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1. This document contains the summary records of the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, held at Windhoek, Namibia, from 30 November to 4 December 2015.
2. Almost 500 participants attended the session among which delegations from twenty three out of the twenty four States Members of the Committee, eighty-three States Parties not Members of the Committee, three States non party to the Convention, one Intergovernmental organization, four Category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, forty accredited non-governmental organizations to the Committee and fifty press/media entities.
3. The full list of participants is available [online](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-Participants.doc).
4. The session was conducted in the two working languages of the Committee: English and French.
5. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.
6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the tenth session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: H.E. Ms Trudie Amulungu (Namibia)

Vice-Chairpersons: Belgium, Hungary, Brazil, India and Tunisia

Rapporteur: Mr Ahmed Aly Morsi (Egypt) – Absent and replaced by Belgium according to Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee

1. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

**DRAFT DECISION 11.COM 4**

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/16/11.COM/4,

2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee’s tenth session contained in this document.

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

*[Monday, 30 November 2015, morning session]*

**ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OPENING OF THE SESSION**

**Document**[*ITH/15/10.COM/INF.1*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-INF.1_EN.docx)

1. The **Chairperson** of the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Her Excellency Ms Trudie Amulungu (Namibia), officially opened the meeting, reminding delegates that interpretation was available in English and French for the approximately 500 delegates attending this session held in Windhoek, Namibia. She informed delegates that as the venue was not large enough for the number of delegates present, a live video transmission would be available in a tent adjacent to the venue, from where observers could follow proceedings.
2. The **Chairperson** noted the presence of the Namibian Minister of Education, Arts and Culture the Honourable Katrina Hanse-Himarwa; the Chairperson of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention, Mr Awad Ali Saleh; the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Getachew Engida; and the Secretary of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Ms Cécile Duvelle.
3. Welcoming Mr Engida, the **Chairperson** also recognised the presence of all ministers and dignitaries of the State Parties in attendance, as well as non-States Parties to the Convention, and civil society and thanked them for their attendance, hoping that their stay in Namibia would be pleasant.
4. The **Chairperson** further welcomed the dual presence of the secretary of the Convention Ms Cécile Duvelle and the future Secretary Mr Tim Curtis, who would be taking over Ms Duvelle’s duties as from 1 January 2016. She was glad that both Ms Duvelle and Mr Curtis were present at the tenth session, and that the Committee could count on a smooth handover. Outlining the heavy workload expected during the week, the Chairperson asked delegates to assist the proceedings by keeping their interventions short and precise.
5. The **Chairperson** mentioned that she would require the assistance of her Vice- Chairpersons (Belgium, Brazil, Hungary, India and Tunisia) from time to time and then invited Her Excellency the Namibian Minister of Education, Arts and Culture to address the delegates.
6. Having given a welcoming address the previous evening, **Her Excellency the Namibian Minister of Education, Arts and Culture** once again welcomed the delegates to Namibia with an informal address; she appreciated the presence of the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO who had arrived in Windhoek that morning and hoped that delegates would have a chance to enjoy the sights of Namibia after the meeting.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister for her brief words, and preparatory to declaring the tenth session open, invited the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Mr Engida, to say a few words.
8. **Mr Engida** greeted all present and expressed his gratitude to the Government of Namibia for hosting the meeting, commending them for their efficiency and hospitality. Noting the exceptional beauty of Namibia, Mr Engida thanked delegates for their attendance and commented how encouraging it was to see representatives from so many African countries present, and how important it was to have deliberations covering African traditions, knowledge and skills in order to preserve them for future generations. Mentioning the 2003 Convention as a pioneering, human-centred and forward-looking instrument strongly supported by UNESCO member states, Mr Engida extended a particular welcome to Kuwait and the Marshall Islands, who had joined the Intangible Cultural Heritage family during the current year.
9. **Mr Engida** mentioned that decisions of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee have substantial responsibilities not only for communities but also at the national and international levels, and that each State Party has a duty to implement the Convention at the national level and to actively cooperate at the international cooperation efforts. Saying that the work of the Committee and efforts of States Parties cannot take place in isolation from the evolving scope of the UN development policy framework, he mentioned that Culture has now been integrated into the international development policy framework, with the UN General Assembly adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, thanks largely to the advocacy efforts of UNESCO.
10. Pointing out the strong links between culture and sustainability, and that safeguarding of living heritage practices is important both for communities’ cultural identities and as invaluable storehouses of knowledge, he felt it was timely that this session of the Committee would examine the amendment of the Operational Directives in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. He assured the meeting that efforts to highlight the roles of Intangible Cultural Heritage are being pursued by UNESCO, a case in point being UNESCO’s participation in the UN’s 2016 Conference on Housing and Sustainable Development focusing on policy frameworks for sustainable urban development practices, including safeguarding cultural heritages.
11. Mention was made of the destruction of priceless cultural heritage in the Middle East, and the demotion of monuments and sites that was also destroying living traditions and practices. **Mr Engida** pointed out that living heritage could not be disconnected from the communities that served as its bearers and practitioners and that those events had reiterated the need for protection of communities so that traditions and customs could continue to be transmitted to younger generation.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO for his words, and declared the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage, open. She then asked the Secretary for guidance on practical matters during the forthcoming sessions.
13. The **Secretary** in her turn greeted the delegates, saying how pleased she was to be with them; she then announced that the audio and video recordings of the proceedings would be made available through the website of the 2003 Convention so that those who were not present in the meeting could also follow the discussion of the Committee; the code for Wi-Fi connection was also communicated to the participants. Ms Duvelle then welcomed representatives of the press, whom she informed of a dedicated press room with access to computers and Wi-Fi connectivity. As part of the environmentally friendly measures, the Secretary said that hard paper copy of the working documents was being made available only on request for members of the Committee. All other participants were invited to download them from the website of the 2003 Convention[[1]](#footnote-2) or to use the flash drives kindly provided by the host country. Ms Duvelle mentioned that copies of the 2014 version of the Basic texts in English and French were distributed to the members of the Committee, which take into account decisions of the previous General Assembly, and copies could also be requested at registration in Arabic, Chinese, Russian and/or Spanish. The Secretary reminded delegates that their identification badges must be worn at all times for security reasons, and mentioning that the meeting consisted of about 500 participants from 110 countries, asked them to please register if that had not already been done, as the list of participants would be updated the following day and those who would not have picked up the badge would be removed from the list. Finally, the Secretary gave information on the distribution of daily subsistence allowance to those who benefitted from the financial assistance of UNESCO to participate in the meeting and concluded her presentation by informing participants that coffee and tea were served at the entrance of the meeting room but that there would not be breaks during the session.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, and seeing no requests for the floor for questions on logistical matters, informed delegates that the Rapporteur, Mr Ahmed Aly Morsi of Egypt, was unable to participate at this session and that in accordance with Rule 16.1 of the Rules of Procedure[[2]](#footnote-3), if a Rapporteur is unable to act at any session of the Committee or Bureau or part thereof, his or her function shall be exercised by a Vice-Chairperson from one of the five current Vice-Chairpersons (Belgium, Brazil, Hungary, India and Tunisia), one of whom would be invited to take on the role of Rapporteur. She clarified that the role of the Rapporteur is not burdensome and consists to verify that the decisions taken by the Committee were faithfully recorded by the Secretariat.
15. The delegation of **Belgium** volunteered to act as Rapporteur and the Chairperson thanked Belgium for its spirit of cooperation; the Committee accepted the proposal by acclamation. Responding to the question by the Chairperson, the delegation of Belgium expressed its preference for staying in the delegate’s seat in order to more freely participate in the discussion, rather than joining the podium and this arrangement was accepted by the Chairperson.

**ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Documents [*ITH/15/10.COM/2 Rev*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-2-Rev.-EN.docx)

[*ITH/15/10.COM/INF.2.1 Rev.2*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-INF.2.1-Rev.2-EN.docx)

[*ITH/15/10.COM/INF.2.2 Rev*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-INF.2.2-Rev.2-EN.doc)*****.*****

Decision *10.COM 2*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced Item 2 of the agenda, inviting Ms Duvelle as Secretary to elucidate it.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that the Agenda listed 21 items and several sub-items, totalling 31 items and that these items were either statutory requirements or were follow up to decisions of previous sessions of the Committee or/and the General Assembly. She stated the Committee that all of the documents had been published by the statutory deadline of 2 November 2015, four weeks before the opening of the current session, and that the list of documents could be accessed in document INF.2.2 Rev. She also explained that all documents use the same code, namely: ITH for Intangible Cultural Heritage, /15 for 2015, /10.COM for the tenth session of the Committee, followed by a number corresponding to that of the provisional agenda. The prefix INF is inserted where an information document is provided. In a few cases, documents initially published on 2 November have been supplemented by corrigenda (COR) or addenda (ADD) or a revision (REV), delegates would be informed of such cases. The Secretary mentioned that the webpage of the Convention had been substantially upgraded to allow easier access to information, and invited suggestions to further improve it.
3. The **Secretary** said that the provisional timetable for the five-day session had been adopted by the Bureau of the Committee when it met on 6 October 2015 (INF.2.1). Delegates were asked to adopt the agenda rather than the timetable that was to be adapted as the work of the Committee progressed.
4. *Day 1 (Monday)*: The Timetable of 10.COM opened with 1) Opening; 2) Adoption of the agenda; 3) Observers; 4) Adoption of the summary records of the ninth session, report of the Chairperson of the Committee on the Bureau’s activities, and a report from the Non-Governmental Organisations’ Forum on their meeting from the preceding day; and 5) Amendment to the Rules of Procedure to include provisions governing voting by secret ballot.
5. Items 6.a and 6.b would deal with the examination of the reports of States Parties on the implementation of the Convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, and examination of the reports of States Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the list of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, respectively. Both of these reports are statutorily required. With regard to Item 6.b, the Secretariat received a letter on 29 October 2015 from the National Commission of Viet Nam indicating its wish to transfer an element inscribed in 2011 on the Urgent Safeguarding List, to the Representative List. The same letter requested the Committee to initiate a discussion on the issue of transfer of an element from one list to another, in order to clarify procedures stipulated in paragraph 38 of the Operational Directives[[3]](#footnote-4). The **Secretary** suggested that a debate on this might be incorporated into general discussions held under item (6.b). In the afternoon session, the first item was 6.c which dealt with reports of States Parties on the use of international assistance from the Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (or thereafter the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund); this would be followed by (7.a) Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities (June 2014 to June 2016); and (7.b) a report by the Secretariat on its activities.
6. *Day 2 (Tuesday)*: The morning would open with (8) the Draft Plan for the use of resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2016-2017, followed by (9) Voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, and finally (10) a report by the Evaluation Body on its work in 2015. The afternoon would deal with (10.a) Examination of nominations for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and start (10.b) Examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
7. *Day 3 (Wednesday)*: The **Secretary** indicated that, in addition to Tuesday afternoon, all of Wednesday would be dedicated to (10.b) Examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (morning and afternoon) and to (10.c) Examination of requests for international assistance (afternoon).
8. *Day 4 (Thursday)*: The day’s business would begin with (11) Modification of the name of an inscribed element as proposed by Guatemala, followed by (16) Accreditation of new Non-Governmental Organisations and review of accredited Non-Governmental Organisations, (12) Establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2016 cycle, and (13) Numbers of files submitted for the 2016 cycle, and files that can be treated in the 2017 and 2018 cycles. The Secretary explained that item 16 was proposed to be discussed before item 12 since the decision on maintain or not certain Non-Governmental Organisations might have implications for the election of the Evaluation Body that included seats for accredited NGOs. The afternoon session would be dedicated to draft amendments to the Operational Directives on (14.a) Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage and sustainable development, (14.b) the Referral option and on (14.c) Schedule of Non-Governmental Organisations accreditation.
9. *Day 5 (Friday)*: The **Secretary** outlined the morning session, starting with (15.a) the Expert Meeting on a model code of ethics, followed by (15.b) Guidelines for the treatment of correspondence with regard to periodic reports, and (15.c) Follow-up on the audits and evaluations. For the afternoon session, (17) would determine the date and venue of the eleventh session of the Committee; (18) the election of members of the Bureau for the eleventh session of the Committee; (19) Other business; (20) Adoption of the list of decisions; and finally (21) Closure.
10. The **Secretary** reminded that the Bureau would meet every morning between 09h00 to 09h30 and that the meetings are open to public. She also mentioned that the Secretariat planned a series of presentations on their capacity-building programme between 13h30 to 14h30 every day on regional basis. Further announcement was made on the press conference that would take place at 13h00 on that day. The Secretary concluded by informing participants that a side-event presenting concrete results pertaining to beneficiary communities in southern Africa resulting from past and ongoing UNESCO capacity-building projects, financed by the Government of Flanders and an earmarked contribution from the Government of Norway to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, would take place at the end of the afternoon session (Monday); information on other side-events organised by States were indicated in the programme of the session that is available on the website of the Convention.
11. The **Chairperson** called on the members of the Committee to respect the length of their interventions and avoid speaking more than twice during the same debate. A request was made to complete the relevant form available from the Secretariat or to submit written amendments electronically if members of the Committee wish to propose amendments on the draft decisions. Observers would be invited to speak during a general discussion but would not be permitted to intervene during discussions on the draft decisions. The Chairperson went on to explain that even though nine hours of debate was planned for nominations and assistance request, only ten minutes could be allocated for each file and that was not ideal. In order to ensure better condition for discussion, she reminded the Committee of the proposal of the Bureau that met on 6 October 2015 and communicated by the Secretariat on 3 November 2015, namely any proposals for debate or amendment on draft decisions on nominations and assistance requests should be made known in advance before the meeting of Bureau at 09h00 on 1 December 2015; after that date draft decisions on nominations for which no request for amendment or debate had been made could be proposed for adoption as a whole instead of paragraph by paragraph. She opened the floor for questions, but there were none. Given there were no comments, the Chairperson declared **Draft Decision 10.COM 2 adopted**.

**ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OBSERVERS**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/3*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-3_EN.doc)

Decision *10.COM 3*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the **Secretary** to give background information on Item 3: Observers. The Secretary began by explaining that this was an annual exercise required by Rules of Procedure. As of this date, two organisations had requested in writing to attend future sessions as observers:

* The *Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization* (ALECSO) requested admission as observer to the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Committee (by Decision 4.COM/4[[4]](#footnote-5), ALECSO was authorised to participate in the fifth, sixth and seventh sessions of the Committee); and
* The *International Centre for Research and Documentation on Oral Traditions and Development of African Languages* (CERDOTOLA), which in October 2015 asked for admission as an observer to the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Committee.

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and given there were no comments, declared **Decision 10.COM 3 adopted** and consequently approving the participation of ALECSO and CERDOTOLA as observers according to their written requests.

**ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE NINTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/4](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-4_EN.docx)*

Decision *10.COM 4*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced Item 4: *Adoption of the Summary Records* of the Committee meeting held in UNESCO Headquarters in Paris from 24 to 28 November 2014, and asked the Secretary to elucidate the item. The Secretary outlined the Item and reminded participants that audio recordings of debates are available on the website of the ninth session[[5]](#footnote-6), and that the current report had been verified against these recordings. In the absence of any interventions, the Chairperson declared **Decision 10.COM 4 adopted**.
2. Before proceeding to Item 5, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee of the outcomes of the Bureau meetings, which in her position as Chairperson she convened on two occasions since the last Committee meeting, the working documents of which are available on the website of the Convention. The first meeting was an electronic consultation held in June 2015 where two international assistance requests (one for US$24,560 submitted by Gabon and the other for US$24,990 submitted by Uganda) were discussed and approved. At the same time, the Bureau examined and approved two emergency assistance requests:

* A request for US$299,972 submitted by Côte d’Ivoire for ‘Inventory of the Intangible Cultural Heritage present in Côte d'Ivoire in view of its urgent safeguarding’. Between 2002 and 2011. Côte d’Ivoire’s efforts in identifying elements of Intangible Cultural Heritage present on its territory were halted by political and military crises during which certain cultural practices were violently supressed. Emergency assistance approved aims to re-state the Intangible Cultural Heritage inventory in Côte d’Ivoire, with a view to its urgent safeguarding contributing to consolidation of peace and stabilisation in the country under the National Programme for Social Cohesion.
* A second request for US$23,908 was submitted by Vanuatu for its proposal on “Safeguarding indigenous vernacular architecture and building knowledge in Vanuatu”. Six important nakamals, (traditional meeting places) were damaged on 13 March 2015 by Cyclone Pam. The emergency assistance would assist with the documentation of pre- and post-cyclone conditions of six significant nakamals, allowing compilation of a set of best safeguarding practices and encouraging revitalisation of skills in building indigenous architecture.

1. On 6 October 2015, members of the Bureau had their first face-to-face meeting at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, where three items were discussed:

* The provisional timetable of this tenth session of the Committee that was presented earlier in the morning was approved.
* A request for international assistance submitted by Sudan for US$174,480 for documentation and inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Republic of the Sudan, a pilot project in Kurdufan and Blue Nile regions. The Committee examined this request during its session in 2014 and decided to delegate its approval of a revised request to its Bureau, which took place on 6 October.
* Three financial assistance requests of up to US$25,000 submitted by Albania, Kenya and Togo, the latter two of which were approved.

1. The **Chairperson** went on to say that the Bureau would convene for a third time on the Friday morning (4 December) to examine a preparatory assistance request of US$7,393 submitted by the Philippines to prepare a nomination for the Urgent Safeguarding List.
2. Given that there were no questions or comments concerning the work of the Bureau, before continuing to Item 5 the **Chairperson** invited Ms Jorijn Neyrinck from the Belgian NGO **Tapis Plein** and Mr Ki Léonce from the Burkinabe NGO **ASAMA** to report on the NGO Forum meeting held the previous day. The Chair reminded that the NGO Forum had been meeting on the eve of Committee sessions every year since 2010, and in Baku in 2013 it was decided to systematically include the outcomes of the Forum in the proceedings of the Committee sessions.
3. Ms **Jorijn Neyrinck** on behalf of the **NGO Forum** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to make a presentation on the outcome of the annual NGO Forum meeting which this time had focused on the questions of ethics under the title ‘Towards a Code of Ethics for Intangible Cultural Heritage NGOs?), as part of the proceedings[[6]](#footnote-7). With a view to contribute to international reflection on the 2003 Convention in relation to ethical questions at different levels, a call for presentations issued by the NGO Forum resulted in four abstracts being selected, followed by a round table debate.
4. Key insights were that dialogue and communication are crucial approaches when dealing with the international field. Challenges tend to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis, with awareness of the roles of communities, groups and individuals in Intangible Cultural Heritage, and the importance of contextualisation and different cultural ethics. Proposals were made for the NGO Forum to focus on questions of governance and equity, which would be taken forward in the coming year. The annual NGO Forum and symposium had over the years developed a tradition of being part of the Intergovernmental Committee meetings, as illustrated by over 70 registrations from over 30 countries of NGOs, communities, researchers, States Parties and members of the national UNESCO Commissions who participated or wished to participate in the previous day’s meeting. Unfortunately, this year due to high travel expenses and some visa difficulties, fewer NGO representatives were able to make it to Windhoek. The **NGO Forum** thanked the Government of Namibia for the opportunity to make contact with ICH activities in the region, and for their generous hosting of the NGO Forum symposium. They stressed their appreciation for the work done by their many colleagues in NGOs in the African region, highlighting the crucial contribution of NGOs in safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage processes with communities, groups and individuals, noting that cooperation with accredited NGOs will be reviewed during the session and decisions made on the relationship with 97 NGOs accredited in 2010. Ms Neyrinck underlined the importance that the Committee’s decision will have on the contribution of NGOs individually and collectively to the work of the governing bodies of the Convention.
5. **Ms Neyrinck** mentioned that 2015 had been an active year for the NGO Forum, with significant progress made. The first international conference of the NGO Forum was held from 6 to 13 June 2015 in Santa Susanna in Catalonia, Spain, kindly hosted by the *Ens De L’Associacionisme Cultural*, where in-depth analysis of the NGO Forum direction took place, as well as possible changes relating to the Operational Directives of the Convention touching directly upon NGOs activities, such as introduction of the evaluation body in 2014 and a review of NGO accreditation. The outcome of the conference was a significant step forward in international collaboration between Intangible Cultural Heritage NGOs related to the Convention: 1) the roles and function of the Forum were made more precise with a shared vision, mission and values, as well as defining nine clear functions; 2) the organisation of the Forum was strengthened by creation of a Steering Committee; and 3) participants analysed how the Forum could potentially improve NGO’s participation in the Evaluation Body, a proposal that will be taken forward by the Steering Committee, bringing greater visibility and information-sharing of existing expertise in the Intangible Cultural Heritage NGOs. Ms Neyrinck said that these proposals were unanimously adopted at the previous day’s forum**.**
6. **Ms Neyrinck** handed over the presentation to **Mr Ki Léonce** of **ASAM**, who elaborated that sustainable development and safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage was the topic of a recent NGO-led event ‘*For Everyone*’ by Museums Galleries Scotland[[7]](#footnote-8), which explored the related strands of sustainable development, identities and human rights. Ethical challenges associated with these themes began to emerge, providing context for the previous day’s Intangible Cultural Heritage NGO Forum symposium on ethics ~~where~~ following some of the most important debates that took place at the 38th session of the General Conference, the Forum expressed its deepest concern for the current and rampant destruction of part of the world’s cultural heritage and therefore the rich intangible heritage so often rooted therein. He assured the Committee that the *Unite4Heritage*[[8]](#footnote-9) campaign of UNESCO could count on the cooperation of the NGOs, whilst not losing sight of slow and often unnoticed processes and contexts putting pressure on and threatening the world’s living heritage. He mentioned that the NGO Forum would be meeting throughout the week, aiming to reinforce activities in the different topics on the Convention’s development currently under scrutiny. He continued that the NGO Forum continues to share its experiences in protecting the Intangible Cultural Heritage through its online journal *#Heritage Alive*[[9]](#footnote-10), and that the Forum’s activities are accessible through their website[[10]](#footnote-11), newsletter and Facebook page[[11]](#footnote-12). He concluded by saying that the NGO Forum had become an indispensable component for the implementation for the 2003 Convention, hoping that the new Steering Committee would facilitate dialogue within the NGO community and becoming a collective voice interacting with and responding to the shared challenges of safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage. Finally, on behalf of the NGO Forum, he expressed gratitude to Indonesia where for the first time a State Party has provided financial support to the Forum.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the NGO Forum for their presentation, and commented on the important role played by civil society in safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage and implementing the Convention at national and international levels, highlighting that the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs was indispensable in identifying and defining Intangible Cultural Heritage within their respective territories The Chairperson noted that [accredited NGOs](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=331) invited by the Intergovernmental Committee to provide advisory services through the years have been instrumental in safeguarding and updating the work of the Convention, and thanked them for their efforts. The Chairperson then moved to Agenda Item 5.

**ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA:**

**AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE TO INCLUDE PROVISIONS GOVERNING VOTING BY SECRET BALLOT**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/5](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-5_EN.docx)*

