not necessarily seem to be the case for conflict.
5. **Mr Chris Ballard** spoke of certain instances where communities appear sadly to be adapted to conflict and their predictable reoccurrence, but can it be said of culture generally that it is adapted to deal with the scale of conflict? This is where scale comes in. Thus, in disaster situations there is the enhanced scope for intangible cultural heritage to be used in mitigation where there is a substantial body of knowledge developed in almost all societies through oral tradition, through knowledge of the local environment, of ways in which to mitigate disaster, for example, where to build a settlement so not to be exposed to certain kinds of disaster. Nevertheless, there can be counter examples where this might also be true for conflicts in general, albeit it is truer of disaster than conflict. There is also an interest in intangible cultural heritage mitigation measures and disaster risk management (DRM), such as the disaster risk reduction (DRR) ‘industry’ and the institutions that are already engaged or that have been interested in *mining* intangible cultural heritage for a long time, often for instrumental purposes. Nevertheless, there is a kind of engagement, an awareness of this body of knowledge, even if there are no mechanisms in place to truly appreciate and understand it on its own terms.
6. Turning to conflict, **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that the first and perhaps most obvious occurrence is the absolute destruction of intangible cultural heritage knowledge and bearers in extreme or long-term conflict. Again, there can be extreme natural disasters that eliminate many or most intangible cultural heritage bearers in a community, but it is particularly true of conflict, which has to do with the targeted assaults on intangible cultural heritage and its bearers, the kind of cultural cleansing that is well-known both to intangible cultural heritage bearers and the material components of intangible cultural heritage, as well as places and artefacts that are essential to the transmission and reproduction of intangible cultural heritage over the long term. There is an uncertain capacity—certainly on the part of the humanitarian industry—of how intangible cultural heritage can mitigate conflict above the local level. All communities are adapted to the notion of conflict, and all communities have some form of conflict resolution. The questions are: How do these mechanisms become scaled up above the local level? How do those voices get heard? How do those mechanisms or ceremonies translate to higher-level or larger-scale groups? This is an extreme challenge. A peace-making ceremony that may function very well between two communities or within a single community may have no application at the district or national level. In contrast with DRM, DRR interest in intangible cultural heritage mitigation measures is very limited in terms of engagement by humanitarian agencies, i.e. there is little attempt by the humanitarian industry to think how intangible cultural heritage might actually be part of the solution and not just another in its list of problems. Mr Ballard concluded that these were some very generalized points and attempts to see some pattern in what is otherwise an extraordinarily dense, complex and slightly chaotic field of examples from both disasters and conflicts.
7. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** invited Ms Hanna Schreiber to speak.
8. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** remarked that some of the points made could be interpreted from different points of view, as a researcher, for example, or as a trainer. From the perspective of a researcher, and although this might be politically incorrect to highlight, the document only concentrated on ways intangible cultural heritage might bring about reconciliation and be a tool for recovery and so on. However, it can be seen at the level of the Representative List (although it was understood that the discussion is based on intangible cultural heritage in general) that intangible cultural heritage itself might create conflict-generating situations. Thus, what can be done if the intangible cultural heritage itself is a cause of conflict and actually the root of problems? This is the researcher’s critical point of view. There were other concerns in trying to prepare something concrete and useful. From the legal point of view, there is a completely different legal framework that is applied for conflict and for armed-conflict situations, whether international or non-international, and to DRM. This can cause many problems in how to formulate real guidelines when trying to prepare for a situation by applying and putting them into one basket. For example, the Hague and Geneva Conventions are not applied to DRM situations, even though humanitarian organizations and military forces act in both situations. They are asked to help in disaster situations, or they are forcibly sent by their States to engage in conflict. What is bothersome, in fact, is the terminology used. Ms Schreiber understood the use of ‘methodological guidance’ (the title of the paper used, as reflected in the decision of the Committee), but a more in-depth look at the document reveals all possible kinds of formulas, such as operational guidance, methodological guidelines, operational modalities and operational principles. She conceded that, as a researcher, she too had difficulty understanding the difference between ‘modalities’ and ‘principles.’ She therefore believed that simpler terminology could be used to make something readable, likable and useful, and she preferred ‘operational principles’ to make it more concise and coherent.
9. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** spoke of her experience as a trainer of military troops. She usually trains commanders who are open-minded, intelligent, highly experienced people. But most people believe, or are led to believe, that the military is composed of very narrow-minded people who adhere to rules and principles that they are expected to follow. However, what is needed when it comes to training are very clear guidelines that are context-related. Ms Schreiber explained that she brings the terminology of intangible cultural heritage into the concept of cross-cultural awareness, which is now introduced in almost every army and military organization in the world, not to mention NATO, which is a specific kind of organization. Practically every national armed forces has a unit and is training troops on cross-culture awareness issues. These topics include cultural heritage protection and the cultural context, which is clearly connected to intangible cultural heritage. Ms Schreiber believed that troops, but also NGOs and humanitarian aid workers, would benefit from practical guidelines and principles on how to understand intangible cultural heritage in the context of emergencies by creating a code of conduct or rules of engagement (to use the terminology used by the military). Although it had been criticized, she called for a certain standardization because in order to have something useful, it would have to be formulated in standard or general terms so that it can be applied at the local context, and this local context will help implement these guidelines.
10. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** thanked Ms Schreiber for her question and opened the floor for further questions and comments.
11. **Mr Tim Curtis** wished to comment on the legal status of the working document, explaining that the Committee had decided not to formulate Operational Directives, i.e. the work would not develop a legally binding document, certainly not at this stage. However, the document would serve as guidance, affiliated with underlying principles or modalities (depending on the term chosen), as well as an operational part that will actually enact the principles.
12. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** remarked on the crucial issues raised by Ms Schreiber on the technical terminologies used. He also spoke of how he gradually moved towards ICH from the 1972 Convention, although he works in both fields. In terms of how to develop the language, he gave the example of the use of ‘experts,’ which was a word loaded with meaning in that everyone expects the expert to solve their problems. When we become experts, we are dealing with issues of communities of intangible cultural heritage, but the greatest experts are actually the communities themselves. In a particular case of conflict, how do we deal with issues that bring brother against sister, a group against another group, who are fighting because of historical issues? How can we be sure that when we bring on board the intangible cultural heritage, and not leave it on the ground, that the communities are not saying ‘if you do it without me, you are against me.’ Thus, any work involving intangible cultural heritage must involve the communities themselves. Many times, the communities will in fact do the work themselves. Thus, there are limits at which point one can enter a community with one’s own prejudgments—in the way experts have been trained—to guide them to do what will actually have a lasting effect, but instead using their own knowledge, which they themselves have created over time. The second terminology concerns the two related but distinct words: authentic and authenticity. Mr Abungu believed that there was no place for authentic or authenticity and integrity in the 2003 Convention, but it was difficult to run away from these terms, which appear time and again. The other terms are traditional knowledge systems or indigenous knowledge systems or ethnic. How do we ensure that these terms are used without connotations of higher or lower place? When is traditional knowledge used as opposed to general intangible cultural heritage? Or when does it become indigenous knowledge as opposed to traditional knowledge? How long does it take for this knowledge to be considered traditional? What is the difference between a traditional knowledge system and knowledge that has developed over 20 or 30 years because of hurricane events or whatever it may be?
13. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** then referred to the presentation by Mr Lassana Cissé who raised the issue of illicit trafficking, adding that one of the greatest threats to the communities in the Sahel was the introduction of guns and drugs (in the same line as trade of cultural material), which had empowered the youth, allowing them to make money quickly and own things, and who no longer feel that the elders have anything to teach them. Thus, there is a breakdown in the leadership that was historically provided by elders and in the wisdom of the elders, as elders can only talk, they cannot financially match drugs and small arms dealers irrespective of religious considerations. The question was how to deal with this new situation whereby people who have grown up believing that elders are always right, now believe they have a chance to speak, even though they have not been granted that authority. These are the issues confronted by the communities, even as the Committee sits here at UNESCO Headquarters to reflect and advise on these kinds of issues to establish good recommendations. In terms of interrelationship between the other international organizations, Mr Abungu explained that he had been involved with UNESCO for nearly 30 years, working with all the Conventions, such as the 1970 Convention. He noted that some Conventions do not communicate together in a sort of cocoonism even though the Conventions are so intertwined. For example, there is no way that the 1970 Convention can operate without the 2003 Convention. How else can it acquire meaning and value, and develop all the attributes necessary of culture without dealing with ICH? How organizations and culture Conventions work together within their mandate is one of the most important questions.
14. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** agreed with Mr Abungu’s remarks in that people like him and others in the room wear several hats at the same time, be it the 2003 Convention, the 1972 Convention, or maybe even the 1954 Hague Convention, who are actually engaged in this field of heritage, conservation and safeguarding across Conventions, but also in the field.
15. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** remarked that there were indeed boundaries to communication, so unless the boundaries are broken down it would be difficult to now start working with the World Food Programme (WFP), the World Health Organization (WHO), the UNDP, and so on. It was thus important to accept that there are some challenges, not problems, and that the recommendations should go beyond simply ‘recommending.’ The 2003 Convention, the 1972 Convention and the 1970 Convention all need to work closely together. For example, in a case of a young man in the Sahel dealing with illicit trafficking, this would refer to the 1970 Convention, and the 1954 Hague Convention in the case of firearms. When these communities break down, it concerns the 2003 Convention. In addition, there are issues that may arise because of people dealing with food, health and so on, and there may be other priorities. All these aspects should be considered whether or not answers are found.
16. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** thanked Mr Abungu, adding that Mr Curtis would later address these remarks.
17. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** remarked that he too had his foot in both the 1970 and 2003 Conventions, and the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, given Senegal’s 700 km of coastline. He strongly supported the remarks made by Mr Ballard on the ability of intangible cultural heritage to adapt, to recreate and transport itself rather than to be fixed in the past with its echoes of authenticity. ICH therefore adapts to disasters and climate change on a day-by-day basis. Mr Guissé gave an example of a herdsman who practises an agrarian rite, an existential rite that begins with the rains, the sowing and the harvest. It corresponds to a season, which is three months in the Sahel, and which is extremely important for these populations that make up 70 per cent of the population. The entire sociology of the environment is related to the agrarian season. The Xooy divination ceremony (inscribed on the Representative List in 2013) is one such element that helps determine if there will be rain or not, when the harvest should start, and so on. The rite usually begins from June, because the rains always started at the end of June. However, with climate change, the rains no longer come in June. Nevertheless, they must practise the rite, which determines when to sow. If they sow the seeds and there is no rain, they will lose the crop, but then they will have no more seedlings and catastrophe ensues. The communities now need to adapt to climate change, even though they do not know what climate change is, which is discussed in the halls of the UN. Nevertheless, they are experiencing a phenomenon that they will have to increasingly understand, i.e. the rainy season has changed and they may need seed varieties with a shorter cycle as it no longer rains for two months. The rites therefore have to adapt; the entire cultural agenda must adapt to these changes. As regards terminology, Mr Guissé recalled that during the discussions at the open-ended intergovernmental working group on developing an overall results framework for the Convention in China, the terms ‘authentic,’ ‘indigenous’ and ‘vernacular’ were discussed. These are of course words loaded with meaning. Do they confer a value judgment? The role of the expert is thus to help decision-makers make the right decisions. It is also the aim of the Expert Meeting to develop the right recommendations that will help the Committee and other UNESCO entities in this endeavour.
18. **Ms Cristina Amescua Chávez** found the conversation very stimulating. She wished to take a step back to ask *why* it was necessary to consider disaster and conflict together. There were surely many important reasons to do so. But what do they have in common besides the aspects already pointed out. What is the broadest common denominator for both? No doubt they contribute to the extraordinary situations that affect intangible cultural heritage. It is known that intangible cultural heritage adapts and changes through time owing to a wide variety of reasons, but in cases of disaster and conflict these occur rapidly and urgently insofar as there is a heightened sense of urgency. For these reasons, it was important to think of some very general operational principles that can guide action in the field. They would have to be general to fully grasp the diversity of intangible cultural heritage affected by disasters and conflicts at the field level. Ms Chávez believed that the Expert Meeting should aim at three or four very punctual operational or guiding principles that can be seen as a common tree trunk with several different branches corresponding to more specific recommendations for disasters and conflicts, as there were very relevant differences. One of the obvious ones is that in the case of disasters, it is the environment that is affecting people in different ways, whereas in conflicts, people are against each other, and therefore disasters and conflicts cannot be treated in the same way. Another point is this idea of the relevance and importance of the community taking the lead in deciding what to do in these cases. Of course, it is fundamental, as had been pointed out in several of the interventions. However, the community is not a unified entity and therefore one of the operational principles should give voice to polyphony, to disagreements, to several voices having divergent points of view operating within the same community.
19. **Ms Cristina Amescua Chávez** also spoke about the need to consider and map the role of other actors that may or may not be part of the community, but who are relevant to intangible cultural heritage and to safeguarding in particular. These would include NGOs, academics, UNESCO entities, or local governments at different levels. Evidently, they are not going to lead the process, although they may do in some cases. However, this mapping was necessary to know exactly the way in which different sets of actors can contribute towards helping the community. Returning to a point made earlier by Mr Lassana Cissé, Ms Chávez believed that mechanisms, such as non-technical inventories that rethink the value of heritage, as very important, and these mechanisms might work pretty much everywhere if one removes the technical aspects associated with national inventories, for example. The extraordinary character of disasters and conflicts lends one to think that intangible cultural heritage will not be the same after an emergency. However, in those contexts, people can value different things, things they did not value as much before and now become part of the narrative. For example, storytelling might be resuscitated by the community in a refugee camp. Thus, it was important to grasp these phenomena as they occur.
20. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** invited Mr Curtis to respond.
21. **Mr Tim Curtis** fully appreciated and understood the remarks made by Mr Georges Abungu on Conventions working together, but that this separation of the different Conventions happens more in Headquarters than in UNESCO Field Offices. Having worked in the field for a long time, Mr Curtis explained that when the Field Offices work they bring together all the tools available to them as they are much closer to the reality in the field. His advice therefore was not to start with Headquarters, but with the Field Offices. However, over the last 6-7 years, financial resources have been cut substantially, yet there is no decrease in the scope of the programme of work such that the system is under strain. Nobody is really opposed to working together, but the structures of the Conventions—with each one having its owns rules and governing bodies—is very demanding. Servicing just one Convention in UNESCO Headquarters is already a huge undertaking in itself, and all six culture Conventions are structurally separated. Nevertheless, colleagues in the field are quite used to and adept at seeing how to work with the different Conventions. With regard to the work at hand, Mr Curtis told the participants that the report was unlikely to cover all the issues of emergencies, but that the Committee should receive some basic modalities or principles that—over the years—will be expanded into these emergency situations and conflicts, both small and large scale.
