

# Draft 19 November 2010

## MoW RSC PROTOCOL and ETHICS

### Introduction

The following principles are set out for the specific guidance of the IAC Register Subcommittee. They apply also to members of the IAC when evaluating nominations, and with relevant adaptations, to regional and national MoW committees.

At every stage the nomination assessment process aims to be completely objective by testing nominations against prescribed criteria (and nothing else). Being a committee-based process, and subject to the final decision of the Director-General, no prediction can ever be made of the success or otherwise of a particular nomination.

### Mentoring and advisory role

It is appropriate for RSC members to provide encouragement and technical advice to nominators and intending nominators in developing nominations for the International Register. This will usually happen in the following ways:

- Identifying heritage for which it *may* be possible to construct a case for inscription. This is particularly the case for countries which have little or no representation in the register, or where the logic and process for nomination is poorly understood
- In the context of structured workshops or training events aimed at developing the skills for preparing nominations
- When a RSC member has been specifically assigned by the RSC or the Secretariat to work alongside a potential nominator in helping them prepare a nomination

“Technical advice” means helping nominators to interpret the nomination form and to provide the fullest range of relevant information for the informed assessment of their nomination.

### Relations with nominators

During the assessment phase, nominations are assigned to individual RSC members and other experts for research and preparation of an initial report to the RSC. Correspondence and contact with nominators during this time is the responsibility of the Secretariat. RSC members do not engage in direct contact with nominators unless specifically authorized by the Chair or the Secretariat to do.

RSC members may **not**:

- Prepare a nomination form, or prepare the argument or “case” for inscription, on behalf of a nominator. This must be entirely the work of the nominator.
- Offer an opinion to the nominator concerning the likely success or otherwise of the nomination
- Express a partisan stance in relation to a nomination and its passage through the MoW process
- Express or imply personal support for a nomination
- Accept gifts or inducements of any kind to support a nomination
- In any other way compromise the objectivity of the assessment process

## **Committee protocol**

Where an RSC member has a real or apparent conflict of interest in relation to any nomination, that conflict is to be declared and its resolution documented in the RSC minutes. For example:

- Where an RSC member is cited as an expert referee in a nomination
- Where the nomination comes from the RSC member's own country
- Where the nomination comes from an organization with which the RSC member has a working relationship or a vested interest

In such cases, the RSC member may provide information or otherwise contribute to RSC discussion when invited by the Chair to do so, but will abstain from any RSC voting in relation to the nomination.

## **Lobbying, gifts and inducements**

Inscription is prestigious and desirable, and it is the experience of the MoW programme that governments and institutions may engage in lobbying activities in an effort to maximize the possibility of a successful outcome for their nomination. This can take many forms, including gifts and offers of travel and hospitality. The practice has different implications and nuances in different cultures; what is deemed improper in one culture may be no more than good manners in another. Careful judgment is required in order to avoid conflict of interest on the one hand, and giving needless offence on the other. At the same time, countries or institutions in a position to fund lobbying activities must not thereby gain an assessment advantage over nominators who are not in such a position.

Mindful of the principles set out in this document, RSC members should weigh such approaches carefully and, if in doubt, consult with the Secretariat or the chair of RSC or IAC. The relevant issues to be weighed are:

- What are the assumptions or expectations of the party making the approach?
- Is the party fully aware of and accepting of the ethical constraints which bind the RSC member?
- Would a positive response by the RSC member usefully add to the information available for assessing the nomination (for example, an opportunity to inspect nominated heritage at first hand)?
- Would a positive response by the RSC member advance the programme in some other way (for example, an opportunity to meet with a national MoW committee)?
- Would a negative response cause genuine offence to the detriment of the MoW programme?

To ensure transparency, all such approaches, and the actions taken in relation to them, are to be documented by the RSC member concerned and reported to the Secretariat. The reports will be considered at the next RSC meeting and will be annexed to the report of that meeting as submitted to the IAC.