Decision *10.COM 5*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary Ms Duvelle to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** reminded that this issue was raised during the ninth session of the Committee when the first Evaluation Body was established in 2014 and the Committee deemed that the best way to vote was through secret ballot. Due to this not being reflected in the Rules of Procedure, the Committee suspended Rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure in order to allow a secret ballot at that time. The present Rules of Procedure currently only provide two modalities of voting, namely ‘a show of hands’ and ‘roll-call’ (Rule 39.1 and Rule 39.2 of the Rules of Procedure, respectively). The Committee invited the Secretariat to propose a draft amendment to its Rules of Procedure by introducing secret voting as an accepted method, which amendment is attached to the working document under the item as an annex. The amendment is inspired by the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention and of the UNESCO Executive Board, with close cooperation from the Legal Advisor’s office of UNESCO. Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure states that amendments to the Rules of Procedure may be adopted by consensus or by a two-thirds majority of voting members present and voting.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened the floor to members of the Committee for questions and discussion.
4. The delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the Secretariat’s proposal to introduce voting by secret ballot into the Committee’s Rules of Procedures. Since the draft amendment proposes that the Chairperson be enabled to call for a secret ballot, Turkey believed it would be sufficient to have a proposal for a secret ballot or request by a single member state, and proposed that the suggestion of a two-State proposal be amended to one single State.
5. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed support for the proposed draft amendment to allow secret voting, saying that Belgium would be in favour of any suggestions that would help improve procedures. Regarding the question of one or two States Parties asking for secret ballot, Belgium pointed out that most other rules of procedure at UNESCO require two members, and that Belgium would support keeping the proposed text. Belgium also took the opportunity to thank the Government of Namibia for their hosting skills and the warm welcome extended to all participants. Belgium went on to say that the Committee was dealing with a fast-moving Convention and environment with many challenges and opportunities with cultural issues now being more widely perceived at the global level Taking into account the global threats to cultural diversity and the viability of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, Belgium made a strong plea that the Committee continue to be guided by the spirit of cooperation and consensus.
6. The delegation of **Hungary** thanked the Government of Namibia for hosting the Committee session, and the Secretariat for its hard work. The delegation of Hungary supported the proposal of the delegation of Turkey, and felt that the Chairperson should not have the sole right to decide on holding secret ballots, believing that the issue should be handled between States Parties.
7. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to respond to the three comments.
8. The **Secretary** said it was not her place to have an opinion on the discussion, but recapped what she understood from it. She said an amendment had been received from Turkey dealing with paragraph 39.4 of the Annex to the draft decision in ITH/15/10.COM/5[[12]](#footnote-13); she recalled that Turkey wished to retain the clause relating to the powers of the Chairperson, but would like to change from two or more States, to one. She expressed confusion over Hungary’s input, in that Hungary claimed to support Turkey’s contribution yet proposed to delete the powers of the Chairperson.
9. The delegation of **Hungary** felt they may have not fully understood the Turkish proposal, reiterating that Hungary would favour a single state proposal, but would not favour the phrase ‘if the Chairperson shall so decide’. If a country suggested a secret ballot, and if the Chairperson agreed with it, this would be acceptable to Hungary but not the idea of the Chairperson having the right to decide alone.
10. The **Secretary** summarised the three positions: Belgium wished to keep the original proposal, Turkey wished to reduce the number of state members asking for ballot from two to one; and Hungary approved of one state member but wished to delete the sole capacity of the Chairperson. The Secretary mentioned that the capacity of the Chairperson was normal procedure in all Executive Boards and General Conference proceedings of UNESCO, but that it was the prerogative of the Committee to establish rules as it sees fit. However, as three different proposals for amendment were now on the table, the procedure would have to look starting at the proposal furthest in substance from the original proposal. Following this rule, Hungary’s proposal would be tabled first.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her clarification, and gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire before Hungary, in case the former had further amendments to offer.
12. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** thanked the Government of Namibia for their exceptional welcome. The delegation underlined contradictions between Rules 39.3 and 39.4, asking if paragraph 39.3 remained unchanged and the roll call is automatic; in which situation would a secret vote then be held. Côte d’Ivoire also gave their opinion that at least two States members should request secret ballots.
13. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Côte d’Ivoire’s last point supported that of Belgium, and gave the floor to Hungary.
14. The delegation of **Hungary** clarified their suggestion, saying that ‘or’ be changed to ‘and’ in the sentence ‘or if the Chairperson should so decide’ in paragraph 39.4, and confirmed their conviction that the Chairperson has the right to play a role in the process, but in a co-decision with a member state.
15. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that Hungary’s second proposal, to replace ‘or’ with ’and’ might pose some difficulties as the reading of it suggests that the approval of both would be required, i.e. a minimum of two States Parties as well as the Chairperson, which would give the Chairperson the option of blocking proposals from States Parties. Belgium reaffirmed their proposal to retain two or more States Parties as is generally accepted practice at UNESCO, and that this would not pose practical problems as finding two States members for a secret ballot. Belgium had no issue with striking out the second part of paragraph 39.4 ‘and if the Chairperson shall so decide, as it is the mandate of members of the Committee to ask for a secret vote.
16. The delegation of **Latvia** congratulated the Chairperson on her appointment, and expressed their hope for a fruitful week ahead. Latvia expressed that they were in favour of keeping the wording of the first part of paragraph 39.4 concerning two or more states being able to propose a secret ballot, and gave support to Belgium’s suggestion of deleting ‘or if the chairperson shall so decide’.
17. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the Chairperson on assuming chairpersonship of the Committee and commended her valuable contribution. Thanking the Government of Namibia and the people of Namibia for their hospitality, the Republic of Korea agreed with the Belgian suggestions, saying that considering the desirability of consistency with other intergovernmental committees of UNESCO, it would be better to keep to the original draft decision, namely two States Parties to request a secret ballot, or if the Chairperson shall so decide.
18. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed their gratitude to the Government of Namibia for their reception and thanked the Secretariat for their thoroughness. Brazil supported Belgium’s suggestions of two States requesting a secret ballot and deleting the last part of the paragraph.
19. The delegation of **Nigeria** confirmed that they supported Belgium’s suggestions.
20. The delegation of **Greece** thanked the Government of Namibia for their hospitality and the secretariat for their hard work, supporting the proposal to return to the original phrasing, i.e. with a minimum of two States members voting for a secret ballot, while the views of the Chairperson should be taken into account; in view of Greece such provision would help avoid a situation in which secret ballot would be used to make an easy way out for decisions rather than attempting to find a consensus by debate.
21. The delegation of **Algeria** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the Government of Namibia for their hospitality, and supported the proposal of Belgium to keep the reference to a minimum of two States being required, but also wished to delete the reference to the Chairperson.
22. The delegation of **Turkey**, saying they were in pursuit of a consensus, proposed an amendment to the first phrase with ‘a decision shall be voted by secret ballot whenever a State Party requests to be supported or seconded by at least one other State member’, pointing out that, with the Chairperson already represented in the Committee, this was not about the power of the Chairperson but a way to find a consensus.
23. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Government of Namibia, and expressed their support of the proposal made by Belgium, i.e. the requirement for a minimum of two States members and deletion of the rest of the sentence referring to the Chairperson.
24. At this point, the **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to summarise the inputs from the Committee.
25. The **Secretary** repeated that the first thing to do would be to determine whether two-thirds of members of the Committee agreed on what the consensus is, i.e. to delete the last part of the sentence ‘or if the Chairperson should decide’ in paragraph 39.4, and that once that had been decided, the formulation of the first part of the sentence would become easier.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, saying it was now necessary to establish the degree of consensus amongst the Committee to change the draft text of paragraph 39.4 to: ‘A decision shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more States Members shall so request’, before moving on to the Turkish amendment. Noting a general nodding of heads, the Chairperson declared that the amendment to delete the last part of the draft decision ‘If the Chairperson shall so decide’ appeared to be generally acceptable. Moving on to Turkey’s suggestion on the last part of the paragraph that this should read ‘seconded by at least one other States Member, the Chairperson asked for opinions on the Turkish amendment.
27. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** intervened, saying they still saw a problem of inconsistency between paragraphs 39.3 and 39.4.
28. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary for clarification on Côte d’Ivoire’s intervention.
29. The **Secretary** agreed that an important point had been raised by Côte d’Ivoire, and that it was necessary to establish an order of priority in order for a secret ballot to have greater validity than a roll call or show of hands. Should two or more states ask for a roll call but one or more states ask for secret ballot, then priority would be given to the secret ballot.
30. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** agreed that priority should be given to a secret ballot.
31. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to change the text to accommodate the wishes of Côte d’Ivoire, whilst enquiring if the Committee could accept the Turkish amendment.
32. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked Côte d’Ivoire for noting the problem of the hierarchical order, and agreed with the Secretary. Belgium continued that with regard Turkey’s proposal, differences between the current text and that proposed by Turkey didn’t appear to be different, and asked for clarification.
33. The **Chairperson** invited Turkey to clarify their amendment to paragraph 39.4 inasmuch as in that way it would not be consistent with paragraph 39.3.
34. The delegation of **Turkey** replied that in their opinion it should be the prerogative of any States Party to propose a secret vote, and that it didn’t matter how many States Parties seconded or supported such a proposal, given that it should only be necessary to have one State Party make the proposal, seconded by at least one other party and that if Belgium agreed, paragraph 39.3 could be amended in the same way.
35. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** greeted the meeting, and supported the amendment suggested by Turkey.
36. The delegation of **Belgium** said that in the original wording of ‘if requested by two or more States members’, in reality this referred to one State Party asking for a secret vote then being seconded, and in Belgium’s view this request did not have to be made by two States Parties at the same time, as in reality, one proposes and one seconds. Belgium continued by saying that they didn’t see any difference between the two wordings, in effect agreeing with both.
37. The delegation of **Turkey** clarified that there was no disagreement, and said that Turkey was happy to hear from other States Parties and was willing to go along with a majority decision.
38. The **Chairperson** pointed out that the suggestions and amendments by Belgium, Turkey and the context of the original text were essentially in agreement, and asked for consensus in order for the meeting to be moved forward.
39. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** suggested a text in French for paragraph 39.3 that should read ‘a vote by roll-call shall also be taken if it is requested by two or more States Members of the Committee before the voting begins. A decision shall be automatically voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more States Members shall so request’.
40. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire, and returned the focus of the discussion to the unfinished business of finding consensus on the wording of paragraph 39.4.
41. The delegation of **Nigeria** felt that, since the original text was essentially the same as Turkey’s amendment, it would be best to adopt the original text.
42. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if there were any objections to the original text; receiving none, the Chairperson confirmed that the original text would be retained. While waiting for the amendment suggested by Côte d’Ivoire to be shown on screen, the Chairperson asked the Committee if there were any other amendments to the parts of the Rules of Procedure under discussion. Noting a point of order from Turkey, the floor was given to Turkey.
43. The delegation of **Turkey,** as a point of order, reminded the Chairperson that it had been agreed to delete the second part of paragraph 39.4.
44. The **Chairperson** confirmed the deletion of the second part of the phrase, and asked the Secretary to comment on the amendment proposed by Côte d’Ivoire.
45. The **Secretary** thanked Côte d’Ivoire, agreeing that the English and French translations of the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure were not the same, as in the English version the reference to the ‘automatic voting’ by roll call is not made and that as per the Côte d’Ivoire amendment the reference in the French version of paragraph 39.3 would be removed while the English version would remain unchanged. Moving on to paragraph 39.4, the Secretary indicated that the first part of the sentence would be retained, with the insertion of ‘the vote by secret ballot shall prevail over any other proposed voting conduct’.
46. The **Chairperson** enquired of the Committee whether consensus had been reached.
47. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Chair, clarifying that it was in the French version of the text where they suggested there was an issue with wording, as a verb was missing.
48. The **Chairperson** asked if it was acceptable for the Secretariat to adjust the English and French texts and to revisit the amendments again on Friday.
49. The **Secretary** pointed out that there was a procedural issue to be considered, in that the amendment had to be adopted in order to apply it to this session of the Committee. Noting that the Committee appeared to agree on the substance of the amendment it was just the outstanding issue of the secret voting that remained. The Secretary noted that as the meeting had to agree on appropriate wording in both French and English, a possibility would be to adopt the French version and then ensure that the English version matched it.
50. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the French text was the correct one and that, as the issue was with the English version the French version would be adopted and the English would be corrected.
51. The delegation of **Belgium** apologised for making a final clarification, pointing out that the phrase in the French text ‘could be considered’ (when two State Parties request a secret ballot) is problematic, and that it should be the English version that should be adopted and then translated into French, rather than the contrary; in other words, a roll-call vote would be requested by at least two member States before the vote begins, and then proceed to secret ballot whenever two or more States Members request it.
52. The **Secretariat** then proposed a text in French that reads for Rule 39.3 ‘A vote by roll-call shall also be taken if it is requested by two or more States Members of the Committee before the voting begins’, and for Rule 39.4 ‘A decision shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more States Members shall so request. [The vote by secret ballot shall prevail over any other proposed voting conduct]’.
53. The **Chairperson** concluded by noting that everyone agreed with both the English and French texts, there were no objections, and the annex was adopted as amended. Proceeding to the adoption of the Decision itself with no objections, the Chairpersondeclared **Decision 10.COM 5 adopted**.

**ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA: REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES**

**ITEM 6.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATE PARTIES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION CONVENTION and on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/6.a*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-6.a_EN.docx)