22. **Mr Tim Curtis** returned to a comment made by Mr Hiroki Takakura when asked about the main challenges he faced. As an anthropologist, he is used to having long-term relations with the community that comes with his role as an expert. Yet in an emergency situation, time is a luxury. Mr Curtis recalled that the basis and the principle of community-based needs identification is already established. The Convention says that communities identify and manage their own intangible cultural heritage. They are the first ones to cope with a crisis situation. But, how does one access the community? Which experts, from UNESCO or elsewhere, do you call upon? In the case of built heritage, for the most part, there is usually a pool of experts that can be called upon to assess a site, for its structural integrity, for example. Hence, the challenge with the 2003 Convention is to establish an action plan that can be put in place in the event of a disaster. It was realized that a body of experience did not exist that could integrate intangible cultural heritage into the overall cultural heritage and culture and disaster modality, which has had more practice and experience in other domains of culture and cultural heritage. Thus, the work involved integrating intangible cultural heritage from the point of view of operational modalities.
23. **Mr Chris Ballard** thanked the speakers for the wide range of comments and questions. He particularly liked Mr Abungu’s point about the term ‘expert,’ as it cut to the core of the challenge that experts should position themselves as facilitators throughout the process so that the proposal is centrally placed at the heart of community-based measures. If there was one thing that had to be communicated to first responders and humanitarian agencies, it would actually be to listen. In this vein, he strongly recommended that the work not focus so much on a series of recommendations that detail what needs to be done, but rather to have recommendations that create and fund resource spaces for the experts who can then actually step in and determine how best to respond in particular situations. The experts’ role was therefore to find that funding and to create and maintain those spaces.
24. Thanking Mr Ballard, **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** believed that experts were not necessarily separated from intangible cultural heritage communities. Depending on how communities are defined, some experts are members of the communities and therefore there is not necessarily this relation of exteriority, i.e. it was a little more complex.
25. **Mr Gamini Wijesuriya** spoke of his unease with the label of expert. He gave the example of a meeting of ICOMOS, which has scientific committees on different themes such as wood, stone, and so on, and where the delegates were asked to prepare a list of experts for every theme. A brave delegate stood up and said that they were not the experts, that the people are the experts. Returning to the point made on terminology, Mr Wijesuriya remarked that both natural hazards and human-induced interventions or conflicts bring about disasters, which is the definition provided in the UN system and in many of its documents, and it is very clearly defined by the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction and the World Heritage strategy, and so on. Thus, the work could borrow from some of the existing knowledge on the subject.
26. **Mr Richenel Ansano** remarked that emergencies bring about or put into motion a whole series of interventions that is different to the work normally carried out within the 2003 Convention, which is to support the communities in whatever they require. In the case of emergencies, the military and humanitarian aid is called upon. Thus, the intervention is a distinguishing factor. There is also a link between natural hazards and the effect on communities. Most natural hazards have human-induced effects on the communities. For example, in the earthquake in Haiti, most people who were affected lived in marginalized areas because of their poverty, the existing economic system and politics. Thus, it was crucial not to separate natural hazards and conflicts because the energy used to help the community does not solve longstanding problems that are human-induced. Mr Ansano believed that it would be a mistake to do that because intangible cultural heritage is not neutral, it is also responding to these human issues of power that existed before the disaster. Power is a very important component when looking at how ICH is defined and how communities use their intangible cultural heritage to create social identity. These two aspects therefore need to be considered together.
27. On the question ofdefinition, **Mr Chris** **Ballard** explained that the original draft of the working document was 30 pages long and had a lengthy explanation on definitions. In this case, ‘disaster’ is used as an unfortunate shorthand in contradistinction to conflict.
28. **Ms Amel Hachana Zribi** returned to the question of the humanitarian aid sector and whether it is empowered to safeguard or participate in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. She added that to put in place operational modalities, it is important to be realistic and see the reality as it stood. This is to say that at the moment of the emergency situation, humanitarian aid actors will not consider intangible cultural heritage, let alone communities. They have other pressing priorities, including survival. In addition, according to her experience, many communities when they exercise their intangible cultural heritage are not aware of its wealth or that they are exercising their heritage; they practise it spontaneously. In an emergency, in the early hours or days, people are not thinking that their priority is intangible cultural heritage. For this reason, they need to be helped and guided to safeguard their heritage. It is also a matter of resources for UNESCO and for the UN. The humanitarian aid sector can help, but they are not empowered to do so as they do not have the minimum requisite knowledge. Someone could be sent to help or sensitize them in advance, or intangible cultural heritage can be integrated into the humanitarian aid programme, as evoked earlier by Mr Curtis. For natural disasters and armed conflict, she personally noted that the common point is the human aspect. There are certainly other victims, nature and animals, but intangible cultural heritage is very attached to the individual. Thus, natural disasters and armed conflicts attack people. Among the operational methodologies, Ms Zribi proposed to work on prevention. For example, by addressing a gender-sensitive approach in these operational methodologies that focuses a little more on women as women are often guardians of the tradition and heritage. If awareness-raising is targeted towards women, then this might guarantee that the tradition is transmitted and safeguarded in different situations of disaster or war, so that future generations will have been trained by these women.
29. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** wished to summarize some of the points of the discussion thus far. One of the points raised was the issue of humanitarian actors and the frameworks or methodologies that humanitarian actors use to intervene in emergencies. An essential question is whether the outcomes and methods of approaching humanitarian assistance are compatible with the 2003 Convention. In the methods of humanitarian response, some organizations, including within the UN system, NGOs or others, some elements of intangible cultural heritage are obviously taken up without using the term intangible cultural heritage, but the way in which these elements are envisaged, as mentioned already by Mr Ballard, do not have the same purpose as the safeguarding aims of the 2003 Convention. They are very utilitarian so that they may, for example, facilitate the delivery of aid or the objectives of humanitarian aid, or because these elements of intangible cultural heritage are considered to have a negative effect on an emergency, for example, in a medical or nutritional setting. Thus, there is the issue of articulating intangible cultural heritage that must be kept in mind. Ms Chatelard agreed that people in emergencies do indeed have other priorities than their intangible cultural heritage, not least as they are unaware of practising ICH; it is in the nature of intangible cultural heritage, this consciousness or intellectual conceptualization of cultural practices and the concept of intangible cultural heritage. Practitioners do not think about their intangible cultural heritage in these terms as they do not need to. It is nevertheless part of their deeper being and their belonging in society that exists in the present. The fact that communities do not use the term intangible cultural heritage or that they lack awareness of their cultural practices is not necessarily problematic. With regard to preventive practices, Ms Chatelard concurred that it is an important issue for discussion, adding that everyone serves as guardians of intangible cultural heritage traditions and not just women. It is the responsibility of everyone.
30. **Mr Öcal Oğuz** agreedwith the general observation that the terminology is not very clear. As a university professor working in the field with students, he knew what can be done to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in this regard. However, as an invited expert on behalf of UNESCO, an intergovernmental organization, the question was different. How can we mobilize UNESCO on this subject? He noted that, as an institution for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, there were two modalities. The first occurs at the national level, which exists in the safeguarding text and in the national or local inventory. The second occurs at the level of the international inventory, such as the Representative List, the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Thus, the question is: What can be done on this subject within UNESCO? First of all, UNESCO terminology must be used to continue doing something. For example, if we talk about terrorists, the word ‘terrorist’ has to be used, as no other cultural, religious or any other word can be used. Thus, UNESCO and the UN adhere strictly to this terminology. Secondly, there is the terminology used so far in the text of the Convention and in its Operational Directives. In this regard, Mr Oğuznoted that criterion U.6[[10]](#footnote-10) of the Urgent Safeguarding List had not yet been used, and he surmised that it may be used in these situations in a next step. With regard to inventories, States have prepared their own inventory, but in some cases, independent experts have helped States conduct an inventory. However, it the prerogative of the State to decide.
31. **Mr Öcal Oğuz** said that in the case ofaninternational nomination that is examined in UNESCO, the question is: How are we going to define emergency situations? How are we going to act in these situations? He spoke ofthe use of terminology. What does ‘conflict’ actually mean? In what system are we talking about conflict? In the case of armed conflict, this might entail biological, conventional or nuclear weapons, or something else. How is it going to be defined? Definitions are also required for ‘natural disaster’ and ‘humanitarian disaster.’ In the case of humanitarian disaster, this invariably refers to economic disaster, as the cause of armed conflict or the consequences of a natural disaster is poverty. In this case, one must speak of emigration and immigrant communities, immigrant groups who flee to other countries. Are these the same situations? What is an emergency situation, during which period and region, and in which group? Thus, it is important to fully understand the many definitions on which explanations are expected. The modality of the 1972 Convention concerning cultural heritage at risk is perhaps another system that could be looked at more closely.
32. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted the interesting discussion around definitions, which are indeed important. However, multiple discussions had already taken place to provide the background, the latest of which is the 39C/5, in which Member States discussed UNESCO’s strategy for intervening in such situations. Initially, it was only armed conflict, but it was later expanded to include natural and human-induced disasters. It was thus not the time or forum to return and open the discussions that had already taken place at the level of the Executive Board, Expert Meetings, and finally the adoption of the strategic document at the General Conference. Consensus had therefore been reached by the Member States on the text. In essence, the task of the Expert Meeting is to find modalities to insert intangible cultural heritage into that strategy, i.e. to bring intangible cultural heritage into the overall work, which had not included intangible cultural heritage up until the present time; a process that initially began in 2016. The Strategy was first adopted in 2015, where it had been discussed at the 2015 General Conference. The Addendum to the Strategy was adopted at the 2017 General Conference. In 2016, Member States had started to ask the Secretariat to look for synergies with the 1954 Convention and at integrating intangible cultural heritage into the Strategy because most of the actions were built around moveable heritage, and it was realized that there was a problem in intervening in the right way.
33. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that the discussion around definitions is a moot point, as those decisions had already been made. The aim was now to determine how to bring intangible cultural heritage into the overall Strategy, i.e. how to ensure that when a country or a community calls upon UNESCO to intervene, such as the case in Northern Mali, Iraq or Syria, that there is the right expertise going in to mobilize intangible cultural heritage in those contexts to the best effect for the intangible cultural heritage and the communities concerned. Mr Curtis reiterated that the Expert Meeting should not try to redefine the terminology. ‘Authenticity’ for example is not a word used in intangible cultural heritage precisely because there had been many debates on the subject and authenticity is understood in the sense of built heritage, i.e. using the same materials that do not change, although this does not mean that communities do not speak about authenticity, it is just the way it is used in the Convention. Also, the General Conference sought to deal with both natural disasters and conflicts. There had been many debates on whether it should stick to either conflicts or natural disasters, but currently those were the topics retained. Nevertheless, it was important that the principles or modalities developed must be inclusive enough that they are not restrictive in the future.
34. **Mr Lassana Cissé** remarked that Conventions were in fact working together. They might be compartmentalized in different offices in UNESCO, but it is not the case on the ground. He gave the example of Mali whose Action Plan contained a component on intangible cultural heritage, which helped it obtain funding in 2013 to rebuild its mausoleums. However, the role of other actors is also very important. The UN Resolution 2347 (2017), which Mr Cissé believed should be used in this work to engage more UN partners, such as UNHCR or the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), are all connected and involved in the management of crises, whether natural disaster or conflict situations. Thus, the two components cannot be separated, as both disasters have the same impact in that they affect people and result in displacement. With regard to recurrent disasters, communities have their own interpretation in that they will say that the disaster had happened because they did not make a sacrifice, for example, or they had behaved malevolently. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has now realized that one cannot manage biological diversity without cultural diversity, which in itself is a breakthrough. The work of MINUSMA was also greatly appreciated for its upstream training programme for soldiers and humanitarian workers in the organization, who helped to carry out work in these inaccessible sites to provide transportation and even contribute to the management of certain aspects on the ground, such as catering. Thus, there is a need to tackle the two components together, as was currently the case in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals. Other actors must therefore be involved, and not only other institutions and UN organizations, so that they may become aware of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in managing other aspects, such as the displacement of refugees, which must consider cultural heritage, especially intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO experts may develop proposals among themselves, but the reality is different on the ground. The work must therefore consider what can be proposed to these organizations. Mr Cissé gave the example of Niger and the work of the NGO that is supported by the European Union. The Foreign Minister of Niger went to Agadez recently to see the work that was being carried out to accompany the youth who were planning to emigrate, but it also helped older generations. This initiative helped these communities enormously. It strengthened their resilience and helped foster reconciliation, especially between communities, as it was managed in a very community-driven way with the involvement of all the authorities, notably, the sultan, women, young people, everyone was involved. This remarkable work is a very good example. Thus, it can be agreed that disaster and conflict practically have the same impacts, at least in the field of heritage. How they are managed together appears to be the direction to follow.
35. **Mr Jose Pontanares Canuday** noted that the discussions so far have looked at emergencies in bursts, i.e. events that happen in an instant and cannot be predicted. However, many emergencies, including both armed conflicts and human-induced disasters or hazard situations, are manifestations of conditions that are already difficult and problematic on the ground. Thus, one way of looking at this situation is to consider possible modes or mitigating mechanisms that could be applied to conditions that already exist. These conditions help predict, even calculate the probability of a difficult situation occurring, whether it is armed conflict or hazard-induced. In fact, it might be beneficial to think of conflicts and hazards, not just as overlapping elements, but as connections between these two conditions. It was earlier pointed out that power relations are involved in emergencies caused by hazards. It is therefore possible to imagine and consider that some communities in these situations within a given power relationship may not have access to resources that would help them recover their intangible cultural heritage. Worse still, they may actually be seen as communities without any form of intangible cultural heritage, which are consequently eradicated. For this reason, it is important to look into the possibility of studying and introducing inventories, by including these elements in an inventory. Thus, which areas or regions in the world could suffer or experience these difficult situations?
36. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** thanked the speakers for the very stimulating discussion. Responding to the remarks by Mr Ballard who talked about the dual role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, i.e. the threats and effects of emergencies on intangible cultural heritage practice and transmission and the mitigating role of intangible cultural heritage as a source of resilience and recovery. Mr Takakura emphasized the important role of intangible cultural heritage in mitigation. By understanding the kinds of threats to and effects on the practice and transmission of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, then one can probably not separate *intangible* cultural heritage from *tangible* heritage as communities usually have a physical manifestation of the element, be it a musical instrument or costume, which inevitably is associated with tangible cultural heritage. He therefore preferred to focus on the mitigating role of intangible cultural heritage as a source of resilience and recovery when discussing modalities.
37. **Mr Chris Ballard** thanked Mr Takakura for the excellent point, and indeed in the report by Ms Meredith Wilson and himself on hazards, natural disasters and so on, the point was made that there is no modelling of the transmission of intangible cultural heritage that would allow to precisely see how intangible cultural heritage is affected by hazards, although it is very clear that it plays a central role in mitigation at every stage in the cycle. He agreed with Mr Takakura in this regard, but the task set was to address both aspects.
38. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed with the points raised, but nevertheless he recalled the discussion in the Committee in 2018 where a number of Caribbean States wanted more than mitigation measures. They are affected by major hurricanes and cyclones and they want help in identifying and understanding how their intangible cultural heritage has been affected. The subject was therefore a lot more complex, notwithstanding that both roles of intangible cultural heritage are important and that the request for ways to think about intangible cultural heritage post-disaster was a very legitimate request.
39. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** adjourned the session for a short break.