Decision *10.COM 6*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced Agenda Item 6.a and invited the Secretary to present it.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the task of the Committee was to examine the twenty-four periodic reports submitted by States Parties in the current cycle and to provide its own synthetic report to the General Assembly (the Annex to document ITH/15/10.COM/6.a), which provides a general overview of the 2015 periodic reports as well as measures taken by reporting States to implement the 2003 Convention. She indicated that the table in paragraph 7 of the document showed the status concerning the 48 States expected to report in the current year, saying that the Secretariat had tried to support them in completing Form ICH-10 with the provision of an additional guidance note, yet despite this a total of 24 or half of the States are currently overdue with their reports, of whom 15 are more than one year overdue. She said that this was a recurring problem which attracted the attention of previous sessions of the Committee and that the present Committee might wish to discuss further in order to find solutions (for example, looking at the possibility of abstaining from examining new nominations from these States).
3. As in the previous cycle, in addition to an overview of topics covered by reports presented in Part II of the Annex, in Part III the Secretariat provided an in-depth cumulative analysis focussed this year on transmission and education, covering all reports submitted thus far. It was proposed that the cumulative focus for the 2016 cycle should be on measures taken by States Parties to integrate Intangible Cultural Heritage and its safeguarding into cultural and other policies. For the first time, the Secretariat had included a new method of including an abstract for each of the reports (the 24 abstracts are presented in Part V of the Annex and are available on the website of the Convention[[13]](#footnote-14)), which would become the norm for following cycles and would be applied retroactively to reports already examined by previous sessions of the Committee. Also for the first time, the Committee had been asked to examine a report submitted by a State non party to the Convention, the Russian Federation, on two elements inscribed on the Representative List in 2008, an overview of the report is provided in Annex II. The draft decision proposed by the Secretariat for attention of the Committee emphasised some trends and addressed several topics raised in Annex I.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her presentation, reaffirming that the main challenge pertaining to the document under question is that a high number of States Parties do not manage to submit their periodic reports, which hinders the Committee in performing its function. She then opened the floor for debate.
5. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked all States Parties who had submitted their reports on time, affirming that the documentation was a substantial source of information on global experiences in implementing the Convention. The delegation wished to highlight three points:
6. Regretting the fact that certain reports had not been submitted, the delegation of Latvia wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the need to consider possible remedial measures such as the possibility of abstaining from examining nominations from those countries that did not submit their periodic reports in time. The delegation also wished to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that certain nominations from countries not yet submitting periodic reports might be of concern, as they are among those due to be examined in 2016 (the list was proposed in Item 13 of the current agenda).
7. The delegation of Latvia thanked the Secretariat for supporting States Parties in their reporting exercises and their initiative in proposing a summary for every report, believing that by providing summaries in both working languages of the Committee would increase readership. As for the current report, namely parts a), b) and c), the delegation suggested that it could have been more informative if States Parties had been identified when giving examples of particular types of cases, so that detailed information in States’ periodic reports could be more easily accessed, which is why Latvia has proposed an amendment to the draft decision.
8. Finally, the Latvian delegation thanked the Secretariat for preparing overviews of reports that had been received as well as the in-depth summaries of transmission and education issues. The delegation was also in favour of the theme proposed for 2016, namely dealing with the integration of safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage in cultural and other policies. As for these thematic reports, taking into consideration that they did not fall within the exact reporting period, Latvia would like to propose that the Secretariat consider the possibility of preparing thematic reports as separate documents in order to facilitate their dissemination, and invited the Secretariat to give them particular visibility on their website.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Secretariat for providing the useful abstracts, noting that paragraph five highlighted the fact that many reports had not been received, thereby preventing the Committee from fulfilling one of its core functions of examining and summarising States Parties’ reports as mentioned in Article 7.f of the Convention[[14]](#footnote-15). The Belgian delegation emphasised that the Convention should not be a static document and that it should be regularly updated. In the event of wishing to move elements from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, and to make a review of the Representative List as mentioned in Operational Directives’ paragraph 40 in which an element shall be removed if it no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription on that list, the Belgian delegation pointed out that the Committee has few applicable instruments at their disposal and that the reports are an important instrument in this regard. The Belgian delegation reiterated that the Committee should take a decision in this regard.
10. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked the Secretariat for their extensive analysis of the States Parties’ reports. Acknowledging difficulties experienced by the Secretariat over several years, the Korean delegation expressed their deep appreciation for the ongoing efforts of the Secretariat in implementing the Convention. The delegation commended States Parties who had submitted their reports and continue their efforts to safeguard Intangible Cultural Heritage elements inscribed on the Representative List. As the matter had been discussed over several years, the delegation believed that major causes of the delays should be identified so that appropriate measures might be developed, for example organising workshops in writing periodic reports in each region in collaboration with UNESCO regional offices and Category II Centres of each region, which might assist States Parties in submitting their reports on time.
11. The **Chairperson** moved the discussion to the lengthy draft decision for which there were a number of draft amendments. The Chairperson proposed that the draft decision be examined paragraph by paragraph and asked if there were any amendments to paragraph 1.
12. The **delegation of Belgium** said that some of the points were related and therefore before proposing an amendment, asked if it was would be possible to see what amendments the Secretariat had received on the whole Decision, which would facilitate discussion while dealing with the document paragraph by paragraph.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for its suggestion.
14. The **Secretary** confirmed that unfortunately some amendments contradict one another in the same paragraph, and suggested that these would be looked at paragraph by paragraph. There were some single amendments which would not pose any difficulty, but other cases had several incompatible amendments in the same paragraph, and would need to be discussed.
15. The **Chairperson** asked for any amendments to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, all of which were adopted without comment.
16. The **Chairperson** asked for amendments to paragraph 4.
17. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed an amendment to remove ‘and’ between ‘current cycle’ and ‘invites’ and replace it with a comma, and to add ‘and encourages States Parties to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations’ at the end of the paragraph.
18. The delegation of **Latvia** also felt that paragraph 4 was the appropriate focus for the Committee to pronounce on the issue of late reporting, and that the delegation would suggest stronger measures towards not examining new proposals from States Parties that were late in submitting their reports. Latvia expressed agreement with at least the draft proposal by Belgium.
19. The delegation of **Brazil** did not support the proposed amendment, saying they preferred the Korean proposal of having training workshops before taking further punitive steps; if these did not achieve the desired results, then harder measures could be adopted.
20. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to support the Brazilian proposal, without withholding approval for the Belgian proposal and wondered if abstaining from examining nominations would create obligations for the States or penalise the intangible cultural heritage and, if for this reason, that the proposal of Brazil based on that of the Republic of Korea is more effective.
21. The **Chairperson** commented that three States were now not in favour of the Belgian proposal. The delegation of Belgium clarified that their proposal was about encouraging States Parties to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations and this proposal is not contrary to the proposal from the Republic of Korea.
22. The **Secretary** asked Turkey about an amendment proposed by them in paragraph 5 which seemed similar to Belgium’s proposal, and suggested that maybe there would be a way to integrate the Turkish amendment. The Secretary asked if Turkey wished its amendment to be typed out on the screen.
23. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with Belgium in not wishing to over-sanction the States Parties, being agreeable to a degree of encouragement limited to advising and promoting the completion of the reports but not supporting penalisation and said that it was not necessary to transcribe the Turkey’s proposal, as the delegation agreed with Belgium.
24. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any serious objections to the Belgian proposal. With no objections, paragraph 4 as amended by Belgium was adopted.
25. The delegation of **Latvia** wished to comment on paragraph 5, repeating their observation that Latvia would like to see actual States Parties mentioned in the overview and summary of the 2015 reports. Without further objections, paragraph 5 was adopted as amended by Latvia.
26. Paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 were adopted without amendment or discussion.
27. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to add two more terms to paragraph 10, namely ‘research institutes’ and ‘centres of expertise’ after ‘Non-Governmental Organisations’. There was no objection to this, and paragraph 10 was adopted as amended.
28. For the sake of conformity with established language, the delegation of **Turkey** proposed a minor amendment to paragraph 11 where the French ‘informal’ should be changed to ‘non-formal’. There was no objection to the amendment, and paragraph 11 was adopted.
29. The delegation of **Turkey** also proposed an amendment in the form of a new paragraph inserted as 12, reading: ‘Encourages all the States Parties, before submitting their periodic reports, to collaborate actively through bilateral, regional or international exchanges on subjects such as the question of transmission as well as formal and non-formal education, for the safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage’.
30. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee for opinions on the new paragraph.
31. The delegation of **Latvia** felt that the attention being given to formal and non-formal education was probably due to that area being the theme chosen in document ITH/15/10.COM/6.a for more in-depth study. Latvia also felt that bilateral, regional and international cooperation was encouraged at any time and not specifically before submitting periodic reports, and expressed confusion regarding the exact wording proposed by Turkey.
32. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** wanted to ask Turkey why in their amendment they spoke about encouraging States Parties to collaborate actively through bilateral, regional and international exchanges on specific subjects before submitting their periodic reports and not on other issues, wondering why this could not just stop at bilateral collaboration.
33. The delegation of **Tunisia** observed that they supported the proposal, whilst wishing to see specific subject matter deleted.
34. The delegation of **Turkey** clarified that they had proposed the new paragraph to expand instructive engagement between States Parties with less practical experience, allowing a broader sharing of experiences prior to the preparation of reports, as Turkey believed that such regional or bilateral exchanges would increase the capacity of States Parties in cooperating more constructively on their periodic reports and promote greater interaction at all levels.
35. The **Chairperson** asked the delegation of Turkey if they would have any problem with considering the proposals from Tunisia and Côte d’Ivoire to modify the paragraph as mentioned, and Turkey had no objection to the proposed modifications.
36. The **Chairperson** saw no objections to the new paragraph 12 but the delegation of Latvia interceded as they still had difficulty with the phrase ‘before submitting periodic reports’, as they believed that this collaboration should be ongoing, not just before submitting reports and that there were probably two things to be distinguished: whether the aim is to encourage States to cooperate, or to encourage this cooperation to be more reflexive. They suggested that in both cases, the wording should probably be different from that currently proposed.
37. The **Chairperson** summarised Latvia’s input, suggesting that the new paragraph by Turkey should read ‘encourages all States Parties to collaborate actively through bilateral, regional and international exchanges’, and asked if Latvia would accept that wording.
38. The delegation of **Latvia** were in favour of the suggestion, further saying that if there was willingness to have links with periodic reports, the proposal could be completed by saying ‘and encourages to reflect this cooperation within the periodic reports’, or similar.
39. The **Chairperson** handed the floor back to Turkey as the proposer.
40. The delegation of **Turkey** expressed their full agreement with Latvia, with reference especially to their periodic reports and thanked Latvia for improving the content of Turkey’s contribution.
41. The **Chairperson** read out the new paragraph 12 as amended, ‘Encourages all the State Parties to collaborate actively through bilateral, regional and international exchanges, and reflect such cooperation in the periodic reports”. The new paragraph 12 was adopted.
42. The **Chairperson** called for amendments to paragraph13; there were none, and paragraph 13 was adopted.
43. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed a new paragraph 14, saying they welcomed that with Decision 9.COM/5 the correspondence mechanism for the Representative List had been introduced to the periodic reports of the States Parties. Turkey was pleased to see that the Secretariat prepared abstracts summarising these periodic reports, adding that it was also desirable that the Secretariat prepare these abstracts (which would be published online for public access) in conformity with established UN language use. Turkey wished to insert a new paragraph 14 as a reminder that periodic reports submitted in previous cycles were not subject to the correspondence mechanism, suggesting that this would ease the work of the Secretariat in summarising previous reports.
44. The **Chairperson** noted no objections, and the new paragraph 14 as proposed by Turkey, was adopted.
45. Paragraphs ‘new 15 and new 16’ were adopted without amendments.
46. The delegation of **Latvia** proposed a new paragraph 17 as a matter of procedure, inviting the Secretariat to complete some parts of the overview. The new paragraph 17 read: ‘Delegates its authority to the Bureau to take a decision on revised overview and summaries of 2015 reports of States Parties on the implementation of the convention and on the current status of elements inscribed on the representative list and to submit it to the General Assembly’.
47. There was no objection to new paragraph 17, which was adopted.
48. Without any objections, the Chairperson declared Decision 10.COM 6.a adopted.
49. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that it was now 12h30 and as the agenda had included Item 6.b in the morning session and only Item 6.a had been concluded, Item 6.b would be moved to the afternoon session.
50. The **Secretary** made an announced about a press conference as well as a meeting for expert facilitators of UNESCO’s capacity building programme and another meeting for NGOs that were scheduled during the lunch break. She reminded delegates that registration was ongoing and encourage those who had not registered to do so. She advised that delegates who had received support from the Fund for travel, whether they were members of the Committee, observers or others, to attend a venue to settle administrative matters. The Secretary also reminded the participants about the side event that would take place at the end of that day. She concluded with the information that the meeting would resume at 14h30, but that the meeting room would remain open.

*[Monday, 30 November 2015, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 6.b OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATE PARTIES ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/6.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-6.b_EN.docx)

Decision ***10.COM 6.b***

1. The **Chairperson** opened the afternoon session with Item 6.b - ‘Examination of the reports of State Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding’ and asked the Secretary to present it to the Committee.
2. The **Secretary** began by saying that the Committee’s task was to examine three reports submitted by States Parties on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, namely one ordinary report from Croatia and two extraordinary reports from Guatemala and Uganda respectively, summaries of which were to be submitted to the next session of the General Assembly.
3. The document listed the three reports that the Committee were to examine during the session and tabled seven reports that had been expected in 2013 and 2014 but were not yet submitted by France (on one element) and China (on six elements). The **Secretary** said that the Secretariat had been trying through different correspondence and reminders to obtain these reports without success and that there was no provision in the Convention or the Operational Directives on how to deal with such situations. She thought that the Committee might therefore wish to adopt a similar decision to that taken in the morning session with regard to late periodic reports in Item 6.a.
4. A draft overall decision was proposed by the Secretariat in the document at the end of the introduction for the attention of the Committee, followed by assessments of the three reports and a draft decision for each of them. The Secretariat had summarised the reports on the effectiveness of safeguarding activities, participation of communities in implementing the safeguarding plan and in the reporting process, and the viability of and current risks for the inscribed element.
5. The **Secretary** mentioned that the previous year the Secretariat had mentioned to the Committee a need to discuss procedures to implement paragraph 38 of the Operational Directives concerning the possible transfer of an element from one list to another, in particular from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. On 29 October 2015 the Secretariat had received a letter from the Viet Nam National Commission for UNESCO in which they expressed their wish to transfer an element inscribed in 2011 on the Urgent Safeguarding List, to the Representative List. Viet Nam also asked that the Committee debate this procedure at the current session and the Secretary suggested that Viet Nam might wish to take the floor during the general debate on the item to further explain the situation to the Committee. The Secretary concluded by inviting general comments from the Committee before entering into the substance of the three individual reports.
6. The **Chairperson** suggested a general debate on the agenda item before moving on to the examination of the individual reports and the corresponding draft decision, commenting that there were a number of issues at stake: the submitted reports and their content; the reports not yet submitted and possible actions; and the issue of the transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, and opened the floor for discussion. She encouraged the three submitting states of Croatia, Guatemala and Uganda to intervene if they were present and wished to do so, as well as those States that had not been able to submit, namely France and China.
7. The delegation of **Egypt** started the discussion, pointing out that in the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding there had been always less inscribed elements if compared to the Representative List, and that was the reason why the Committee should assist countries in inscribing elements to that list.
8. The delegation of **Belgium** raised a more general point about safeguarding plans, saying it was time to start reflecting on how these could be updated. Belgium pointed out that on the nomination form, section 3.a questions past and current efforts to safeguard elements and section 3.b is about the proposed safeguarding plan for the element, while the required timetable only covers a period of about four to six years and there is no provision to update the safeguarding plans. A mechanism is required to update safeguarding plans and Belgium proposed a solution whereby, if section 3.b on the nomination form (where safeguarding plans are proposed) is copied into the report, when submitting a report on a specific element a new safeguarding plan could be included in this new section. Belgium suggested that it was time to consider updating the List in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and that perhaps using the report to start a new plan could facilitate this. Belgium felt that urgency cannot be forever, therefore one could expect that at one point some elements could be removed from the Urgent Safeguarding List.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for proposing that the Committee started reflecting on updating the safeguarding plan under sections 3.a and 3.b.
10. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked the Government of Namibia and the Committee for their hospitality and hard work. Responding to possible needs to remove an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List referred to under Chapter I.11 of the Operational Directives, which states that if an element fails to satisfy criteria for inscription on the list it should be removed, a community should be the first body to assess this, after which it can be passed on to the Committee for review and approval. In short, if a community has already agreed that one or two criteria are not satisfied anymore, it would be appropriate for the Committee to agree with the community to move the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked Uganda, for their suggestion that the Committee needed to hear the view of the State Party requesting for the transfer. She asked if Viet Nam was present in the room and gave the floor to the Viet Nam delegation.
12. The delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed their thanks for the hospitality shown to their delegation and congratulated the Chairperson for her appointment while expressing their conviction that that meeting would be successful under her guidance. The delegation raised a point concerning the transfer of an element from one list to another, as it was not specified in either of the specific texts nor the Operational Directives apart from paragraph 38 that allows transfer from one list to another if deemed necessary by a community and if a State so requests it. The Viet Nam delegation said they wanted to request the transfer of the element of Xoan singing from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, pointing out that Xoan singing was inscribed five years ago since which time government, local government and local communities have made tremendous efforts in trying to revitalise, promote and safeguard the element. It has become so popular that it does not meet any of the requirements for urgent safeguarding and it would be appropriate at this time to move it from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. This move was also the wish of the community involved and the delegation hoped that members of the Committee would discuss and endorse the request, thereby acknowledging the efforts in safeguarding and protecting an element which was in need of urgent safeguarding, and this would further encourage Viet Nam in continuing its safeguarding efforts. Viet Nam said that this step would be in conformity with a measure described in the Convention. Regarding procedures, Viet Nam suggested that if the Committee were in agreement, the transfer could be adopted at the eleventh session of the Committee and until that time experts could evaluate the current status of the element and whether it could meet requirements for inscription on the Representative List.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation of Viet Nam for their clear presentation, reminding that the procedure suggested by Viet Nam would allow sufficient time to the Committee to look at the situation and decide only at its eleventh session. The Chairperson then opened the floor for comments.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** said that, after perusal of the Operational Directives, their delegation was of the opinion that under paragraph 38, transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List would be legally possible and they welcomed Viet Nam’s proposal that this should not turn into an automatic inscription but should be done after due examination by the appropriate organs and Committee in a way that would result in eventual adoption, and would also encourage the State Party to reinforce its commitment to achieving higher standards. The delegation was of the opinion that Turkey could recognise such a proposal and incorporate it into the Committee’s decision.
15. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** considered the approach of Viet Nam as being very constructive and the process in this instance of an element’s removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List as an encouraging one. They said it was a positive signal for the element, showing that the community took constructive measures to safeguard it and that now, according to the report from Viet Nam, it could be moved to the Representative List. This positive signal should be encouraged and used as an example for developing specific future procedures. The approach suggested by Viet Nam in taking one more year to consider the case was seen as acceptable, as it gave enough time for analysis and consideration and Kyrgyzstan expressed its support to the approach taken.
16. The delegation of **Latvia** congratulated States Parties that had submitted periodic reports on elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Latvia confirmed that they supported Belgium’s proposal to reflect not only how well specific safeguarding plans had been implemented, but also their update for the future. They also raised the question whether the Committee should take a decision on this in order for the Secretariat to integrate this particular aspect within the report form. Regarding the issue of the transfer of an element from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List, Latvia considered that further such cases might arise in the future and suggested that certain procedures should be agreed upon before examining the first case of Viet Nam. Latvia referred to paragraphs 38 and 39 of the Operational Directives where certain basic provisions already existed, namely the necessity for the consent of the concerned communities for the proposed action and the necessity to respond to all of the criteria set for the Representative List. The delegation of Latvia believed that a separate form would be useful in such cases, where States Parties would be able to respond to criteria required by the Representative List and be able to give more information on how aspects affecting the viability of elements might have changed or are changing over time.
17. The delegation of **Belgium** commended the States Parties for their information and for the discussion on transferring an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List; this activity was one of the main objectives of the Convention and the Committee, so the efforts made by Viet Nam were commendable. With regard to procedure, Belgium felt that there were some aspects of the Operational Directives that, as mentioned by several delegations, would have to be clarified and safeguarding measures would have to be discussed by the Committee in parallel with a review of the process of nomination to the Representative List. Belgium spoke of how in the Operational Directives it was mentioned that procedures and guidelines for nominations needed to be established and asked whether the Operational Directives needed to be changed, or could the Committee work within the existing directives. The delegation mentioned the proposal of the separate form which Belgium found to be an interesting suggestion, concluding that they were very open to possible solutions.
18. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, commenting on Viet Nam’s request, felt it set a very good example in showing how a country’s hard work and efforts to protect intangible cultural heritage in danger could succeed, emphasising that in their opinion this set an exemplary example for States Parties to follow. In this regard, the Korean delegation supported previous comments on the Committee taking more time to review Viet Nam’s proposal.
19. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the Belgian proposal concerning the updating of safeguarding plans and expressed satisfaction with Viet Nam’s efforts in safeguarding the element under discussion. Brazil asked the Secretary what the adequate procedures might be in going forward and to perhaps make a proposal to the General Assembly to help in defining procedures.
20. The delegation of **Namibia** expressed their appreciation of Viet Nam’s work in safeguarding the element and supported the elucidation of a procedure that could be followed in moving an element from one list to another.
21. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to comment on the preceding discussion, particularly on existing procedures to move an element from one list to another and to react to the Belgian proposal about updating existing safeguarding plans.
22. The **Secretary** first addressed the proposal regarding updating of the safeguarding plan to include aspects of progress in the periodic reports, which should not just be reports on plans included in the nomination form at the time of inscription, but should take into consideration any new measures needed after the inscription, for instance if the element, despite implementation, is not yet considered to be viable. This would mean that additional measures would be in the meantime adopted in so updating the safeguarding plans at the time of inscription, and states shall report on any new measures. An element can remain for 10-20 years (or more) on the Urgent Safeguarding List, which is acceptable as intangible cultural heritage can still disappear, despite safeguarding measures taken. Therefore, the suggestion to include a new section in the reporting form where the State must, after every four years following inscription, include not only a report on measures that have been taken but also new measures in an updated safeguarding plan, seemed to be absolutely reasonable and a less onerous procedure than preparing a new nomination.
23. With the issue of transferring an element from one list to another, the **Secretary** was of the opinion that this would be the role of the Committee to discuss in greater detail, as until now the Secretariat had been reviewing the Operational Directives, discussing the issue with Viet Nam and within the Secretariat itself and it appeared that the Operational Directives reflected two different though not contradictory concepts, which were hard to reconcile. The first principle, which has been respected until the present time, is that an element cannot be inscribed on both lists at the same time; that is why there is the possibility to transfer an element in either direction. The second one is that an element is inscribed if a new nomination fulfils all the criteria for the new list. These two principles become complex in light of paragraphs 39 and 40. Paragraph 39 states that removal from a list will be decided by the Committee, not by a State, following assessment of the safeguarding plan and its implementation when there is reason to believe that certain criteria are no longer being fulfilled.
24. There is, however, no information given on how such an assessment might be performed, and the **Secretary** suggested that periodic reports might be one source of information but wondered if they would be an adequate source for Committee to draw conclusions from. If, for instance, after four years on the Urgent Safeguarding List an element can demonstrate that it has implemented effective measures that have made it possible to safeguard the element and therefore that the threat hanging over the element no longer exists, one of the criteria is no longer fulfilled and the Committee can conclude deciding to remove that element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. If however there has been no nomination to the Representative List that should have been submitted by the State 18 months previously predicting that it wants the element to be transferred to the Representative List, then the Committee cannot in the same session remove an element from one list and inscribe it on another. Furthermore, if the Committee had not received a report or something similar in which it was possible to understand whether the element no longer requires to be on Urgent Safeguarding List, then such an element could not be inscribed on the other list, the Representative List in this case, even if a new nomination would fulfil all the criteria, as it could not be on two lists at the same time.
25. The **Secretary** was of the opinion that although the paragraphs are clear and concise, they do not link together well and there were aspects of their interpretation requiring clarification by the Committee. The paragraphs lacked clarity on the order of procedural implementation and time frame, for example when it comes to an element to be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, how the Committee could implement paragraph 39 whilst considering its fit with paragraph 38 in terms of the time frame.
26. The **Secretary** further expressed concern that there might be self-inflicted procedural difficulties ahead, given that permitted annual limits and criteria on the number of nominations permitted had been established but that if an element on the Representative List needed to be moved to the Urgent Safeguarding List, then that nomination should be a priority; but that if the proposal were reversed, would it still be considered as a priority, or permitted above the ceiling?
27. The **Secretary** concluded by reiterating that the individual paragraph of the Operational Directives were logical, but when read collectively were difficult to fit together. Without looking at the issue of the yearly ceiling, she felt that at some point the Committee would have to deal with a situation where a State approaches the Committee regarding transferring an element to another list by lodging a nomination and only after examination or acceptance of safeguarding measures would it be possible to remove it from a list. This could not be an independent assessment and could be seen to be contradictory; with existing directives on when an element fulfils the criteria and can be inscribed, why should its inscription on the Representative List be turned down merely because the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List are still satisfied.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her explanation and opened the floor for discussion.
29. The delegation of **Turkey** felt that there should be no objection to the principle of transferring an element from one list to another in either direction, saying it was obvious that the Committee would need a review mechanism and a formula for decision-making, maybe incorporating a paragraph in the decision recognising that such transfers should be possible and that, without making specific mention of individual countries, the Committee could request the Secretariat to prepare draft modalities of review and decision-making mechanisms and submit them for consideration to the States Parties before the next meeting. Another question was that of Viet Nam, which had made a proposal that the Committee wished to consider in the next session; if the final decision was adjourned until the following year, what would happen to the Viet Nam proposal?
30. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked the Secretary for explaining the complexity of the situation. Returning to their earlier proposal to consider the possibility of creating a separate form for cases concerning transfers from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, Latvia felt that such a form could be based within the existing form for nominations, including a mechanism to deal with issues mentioned in paragraph 39 of the Operational Directives, namely to assess why a nomination would be proposed to the Urgent Safeguarding List and whether or not its situation had changed. This form could allow the Committee to take decisions on whether an element could be transferred from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List and a decision could be taken at the same session of the Committee in one common, single decision. On whether further decisions on this could be made during the next Committee meeting, Latvia believed that such cases should anyhow go through the Evaluation Body so that the Committee decision would be informed by an assessment already carried out by experts within the Evaluation Body. In order to proceed to this already-established process, the existing deadlines for submitting new nominations should be applied. If the Committee wished this processes to be undertaken next spring and if the debate proceeds that far, then the Bureau of the Committee could take the final decision on the exact modalities required.
31. The **Secretary** asked the delegation of Latvia about the special form they had suggested and whether they could consider that a report as those already existing for examination every four years under item 6.b together with a new nomination should be sufficient. This request could be regularised and so no new form would be needed. In reply to the question on the procedure to be followed, the Secretary emphasized that the Operational Directives should be amended, so it must be first examined by the Committee and then approved by the General Assembly. This would take place not earlier than at its session in two year time, and therefore the Committee might wish to think about a special pilot case with Vietnam in between that could pave the way of the future procedure.
32. The delegation of **Turkey** expressed their approval of the Secretary’s words, adding that additional mechanisms and processes to the Secretariat workload should be avoided. Turkey mentioned that even though this was an exceptional situation, there would probably be similar cases in the future that would always be exceptional and recommended that the current Evaluation Body should evaluate the new nomination along with the report on the Urgent Safeguarding List. They added that to save time the process could be accelerated and finalised by correspondence prior to the next General Assembly, if the Rules of Procedure permitted it. If the Secretariat were to advise the States Parties on the methodology to be followed, it could perhaps be adopted by the next General Assembly so that the Committee could have an appropriate decision-making methodology in place. Turkey felt that these cases should be maintained outside the normal ceiling, in that if a case were not considered within the current ceiling it should be considered as an exception outside the standard ceiling.
33. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to comment on the two issues. Firstly, that a mechanism to move an element between the two lists needed to be clarified, requiring time and also amendments to the Operational Directives which would not be possible at the next General Assembly, so by definition would happen at a later time. Belgium suggested that a way forward might be add a paragraph to the decision to the effect that the Committee would continue its reflection on the definition of a new procedure. Secondly, on the current situation of Viet Nam, Belgium was of the opinion that as the situation was complex it would not be possible to draft specific language for this as a pilot case at the current time, suggesting that the Committee should continue reflecting on the case and maybe by the end of the session have a specific point on Viet Nam’s situation allowing discussion on a way forward.
34. The delegation of **Peru** wished to acknowledge the efforts of the Government of Namibia in hosting the conference and for their warm hospitality. Regarding the case of Viet Nam, Peru was encouraged to see this successful example showing that the Urgent Safeguarding List yielded fruit, saying that Viet Nam deserved to be congratulated. Peru agreed that criteria and procedures for transfer between the lists have to be established, pointing out that elements on the Representative List might equally be suffering for whatever reason, and so a procedure has to be devised for transfer in either direction. Peru also felt that the whole of the problem should be looked at, not the creation of a makeshift mechanism that wouldn’t meet today’s needs, especially in the case of elements that were inscribed from the former programme Masterpieces of the Oral and Intangible Heritage of Humanity in 2008 from which 90 elements were automatically transferred to the newly-formed Representative List.
35. The delegation of **Nigeria** supported the Viet Nam request, saying it should stand as a test case using interim measures promoting the element as a success story and accelerating Viet Nam’s request for a seamless transfer, after which permanent procedures could be put in place for future guidance.
36. The delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked members of the Committee expressing support for the general principle of transferring an element from one list to another list. Viet Nam also thanked the delegations supporting Viet Nam’s request, especially those who highlighted the case as a success story. Viet Nam said that they believed that theirs was indeed a success story involving each household, family and village to revitalise and popularise the tradition of Xoan singing. At the time of inscription the element was little-known in Viet Nam, yet after four years of hard effort it was now widespread and popular and no longer met the requirements for the Urgent Safeguarding List. Regarding procedures, Viet Nam’s view was that it would be realistic to have the next year’s Committee examine the periodic report submitted by Viet Nam explaining what it had been done also in order to demonstrate that the element meet the criteria for inscription on the Representative List. Viet Nam believed that transferring the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List would be a positive move and a source of encouragement for Viet Nam and other countries. The Committee would have a year during which the Evaluation Body could evaluate the report from Viet Nam and decide whether the element being removed from the Urgent Safeguarding List met the requirements for the Representative List. Viet Nam also supported Turkey’s comments on this being an exceptional case.
37. The **Chairperson** agreed that moving an element from one list to another, in either direction, was complex and that the Committee needed to establish a mechanism on how to go to about it. Recalling a comment that the Committee should not rush into a decision, the **Chairperson** also asked for clarification on whether the Viet Nam request should be considered separately from the need to identify a clear procedure.
38. The delegation of **Belgium** intervened with a procedural question, wondering if the Committee should be addressing the case of Viet Nam in the decision of this item, as they were considering other reports and it was perhaps not procedural to be taking a decision referring to Viet Nam when there was nothing written in the document, and in the absence of a report by Viet Nam. For that reason it was suggested that the case on Viet Nam be debated as a separate item.
39. The **Chairperson** commented on the debate concerning the issue of the transfer of an element from one list to another being an interesting one, suggesting that as proposed, the Secretariat could draft a decision based on the discussion to be further discussed by the Committee on Friday under Item 19: Other Business. Asking the floor if this was acceptable, she acknowledged consensus shown through a general nodding of heads.
40. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** opined that regarding the procedure, the Committee needed more time to review the mechanism and procedures, nevertheless agreeing with other members that there was a need to consider Viet Nam as a special case. Considering that several other members of the Committee expressed their concern about this, suggested creating an open working group to address the issue for possible inclusion on the agenda item on Amendment of the Operational Directives.
41. The **Chairperson** asked the Korean delegation if they would be amenable to the discussion being included by the Secretariat in their draft decision for other business on Friday, to which Korea agreed. The Chairperson mentioned that there were a number of interventions concerning the report that had not yet been submitted and subsequent actions that the Committee could take, and suggested attending to those when examining the overall decision for the item.
42. The **Chairperson** then moved to the presentation of the three reports before the Committee, first of which was the ordinary report submitted by Croatia on Ojkanje singing and asked the Secretary to introduce the draft decision relating to this report.
43. The **Secretary** informed the meeting that she would proceed immediately to the draft decision proposed for this report. All draft decisions relating to each report consist of a few standard paragraphs as well as specific ones addressing the needs, achievements and challenges for each inscribed element. In the case of the only ordinary report received from this cycle, submitted by Croatia, it should be noted that in paragraph 4 it was proposed to take note of Croatia’s continued efforts in safeguarding Ojkanje singing which was inscribed in 2010, in particular through both traditional and new methods of oral transmission by cultural associations. Paragraphs 5 and 7 highlighted two means by which the reporting State might strengthen its efforts; the Committee might wish to invite the State Party to provide adequate funds to all stakeholders involved in safeguarding the element and to encourage the State Party to explore cooperation with similar elements and communities outside Croatia. The Secretary concluded by saying that the Committee may caution the State Party about the possible adverse aspects of tourism, encouraging it to work with tourism entities in order to avoid denaturation of the element.
44. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and moved to Draft Decision 10.COM 6.b.1[[15]](#footnote-16) on the specific report, proposing that the Committee adopt the draft decision in its entirety unless there were amendments to any of the proposed eight paragraphs; there were none, and **the Chairperson declared Decision 10.COM 6.b.1 was adopted**.
45. The **Chairperson** moved to the two extraordinary reports, starting with that submitted by Guatemala on Paach ceremony, which she asked the Secretary to introduce.
46. The **Secretary** explained that when this element was inscribed in 2013, the Committee requested an extraordinary report (8.COM 7.a.5[[16]](#footnote-17)) to be examined at its tenth session. In paragraph 5 of this draft decision the reporting State was encouraged to fully involve the bearers at all stages of decision-making, while paragraph 6 stated that the Committee may wish to invite the State to identify and adopt new approaches for the transmission of knowledge more adapted to the Maya Mam people. In paragraphs 7 and 8 the reporting State was invited to find sustainable funding for safeguarding the element at the local level, such as the creation of a permanent fund managed by local authorities. Finally, paragraph 9 suggests that subsequent reporting by Guatemala follow the normal four-year cycle from the date of inscription and should therefore be submitted on 15 December 2017.
47. The **Chairperson** moved the discussion to Draft Decision 10.COM 6.b.2, suggesting that if there were no amendments to any of the 10 proposed paragraphs it be adopted in its entirety. There were no objections and **Decision 10.COM 6.b.2 was adopted**. The Secretary moved to the last extraordinary report, submitted by Uganda, and invited the Secretary to present it.
48. The **Secretary** said that at the time of the inscription of the element presented by Uganda (the Empaako tradition of the Batooro, Banyoro, Batuku, Batagwenda and Banyabindi of western Uganda[[17]](#footnote-18)), the Committee had requested that an extraordinary report be examined at the present session. In paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed, the Committee commended the participatory design of the safeguarding plan set up by Uganda to ensure the largest possible community participation, while in paragraph 5 the Committee wished to invite the reporting States to secure funds and ensure financial sustainability for present and future safeguarding activities and in paragraph 6 to encourage it finding solutions to address external factors causing a decline in observance of the practice. As was the case with Guatemala, in paragraph 7 it was suggested that the next report by Uganda follow the normal four-year cycle from the date of inscription, so that it would be expected on 15 December 2017.
49. The **Chairperson** moved to adopt Decision 10.COM 6.b.3; there were no objections and Draft Decision 10.COM 6.b.3 was adopted. Thanking the Committee for their cooperation, the Chairperson moved to the chapeau decision in paragraph 9, namely Decision 10.COM 6.b. There were no objections to paragraphs one to three which were adopted; then the floor was given to Turkey for an amendment.
50. For the sake of uniformity with preceding decisions, the delegation of **Turkey** wished to insert a new paragraph between paragraphs 3 and 4 encouraging States Parties that had not yet submitted their reports to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations.
51. The delegation of **Belgium** agreed with Turkey’s amendment in encouraging consistency with previous decisions, but proposed that this amendment be included as a new paragraph 5 inserted after paragraph 4 in which the Committee would also regret not receiving such reports before encouraging them to submit as proposed by Turkey. The order of the paragraphs would then change to reflect ‘thanking’ in paragraph 3, ‘commending’ in paragraph 4, and ‘regretting’ in paragraph 5.
52. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Belgium supported the Turkish amendment, as amended by Belgium itself, to be arranged as paragraph 5 after paragraph 4.
53. The delegation of **Belgium** said they wished to conform to the inputs of the other delegations, emphasising that the delegation wished to create a new paragraph 5 beginning with the Belgian amendment and then continuing with the Turkish amendment, asking that these be combined into a single paragraph rather than two paragraphs in order to be consistent with previous decisions.
54. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for the clarification, pointing out that paragraph 4 had not yet been adopted. She asked if it could be adopted before proceeding to the amendment by Turkey as amended by Belgium.
55. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** apologised for raising a query regarding paragraph 3 that had been already adopted, specifically the point that the deadline for submission mentioned in paragraph 3 of 15 December was only two weeks away and asking if that was sufficient time for the deadline to be met.
56. The **Chairperson** responded by saying that the Secretariat informed her that that was old information, that those States Parties were aware of the deadline and had accepted it. Returning the discussion to paragraph 4, the Chairperson received no amendments and paragraph 4 was adopted. The new paragraph 5 that included the Turkish amendment as amended by Belgium was also adopted as was paragraph 6. Paragraph 7 was introduced and Belgium took the floor.
57. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to include an amendment to request the Secretariat to include the possibility of updating safeguarding plans proposed in section 3.b of the nomination form ICH-01[[18]](#footnote-19) in the report of a State Party on the current status of elements inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, by including a similar section inspired by section 3.b in the form ICH-11[[19]](#footnote-20). Responding to queries from the Chairperson as to where Belgium wished the new paragraph to be inserted, Belgium preferred the new paragraph to become the new paragraph 7.
58. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium, commenting that the Secretariat would align the French version with the English revised version. The Chairperson read out the new paragraph 7, to which there was no comment or amendment offered, and new paragraph 7 was adopted; there were no further amendments to paragraph 8, which was adopted. The Chairperson **declared Draft Decision 10.COM 6.b adopted**.