*[coffee break]*

1. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** remarked that the round of questions would soon close. Mr Ballard would then make a presentation on emergent operational principles and modalities that were derived from the various readings and analyses carried out in the desk study, which will be presented as possibly a first draft of these operational principles and modalities open for discussion. She began by inviting Ms Blanche N’Guessan to take the floor.
2. **Ms Blanche N’Guessan** wished to return to situations of conflict. Earlier it was said that more general recommendations should be sought, but she wondered whether some of the recommendations could take into account all the realities of conflict, as described by Mr Cissé earlier in the session when he gave the example of Mali. He spoke of the forces involved and the conflict between communities. However, perhaps the recommendations could go one step further to see how the different types of conflicts and the forces present in a conflict or the causes of a conflict could impact intangible cultural heritage. For example, when military forces are in place, as well as actors from various origins who settle permanently in certain ritual places, they transform them to the extent that communities have no say over the space, rendering a solution even more difficult. There are certain practices whose impact cannot be measured over a short period of time and thus it is not known until the impact of this conflict is felt on intangible cultural heritage, which can last decades. The recommendations could therefore pay more attention to that aspect to take into account certain realities. Indeed, conflicts can oppose communities internally, for example, the military-political conflict in Côte d’Ivoire. When it is a political conflict, all the military forces in place and the different actors should be taken into consideration. In this way, the recommendations formulated will be reflected in terms of the modalities that can be applied to certain realities.
3. With respect to humanitarian interventions during conflict, **Ms Blanche N’Guessan** explained that—based on her experience—the community-needs should be determined by the communities themselves. It is the communities who know what is important in their heritage, i.e. the intangible cultural heritage that must absolutely be safeguarded for their sense of continuity or identity. Based on her experience, for example in some communities in the west where the crisis has been intense, some communities have identified masks as being a central element of their culture and being. When intervention takes place, beyond the needs of sanitation, education or survival in terms of food, what matters to these communities is really knowing the central element. It is difficult for these communities to live without masks. When sacred groves are occupied by other people who come to establish their plantations, or when accessories of the masks, figurines and so on are taken, or when bearers leave and never return, then the communities cannot rehabilitate or revitalize the element and consequently these communities feel deprived because their element cannot be practised. For them, this is what is important. This is what the State and aid workers need to help them restore. They need to reclaim their sites of practice and initiation to rebuild the place of the masks. However, to achieve this, one must really know how the element is structured, otherwise there is a risk of it being decontextualized. As Mr Cissé explained, if the cultural workers cannot access sites, then they cannot access the communities. A lot had been said about refugees, but there are not only refugees, there are also people who have remained or who have moved away, but then returned, and who cannot practice certain elements. These aspects also need to be considered in the recommendations.
4. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** preferred to use the broader term ‘displaced population’ instead of ‘refugee’ as it included people who are internally displaced or who have returned, as well as all population movements across borders related to an emergency, whether through conflict or natural disaster.
5. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** did not believe there was a difference between natural disasters and conflicts. Intangible cultural heritage was being discussed as if it were external to communities when in fact it is inherent to these communities, resting on a social and material base. When a disaster or a conflict occurs, it is this base that is more or less destroyed or altered and therefore communities become totally disjointed from their heritage elements, which are affected in various degrees by one or other disaster. What happens is that the communities who are affected will try and rebuild their daily lives, whether they live locally or elsewhere—displaced persons do not always live in camps—but their life will be controlled by survival and subsistence, and some elements might therefore lose their functions or the material base that allows them to function. Thus, a selection will be carried out by the population itself, i.e. not by external interventions, with some elements deemed essential for their survival, while others not so much, which is part of the adaptive process. Ms Tohme Tabet noted that it was said that there is a difference between disasters and conflicts, and that during conflicts, communities build a new way of life that adapts. This happened in Lebanon. For 15 years, there were two lifestyles that alternated, depending on the shelling, but people knew what to do and what to take away from their intangible cultural heritage, they knew when to take shelter or hide, and how to resume their normal lives, or what was considered normal at the time. The question is whether one should restore elements that have lost their primary function, and revitalize or safeguard elements that disaster victims consider indispensable to their new mode of life, i.e. the elements carried with them or that they deem indispensable for revitalization, which would apply to both disasters and conflicts.
6. **Mr Patricio López Beckett** remarked on the different moments of an emergency, which may fall apart when we think of long-lasting conflicts. There is, for example, a preventive moment where things can be done. The tool that will help in this regard is likely to be the inventory. The second moment is the intervention itself, and the third moment is the aftermath. What happens post-emergency? If we think of disasters and armed conflicts in this sense, one can see convergence at some points and divergence at others. For example, when one talks about prevention, it would be useful to think of what and how an element has been inscribed on local or national inventories. In what sense is the information contained in the inventory able to address whether the element is at risk if something were to happen in a particular region? Many inventories contain information on the element itself, but they often lack the territorial information needed to know if the element is threatened should disaster occur. The territorialization of the element is also something that could be very useful for these kinds of situations. There are three different ways in which this is important. One way has to do with the localization of the bearers. Should a disaster event occur, such as a fire, earthquake or an armed conflict, it is important to know where the communities live, particularly mobile communities as they move from one place to another. The second point worth noting is the deep relationship between some elements and some particular aspect of the territory, like a sacred grove or forest. These places should be identified before even thinking about the 1954 Convention. These spaces are important for intangible cultural heritage and they can be protected under this kind of Convention.
7. **Mr Patricio López Beckett** then spoke of the intervention level and how it is very important to think about how intangible cultural heritage can, in general, help during the conflict, and how one can work with these places and communities. This is important because there is often a gap between what the Convention says about how the State should take care of safeguarding the element in their territories, with what happens with displaced communities in another nation’s territory, which is an aspect that is worth exploring. The form of displacement, as previously stated, is not always the same. Not every culture makes camps. Finally, on the aftermath, there is a big difference between conflict and disaster. Most policies related to disasters tend to rebuild the bonds and the production network of the communities. For example, after an earthquake, the infrastructure is rebuilt so that cities can reuse the space. However, usually after a conflict, the policies are aimed in a different direction, which is to sustain the power position that the winning party has gained. More often than not, the aftermath of the conflict may end in new threats to the intangible cultural heritage itself. Mr López Beckett was happy to note that the summary highlights how intangible cultural heritage can be the target of the conflict itself and that it is a very different situation to that of disasters. Disasters can target a particular population, but not intangible cultural heritage. However, armed conflict does target intangible cultural heritage and aftermath policies continue to target intangible cultural heritage. These are the kinds of points that need to be examined during these different moments of an emergency.
8. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** thanked all the speakers for their very stimulating contributions. It was noted that several participants had wanted to have a more guided and formatted structure for the discussion, but it was considered better to allow the speakers to freely express themselves and to hear also some disagreements among the participants. She explained that the next session would be more framed as it will prepare the way for the following sessions. It would start with a presentation by Mr Ballard on emergent operational principles and modalities, as contained in the background document that was distributed. She invited the experts to refer to this document in preparation for the upcoming sessions.
9. **Mr Tim Curtis** wished to remind the experts that they will have until the final session the following day to refine the modalities and principles within the document based on which the consultants, Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard, will work and eventually transform into a report to present to the Committee. The Committee will express itself in that report and recommend it or not to the General Assembly for its approval. Mr Curtis recalled that the document is the result of the work of the consultants and the Secretariat. Their role as experts was to examine the points in the document and see whether there were points to add or subtract from the work so far. To save time, he would moderate and guide the discussions in a more consultation format. As a very diverse, representative and informed group of experts with different experiences and backgrounds, it was deemed important that the report at the end of the day’s session is something that everybody is happy with and that represents a consensus among the group, which can then be confidently shared with the Committee, and finally presented to the 178 States Parties for eventual adoption.

#### SESSION 4: DEFINING METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE

***Moderator: Mr Tim Curtis***

1. **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that the working document attempted to encapsulate all the opinions compiled from documents and from people who were consulted to generate something that is maximally inclusive. It comprised a provisional list of headings or topics that essentially covered most of the discussion so far, though there may be other topics that are considered important and that could be included. Nevertheless, the document presented a provisional draft list as a basis for discussion and debate so that it could be refined to produce a list that represents all the concerns, interests and experiences of all the experts present. These are the operational principles. What is the difference between principles and modalities? Principles guide modalities. The modalities enact the principles. They put those principles in action and set out a series of actions or operations that enact those principles. It was noted that there was no sense of priorities in the sequences of topics presented, though certain topics may be prioritized in the list should they appear of greater importance. Operational principle 1 acknowledges the breadth and complexities of emergencies. The differences and similarities between ‘disasters’ and ‘conflicts’ had been widely discussed, so this principle acknowledges how extraordinarily broad, complex and layered these categories are, which is a challenge in and of itself, and it is a huge category under one single heading; 90 per cent of the discussion so far probably fell under this first category. Operational principle 2 concerns the involvement of the widest possible range of stakeholders. How do we pick apart the notion of community? How do we consider the role of the military, academics, and other non-State actors, other agencies and other Conventions? Operational principle 3 places an emphasis on community-based approaches, which is at the heart of the Convention and the core of the challenge in working with other stakeholders. How do we actually convince people and give them the tools with which to do work? Operational principle 4 concerns developing regional cooperation mechanisms. How do we actually aggregate knowledge? Not least because experience with disasters and conflicts comes in a multitude of forms. How do we capture some of that knowledge, learn from it, aggregate it and document it? Possibly one of the best ways is actually at a regional level where experiences from several different States are assembled and brought together in a region that share a cultural, historical and environmental unity. For example, the Caribbean Heritage Emergency Network might be a model.
2. **Mr Chris Ballard** then presented operational principle 5 that bases intervention strategies on local knowledge and practices, building on the idea of community-based approaches. Can you scale up from what are essentially community-level strategies to the district, the regional, the national or the international levels? Do conflict resolution strategies that work face-to-face function at all at higher levels? Can we learn from them? Operational principle 6 concerns empowering communities and mainstreaming the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage across the emergency cycle. This encompasses the idea of working at preparedness, the immediate response and recovery stage that has to be simultaneously considered throughout the entire cycle. Where does intangible cultural heritage safeguarding strategically impose itself at each point of that cycle? These were the six operational principles generated in the original report. However, having listened to the discussion in the earlier session, there may be additional points that do not feature under any of these headings. If so, Mr Ballard would raise those points in the next session, and at the same time, he invited criticism, rejection and general discussion of these principles. Nevertheless, there was a sense that the six operational principles captured quite a lot of the discussion so far, fitting under one or more of the principles outlined.
3. **Mr Chris Ballard** then turned to the five operational modalities, noting that there were six in the report, but that one was dropped, adding that these are all in the active mode, representing actions that put the principles into action. Operational modality 1 addresses safeguarding needs pre-emptively. This is the stage of the emergency cycle that is prior to the emergency, and in fact, it is in a permanent, pre-emptive state. This involves the documentation, safe storage and action plans for predictable and unpredictable contingencies, integrating intangible cultural heritage into emergency planning at all levels. Operational modality 2 concerns evaluating the post-emergency safeguarding needs, which can perhaps be considered as the next step in the cycle. This raises such questions as: Who is the community? Who decides what intangible cultural heritage is within, for, or outside the community? How do you give voice to the marginalized within the community or to marginalized communities? How do you assess damage to materials and places that have intangible cultural heritage implications or intangible cultural heritage relevance? Who is doing that work? How do you work across borders? Most emergencies involve collaboration, so how to communicate from either side of a border and ensure that the messages are being heard on the other side? Operational modality 3 prioritizes community-based needs identification, which picks up on one of the principles and enacts it. This is essentially about creating, resourcing, defending and maintaining the space for community deliberations. It is not filling in the content of that deliberation, nor telling people that these are the points they have to discuss. It simply opens the space and keeps it open. Operational modality 5 targets stakeholders for awareness-raising and capacity-building programmes. Once you identify the full range of stakeholders, what do you do with them? What do they need to know? Essentially, they need to know how to sense everything. Stakeholders include communities in all their forms, militaries, donors, media, academics and so on. Operational modality 6 concerns the deployment of the mechanisms of the 2003 Convention. Making people aware of the provisions and the possibilities, and giving them access to International Assistance, the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List so that intangible cultural heritage elements can help in emergency preparedness or mitigation. These were thus the operational modalities that could be seen as putting the principles into action.
4. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted that a modality had been removed from the document, inviting Mr Ballard to explain why this was so.
5. **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that it corresponded to operational modality 4 in the document. It concerns adopting immediate and mid-term measures to help affected communities practice their intangible cultural heritage. It is the third part of the emergency cycle, i.e. the recovery phase, following on from the preparedness and response phases. Thus, it should very much be an operational modality. In a sense, there are three modalities that each relate to the three broad steps in the emergency cycle, also known as the DRM cycle. This involves attaining financial contributions from national, local, as well as international authorities, and making them available to practitioners, incorporating intangible cultural heritage in all aspects of material reconstruction and recovery, and establishing educational and other activities aimed particularly at younger people within the communities concerned. Thus, it simply maps out the three phases of the emergency cycle.
6. **Mr Tim Curtis** opened the floor for comments, reminding the experts that the following day would be spent refining these principles and modalities, perhaps working in smaller groups.
7. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** recommended avoiding more academic language to make the report clearer for every possible stakeholder. She suggested deleting the term ‘modalities,’ and distinguishing the difference between *general* operational principles and *specific* operational principles. Operational means working in the field, so by connecting ‘operational’ and ‘principles,’ it already introduced an aspect of implementation and of working in the field. For the sake of clarity, she believed that it would be useful to link every operational principle with an operational modality, for example by acknowledging the breadth and difference of the various emergency situations, which can be combined with addressing safeguarding extemporarily, as done beforehand. In this way, it acknowledges the situations that may be encountered in the field to reflect on them before they happen, with associated actions. This would clarify the report in terms of structure.
8. **Mr Lassana Cissé** wished to rebound on the remark concerning semantics, adding that the understanding is not the same whether one speaks French or English. From a French point of view, it is not academic to say ‘emerging operational principles and methods.’ On the operational modality concerning mechanisms of the 2003 Convention that referred to the intangible cultural heritage Lists, Mr Cissé recalled an earlier comment that spoke of the importance of all heritage, whether on one List or not as all heritage is important in an emergency situation when there are very important intangible cultural heritage elements at risk. For example, the Dogon prepare the Sigui feast every sixty years, which should take place in 2027. However, the conflict has blocked the preparation process. There is also traditional medicine, or Dogon therapy, which is very important for the communities in terms of the knowledge and know-how that people possess. Thus, it is important to address these mechanisms in a global way that not only includes Lists, but all elements of threatened cultural heritage.
9. **Mr Tim Curtis** believed that the way the document was presented may necessitate making a distinction between principles and modalities. He conceded that it was true that the titles sound better in French than in English and that it was an issue of translation. With regard to the principles, it may indeed be important to clarify from the beginning that interventions should not exclusively benefit intangible cultural heritage already inscribed on the Lists. However, what is proposed is that during a disaster or a conflict, it could be interesting to consider as an operational modality to have the element trigger criterion U.6 in cases of extreme urgency, which has yet to be used. Mr Curtis gave the example of the Cultural Space of Yaaral and Degal, which was previously mentioned. He was lucky to have worked on the element in 2004 at the time of the Proclamation of Masterpieces, adding that it was a beautiful element that brought together fishermen, herdsmen and pastoralists. However, it has been four years since it has been practised, so now could be the time to consider transferring the element to the Urgent Safeguarding List owing to its threatened status because of the conflict. This was a concrete example of how the Lists could be used, i.e. not to define what should be done, but rather how to deal with situations later in the future.
10. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** found the document to be excellently summarized. He remarked that sometimes language can be very difficult, adding that he did not find the use of pre-emptive appropriate, as it evoked military language. In fact, the notion is closer to ‘reactive,’ although the idea is to be proactive, which would be a better substitute for ‘pre-emptive.’ Nevertheless, the document truly captured most of the aspects that had been discussed. Referring to Ms Schreiber’s remarks on how to ensure that some stakeholders are involved, he replied that although it is said that all stakeholders are equal, they are not all equal as it depends on the size of the stake they hold. In this case, the humanitarian group holds a larger stake. The funders, donors and builders also hold a greater stake compared to others. So how do we make sure that they are captured without having to inundate the list with stakeholders? Where does the list end? For example, the humanitarian and military sectors are the most important stakeholders and it is important that they are referred to directly so that they have a sense of responsibility. However, a stakeholder can also be anybody; they may choose not to be part of the wider definition of stakeholders. In addition, in emergencies, including disasters and conflicts, there is a need to incorporate sustainable development. How can it fit somewhere so that it is not only seen as a stand-alone aspect, but that it really adheres to the current thinking in terms of looking for sustainability in planning for disasters as part of a sustainable development strategy, so that it does not get left behind. One cannot assume that we operate in a world with no problems, and therefore sustainable development must somehow fit into the overall plan somewhere.
11. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** took on board the point on sustainable development. However, this concept and vocabulary, she noted, really belonged to the international development sector. This did not mean that the humanitarian sector is not using it, but it is not really part of its agenda. The United Nations Development Group (UNDG) is not an agenda of the humanitarian sector. Ms Chatelard has not worked as a trainer, but as an expert working with humanitarian organizations. She agreed that there is a continuum between emergency and development. Nevertheless, she voiced concern about trying to fit in too many ideas and concepts that belong to different spheres of intervention. In the end, the report will appear as though it is trying to mix together a lot of different things that do not necessarily belong together. Moreover, sustainable development is quite comprehensively addressed in the Operational Directives. For this reason, she was cautious about introducing sustainable development, adding that emergency assistance has a vocabulary of its own and its own way of prioritizing goals, which is different from international development.
12. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** totally accepted the comments. However, he wondered whether the concept could be introduced into the main text in a form of an explanation. He was worried that it would otherwise be excluded from the narrative that refers to the origins of resources, without whose protection the affected communities would become victims. He thus preferred to see it mentioned in the report so that it could be referred to in the text in the future.
13. **Mr Juan Mayr Maldonado** also wished to comment on sustainable development, recalling a recent closed meeting that sought to understand what had been done with sustainable development. When we see all the figures and predictions of climate change and how biodiversity is disappearing (the last report showed that one million species have been lost), the pollution in oceans and freshwater, the loss of soils and so on, it seems that we do not have a solution. Thus, we need a new kind of approach as the problems, such as climate change, were moving really fast, yet solutions were moving very slowly. The gap between both was therefore getting wider and wider. So, we have to ask ourselves if we are doing the right things, and the figures show that we are not resolving the problems. Mr Maldonado was of the view that intangible cultural heritage is the core of sustainable development and thus he wished to have some wording about the importance of intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development, which may be an important contribution to look towards in the future.
14. **Mr Tim Curtis** wished to address a couple of the concerns raised that were very valid. Firstly, he agreed that another term could be used instead of pre-emptive, which had military connotations, and he suggested ‘preparedness.’ He understood and supported the comments made by Ms Chatelard because it is very difficult for UNESCO to intervene in humanitarian actions if it is not using the right language, but also there is a wish not to crowd the scene. For humanitarian agencies to be interested, they have to be convinced that it is useful, i.e. any intervention must demonstrate its usefulness. Nevertheless, it is perfectly logical and consistent to say that sustainable development is intimately linked to the risk of disasters, be it peace, conflict resolution or the environment; all of which are sustainable development goals. For example, soil degradation leads to landslides, and there are all sorts of disasters that are a reaction to this. Sustainable development can therefore be easily introduced in the preparedness stage, which acknowledges the links between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development as an integral part of disaster preparedness, which can infer long-term prevention. Thus, it is an easy link to make by bringing sustainable development into the preparedness phase, rather than as a response to a specific disaster and where it is an advantage to speak the language of the humanitarian and disaster intervention agencies. Hence, there is room to retain sustainable development in the preparedness phase, and even introduce a preamble in this regard.
15. **Mr Gamini Wijesuriya** remarked that there were indeed different views on the definitions of disaster, conflict, and so on, for which there needs to be an agreement. The website of the UNDRR defines disaster as a “serious disruption of the functioning of a community.” In other words, a disaster only occurs when communities are affected. Conversely, natural hazards, such as fires, happen in nature, but if they do not impact people or communities it is not considered a disaster. Thus, when a disaster occurs it impacts people in different ways. The other point concerned the terminology, and he noted that the terminology used by others was being avoided, such as language used by humanitarian institutions on preparedness, response and recovery. Mr Wijesuriya had no problem to adopt a different set of terminology, but that there was a need to acknowledge that there are words used by others that are perhaps different, and in this way, messages of culture could be sent to humanitarian agencies or institutions. When the Kobe earthquake happened in 1995 and when the Hyogo Framework for Action[[11]](#footnote-11) was developed, culture was not in the UNDDR. Today, in the Sendai Framework there are five places where cultural heritage is mentioned, which is a great achievement thanks to UNESCO and other agencies. The UNDRR is an important institution as it is the main agency bringing together all the humanitarian institutions, such as the Red Cross, who has vast experience in moving in to a disaster site. However, the army and humanitarian agencies often do not allow other stakeholders to enter the disaster zones. This is an ongoing discussion with humanitarian institutions, but a lot of progress has been made in this regard. For this reason, it was good to make reference to what has been achieved.
16. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked Mr Wijesuriya for the excellent and important point that the report should adopt as much as possible the language used in the international context, whether it is the UNDRR or any other agency, as the further removed the report is from the official language, the more it will be excluded. It is a simple and strategic understanding, and the same applied for sustainable development as it is difficult to advocate for the inclusion of culture into sustainable development if it is not already contained in the texts. However, it was important to also respect the core principles and spirit of the 2003 Convention, and the role of the Expert Meeting was to bring forward those principles in an advocacy way. The aim was to unpack these ideas for discussion the following day so that they could be brought together, reworked and later shared electronically among the experts with a limited time for feedback. The report would then be submitted to the Committee through the representatives of the States Parties. As experts who advise Committee members, some of the experts present would effectively be translating the work of the experts to the Committee Members. Mr Curtis therefore invited comments and ideas to move the process forward.
17. **Ms Christiane Gradis-Johannot**, **NGO** **Traditions pour demain,** spoke on behalf of the ICH-NGO Forum to thank the Secretariat and UNESCO for the invitation to participate in this meeting to speak about the role of NGOs to help safeguard intangible cultural heritage, whether in situations of conflict or natural disaster. She fully understood the combination of the two situations because evidently there will be measures that will be common to both. However, it was important to keep in mind that a war occurs between people, whereas a natural disaster involves people combating events. Moreover, there is no intentional character in the destruction of the intangible cultural heritage in a natural disaster situation, which is not the case in a conflict situation, as well explained by Mr Cissé. Thus, it was important when considering modalities that the measures might be different depending on the situation. Referring to question of law, as pointed out earlier by Ms Schreiber, it is true that in armed conflict there is a specific legal regime that applies, the law of armed conflict, as well as a series of Conventions, for example the 1954 Hague Convention and its two important protocols, including the First Protocol[[12]](#footnote-12), which applies to situations of military occupation when intangible cultural heritage is particularly threatened, especially in situations of continued occupation. Ms Gradis-Johannot made reference to the remarkable film *Timbuktu*, which clearly illustrated how intangible cultural heritage can be destroyed in these kinds of situations. The Second Protocol of 1999[[13]](#footnote-13) also includes some norms that can be related to situations affecting intangible cultural heritage, for example by prohibiting the destruction of the cultural testimony of objects, which is not intangible cultural heritage *per se*, but relates to objects of cultural testimony that are used in the practise of intangible cultural heritage. Most importantly are the Geneva Conventions, which go to the heart of armed conflict and are a pillar of law. Even though intangible cultural heritage is not specifically mentioned, there are many standards that, for example, protect places of worship, that the conduct and right to cultural identity must be ensured, and that habits and customs must be preserved. In fact, there are many provisions that seek to safeguard intangible cultural heritage, even if intangible cultural heritage is not explicitly mentioned.
18. **Ms Christiane Gradis-Johannot** then spoke about the role of NGOs. Having worked at the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) for many years, she understood that in situations of conflict the lives, physical integrity, nutrition and so on of the communities must be assured from the outset, but there is also the cultural dimension that exists. Thus, it was important to ensure that the civilian population also benefits from the protection of the law. In the field, as had been evoked earlier, when someone is suffering, whether due to hunger or ostracization, there is no difference in the suffering, it is simply omnipresent. Another thing that was mentioned and is essential are the measures adopted at the different stages. Preventive measures are essential, but so are the measures taken during the conflict and post-conflict phases. As an ICRC delegate, Ms Gradis-Johannot had worked extensively on preventive measures, and one element that was absolutely essential was the training of the armed forces, as previously mentioned by Ms Schreiber, as parties to the conflict either apply the law or not. She agreed with Ms Schreiber that the military is not at all obtuse or closed, but training was necessary to teach what they simply do not know. Ms Gradis-Johannot agreed with a frequent remark concerning the different Conventions. It was not a question of referring specifically to the 2003 Convention or another Convention in quoting the legal references. Those in the field must be trained to adopt a certain behaviour, or not to exercise a certain behaviour. Thus, training of the armed forces is fundamental in this regard. However, training at the ministerial level was also deemed important, such as at the ministries of Defense, Health, Foreign Affairs, Education and so on, as they are the ones determining the actions to protect cultural heritage.
19. **Ms Christiane Gradis-Johannot** then presented two examples of measures taken during times of conflict and post-conflict. She spoke of the work of NGO Turquoise Mountain that is doing remarkable work in Afghanistan to ensure the safeguarding of craftsmanship and artistic skills in a conflict situation. The NGO is also working in the camps in Jordan, helping people to continue exercising their knowledge and realizing their know-how in creating their heritage, which also gave people a sense of dignity. This was therefore an excellent example of NGO action that can be linked to more general action led by UNESCO. She then spoke of the work carried out by her own NGO Traditions pour demain that works principally in Latin America. In the past, the work was carried out in situations of armed conflict, however, these have become post-conflict situations as the number and intensity of conflicts in Latin America has fortunately decreased. Nevertheless, it had intervened during conflicts that were very long and where intangible cultural heritage was most affected, particularly in Guatemala where Traditions pour demain helped in the reconstruction of objects of cultural testimony, such as masks, musical instruments and costumes, for the celebration of festivities called the Rabinal Achí, which is inscribed on the Representative List. This led to the renaissance of this tradition that had disappeared for 30 years. In this regard, she agreed with Mr Curtis on the importance of seizing the Urgent Safeguarding List as a mechanism for safeguarding. The second case involved another conflict that has just ended in Colombia, but which lasted for more than 50 years. In this case, the NGO Traditions pour demain helped people who had been displaced because of the conflict for almost 50 years to find and re-identify with all the sacred sites where rituals had taken place on land that had been confiscated but were taken back, allowing these populations to recover their identity. She returned to the fundamental question: What entities, structures and mechanisms should be created to really ensure the most complementary cooperation possible with NGOs? There are thousands of NGOs working in this field, some known to UNESCO, while others work alone. How then to structure this cooperation to really improve the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in all possible emergency situations? She gave the example of UNHCR and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) that have a tradition of working with NGOs. These mechanisms could thus serve as sources of inspiration to invent, create or adopt measures for intangible cultural heritage.
20. **Mr Tim Curtis** reminded the participants that indeed the Convention was also reflecting on the role of accredited NGOs in its work and it is perhaps in this context that these questions be included. He believed that once a framework of intervention has been established under the Convention then there will be more clarity about how to engage accredited NGOs precisely in this framework for implementation. With regard to the different stakeholders, evidently NGOs should be part of that undertaking, thus it was timely that the two discussions were happening at the same time. With regard to discussing operational modalities, it was noted that there was a parallel discussion happening in the Convention on the advisory services and roles of NGOs, so it was important to see how that evolves. Mr Curtis thanked the experts for their participation and adjourned the day’s session.