**ITEM 6.c OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORTS OF STATE PARTIES ON THE USE OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/6.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-6.c_EN.docx)

Decision *10.COM 6.c*

1. The **Chairperson** opened the session and invited the Secretary to present the item on the use of International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund.
2. The **Secretary** began by reminding the Committee of Article 24.3 of the Convention: ‘The beneficiary State Party shall submit to the Committee a report on the use of the assistance provided for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’. She continued that this was the second year that the Committee had received such reports, covering the period from October 2014 to September 2015. The reporting procedure had been standardised with the introduction of a form that is already being used in most cases, the use of which will in future be mandatory. She told the meeting that the interim report from Mali on the first emergency assistance ever granted, that was approved by the Bureau in October 2013, was part of this document. She explained that despite contextual challenges the project promised early results demonstrating the contribution of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through the consolidation of peace and international community dialogue. The Secretary mentioned that this was a project which, given the current context, they were particularly proud of. Since this document was written, three requests for international assistance had been granted by the Bureau that met on 6 October 2015, namely:

* *Kenya* (US$24,038) for inventory of the living heritage of the semi-nomadic pastoral Samburu community in northern Kenya, particularly in the region of Mount Kulal Biosphere Reserve;
* *Togo* (US$24,950) for a pilot project on the inventory, conservation and enhancement of Togolese traditional musical instruments skills; and
* *Sudan* (US$480,174) for documentation and inventory of its intangible cultural heritage following a Committee decision taken during its ninth session.

1. The **Secretary** concluded that the Committee asked to be kept informed on the use of assistance granted, inviting States to use the standard ICH-04 Report Form***[[20]](#footnote-21)*** to do so. She said that apart from the simple draft decision, what was interesting was seeing what the States accomplished with the international assistance provided.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, saying that before proceeding to the discussion she had been informed that some of the beneficiary States wished to share their experiences and achievements through audio-visual materials brought to the meeting, and asked the countries to be brief due to time constraints.
3. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** thanked the Government of Namibia for the welcome extended to them and the Chairperson for her capable handling of proceedings. The delegation expressed their gratitude to UNESCO for the assistance provided to Burkina Faso in safeguarding and promoting their intangible cultural heritage. Assistance received from UNESCO in 2011 made it possible to initiate an inventory project in 2014 for two out of the 13 administrative regions. This exercise was concluded in 2015 with awareness-raising and involvement of local communities as well as the establishment of the administrative organs of the project, training of members, identification of 97 intangible cultural heritage elements in the pilot area and external assessments of that phase. The main inventorying phase was launched in August 2014 in the presence of the Governors of the 11 regions concerned and with the involvement of the Ministries of Research and Innovation, Higher Education and Territorial Administrations. Training materials were produced and disseminated, awareness was raised amongst communities and an awareness-raising film in each of the country’s eight main languages was produced. According to the delegation, fieldwork would be commencing on 8 December and concluding in February 2016.
4. The delegation of **Burkina Faso** further pointed out that the project enabled them to involve communities, build capacity and to create a website and a dynamic database. Results of the inventory at the local, regional and national levels changed the way intangible cultural heritage is perceived and that Burkina Faso has committed itself to providing adequate human, scientific, material and financial resources needed to face any unexpected events that might arise. It concluded by saying that, despite the difficult socio-political context of the country, it was committed to implement the project as planned, reinforcing interaction between inventorying and promotion of intangible cultural heritage. Decentralisation for the scientific and technological activities is underway, as well as secondary and higher education for better safeguarding and promotion of the country’s intangible cultural heritage.

[Audio-visual presentation by Burkina Faso]

1. Thanking Burkina Faso, the **Chairperson** invited the delegation of Senegal to give their presentation.
2. The delegation of **Senegal** offered its thanks to the Government of Namibia for the excellent working environment, going on to say how proud the meeting in Windhoek made them as Africans and that to them Namibia was a symbol of the new Africa, full of hope and determined to face its challenges. Regarding financial assistance received and mentioning particularly Ms Duvelle of the Secretariat who had visited Senegal, the delegation affirmed that they were grateful to the Secretariat not just for the assistance provided to Senegal, but above all for the constant advice provided through the different stages of the process. It explained that the inventory of traditional music in Senegal proved to be a very enriching experience and the results would have a lasting impact on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Senegal. Above and beyond capacity building brought about by the inventorying exercise and digital storage of data, communities involved in the project showed remarkable enthusiasm, stressing that certain types of traditional music were fast-disappearing under the onslaught of modern music through access to public media. The project helped communities rediscover their cultural heritage. The delegation went on by saying that traditional music in Senegal celebrates birth, marriage and death and that the cycles of life form part of the education of children, providing lessons on the initiation rites of adolescents. The inventory enabled the identification of 72 traditional musical expressions in five regions in northern and southern Senegal, involving 548 people in meetings and workshops, training of 78 stakeholders and produced five local action plans, some of which have started being implemented. A festival for traditional music would be organised in April 2016. It concluded by thanking UNESCO on behalf of local communities, local leaders, non-governmental organisations as well as the State of Senegal for the financial assistance granted.

[Audio-visual presentation by Senegal]

1. Thanking Senegal, the **Chairperson** invited the delegation of Mali to give their presentation.

[Audio-visual presentation by Mali shown concurrently with the oral presentation]

1. The delegation of **Mali** thanked the Government of Namibia and the Chairperson for her involvement and the Secretariat for overseeing implementation of the programme. It said that Mali received financial support from the Convention in 2013 for an inventory project consisting of two phases. The first phase initiated in 2012 was a response to conflict in northern Mali, which caused severe damage to cultural heritage in the region, long before similar situations arose in Syria and Iraq. The delegation underlined that what suffered the most and silently from the crisis was intangible cultural heritage as certain forms of expressions were prohibited and people punished for practising them.
2. At the same time the **Malian** delegation pointed out that the conflict led to a revitalisation of certain rituals and practices, as in communities’ vision of the world there is a strong link between the dead and the living and ancestors have always had a protective role, and that in the time of conflict communities felt the need to consult them. It then gave other examples of elements identified through the inventorying exercise such as music traditions in Kidal, certain in which women come together to express joy in the time of sorrow, agrarian rites, ceremonies related to rainy season and harvests as well as festivals containing practices, which became the subject of prohibition in certain regions. The delegation then talked about the synergies of this project with the reconstruction of the mausoleums carried out under the World Heritage Convention. It explained that an inventory was being dressed on the intangible aspect of traditional masonry, which has a strong link with the building techniques practiced by the communities living around the mausoleums. The delegation further informed the meeting that the second phase of inventorying was being launched for southern Mali in four regions not directly affected by the war. The delegation concluded by thanking again the 2003 Convention and by commending the resilience of communities thriving despite the savage massacres and other damage inflicted on their heritage.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Mali, and gave the floor to Uganda.
4. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked the Secretariat and members of the Committee for the assistance received for the elaboration of a nomination concerning the ‘Madi O’di music and dance’ to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and also for a second one received for inventorying intangible cultural heritage elements of four Ugandan communities. The preparatory assistance was invaluable firstly because it empowered the Madi people to mobilise their youth to embrace O’di learning in schools; secondly, it created ownership by district and local governments to mainstream culture into their district development plans; and lastly, it allowed Uganda to submit a file in time to be considered for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. With the second international assistance received and the participation of communities at all levels and in all processes, a national strategy on inventorying was developed and national awareness was raised. A national inventory of 68 elements was drawn up from these four communities and four elements were also identified as part of these activities. There is now a database of all elements, resources and processes under the Ministry responsible for culture. Uganda appreciated the support it had received and thanked the Madi community who took an active part in the elaboration of the nomination file and continue to embrace their culture and pass it on to younger generations. Uganda concluded by saying it would like to continue to support these communities in their promotion of Uganda’s intangible cultural heritage.