*[Wednesday 22 May, morning session]*

#### SESSION 4: DEFINING METHODOLOGICAL GUIDANCE [CONT.]

***Moderator: Mr Tim Curtis***

1. **Mr Tim Curtis** welcomed the experts to the morning session on day two of the meeting. The working document was prepared and distributed, based on which the experts would discuss the operational principles and operational modalities. He proposed that the experts separate into two groups; one with English speakers and the other with French speakers. Interpretation was made available to the French group. It was hoped to have balanced groups in terms of numbers. Each group was asked to designate a moderator and a rapporteur, with Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard serving as resource persons. The groups were asked to return before lunch to make a brief presentation of the group’s work. After lunch, the experts will come together in the plenary to discuss the wording and content of the future report, namely on the operational principles and modalities. The experts were asked to note if anything was considered missing or unnecessary from the working document, and they were reminded not to be concerned with the specific terminology, as it was already bound by the decisions of the governing bodies of UNESCO. In this regard, Mr Curtis referred to the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Addendum on disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards. It was recalled that the General Conference in 2015 included the Addendum to the Strategy, as a large group of Member States wished to include natural disasters. The Addendum was thus presented to the General Conference in 2017. The terminology in the document should therefore be aligned with the discussions that have already taken place and been adopted at the intergovernmental level. The groups were asked to focus on the substantive part of the document. Are these actions appropriate? Is this the right approach from an operational perspective? Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard were available to answer questions. Unfortunately, Observers were not part of the group discussions, but they were of course welcome to participate in the plenary.
2. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** noted the general modalities and principles that constituted the framework for the work. However, he wished to know the extent to which the groups were able to add, modify, delete or remove any items.
3. **Mr Tim Curtis** concurred that it was indeed the case, but experts should bear in mind that the groups would come back to plenary afterwards to remove or add items that might be required. The documentwas simply a basis for discussion. Nevertheless, the danger was to think only of one’s own specific situation, covering everything that is familiar, when the idea is to capture what fits within the overall, global context. Thus, the more specific the points raised, the more likely the document will encounter obstacles when it is submitted to the Committee. It was therefore important to get the balance between the operational principles and modalities and what can be applied generically, i.e. looking for overlaps, but not absolute, exhaustive descriptions of every situation that could arise. Not only because this is not realistic, but also because these guidelines will be rolled out and from which other things will emerge. However, there are some set principles, for example, the Committee has already adopted the idea of community-based needs identification. But *how* exactly is this done?
4. **Mr Hani Hayajneh** remarked that another important point concerned refugees and host communities, which did not appear in the framework.
5. **Mr Tim Curtis** replied that it was intentional in that it concerns displaced people under situations of natural disaster, conflict or other catastrophes. The idea was to keep things broad and not to get into specifics, as this might cause certain States Parties to reject an action on the basis that it did not apply to their situation. The report has to work at that level; this was how the report was drafted. Nevertheless, the experts were free to propose additions, suggestions or new ideas. The experts were led to one of two working groups.

*[Group sessions]*

1. **Mr Tim Curtis** welcomed the participants back, inviting the Rapporteurs of each group to join him at the podium to make a brief presentation of the discussions within each group. Following the summary, the floor would be opened for questions before lunch. In the afternoon, the experts would return to plenary to reach an agreement on the way forward with the report. Mr Curtis reminded the experts that the report did not have to be thoroughly fine tuned by the end of the day, as this will be tackled at a later date after being shared electronically among all the experts. However, the groups had to agree on the proposed content that would be brought to the Committee. Discussion on such issues as language and definitions should refer back to the texts adopted in intergovernmental meetings within UNESCO’s framework, as there was no point in trying to open new discussions and wording in this regard.
2. On behalf of the Francophone group, **Ms Blanche N’Guessan** served as the rapporteur, and Ms Annie Tohme Tabet served as the moderator. The methodology used in the work was to review the principles, after which the corresponding modalities were examined. In the first principle, a concern was raised with respect to both themes: ‘emergency’ and ‘non-emergency.’ The group agreed that there were already provisions in place in the Convention, including the Operational Directives, to deal with a non-emergency situation. The group therefore agreed to delete the theme of ‘non-emergency’ in operational principle 1, adopting the first principle as it now stood. In operational principle 2, there was only one addition, completing the sentence, which read, ‘The widest possible range of stakeholders implicated in intangible cultural heritage and emergencies should engage. These stakeholders include in priority communities, groups and, if appropriate, individuals.’ In operational principle 3 on ‘community-based approaches,’ the term ‘multiple’ was added. In operational principle 4, the group preferred ‘put in place’ instead of ‘develop’ on the theme of development, i.e. ‘put in place international mechanisms’ and therefore ‘international’ instead of ‘regional,’ as it sought to look beyond regional mechanisms so as to benefit from international experience. The text ‘see above for the example related to the creation of the Caribbean Heritage Protection Network’ was deleted. Both operational principles 5 and 6 were left untouched.
3. **Ms Blanche N’Guessan** then turned to the operational modalities in which additions were made to the first modality, ‘Addressing safeguarding needs pre-emptively.’ The first point was validated. In the second point, which begins ‘Generating contingency plans,’ the following text was added, ‘and incorporate them if possible into emergency safeguarding plans for the communities and the elements.’ The paragraph was now completely revised. The third and fourth points were unchanged. In operational modality 2, the text ‘during and after conflicts,’ was added, which would now read, ‘Evaluating safeguarding needs during and after conflicts and disasters.’ All the other points were unchanged. In operational modality 3, the following text was added, ‘communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals.’ In operational modality 4, ‘and the bearers’ was added, which would read, ‘Obtaining financial contributions for practitioners and bearers within communities.’ In the second point of operational modality 4, the following text was added, ‘and by ensuring the viability of intangible cultural heritage of the displaced populations.’ In operational modality 5, in the fourth point, the following text was deleted, ‘disaster risk reduction,’ and replaced by ‘and conflicts,’ which would read, ‘International humanitarian and organizations with a mandate in disaster risk management and conflicts.’ The rest under operational modality 6 was retained.
4. On behalf of the Anglophone group, **Mr Saša Srećković** explained that a slightly different methodology was used. The existing document was revised, but it was also decided to introduce a kind of preamble or guiding principle or statement, which would read: ‘Recognizing the critical importance of culture in all phases and aspects of emergencies, being aware of the integral role of intangible cultural heritage and heritage in general in sustainable development and for the culture of peace, and taking into account that intangible cultural heritage was so far absent from most of the formal frameworks, although it was threatened in many situations, as is heritage in general, and of course knowing that the UNESCO 2003 Convention has already addressed many such situations.’ The group then turned to the operational principles and modalities to emphasize the need to change the language of expression. It was decided to switch from a passive tone to an imperative tone in order to be useful and practical to facilitators during emergencies. The principles were divided into three categories. The first category could be ‘scope,’ accommodating three sub-categories. The first sub-category is complexities of emergencies and relevant intangible cultural heritage practices in response. The second sub-category is ‘communities.’ There ensued an in-depth discussion on communities, especially refugees, host communities and displaced persons. A term ‘affected communities’ was introduced. The third sub-category is ‘stakeholders,’ who are engaged in emergency situations. The second category under principles is ‘scale,’ referring to local, regional, national and international scales. The third category states that principles should be implemented and applied throughout all phases of the emergency cycle. Evidently, each principle should be considered in the context of all the other principles. It is therefore cross-cutting. Another chapter was dedicated to modalities, as contained in the original document. In the modalities, community-based approaches in defining the needs in emergency situations should be privileged and emphasized. Several phases were identified. The first phase is prevention, followed by preparedness for emergencies, and then the response and recovery phase. This emphasized how intangible cultural heritage is critical at every stage and every phase of an emergency situation, and also how intangible cultural heritage was naturally present and used by communities through the ages. This should then be introduced formally so as to be acknowledged and supported by all relevant stakeholders, such as decision-makers, humanitarian organizations, and all other stakeholders that are involved in such situations of emergency. Other categories discussed included the different ways of communicating knowledge and behaviours in an emergency situation to all the stakeholders through capacity-building and awareness-raising activities, and through education. Lastly, the importance of using the 2003 Convention mechanisms at every stage of an emergency was highlighted, especially, for example, in establishing some kind of register of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
5. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked the Rapporteurs, adding that Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard would look at how and where the two groups converge and diverge with the aim in the afternoon session to determine how to move forward. The floor was opened for comments and questions.
6. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** remarked that it was good that the two groups came with different approaches. The Francophone group made changes to the document, whereas the Anglophone group came up with new ideas. It was thus up to the experts to examine the document as a whole and to bring together the work of the two groups.
7. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** found the two approaches diametrically different, and asked the Francophone group whether it found the document sufficiently comprehensive that it did not require a preamble and only required a few changes, and what it thought about the Anglophone group’s approach where it looked at a preamble and then classified the principles into three different areas. It was noted that there was now two different documents, which did not appear as if they could be merged, although the two groups would have to agree on an approach. Nevertheless, the Anglophone group felt very strongly that for it to make sense, the document had to follow a structure. The content could be more or less similar, but a structure was needed on which to base the arguments.
8. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted that three thematic groupings were mentioned. The first was scope, the second was scale, and he wondered about the third category, as it was unclear. It was confirmed as ‘cycle.’
9. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** wished to clarify the approach of the Francophone group. The group welcomed the preamble, which was something new and it was favourably received. The Francophone group had run out of time, but on the discussion of each principle it was decided to prioritize or categorize the different principles into a hierarchy on what should be done.
10. **Mr Tim Curtis** did not actually see a problem with having two different documents, as each group workedin two distinct ways, with one of the groups working more on the details of the actual actions. The documents would still be able to be brought together.
11. **Mr Lassana Cissé** did not see the documents as divergent or separate. The only difference being the addition of the preamble, which complements the document without taking away from the substantive content, nor did it create a discrepancy between the two documents. The documents can indeed be brought together, notwithstanding the linguistic parameters that exist between the French and English languages; often complex on one side making things too simplified on the other.
12. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** explained that the task involved questioning and analysing the work presented, rather than drafting a final text.
13. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** explained that the idea of a preamble came about because there was a sense that most of the sentences—now operational principles—were in fact statements or acknowledgements of the reality, such as emergencies are complex, stakeholders need to be taken into account, and so on, i.e. they are not principles, but rather introductory remarks, which is why the discussion took this particular direction.
14. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** agreed with Ms Schreiber that one group corrected the statements, whereas the other group changed the statements, so the approach was not the same.
15. **Mr Tim Curtis** remarked that it was now important to have the time to reflect on the work, given that only oral reports had been given. It appeared that the Anglophone group reworked the operational principles in particular, and presented a preamble, although there was work still to do on the points under the modalities. Thus, it was structural work rather than detailed work. The Francophone group went through all the modalities and looked at the details, rather than the overall structure. He added that the two different approaches were probably a good thing now that the two sides will come together. Mr Curtis asked the groups to share any written notes so that he, Ms Chatelard and Mr Ballard could start working to bring the two documents together over lunch. It was recalled that the document would then be checked against previous intergovernmental decisions and that it will require both the Committee and the General Assembly to decide. Thus, the document would not be a final adopted text, but it will help to move along those processes. The morning session was adjourned.