[Audio-visual presentation by Uganda]

1. The **Chairperso**n thanked Uganda, and gave the floor to Uruguay.
2. The delegation of **Uruguay** presented the project ‘Documentation, promotion and dissemination of the Candombe traditional drum calls, expressions of identity of the Sur, Palermo, and Cordón neighbourhoods in the city of Montevideo’***[[21]](#footnote-22)*** financed by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. The delegation started by saying that they had accomplished everything foreseen in the project and that the complete report was available online. It went on by giving information about the lives of the Afro-descended community in Uruguay both before and after this project that was carried out over 18 months. It explained that some three centuries ago, European colonists were taking people from Africa to the New World and Montevideo was the primary destination of the slave trade in the south Atlantic, and at independence more than a third of the population of Uruguay was African. New waves of immigration changed the demographic balance of the country, the sons and daughters of the African population remained poor and their cultural values were dismissed. The various African ethnic groups and nationalities managed to build a distinctive set of cultural practices that retained the pride of their cultural heritage, of which Candombe was the most popular. It took almost two centuries for Uruguay to acknowledge the legacy of the Africans and their families as being part of the Uruguayan culture, and in the last decade the country passed several laws condemning discrimination, racism, and establishing positive policies to empower the Afro-Uruguayan community. One of the first of such actions was the symbolic impact of inscription of Candombe on the Representative List. With financial support of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, the country established a series of measures that today are national policy. The project assembled community leaders and helped to create a Candombe advisory group that has been meeting with national and local authorities with the participation of the Under-Secretary of Education and Culture. This committee, in permanent consultation with representative groups of civil society, has visited every provincial capital and established links with descendants whose social situation have not yet benefited from the new policies. This national activity of Candombe and Candombe leaders created a network that began changing the isolation of those groups in smaller cities with workshops at schools, media presence, political acknowledgment and legacy appropriation. The delegate for Uruguay concluded by saying that Candombe’s place in Uruguayan national and cultural society is secured.
3. The delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed their sincere thanks for assistance provided by the Committee towards protecting and safeguarding indigenous knowledge associated with the ecological environment of the Black Ha Nhi people based in Lao Cai Province. The delegation continued that the project has documented knowledge adapted to the ecological environment of Lao Chai village, assessing the community’s ancestral knowledge on forest protection and its transmission. This practice applies local knowledge in sustainably protecting their environment with the active participation of the local communities. The Viet Nam delegation concluded by expressing their belief that this project would become a useful example for other communities in protecting their forests and water resources.
4. The delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Government of Namibia for its hospitality and the Chairperson for the manner in which she was guiding the Committee. Kenya had received international assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to elaborate a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List concerning practices and traditions associated with the Kit Mikayi shrine of the Seme community in western Kenya. The State Party worked very closely with the community in terms of performance of the rituals and in open air fora. The involvement of the community created awareness especially amongst the young and the State Party is committed to safeguard these practices for the benefit of future generations. The Kenyan delegate said that safeguarding measures involving communities were devised with the Kisumu County with whom they worked closely to safeguard this element nominated for the Urgent Safeguarding List for the next cycle and for which the delegation was hoping for favourable consideration.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked delegations that had shared their experiences, and conveyed that the Committee appreciated proof of what the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund brought to countries and communities. There were no requests for floor, and the Chairperson moved to draft decision 10.COM 6.c.
6. The delegation of **Turkey** expressed their recognition and appreciation for work achieved in this area, saying that as a fundamental issue falling within the mandate of UNESCO they would have preferred to have seen hundreds, rather than seven or eight beneficiary States and that every year UNESCO should be flooded with small but visible success stories. With so many rituals facing extinction in different parts of the world, Turkey felt that this is an area where the legacy of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage would be sustained in the future and would become one of UNESCO’s flagships. The delegate of Turkey expressed the wish for a wider geographical spread of funding requests and more assistance becoming available, which would result in more examples of intangible cultural heritage being safeguarded. In this vein they wished to introduce a new paragraph 9, by which encouraging increasing voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund with a view to supporting those States Parties in need of technical and financial assistance to prepare and develop their national inventories. Turkey concluded by expressing their hope that colleagues and other members would promote the idea, encouraging countries to give more voluntary funds to allow the Secretariat to expand its scope and number of activities.
7. The **Secretary**, while not wishing to oppose the very welcome proposal from Turkey, suggested a slightly different wording as the Convention does not speak of ‘national inventory’, but ‘inventory of intangible cultural heritage at the national level’.
8. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the Secretariat’s suggestion, with an inclusion of ‘also’ in the amendment, and with no further comments or objections the Chairperson declared **Decision 10.COM 6.c adopted as amended**.

**ITEM 7.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON ITS ACTIVITIES (JUNE 2014 TO JUNE 2016)**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/7.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-7.a_EN.docx)*

Decision *10.COM 7.a*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the next the item, the report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities from June 2014 to June 2016 and invited the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** began by reminding that in accordance with Article 30 of the Convention the Committee is to submit a report of its activities to the General Assembly at each of its sessions, so that the current report would be submitted to the General Assembly at its sixth session in June 2016 and would also be brought to the attention of the next session of the General Conference of UNESCO in 2017. Since the report covered activities undertaken before October 2015, it needed to be completed with activities of the Committee between the time of the writing of the report in October 2015 and the next session of the General Assembly in June 2016. The Secretary pointed out that this was a short document, aligning with the requirement of the General Conference that documents should be no longer than six pages. The report should be read in tandem with the financial report of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (annex to document [ITH/15/10.COM/8](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-8_EN.docx)), the follow-up on the audits and evaluations (document [ITH/15/10.COM/15.c](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-15.c_EN.docx)) and on two documents related to periodic reporting ([ITH/15/10.COM/6.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-6.a_EN.docx) and [ITH/15/10.COM/6.b](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-6.b_EN.docx)).
3. The **Secretary** went on by explaining that the document started with some basic information on the composition of the Committee, its Bureau and the Evaluation Body and was organised according to the different functions of the Committee set out under Article 7 of the Convention. She mentioned that when drafting the documents of the current Committee session particular care was taken to distinguish between the decision-making activities of the Committee in this report (7.a) and activities undertaken by the Secretariat to implement the decisions of the Committee in the report of the Secretariat (7.b). The draft decision proposed that that the Committee delegates to its Bureau the authority to approve the final report of the Committee, as in previous years.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, and opened the floor for comments.
5. The delegation of **Nigeria** mentioned an omission in the previous decision (Decision 10.COM 6.c), in that Senegal had benefitted from assistance but was not commended as other States that received assistance.
6. The **Secretary**, advised that that the two States mentioned and commended in the decision had benefitted from international assistance that resulted in submission of a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List, which was not the case of Senegal.
7. The delegation of **Nigeria** thanked the Secretary for their clarification.
8. The **Chairperson** moved to draft decision 10.COM 7.a.
9. The delegation of **Turkey**, with the aim to promote further ratification of the Convention, proposed a new paragraph inviting the Director-General to write to all Members States not party to the Convention, inviting them to ratify it. Turkey suggested that a new paragraph be inserted between paragraphs 3 and 4 in this regard.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and sought clarification concerning the new paragraph 4. Turkey mentioned that that the Director-General would be ‘requested’, yet the text submitted to the Secretariat was the Director-General being ‘advised’.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** apologised for the observed discrepancy between their draft and what was conveyed to the Secretariat, repeating that their request was for the Director-General to invite the Members States not party to the Convention through a written appeal to ratify.
12. The delegation of **Peru**, saying that the Committee should have a proactive approach towards countries that have not yet ratified the Convention and even though they found Turkey’s proposal interesting, expressed its wish to hear from the Secretariat on the traditional mechanisms used to call upon Members States not party to the Convention to ratify the Convention, as the paragraph suggested by Turkey seemed to be outside the usual scope of the Committee’s work.
13. The **Secretary** explained that their strategy to ratification to the Convention consisted of meetings, training and workshops, bringing together Members States not party to the Convention, sometimes with existing States Parties, to convince them of the benefits of becoming a member of the Convention. She mentioned work undertaken with the Category 2 centre in CRIHAB, to encourage ratification of some specific countries such as Australia, New Zealand and Pacific States. The Secretariat thought it was too optimistic to expect States to ratify as a result of letters sent repeating that a proactive strategy was employed working through workshops, sessions, role-play and strategizing arguments to convince Members States not party. The Secretary mentioned that certain States do not ratify due to specific reasons and are impossible to convince through workshops or meetings. Expressing the hope to reach as many ratifications as possible she also reminded the meeting that the 2003 Convention is the most rapidly-ratified convention in the history of UNESCO.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** responded that if there were no objections from the States Parties, it would do no harm to the Convention to retain the paragraph.
15. The **Chairperson** asked whether it was acceptable to have parallel actions promoting the Convention or encouraging ratification.
16. The delegation of **Latvia** returned to the concern expressed by Peru, suggesting that asking the Director-General to contact Members States not party would possibly be confusing as it is currently the role of the UNESCO Secretariat to invite different countries to join the Convention. Latvia went on to say that as the 2003 Convention is one of the most ratified worldwide and therefore there was no specific necessity to include the paragraph.
17. The delegate of **Peru** apologised for raising the topic again, saying that if the Committee wanted to encourage Members States not party, the procedure should not be through the Director-General of UNESCO but through the Secretariat, to strengthen efforts already made in encouraging States to ratify the Convention rather than invoking a specific mechanism such as a letter from the Director-General to States. Peru went on to say that the Committee should maintain a more sustained effort in inviting States to ratify, and the inclusion of a more open-ended paragraph that does not focus only on the Director-General.
18. The **Chairperson** suggested the Committee might want to include something in the decision encouraging the Secretariat to find a language that satisfied Turkey but was inclusive of what Peru was proposing, in that it should not only be around the Director-General, but the Secretariat.
19. The delegation of **Turkey** said that the office of the Director-General should be involved and that in earlier cases the Director-General had approached Members States not party to Conventions, to encourage them. Turkey highlighted that in 2008 the Committee had authorised the Secretariat to incorporated Masterpieces in the Representative List; certain elements originated from Members States not party to the 2003 Convention. Turkey continued by saying that if Latvia and Peru wished to incorporate a paragraph, and instead of asking the Director-General to write a separate letter, where the Committee encouraged Members States not party to consider ratifying the Convention, it would be in agreement with this.
20. The delegation of **Greece** felt that by discussing this issue participants became more aware of the worldwide efforts of the Secretariat. Regarding encouraging more countries to ratify the Convention, Greece suggested keeping both proposals along the lines of Turkey’s suggestion, encouraging the Committee and Secretariat to raise awareness about the Convention among Members States not party. Greece concluded that the efforts of the Secretariat in this regard would be enhanced if Members States not party were reminded about the Convention at the highest level, such as through a letter from the Director-General of UNESCO.
21. The **Chairperson** pointed out that the Committee was still looking for appropriate wording to capture the Turkish amendment within paragraph 3. As it now stood, it welcomed the two States that had ratified the convention since the fifth session of the General Assembly, and encouraged Members States not party to ratify it.
22. The delegation of **Turkey** suggested that Greece formulates what they wanted to be added and requested the Secretariat to continue their activities promoting the early ratification of the Convention.
23. The amendments were shown on the screen, encouraging Members States not party to ratify the Convention and requesting the Secretariat to continue its efforts to promote the ratification. Without any objections the Chairperson declared **Decision 10.COM 7.a adopted as amended**.

**ITEM 7.b OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

**Document** [*ITH/15/10.COM/7.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-7.b_EN.docx)

**Decision** *10.COM 7.b*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the next item and asked the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** of the Convention presented the activities of the Section of Intangible Cultural Heritage section at UNESCO Headquarters and of UNESCO’s field offices from January 2014 to November 2015. The report also included the main achievements presented at the ninth session of the Committee in 2014, and is a cumulative document.
3. The **Secretary** explained that the Section is divided into two units and comprises civil servants and staff on temporary positions. Referring to the latter, she noted that these were precarious job positions that existed solely with the financial support from the Member States. Without such support, the history of the Convention would disappear together with the staff, which are the living memory of the institution and she strongly encouraged States to bear that in mind when they provided contributions. It was important for these contributions to be based on programmes, but also to support a critical mass of staff, which is only maintained through extrabudgetary contributions.
4. The main activities of the Secretariat during 2014-2015 were focused on eight axes, according to the Performance Indicators developed for the Expected Result on the 2003 Convention in the Approved Programme and Budget for 2014–2017 (37C/5***[[22]](#footnote-23)***) which includes the results framework approved by the Bureau of the Committee, in particular pertaining to the ‘Other Functions of the Committee’. These are the Committee functions which the Secretariat carries out on behalf of the Committee through the year based on decisions of the Committee, such as promoting ratification of the Convention.