*[Wednesday 22 May, afternoon session]*

#### CONCLUSIONS AND CLOSING

***Moderator: Mr Tim Curtis***

1. **Mr Tim Curtis** began the session by acknowledging the intense work carried out by Mr Chris Ballard, Ms Géraldine Chatelard, Ms Caroline Munier and Ms Fumiko Ohinata over lunch as a preliminary attempt to integrate the various comments and discussions that arose through the groups. This work would form the basis of the afternoon’s session. Mr Curtis recalled the process on the first day, which involved rather broad discussions, with some concern raised that this topic was too vast to cover over two days. However, he reminded the experts that this work had been developed over the past three years and discussed at both the General Assembly and three sessions of the Committee, during which documents have been produced. Ms Chatelard worked more on displacement and conflict situations, and Mr Ballard worked more on issues of natural and human-induced disasters. Together, they have developed a set of principles and modalities. As concerns the current work, recognizing the slow build-up of the comments brought forward and the adjustments made, by and large the report appeared to be on the right track. No major issues were encountered and new areas of work did not emerge, with minor editing and no issue with core concepts, which was heartening for the Secretariat as this meant that the process was moving along in the right direction. Nevertheless, new situations will invariably arise which will need to be confronted in real, complex, on-the-ground situations that will always have their own particularities and complexities. The report drafted would be presented, and the experts had the rest of the day to engage in the discussion and finalize the document.
2. **Mr Tim Curtis** furtherexplained that the report of the meeting will reflect the meeting as faithfully as possible. The Secretariat will prepare a document for the Committee, but it will not be an exact replica of the report of the meeting. The report for the Committee will be a statutory document that takes into account issues that may have not been discussed in detail, such as the Decision of the General Conference on culture and situations of armed conflict and the Addendum on natural and human-induced disasters. Nevertheless, the Secretariat will not alter the wording or the agreed concepts on the modalities. The report will be made available online. Thus, the first phase of the process will be a report of this meeting, and the second phase would take what is deemed important from the report to incorporate it into a document that will be prepared for the Committee. The Committee will then present it to the General Assembly in June 2020 for adoption. Mr Curtis acknowledged the concern expressed about the size of the task, but he was confident of the progress made so far. Before starting the discussion, Mr Curtis noted a request from a representative of the ICH-NGO Forum to make a statement as an Observer. He explained that the ICH-NGO Forum is a consortium of accredited NGOs to the Convention. This statement came on behalf of its steering committee.
3. **Mr Laurier Turgeon** wished to present a two-point statementon behalf of the steering committee of the **ICH-NGO Forum**. The first point concerned the role of NGOs in emergency situations. NGOs want to play an active role in the uses and mobilization of intangible cultural heritage in situations of natural disaster and conflict. They are deeply convinced that they can act effectively for the following reasons. First, they are numerous and present in practically all the signatory countries of the Convention; secondly, they have very good field knowledge. The NGOs not only represent the communities, but often they emanate from the communities themselves. They therefore have a very direct link with the communities, as well as very good knowledge of the cultures concerned and a good knowledge of the Convention generally. NGOs therefore believe that they can play a very effective role as intermediaries between the Convention and the actions that need to be taken on the ground. The second point is that the NGOs are very happy with this initiative and the proposals that have been made. There was, however, a small concern expressed with the prioritization of modalities. This was mentioned in the morning session, but NGOs would like there to be a reflection on an eventual hierarchy of intervention modalities. NGOs recognize that these modalities need to be flexible, adaptable to situations that can be extremely variable, but at the same time it may be important to prioritize actions that can guide stakeholders in terms of priority actions. For example, much had been discussed on the importance of inventories, however, in some situations, this may not be the action that is required in the first instance. In situations of extreme urgency, it is necessary to mobilize the practices, first of all to solve the problems that are present on the ground, and the inventories in this case can be established in a second phase. Mr Turgeon thanked the Secretariat for the invitation to participate, noting that it was the first time that NGOs had been officially invited to an expert meeting and they were touched by this invitation.
4. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked Mr Turgeon for the intervention. Indeed, he agreed that going forward it was important to take into account all aspects of partnership, adding that perhaps the NGOs will have the opportunity to discuss these kinds of issues during the ICH NGO Forum in Bogota at the 14th session of the Committee or during other instances. He then returned to the work at hand, inviting Mr Ballard to present the document.
5. **Mr Chris Ballard** would present the work carried out on the re-structuring of the document largely resulting from the deliberations in the Anglophone session, while Ms Chatelard would intervene on some of the material worked on largely by the Francophone group. The two approaches had been brought together, but it was far from a perfect document, and it was now a rougher draft than the original document. However, the task from tomorrow was to begin turning this document into something approaching a stronger text. The areas marked in red had been added to the original document. Highlighted in yellow were personal comments and notes that would be extracted later. Mr Ballard made the experts aware that the language of the text would be dramatically transformed when it will be submitted for review in the following week. Nevertheless, it was hoped that the document reflected all the ideas and content discussed. With regard to the re-structuring of the document, it was noted that a preamble had been introduced. Without focusing on the words, the idea was that some information from the principles or the modalities could be taken and inserted in text form to draft a statement along the lines that culture, and intangible cultural heritage in particular, are important at all phases and in all aspects of an emergency. It was noted that during some of the discussions, examples were given demonstrating that intangible cultural heritage actually matters on day one of an emergency, while being aware of the integral role of intangible cultural heritage in other domains. This question strategically links intangible cultural heritage to other forms of heritage, sustainable development, the culture of peace, and so on. Despite the very obvious observation that intangible cultural heritage is present and functioning in all phases of an emergency, it was so far absent from many of the formal emergency frameworks. The work therefore attempted to formalize what communities do naturally, as brilliantly described by Mr Georges Abungu in the morning session. The idea is not therefore to teach people how to enact intangible cultural heritage in emergency contexts, but rather to send a message to humanitarian agencies that are engaged in this work, but for whom intangible cultural heritage has not appeared in their formal frameworks. Thus, it was a question of re-formalizing something that is already functioning in many other respects, while the Convention already addresses many of these situations. It is important then to go back to the Convention and see what is already in place so that it can be productively utilized. With regard to the comment about modifying the expression of the principles from a passive to a more imperative tone and producing a framework that will ultimately guide practical action by stakeholders, particularly facilitators, Mr Ballard and the other facilitators agreed that it was a good idea, but they also wanted to see something that will ultimately serve a purpose on the ground.
6. **Mr Tim Curtis** voicedsome concerns, notably taking into account the discussions that had taken place in the last three sessions of the Committee, in which emphasis was placed on the dual role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, in terms of posing a threat to intangible cultural heritage and intangible cultural heritage being a central part of a community’s resilience and ability to respond. This dual role appeared to have disappeared in the beginning of the document, and this was now not consistent with the work over the last three years. It does appear in the principles and modalities in an underlying way, but it would be good to highlight it again in the preamble. Also, he was uncomfortable with the second point that stated, ‘being aware of the integral role of intangible cultural heritage in other domains including heritage more generally.’ He did not think that ‘heritage more generally’ could be considered as another domain given the intimate interconnectedness between intangible cultural heritage and heritage, i.e. intangible cultural heritage *is* a domain of heritage. The text suggested that ‘heritage more generally’ is another domain to intangible cultural heritage. Thus, the wording would send a very contradictory message. Conversely, sustainable development is a domain. Mr Curtis asked the experts whether they were comfortable with the way the dual nature of intangible cultural heritage was presented.
7. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** felt that the dual nature of intangible cultural heritage came out very clearly in the present meeting, and he recalled a remark by Mr Deng Nhial Chioh who used the word ‘management’ in that intangible cultural heritage needs to be managed because mismanagement of intangible cultural heritage can be very dangerously used. However, if managed properly it achieves all the things that it sets out to achieve. Thus, the dual nature of intangible cultural heritage should be prominent. With regard to the wording, Mr Abungu recalled Mr Ballard’s comment that the wording should not be a concern at the moment, as this will be changed and improved upon later. Moreover, intangible cultural heritage sits within a larger sense of heritage, and there was no need to hone in on it, not least because the work starts from a bigger scale before focusing on intangible cultural heritage, as interest in intangible cultural heritage sits within a bigger framework.
8. **Mr Tim Curtis** fully agreed with the points raised, returning to his earlier point that the work should bring intangible cultural heritage into UNESCO’s overall documents on culture in emergency situations of conflict and disasters, which were adopted in the 2015 Strategy and in 2017 for the Addendum by the General Conference, that were the starting points. Thus, the best way to ensure that all the discussions so far are reflected in the report is to ensure that they are anchored within the existing decisions of the governing bodies, i.e. that they are directly linked and part and parcel of the overall strategy. Then, there were the discussions around sustainable development and possibly culture of peace, although some countries and regions were uncomfortable with this concept. Nevertheless, sustainable development and Agenda 2030 have been adopted by all UN Member States so there could be one paragraph anchoring these in a statutory way to UNESCO’s strategy on culture so as to ensure that intangible cultural heritage is not separate from other forms of heritage. Another sentence could present the importance of sustainable development as a foundation of intangible cultural heritage, as well as the fact that the real root cause of disasters is often linked to sustainable development issues, such as poverty, conflict, climate change; all of which are interlinked. The preamble could therefore recognize the role of intangible cultural heritage and its links with sustainable development and a culture of peace.
9. **Mr Lassana Cissé** believed that what was presented was indicative and that the document would in any case be submitted to other experts for review, adding that the following wording could be included, ‘aware of the integral role of intangible cultural heritage in other domains.’ The point is that the cultural dimension is increasingly taken into account in resolutions of conflict, disasters and so on. Mr Cissé cited as examples the UN Resolution 2347 (2017) and others, and even sustainable development. In this regard, the following text could be added, ‘aware that the cultural heritage dimension in general is increasingly taken into consideration.’
10. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** noted that thishad already been mentioned in the excellent original version of the document, which had a leading statement based on which these points could be included. He fully agreed with the comment made by Mr Curtis that the Committee had the necessary expertise to iron out the wording in the report.
11. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** remarked that the first statement covered sustainable development, and he suggested to replace culture of peace with peace education.
12. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** struggled with the modalities, but would accept the principles and modalities after re-reading the document. However, she was not entirely happy with the word ‘emergent’ and preferred a simpler title, such as ‘operational principles and modalities for safeguarding ICH in emergencies.’
13. **Mr Tim Curtis** could agree with the observation, although at this stage the operational principles and modalities were in fact emergent.
14. **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that ‘emergent’ was the term used in the report as the drafters did not want to prefigure any points, but he agreed that it could now be removed. With regard to the operational principles, he further explained that each of the operational principles should be considered within the context of all the other principles, i.e. they could be seen as cross-cutting interlinked principles; when looking at one principle, the others should also be in mind. The sub-heading ‘scope’ was a way of grouping certain items, but it would be removed from the document. There were three broad areas that defined the scope of the theme. The first is the breadth and complexity of emergencies, for which there were some additions and changes to the text. The second is the fundamental insistence on community-based approaches. The third is the involvement of the widest possible range of stakeholders. In yellow, highlighted under community-based approaches, were some of the morning’s discussions on the different kinds of communities affected, and the challenges associated with identifying the communities to be consulted and considered in the different phases of the emergency cycle. The first three principles addressed the scope of the challenge and they remained unchanged; ‘community’ was simply placed above ‘stakeholder’ in the sequence.
15. **Mr Chris Ballard** then turned to the next set of principles that were related to questions of scale. From the day’s discussion, it was noted that there was one section on local knowledge, another on regional cooperation, but nothing that addressed the national or international scale. Thus, these were included in the text. Mr Ballard surmised that the best strategy was probably to collapse all four scales into one single principle, which would insist that sources of knowledge, expertise, mechanisms for cooperation to be consulted and considered are at the local, national, regional and international levels. It was the broadest way of including and requiring people to think about the scales, as well as all the various mechanisms that operate differently at each scale. In this way, it would cover all the bases. If people are made to think about different kinds of stakeholders, then they may also want to think about different kinds of scales. Thus, points 4, 5, 6 and 7 could be collapsed into a single principle that deals with both the themes and the scales in a single statement.
16. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** fully agreed with the observation that the national and international scales were missing, and that combining all the scales into one paragraph would be a wise thing to do in order not to go into a lot of detail. Nevertheless, it was also important to stress that the scales were not necessarily all working at the same time. Sometimes it works only at the local level or only at the international level. It therefore required some rephrasing.
17. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** remarked that stakeholders do not have to think through all the different levels to cooperate or to coordinate actions, especially in emergencies. She therefore suggested that ‘pertinent,’ ‘adequate’ or ‘relevant’ level should be privileged for actions, depending on what is available under certain emergencies.
18. **Mr Patricio López Beckett** cautioned about the phrasing of the principle because it referred to local, national and international scales, not least because it involves dialogue with communities, and thus it was very close to criterion R.2 of the nomination file, which can lead to confusion if not addressed in the correct way.
19. **Mr Tim Curtis** remarked that the idea was not to look to the listing mechanism and the issue of R.2, which had proved confusing and not purposeful in this context. However, the point is that the wording should direct the stakeholder to the relevant scale—be it local, regional, national and international—and not necessarily at the same time. In particular cases more than others, one may need to think of all the possibilities, or privilege one scale over another.
20. **Mr Chris Ballard** conceded that this single principle would involve a fair amount of time, as it was the largest area for work because of the novel ideas introduced and because it combined various points together. The last principle is a single principle that had been grouped under a different heading ‘cycle’ for the discussion. The title had been re-worded in that intangible cultural heritage must be mainstreamed throughout the emergency cycle from preparedness to response and then recovery. It thus insists that intangible cultural heritage is present, functions, and must be addressed and considered at every stage.
21. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted that the way the principle was formulated, it was losing again the dual approach of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The following paragraph was focusing on how to safeguard threatened intangible cultural heritage and not on how to help communities use their intangible cultural heritage to deal with their emergencies. Mr Curtis felt that this approach should be prominent when working through all these principles because it formed the basis of the work carried out so far, which is a little different to other forms of heritage. In intangible cultural heritage, the communities play a very strong role in that they use intangible cultural heritage because it helps them, and they do not necessarily need an institution telling or guiding them on how to practise their intangible cultural heritage. They do nonetheless need to be allowed to have the space to practise their intangible cultural heritage.
22. **Mr Chris Ballard** remarked that intellectually this comes in a sense from two slightly different traditions wherein the intangible cultural heritage under conflict situations is largely considered in terms of the impacts to it, whereas in disaster situations there is a lot more interest in the use of intangible cultural heritage as a mitigation measure. Thus, this approach was partly bringing two literatures together that had been very distinct for a long time and trying to marry them together.
23. **Mr Tim Curtis** returned to operational principle 3 on community-based approaches, adding that when one talks about the breadth and complexities of emergencies it would be good to bring that concept out in the breadth and complexities of communities, which is captured in the first question. Moreover, it was important not to introduce questions, as the report should provide guidance/guidelines not questions, and thus they should be reformulated into actions.
24. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** fully supported the notion that the community-based approach is rather a modality, i.e. it sought to put into action a concrete recommendation and therefore the principle should be reformulated.
25. **Mr Chris Ballard** then turned to the section on modalities, in which there were fewer changes. Some of the points had been moved around a little and the headings had been clarified, as was instructed. At the top, was the idea of privileging community-based needs identification as the starting point, which had reached consensus. This was followed by the three phases: i) preparing intangible cultural heritage for emergencies (with some changes to the detail of the text); ii) intangible cultural heritage in emergency response (the nature of intangible cultural heritage in response is only as good as the work done in preparing intangible cultural heritage for emergency); and iii) intangible cultural heritage in the recovery process.
26. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** wished to return to the point on ‘preparing intangible cultural heritage for emergencies,’ explaining that in matters of prevention and preparedness this referred to safeguarding strategies. The work would therefore involve preparing safeguarding strategies or programmes of action, not preparing intangible cultural heritage itself.
27. **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that the dual function referred not just to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, but also preparing to use intangible cultural heritage.
28. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** believed that this had a different meaning because preparing intangible cultural heritage implied an intervention into existing intangible cultural heritage so as to prepare it for something.
29. **Mr Chris Ballard** agreed that different wording was indeed required.
30. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted the important point made, adding that the French version also had slightly different language, which read, *‘se préparer pour les situations d’urgence*.*’* In English this translated to ‘be prepared for situations of emergency,’ i.e. not ‘preparing intangible cultural heritage for emergencies.’ He reiterated that the document would have to be re-read so that the concept of the dual role of intangible cultural heritage is consistent with Committee documents on this subject. Moreover, ‘preparing for emergencies’ could also involve inventories, as well as many other actions.
31. **Mr Chris Ballard** explained that the structure then is moving from privileging community-based needs identification to considering each of the three phases in turn, which he believed were worth disaggregating because quite often different agencies or functions are focused on just one of the three, yet they are all obviously interlinked. For example, if one is not adequately prepared, the response will be inadequate, and the nature of the response often structures the nature of the recovery. What happens in those first few days and weeks can be critical to the entire structure of recovery. It was felt that pulling them apart and insisting on their connection was strategic here. The last two operational modalities concerned, education, awareness raising and capacity building, and the process of mainstreaming these ideas, principles and modalities among communities, stakeholders and the relevant organizations was considered a critical step. Finally, how do we harness and employ the mechanisms of the Convention in each phase of the emergency at every level? It was noted that there were few changes made in the revised structure, which it was hoped made it slightly more logical, while prioritizing sequences.
32. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** noted that the international humanitarian aspect and mention of military organizations was missing. By citing other civil society stakeholders, but not including humanitarian or military organizations is to really miss important stakeholders in the field who act in times of armed conflict and disasters.
33. **Mr Tim Curtis** suggested to include international humanitarian, military and other relevant organizations.
34. **Mr Lassana Cissé** remarked that the English version, ‘international humanitarian organizations with a mandate,’ had a different meaning in French, which read, ‘humanitarian associations, qualified organizations,’ adding that there was a need to harmonize.
35. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** regretted that the French translation was inaccurate compared to the English text, which had generated problems. She had tried to align the French text, as the original document was drafted in English. For example, there was no translation of *‘association’* in the English text, which could be translated as ‘humanitarian organizations’.
36. **Mr Lassana Cissé** noted a translation error in the English version, which read, ‘organizations are mandated,’ which is different from *‘qualifié’* or ‘qualified’ in the French version. For example, organizations such as UNHCR and ICRC are *mandated* in practice.
37. **Mr Tim Curtis** assured the expertsthat the Secretariat would harmonize the text and he agreed that ‘mandated’ and ‘qualified’ had different meanings. It was for the Committee to decide who is mandated.
38. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** asked whether thefirst point under ‘privilege identification’ referred to a situation of non-emergency or emergency, adding that preventive measures could not follow the identification of needs as the first action to be taken in an emergency situation. In fact, in a normal or non-emergency situation, preventive measures should be taken, developed and implemented beforehand.
39. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted that there was indeed an issue in the chronological order of actions to be taken. However, he understood from the discussion that perhaps what was thought to be the most important action before the disaster—in this case, community-based needs identification—is not necessarily the most important for the community after the disaster.
40. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** concurred with that understanding, however, point 2 referred to safeguarding measures adopted in a situation of peace, i.e. that an inventory cannot be undertaken in an emergency situation. Thus, point 2 was not logical.
41. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** recognized that the point was badly worded. The identification of needs must be a measure put in place during the second phase, the response phase, whether in the immediate or recovery phase. The point being that the communities, groups and individuals, bearers of intangible cultural heritage, must always be at the centre of all actions at each phase.
42. **Mr Jose Pontanares Canuday** wished to return to the idea of mainstreaming, and he wondered about the response of humanitarian responders and other responders on the ground on how they think this document might be interfaced with what mainstreaming might be. It may be that they think of this document as yet another mandate that they have to add to the already complex, expansive response mechanism that they have to follow. However, what if it is integrated and mainstreamed at the same time so it becomes part of all the other responses they perform from food aid all the way to post-conflict intervention.
43. **Mr Tim Curtis** concurred that this was indeed an important point, adding that the concept of mainstreaming will require the input of some humanitarian agencies, but that one had to be cautious about how much is added to their load, and therefore some privileged goals should be chosen to fit into the complex set of actions. If one goes back to basics, even before thinking about safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, people need to be safeguarded. If the people in the communities die, then so does intangible cultural heritage. Mr Curtis also returned to the point on education in the operational modalities on awareness raising and capacity building. He was not convinced that the modalities should begin with education. Education could be considered both as awareness raising and capacity building, and he is very much for intangible cultural heritage in education. Indeed, the Secretariat has put a lot of effort into opening up a new priority within the Convention on integrating intangible cultural heritage into education and schooling systems. However, in this case, it is referring to disaster situations, and one of the ways to work through education systems is through awareness raising and capacity building. He was therefore concerned about confusing the discussion on intangible cultural heritage and education by bringing education to the fore here. He thus proposed wording along the lines, ‘awareness raising and capacity building for assessing, planning and implementing programmes among communities/groups concerned, particularly youth, including through education systems.’ This would place less focus on education, which after all includes universities, schools, formal and non-formal education, and so on, that were in themselves complex discussions.
44. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** noted that ‘training’ was missing in this point, which again is a term related to the military that would refer to training it should receive in this regard.
45. **Mr Tim Curtis** remarked that training can be considered as a subset of capacity building and awareness raising. If there is awareness raising and capacity building, then this can include youth in education programmes or education systems, working with education institutions, training for military and humanitarian organizations, and so on. Thus, training can be introduced as one of the points, whereas ‘education’ could move down a point.
46. **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** agreed in that capacity building was used because it encapsulated all forms of training, education, vocation and so on, as capacity building means to build one’s capacity by all means available.
47. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** also agreed, but she noted that NGOs were not mentioned.
48. **Mr Tim Curtis** took note and suggested keeping awareness raising and capacity building as the overall title, followed by training, schools, youth, education, military and humanitarian organizations as among those to target, but evidently beginning with the communities/groups concerned, and to include training and other forms of capacity building. Education would therefore be mentioned in a subsequent point.
49. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** referred to point 4 on intangible cultural heritage and the recovery process, noting that it mentioned ‘obtaining financial contributions.’ She wondered whether it would be more accurate to say that they are made available because in order to obtain them they already need to exist and it was not sure that they did. However, there is a mechanism under the Convention, so some incentives for funding opportunities should be made available.
50. For the sake of clarity, **Mr** **Georges** **Abungu** suggested to first start with point 1 and then to move to the next point once the point is agreed, with opportunities to return to earlier points if required. In this way, it would follow the structure of the document and make the work easier to follow and comment.
51. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed with the point raised to proceed in a step-by-step manner, and he returned to point 4. He noted that ‘engaging in the recovery process’ was unclear in that it is a broad process. Did it that mean engaging in disaster recovery mechanisms? He also noted that point 4 was not of the same order as the other items in that they almost become subsets of point 4. He surmised that there was perhaps a title missing because education was also appearing in point 5.
52. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** agreed with the observation made in operational modality 4 on obtaining financial contributions, which should in fact be re-phrased to ‘making available,’ i.e. ‘obtaining’ funds would be the subsequent step. She also agreed with Mr Curtis that establishing educational and other activities was already contained in point 5, which was good. Referring to operational modality 2, and the observation made by Mr Curtis, she agreed that the duality of intangible cultural heritage was missing in that intangible cultural heritage has a very important role to play in the recovery process and not necessarily in terms of being safeguarded per se. She suggested dropping point 3 to stress the other part of intangible cultural heritage, and to leave it in point 5. For operational modality 5, she suggested to take out education in the title, while leaving in awareness raising and capacity building, and keeping education as a subset, as point 5 referred to who would be involved with awareness raising and capacity building, rather than how they would be involved.
53. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked Ms Schreiber for clarifying the points, noting that the third point under modality 4 should either be deleted or potentially moved to modality 5, and that ‘education’ could in fact be omitted.
54. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** realized that education is actually contained in Article 14 of the Convention where ‘education, awareness-raising, capacity-building’ is mentioned together. Thus, it would be best not to delete education, as it should link to the Convention text.
55. **Mr Tim Curtis** understood the point raised, but he expressed concern about the modality of implementation for a number of very pragmatic reasons. First, the Secretariat was undertaking a vast programme on intangible cultural heritage and education precisely for Article 14 and Article 2 where education is mentioned, but it had never really been triggered in terms of safeguarding. This is very complex work as it involves working with education colleagues and the education sector to actually integrate intangible cultural heritage into education. Working with the emergency preparedness sector is also a huge task, and Mr Curtis was concerned that this would confound the complexities. Moreover, there was no obligation to follow the exact language of the Convention, even if it is ok to do so. There was, however, a risk of causing confusion in bringing together two hugely complex issues.
56. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** noted that the text of modality 4 was now unclear, as it only mentioned ICH in the recovery process, whereas the original text was more concrete as it referred to the adoption of measures in the immediate and mid-term.
57. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed that the title was probably problematic under modality 4.
58. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** was fully aware of the problem and complexity of combining all the different aspects. However, this two-page document sought in a way to bring everything together in very general terms, and that it should be treated as a starting document for further work, i.e. in the creation of guidebooks for different stakeholders and so on. For that reason, she wondered whether deleting or leaving items in the report at this stage would have a wider and/or strong impact later on.
59. **Mr Tim Curtis** suggested taking ‘education’ out from the title and leaving it in as a subset so that the possibility of carrying out education activities was not excluded as a subset of awareness raising and capacity building in that one might mobilize schools to raise awareness or mobilize training institutions to build capacity. In fact, education can be both awareness raising and capacity building. Indeed, in the text of the Convention they are at the same level. Thus, education can be seen as a sub-tool, particularly for youth because most children go to school and re-establishing schools is also often a key priority in situations of displacement during emergencies. He explained that one of the first things that colleagues at UNICEF or UNHCR try to do is to get children back into school. He reiterated that education could therefore be taken out of the title, but not completely removed, and he suggested adding, ‘communities/groups, particularly youth, including through education systems.’ In this way, ‘education’ can include formal, non-formal, informal, technical, higher and so on.
60. **Ms Annie Tohme Tabet** remarked that educational activities were not the only activities that could be developed in an emergency. In fact, therapeutic activities on ICH could also reinforce resilience, as this helps distressed populations distance themselves from their despair. Thus, the idea is not only to focus on the transmission of intangible cultural heritage, but also on the important role of intangible cultural heritage in supporting these populations. Ms Tohme Tabet spoke of aberrant situations in which activities were developed by national or international NGOs that were alien to refugees, for example, teaching Syrian refugees how to make origami, whereas in other situations some NGOs relied on intangible cultural heritage practices, which clearly made the communities happy.
61. **Mr Tim Curtis** understood that the use of ‘education’ could be a little complicated, but the related topics were not quite the same. It was therefore important to clearly distinguish between humanitarian interventions by NGOs, UN agencies and so on when they undertake educational activities and more institutional education systems. In the former case, it concerns being aware of using appropriate intangible cultural heritage in context and not using or instrumentalizing inappropriate intangible cultural heritage. This is different to the latter case, which refers to setting up schools and education systems, and viewing education as a sector, mobilizing education in a government ministry for example. In this regard, awareness raising or capacity building can capture all the different aspects of education, which evidently must also be sensitive to and in line with intangible cultural heritage and its values. Nevertheless, there was a difference between talking about education as a system and talking about doing activities that are educational.
62. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** agreed that ‘education’ was probably too broad, but it was nonetheless already incorporated under modality 4 under ‘incorporating intangible cultural heritage into reconstruction and recovery,’ although she conceded that it probably needed to be a bit more specific. This boiled down to the issue of enhancing or making the dual role of intangible cultural heritage more visible, which is not just about incorporating intangible cultural heritage or safeguarding intangible cultural heritage because it is at risk, it also involves building on intangible cultural heritage and the intangible cultural heritage that people already use to facilitate recovery and to develop other types of intervention. It also means to ensure that humanitarian interventions are sensitive to intangible cultural heritage, i.e. that actions and activities are culturally-sensitive, which should also be included in the guidelines.
63. **Mr Chris Ballard** returned to Mr Takakura’s question on the changed title of modality 4, which read, ‘adopting immediate mid-term measures to help affected communities practice their intangible cultural heritage.’ He agreed that it was wrong to remove it and that now it did not meet the dual role requirement of intangible cultural heritage and therefore should be included under the heading ‘intangible cultural heritage in the recovery process’.
64. **Mr Patricio López Beckett** noted in the wording of modality 4 that intangible cultural heritage only appeared to exist as something that required funding or as being useful for other things when in fact the restitution of intangible cultural heritage should be a priority in the recovery process. Thus, the text could be re-worded to convey the notion that intangible cultural heritage should be given space in the recovery process because of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in its own right and not because it is useful for other things.
65. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** referred to the emergency management cycle where in the literature four phases have been identified: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. These could therefore be used as headings to help structure the document. In this way, recovery comes naturally after response, and for preparedness and prevention there are specific tools or modalities to implement these principles.
66. **Mr Hiroki Takakura** suggested that modality 4 should address the reason why intangible cultural heritage is very important and, in addition to the financial aspect, its mitigating role in the recovery process should also be taken into account and incorporated into modality 4.
67. **Mr Tim Curtis** returned to the point made by Ms Schreiber, recalling that the Anglophone group had re-worked the structure of the document into ‘scope’ and ‘cycle.’ He hesitated opening it up further, adding that he was uncomfortable with the title and text of modality 4, not least for the reason evoked by Mr López Beckett. He understood that Ms Schreiber proposed to take the actual disaster cycles or phases to associate them with a principle and modality, i.e. to restructure the entire document.
68. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** concurred with that understanding as the discussion centred around the emergency cycle and the different needs at every stage as the situation develops, whether it is a situation of armed conflict or natural disaster. Moreover, every stage needs specific modalities, and this would have the effect of clarifying the notion of emergency. She explained that the operational modalities 1, 2 and 3 already evoked elements of the emergency cycle in terms of the emergency response and the preparatory work. Thus, the use of these simple labels would make the document clearer, albeit it will not solve the other problems with the structure of the document, but at least it will help structure the first part.
69. **Mr Chris Ballard** remarked that modalities 2, 3 and 4 in fact mapped the emergency management cycle i.e. it collapsed prevention and preparedness into a single step, as the classic DRM cycle has three phases and not four. However, if very different and specific things need to happen for intangible cultural heritage between the prevention and preparedness phases then perhaps they should be separated into two distinct phases. He further remarked that the intangible cultural heritage implications under each of the steps of the phases was not adequately fleshed out, nor were the intangible cultural heritage actions at each stage. This was particularly the case in modality 4, which refers to intangible cultural heritage and the recovery process where intangible cultural heritage has been incorporated into reconstruction or recovery, which is an enormous task. However, it does not specify how that happens, what happens, and who does the work in terms of reconciliation, mitigation and therapy. Thus, the problem was related to the failure to elaborate the finer points within that category, rather than the category itself. He noted that there was a disagreement about preparation and prevention, even though there is the idea of phases, which is instructive for intangible cultural heritage because it was not thought out in strategic terms of emergencies or phases.
70. **Mr Tim Curtis** added that the idea was to do a bit of both, i.e. there are three phases, but there is also education, awareness raising and capacity building, as well as the mechanisms of the 2003 Convention. What is unclear is how they relate to these different phases, which goes back to Mr Takakura’s question. The work done so far has moved in-between these areas, so the report would need to be more carefully examined. Mr Curtis also wished to clarify that the work did not involve intervening *on* intangible cultural heritage, but rather *with* intangible cultural heritage. Nevertheless, he noted the progress made, although an understanding of the different phases was needed. For example, community-needs identification happens at all phases, just like other actions might happen at different phases.
71. Having looked atmodality 4, **Mr Richenel Ansano** remarked that one thing that seemed to be missing is the mention of bearers. Whether incorporating intangible cultural heritage into reconstruction, making available financial contributions for bearer communities, or establishing educational activities and so on, they need to involve the people themselves in the solution. The people on the ground have solutions that need to be examined, which needs to be better clarified in the second point on incorporating intangible cultural heritage into reconstruction. However, it was not just a question of incorporating intangible cultural heritage; it was a question of also strategically, organizationally and operationally involving the communities in making decisions about the situation.
72. **Mr Chris Ballard** reflected again about the structure of the modalities, and it was generally agreed that the phases probably need to be identified and treated separately. There are different kinds of things happening and people need to think about each of those phases, as well as the relationships between the phases. Thus, the reason community-based needs identification was privileged as modality 1 is precisely because it concerns the bearers before all else, and so it is understood that community-based identification is present at every phase. The bearers are considered at each phase: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Mr Ballard explained that the reason for separating out awareness-raising and capacity building on the one hand, and the mechanisms of the Convention on the other hand, was that it was realized that it was beyond the scope of a two-page document and a two-day forum to pick apart the Convention now and attach the relevant mechanisms to the relevant phases. He spoke of the possibility of dismantling modality 6 and simply integrating the relevant mechanisms into every phase. But he advised against this, as this would pre-empt later work. Currently, what had been identified is that: i) community-based identification is a priority; ii) things happen differently at the various phases; and iii) awareness has to be considered separately, though of course it will be integrated into each of the phases. In addition, the mechanisms of the Convention have to be taken into account. Thus, the guidelines are not a model of how things unfold in real time, but rather a map of the different aspects that should be considered in approaching more elaborate planning in the future.
73. **Mr Tim Curtis** still felt that the point on community-based needs was not clearly understood in modality 4, noting that the problem appeared to be that the points were spread across the cycles, and the overarching methods and principles in the way the report was structured, which was why the issues seemed to move between the points. Mr Curtis suggested to approach the report by first outlining the principles, then consider what actually happens in emergencies and identify the classic cycles, and then replacing all these aspects—whether using the Convention, awareness raising and capacity building, or the main principles of community-based needs—to see how the points relate to each part of the cycle, i.e. undertaking awareness raising and community-based needs identification in a recovery phase may be treated differently in a preparedness phase. Mr Curtis believed that this would also speak to humanitarian workers by clarifying the actions, which was currently not the case as the different aspects seemed to be spread across the different modalities and points.
74. **Mr Chris Ballard** tried to understand how to draft the text in two pages.
75. **Ms Hanna Schreiber** remarked that this was exactly what she had in mind; that the document must be made readable, understandable and applicable for humanitarian actors and others who actually act during emergency situations. UNESCO works upstream and rarely acts in emergencies when it usually cooperates with other stakeholders. Thus, in terms of cycles and phases, to be helpful it must use the terminology that is already applied and recognized in the literature on disaster risk management. In this way, it will be readable, understandable and familiar for others. With regard to the mention of communities, she suggested adding ‘communities, groups and individuals’ so as to keep it consistent with the wording of the Convention.
76. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed that ‘communities, groups, or if applicable, individuals,’ should be used throughout, even if it is understood to be the case when simply cited as ‘communities.’ The report will be drafted at a later stage to smooth out any inconsistencies that may arise before its presentation to the Committee. Also, the report could be 3-pages long if necessary.
77. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** thought about ICH in terms of the process of development within the UN system, i.e. with the UNDP for development and UNESCO for culture, such that under point 2 on ‘incorporating intangible cultural heritage into reconstruction,’ the issue of sustainable development could be added. The aim of this Expert Meeting is to empower intangible cultural heritage through the involvement of humanitarian organizations and local NGOs so that the issue of sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage can be merged into one.
78. **Mr Tim Curtis** recalled that Ms Chatelard had already spoken on the issue of sustainable development, adding that there is also a chapter in the Operational Directives specifically on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. For this report, the preamble will reference the transition from emergency to sustainable development. However, as in the case with education, bringing all these complex issues into the report will only lead to confusion. Thus, it will be mentioned in the preamble where the role of intangible cultural heritage in the transition phase is acknowledged, but that the task at hand is to focus on emergency response situations, not least because sustainable development was already treated in other parts of the Convention.
79. **Ms Amel Hachana Zribi** wished to comment on the content and wording of some of the points. For example, in modality 4, which read, ‘Obtaining financial contributions from national, local as well as international authorities to practitioners,’ she wondered why only national, local or international authorities were mentioned when other actors could provide assistance, even if they have not yet been identified, which could also include the communities themselves. Thus, ‘other actors’ could be added. The second expression concerned, ‘ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage of displaced populations.’ Ms Hachana Zribi recognized the importance of the objective, but that it was not guaranteed. She therefore proposed to re-word the text to read, ‘to realize efforts to ensure...’ thereby making it more realistic. Under modality 6, which referred to ‘the mechanisms of the 2003 Convention,’ she proposed to add ‘adequate or appropriate mechanisms,’ as not all mechanisms could be used in emergency situations.
80. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed that this was important.
81. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** admitted that he was uneasy with all the changes made when modalities should imply actions, adding that the recent changes meant that ‘employed’ was deleted, leaving only ‘mechanisms’ and ‘education’ was also deleted. He did not wish to return to the discussion on terminology, but still, it was difficult to understand some of the changes. For example, ‘preventive safeguarding’ was deleted and replaced by ‘preparing emergencies’.
82. **Mr Tim Curtis** remarked that the changes were normal given the many discussions and comments, which will be sifted through and re-worked. For example, it was understood in modality 4 that the financing aspect had to be clarified, and the comment by Mr López Beckett on intangible cultural heritage and recovery would also have to be taken into account. Mr Curtis noted that the big changes that occurred involved the idea of restructuring and regrouping the report, which had been proposed by the Anglophone group. The report now starts with the principles, followed by the modalities that outlines the phases of emergencies. The idea is then to bring the principles into each phase and combine some of the modalities under the phases, which seemed to be the most logical way of presenting the modalities.
83. **Ms Géraldine Chatelard** fully agreed with the rationale and the comments made by Ms Schreiber that the report must be immediately readable and understandable for stakeholders who intervene during emergencies. However, this did not prevent the fact that the phases could be broken down and that there could be crosscutting issues, which should be clearly stated. For instance, a stakeholder does not have to be the owner of awareness raising and capacity building throughout all the different phases.
84. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed and said that in fact the report could go further in that not only does it outline the actions that have to be done throughout the different phases, but that they may be done in slightly different ways in the different phases. This is the kind of structure that would work, even though the points were currently a little dispersed across the different modalities. Summarizing, Mr Curtis explained that, for example, community-based needs identification could involve community-based inventorying, as it is called in the Convention, which may be carried out in the non-disaster preparedness phase. This work could involve the communities who are asked about the kinds of preparation they make in cases of an emergency, for example, during a hurricane. This could also be included in standard inventorying, or one part of the inventorying process. Once a disaster has struck, the community can be asked about their actual needs under the circumstances, which may not be exactly what was previously foreseen. For example, maybe there was a fire instead of a hurricane, or maybe something else was damaged that they did not anticipate. Thus, action would be elicited in both phases. The report will now have a preamble. It will have the principles of acting in intangible cultural heritage, followed by the modalities that will be broken into the three phases of an emergency: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery, and possibly with some of the same modalities repeated in the different phases at varying degrees of emphasis.
85. **Mr Chris Ballard** joked that he now had to think about how to write the report.
86. **Mr Tim Curtis** assured Mr Ballard that the report will be worked on by the Secretariat, the Committee and the General Assembly, so nobody owns the text or is the author of the text.
87. **Mr Chris Ballard** remarked that it was important to think to whom this report is immediately addressed and what it would give rise to later. If this report is in a sense a ground plan for then elaborating and producing operational plans, then it can have a certain structural openness. The key thing was to make sure that the report drew people’s attention to particular issues. For example, he felt that by disaggregating the privileging of community-based needs and merging it into each of the phases would dilute the associated action. In fact, the report needs to start with that aspect and see how it now applies to each of the phases. In this regard, structurally speaking, the idea of crosscutting modalities is important.
88. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that this was the reason for the principles, which laid out all the crosscutting modalities by aligning them to the corresponding principle. Thus, the principles will consistently be referred to in the actions taken across the emergency phases.
89. **Mr Chris Ballard** gave the example of awareness raising, which would refer to the appropriate mechanisms of the Convention in the principles, but then operationalize them under the phases through the modalities.
90. **Mr Tim Curtis** adjourned the session for a coffee break to allow for some reflection.

*[Coffee break]*

1. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked everybody for the two intensive days of discussion, adding that the final session was an opportunity to pull together a number of ideas. He would summarize the meeting, but first opened the floor for comments.
2. **Mr Gamini Wijesuriya** returned to the earlier discussion and wondered in fact whether all the points were being mixed up, not least because the DRM cycle was well established within UNESCO and other systems where one talks about preparedness, response and recovery. If this is taken as the key, then all the other points could be seen as general notes. He spoke of the book, *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage*[[14]](#footnote-14)*,* which he helped develop that discusses the DRM cycle and how it is framed with regard to actions that need to be carried out. From his own experience with the destruction of a World Heritage property, he recalled all kinds of training programmes that were implemented, as well as many of the actions outlined in the list. Thus, the general notes should be separated out and then linked to the DRM cycle, as this would resolve many of the issues.
3. **Mr Tim Curtis** agreed that this was indeed the outcome from the discussions. The report structure will start with a preamble as its basis, followed by the core principles and then the modalities positioned within the three phases of the emergency cycle. He added that the many discussions had helped clarify the process, as well as the many issues at stake. The finality is that there are now some core principles on which everybody agreed, which had come up several times and are transversal in scope. To begin with, the community leadership is first and foremost the core principal, in line with the Convention. It is the community that identifies its needs and its strategies so that it can react in all emergency phases, with the other actors there to support them. Another core principle of the Convention is that ICH is dynamic and adaptive, which plays into intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, which is to say that intangible cultural heritage is not in conservation mode in that sense. This is core to the Convention. In addition, intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergencies has a dual role. The Convention not only looks to safeguard intangible cultural heritage , it understands that intangible cultural heritage is fundamental in providing a means for communities to address, prepare, overcome and recover from situations of emergencies. Other principles include the complexity of emergencies, the complexity of communities and so on. This was the first structure under which all the modalities would be brought in under the different emergency phases, such as preparedness, prevention and so on. Modalities that would be looked at would include how the community identifies the issues for preparedness, but these modalities could also come in again in the response and recovery phases, but perhaps with slightly different emphasis. The core principles will then come through under modalities as cross-cutting in each of the phases. Noting that everyone in the room appeared to agree with the structure, Mr Curtis acknowledged that it was indeed a very successful meeting.
4. **Mr Deng Nhial Chioh** suggested that the report be shared among the experts for input once the changes were incorporated, for later submission to and consultation with the Committee.
5. **Mr Tim Curtis** explained that the following day will be spent going through the report to structure all the points. The draft report will then be sent to everyone by email for comments. Based on the feedback, the Secretariat will be able to make informed decisions on the comments overall and note whether a thread of thought emerged, based on which the report of the meeting will be formulated. Nevertheless, the meeting had brought to the fore a number of subsections. All now agreed on the structure, which took some time to materialize, but was worth the time and effort working together to achieve. The experts would be given a week to respond and provide comments. Mr Curtis asked that the experts bear in mind the discussions that took place, rather than to try and bring in other issues that could further complicate the process, and he congratulated everyone for the work accomplished.
6. **Mr Juan Mayr Maldonado** spoke of the wonderful days in which very good progress had been made despite the short time to get to know the experts and hear more of their wisdom. He believed that the original text was excellent, which provided the basis and the opportunity to shape it in different ways. He congratulated Mr Ballard, Ms Chatelard, the Secretariat and all those who had supported this successful meeting and who had given their best to help move forward with the text. It was hoped that future meetings will be equally successful in providing the best possible guidance to the different institutions that help protect the world’s most vulnerable people.
7. **Mr Tim Curtis** thanked Mr Maldonado for his very encouraging remarks.
8. **Mr Öcal Oğuz** recalled that the Francophone group had worked on the French version, although it had not formulated a preamble and he congratulated the Anglophone group for this work. However, he felt that the preamble could be strengthened, not least because the preamble of the Convention covered many of the topics. For this reason, he suggested to cite Article 17.3 and U.6 of the Operational Guidelines in the preamble. Mr Oğuz also noted the many references to the ‘UN system’, adding that it was difficult to fully understand the implication. In this regard, he recommended to include references to the Convention itself. He concluded by thanking the Secretariat for the invitation, adding that he was happy to have worked with all the experts during the two-day meeting.
9. **Mr Tim Curtis** noted that the meeting was coming to a close.
10. **Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé** remarked that Mr Oğuz had addressed an important point in praising the original document for its excellence and clarity, which helped lay the groundwork for the ensuing work. He conceded, however, that the terms of reference may have been a little vague in parts, but that now they were very clear and suggestive, serving a good basis for future work. In this regard, he thanked Mr Ballard and Ms Chatelard, and also the Secretariat for organizing the meeting. Mr Guissé referred to Mr Cissé’s earlier remarks on the preamble, who also noted the excellent document, adding that there was sufficiently good text to formulate a preamble. The experts who proposed the preamble were able to integrate this information to strengthen the text. In addition, the preamble will be worked on and rewritten, and will no doubt fully meet expectations. It was hoped that the Committee will appreciate the work of the experts whose role was simply to propose new ideas. However, it was hoped that the report would not drastically change, although it is always difficult to cover a lot of ground in a short period of time. Nevertheless, the result is always excellent and the Committee will have the opportunity to deliberate on the report before it moves to the next two instances. He then spoke of the friendships cemented during the meeting, particularly with colleagues from the Caribbean that recalled the special relationship between Africa and the Caribbean. He concluded by once again thanking Mr Ballard and Ms Chatelard.
11. **Mr Tim Curtis** felt reassured, adding that the importance of the work achieved should not be underestimated. This work has been ongoing for three years when the Secretariat had been asked to integrate intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. It was an exciting and enthusiastic prospect, but daunting nonetheless given the complexity of the subject and then thinking how to actually implement it. The work carried out during this Expert Meeting crystalized how this work should be presented, and Mr Curtis felt confident that this will translate into something tangible for the Committee, that will then go on to the General Assembly. Once that happens, the guidelines will take up a life of its own. Field offices and people will start using and referring to it as a guide on how to act in certain situations. It will also grow with experience, but the report was in a sense born during these two days. Indeed, it was a huge task, but everyone was able to bring it all together. Mr Curtis noted that some of the experts knew each other, some were long-time followers of the Convention, others were newcomers, and some had experience of other Conventions, but everyone brought with them an interesting perspective related to the Convention. It was thus a deliberate choice in bringing together these different voices and the result was extremely positive.
12. **Mr Tim Curtis** then turned to Mr Ballard and Ms Chatelard to thank them for their tremendous work in preparing the draft text, even though they were thrown into the deep end. They both worked very hard on researching the background around the subject and carrying out fieldwork. Ms Chatelard worked in two situations concerning Syrian displaced persons in Lebanon and Jordan, and also in North Kivu in the Congo. Mr Ballard conducted an extensive desk study on natural disasters. Even though one cannot plan when a disaster might occur, Mr Ballard brought to the process his own experience from his work in the Pacific working with communities in situations of disaster. They were warmly thanked by a round of applause. Mr Curtis then thanked Ms Caroline Munier, the Focal Point for Emergencies, who had conducted a lot of the groundwork on the subject over the last three years. He also thanked Mr Fumiko Ohinata who ensures that everything is ready for the Committee, translating and facilitating the process. Their huge contribution was appreciated by a round of applause. Finally, Mr Curtis thanked the experts who took time from work and busy schedules to contribute to the process. Many had come often to UNESCO, others were newcomers to the Convention, but it was hoped that the work had sparked their interest to stay engaged with the Convention. It is a very invigorating area in which to work as a lot is happening and moving forward. A photo call was announced, and with concluding remarks to wish everyone a safe journey home, Mr Curtis closed the Expert Meeting on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.

*[Close of Expert Meeting]*
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