* Under Performance Indicator 1 the report covered activities aimed at supporting good governance by the governing bodies of the 2003 Convention, including the organization of eighteen statutory meetings in 2014 and 2015: one General Assembly, two meetings of the Committee, two physical meetings of the Bureau plus four electronic consultations, six meetings of the evaluation bodies and three expert meetings requested by the Committee held in Istanbul, Valencia and Paris respectively.
* Performance Indicator 2 was about the capacity-building programme, which is very well considered by the Committee and for which the Secretariat and field offices are heavily involved. Capacity-building activities were initiated or implemented in over 70 countries over the past two years in all regions of the world, including in developed countries in Europe where activities are self-financed by the relevant States. They are the result of close collaboration between the Intangible Cultural Heritage section at Headquarters, field offices and a network of expert facilitators from around the world. Africa as usual received special attention with 26 beneficiary countries receiving assistance during the past biennium. The **Secretary** continued that the current venue was an opportunity to thank all donors who had supported the Secretariat in this effort, thereby allowing the programme to continue while bearing in mind that this support was essential but never enough. The Secretary expressed her appreciation for the amendment proposed by Turkey that had invited additional contributions to address all the needs expressed. She highlighted a number of initiatives from the past two years carried out in accordance with the requests of the Committee:
  1. Comprehensive needs assessments have been introduced during the project development phase. The Secretariat was no longer launching capacity-building projects without prior evaluation mission, which allows national partners to be more specific about their needs and to be more involved and likely to take ownership as active executants as well as beneficiaries. Such assessments had been completed in 10 countries, in particular thanks to the support received from the United Arab Emirates, which have opened a fund dedicated to capacity-building in 8 countries.
  2. As requested by the Committee last year, specific support was provided to countries to assist with developing policies and laws relating to intangible cultural heritage (through specialized training workshops, advisory services, strengthening of the skills of facilitators, enabling them to provide these services, and expansion of the network of facilitators); Algeria had very generously hosted a meeting in September to discuss and update these skills with a particular attention on Africa.
  3. Following recommendations from the evaluation bodies and from the Committee, the establishment of a mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of capacity-building activities has been initiated to be able to know the long-term efficiency of capacity-building activities beyond the short-term results immediately after the completion of activities. For instance, the Secretariat would like to know whether five years after training activities, some participants had changed something in their country, whether some participants had changed their responsibilities to practically apply their new skills and change the reality of the country regarding the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. A workshop was held at UNESCO Headquarters in June 2015 with national partners, expert facilitators, Section at Headquarters and field offices.
  4. The network of facilitators has been strengthened with four regional workshops in Kuwait City, Sofia, Shenzhen and Constantine in order to widen the number of experts available, in particular in Asia and the Pacific, the Caribbean and southern Africa.
  5. Capacity training materials have continuously been adapted because new topics and new approaches emerge. In particular the Secretariat has developed a training unit on the development of policies for intangible cultural heritage and one on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, and updated materials on sustainable development in connection with the objectives of the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development.
  6. Two thematic brochures have been published on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and gender and on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development.

1. Performance Indicator 3 focused on safeguarding plans and measures developed and implemented by Member States. More than 130 safeguarding plans had been prepared and submitted by them during the biennium, including plans incorporated in nominations and requests for international assistance. To help States Parties in the development of safeguarding plans, an *aide*-*memoire* dedicated to international assistance had been prepared in addition to two aide-memoires dedicated to nominations which had previously been launched.
2. Performance Indicator 4 explained the work of the Secretariat in implementing international cooperation mechanisms of the 2003 Convention, in particular nominations and international assistance:

* In 2014 and 2015, 141 files including nominations and international assistance requests had been submitted by States Parties and processed by the Secretariat;
* In accordance with a request from the Committee, the Secretariat implemented a technical assistance mechanism for States Parties wishing to develop requests for international assistance. A first group of eight States Parties, including six from Africa, benefited from this experimental mechanism, the initial results of which were encouraging (three revised requests approved by the Bureau; two cancelled by the national authorities following technical assistance, which is not necessarily a negative result, rather indicating that the national authorities understood that their requests were not in compliance with relevant safeguarding actions; and three under revision for which the Secretariat believes that they could eventually meet the criteria). A training workshop was organised in July 2015 to allow the expert facilitators to clarify what is expected of them under this mechanism.

1. Performance Indicator 5 addressed periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention at the national level. Of the 75 States Parties required to submit a report for consideration during the 2014 and 2015 cycles:

* 51 submitted periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention;
* the Secretariat received 11 reports on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List;
* for the first time, a State non Party submitted a report on its two elements inscribed on the Representative List.
* Since last year, the Secretariat has introduced comprehensive studies made on specific topics: inventories for the 2014 cycle, and transmission and education measures for the 2015 cycle. The Secretariat was working on systematic production of summaries of periodic reports to improve accessibility. It considered as encouraging that twenty reports examined by the Committee in 2014 and seven reports to be considered at this session of the Committee took gender-related issues into account, with the Secretary recalling that the Committee had asked for gender mainstreaming issues to be included within the framework of intangible cultural heritage.

1. Performance Indicator 6 highlighted the growing number of States Parties to the Convention, with five new countries becoming States Parties bringing the total to 163 States Parties. The Secretariat especially welcomed Kuwait and the Marshall Islands, both of which ratified the Convention in 2015.
2. In Performance Indicator 7, the report dealt with the strengthening of important partnerships in implementing the Convention with category 2 centres, United Nations agencies (WIPO, World Bank) and civil society. Progress was being made in two areas, especially:

* support for category 2 centres, noting that a third coordination meeting for these had been held in July 2015; exchange and ongoing support to guide these centres in developing their programmes, including participation in their respective board meetings; renewal of the agreement with the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Latin America (CRESPIAL) in Cusco, Peru; and coordination of evaluations of the International Research Centre on Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (IRCI) in Sakai (Japan) and the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP) in Jeonju (Republic of Korea);
* following two decisions of the Executive Board of UNESCO in 2015 on the role and responsibilities of UNESCO in the field of culture in conflict areas, the Secretariat made special efforts to integrate into emergency responses of the international community capacity-building for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage (for instance the ongoing awareness-raising pilot project in Syria, particularly towards humanitarians working in the field with communities).
* Performance Indicator 8 addressed optimization and operation of knowledge management services for the implementation and effective sharing of information, as well as the improvement of visibility and awareness about intangible cultural heritage. Managing this large amount of information was a huge workload of which the website is only the most visible part. It also involves the internal management of information to allow the Committee and evaluation bodies to carry out their duties.

1. The report stressed that the Secretariat strove to provide the international community with a more favourable environment to encourage international cooperation and better implementation of the Convention at the national level, to the benefit of communities, groups and individuals whose intangible cultural heritage is crucial to their identity and continuity.
2. The Secretariat worked to meet the demands of the Committee in helping the international community consider various cross-cutting thematic areas such as sustainable development, codes of ethics, management of conflicts and disasters and the role of gender, which would be addressed in the following agenda items.
3. The **Secretary** concluded by again pointing out that the Secretariat’s human resource situation remained very precarious, given the significant responsibilities and workload assigned to it. She added that the Committee should bear in mind that it was necessary to either to find a more stable situation for Secretariat, or to decrease the Committee’s expectations of it.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, noted applause from the Committee and opened the floor for discussion.
5. The delegation of **Mongolia** expressed gratitude for the warm welcome received in Namibia and for the organization of the Committee. Mongolia thanked the Secretariat for its continuous help and support, for instance on the safeguarding of Mongolian traditional epic which had swiftly received international assistance as it had been dying out and had been forbidden for 70 years during Soviet rule and was now able to be revitalized. The delegate told the Committee that Mongolia was proud to announce that it now had epic singers and a sub-regional symposium had been organised. Mongolia also benefited from financial assistance from UNESCO for strengthening the implementation of the 2003 Convention. Since 2012, Mongolia has organised every year workshops with experts appointed by UNESCO so as to implement the 2003 Convention. This year, Mongolia held a capacity-building workshop for NGOs in Mongolia. As mentioned earlier, the delegate reminded the Committee that 70 countries had benefited from this form of assistance and that Mongolia was very happy to be one of them.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegation of Mongolia for its appreciative words directed at Mme Duvelle and her team.
7. The delegation of **Niger** wished to warmly thank the Republic of Namibia for its warm welcome and the Secretariat for the relevance of activities undertaken and mentioned in the report. The delegate said that while the report mentioned time and again the issue of capacity-building, he was interested to see to what extent the training of elected officials would be encouraged as more and more countries, especially in Africa, found themselves in a process of decentralization. He confirmed that Niger had seen that there was enthusiasm from those concerned, especially local authorities in the context of the decentralization of local development. It would be interesting to note to which extent that category of persons might be integrated into capacity-building projects so that they could truly take charge of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, which was not simply an opportunity but also a development possibility for local communities.
8. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its sincere appreciation for the clear presentation of the Secretary and for the extensive work of the Secretariat on capacity-building, including new training materials on issues such as policy-making and legislation at the national level, all of which were of benefit to intangible cultural heritage. Regarding Performance Indicator 7, Latvia appreciated the diversity of cooperation carried out by the Secretariat, including collaboration with WIPO, as well as category 2 centres and NGOs, and its efforts to reach fruitful outcomes with these organisations. Latvia highlighted the network of UNESCO chairs cooperating in 11 different countries within the field of intangible cultural heritage mentioned in paragraph 71 of the report. Latvia said that this cooperation would contribute to the implementation of the Convention and, in continuity with decision 9.COM/6 taken during the previous session of the Committee, the delegation invited the Secretariat to continue considering possible forms of cooperation with UNESCO Chairs. Latvia believed that it would be very informative to learn more about the activities and experiences of those eleven countries and proposed that the Secretariat integrate the UNESCO Chairs with actors involved in the Convention’s website thereby providing some initial insight into their work with links to further sources of information. This would contribute to Performance Indicator 8 concerning knowledge management. Latvia was aware of the large amount of work carried out by the Secretariat and understood the limits to possible broadening of cooperation, and concluded by saying that the added visibility given to the aforementioned network of UNESCO Chairs would be very much appreciated.
9. The delegation of **Turkey** concurred with previous speakers in applauding the professionalism of the Secretariat, saying it entirely endorsed the report which it viewed as a transparent sign of good governance and a guideline for States Parties elaborating policies and following up on decisions. Despite this endorsement, Turkey mentioned six minor discrepancies in the report where mention was made to Convention terminology, so in line with the decision of the General Conference and Culture Committee in 2013, it requested the Secretariat to harmonize the report with the working language of the Convention. For example, in paragraph 2 there is a reference to ‘indigenous and endangered languages’, whereas Article 2 of the Convention refers to ‘including language as a vehicle of intangible cultural heritage’. Turkey encouraged States Parties to understand the financial and human resource limits of the Secretariat. Turkey thanked the Secretariat again for its efficiency and transparency and encouraged States Parties to strengthen the Secretariat by making in-kind contributions through secondments, as experience with other departments had proved this to be a useful approach. Turkey commended the experts and staff who had improved the Secretariat’s website, encouraging States Parties without websites to create mirror sites either based on that of the Secretariat, or developing websites suited to national agencies, institutions and/or NGOs, in order to broaden the outreach of UNESCO and the concept of intangible cultural heritage.
10. The delegation of **Namibia** thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive report, reaffirming its commitment to intangible cultural heritage and thanking the Secretariat for assisting Namibia and other States Parties in implementing the Convention through capacity-building programmes. Namibia thanked the Government of Flanders for its financial contribution towards capacity-building of stakeholders in the Namibian cultural sector, saying these were appreciated and requesting that capacity-building be a continuous programme, pending the availability of human and financial resources, catering for staff mobility in Member States. With regard to the expert meeting on intangible cultural heritage and climate change (Decision 8.COM 12) scheduled for 2015, Namibia wanted to know whether there would be further discussions on funding and when this would be implemented. Namibia commended the Secretariat’s efforts in establishing follow-up and evaluation mechanisms for capacity-building activities, looking forward to the finalization of data-collection tools to facilitate the implementation of new mechanisms.
11. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed appreciation of the Secretariat’s hard work despite its situation of limited resources. The Republic of Korea had always been a strong supporter of the capacity-building programme, firmly believing that the programme has strengthened States Parties’ abilities to develop regulations and policies to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. In this vein, the Republic of Korea suggested that the Secretariat invite regional and cluster offices, category 2 centres and accredited NGOs to reflect on the differences of each nation and region during the process of developing and implementing capacity-building strategies.
12. The delegation of **Kuwait** expressed its pleasure at joining the Convention as a State Party and in being able to participate in the tenth session of the Committee in Namibia in this capacity. As a new State Party, Kuwait expressed its desire to contribute to the implementation of the principles of the Convention and to Kuwait’s living cultural heritage. Kuwait thanked the Government of Namibia for its hosting and the Secretariat of UNESCO for organizing the meeting, and wished the Secretary of the Convention, Mme Duvelle, all of the best.
13. The delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its pleasure at being among the States Parties benefiting from the capacity building programme, which had allowed the creation of a UNESCO-trained team. Such orientation could better foster a proper balance between regions and Tunisia suggested that efficacy would be improved if the number of trainers was increased.
14. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that the meeting proposed by Viet Nam and accepted by the Committee on Intangible Cultural Heritage and Climate Change had yet to take place, as unfortunately Viet Nam had experienced administrative difficulties. The idea had not been given up, but was not possible for the time being. The Secretary said that this was a pity, as they had wanted it to take place in conjunction with COP 21, but Viet Nam had been unable to mobilize adequate financing.
15. The **Chairperson**, mentioning that all comments thus far had been in support of the report and the efficiency and transparency of the Secretariat, asked the Committee to adopt Decision 10.COM 7.b as a whole.
16. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to make two minor additions in paragraph 5 after ‘longer-term efforts’, with a proposal to include ‘including human resource contributions in kind’. In paragraph 6 after ‘developing online tools’, Turkey proposed an amendment that read ‘invites States Parties who have not, to create similar or mirror sites expanding UNESCO’s outreach’.
17. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to look at Turkey’s amendment to paragraph 5 and seeing no objections, the amendment was accepted. Comments were invited regarding Turkey’s amendment to paragraph 6.
18. The delegation of **Belgium** had a question regarding paragraph 6, specifically the term ‘mirror sites’, asking whether this meant linking to the UNESCO website or making another website completely.
19. The delegation of **Turkey** suggested that the meaning was flexible, allowing a party to create similar or mirror sites depending on individual technical abilities and wishes of the parties involved.
20. The delegation of **Latvia** wondered whether it might be difficult to make a similar website, as the existing UNESCO one was comprehensive, with substantial content.
21. The delegation of **Peru** found that Turkey’s proposal regarding paragraph 6 was insufficiently clear to be approved at the time, as it could lead to confusion as to what it is requesting States Parties to actually do, and should therefore be deleted.
22. The **Chairperson** advised the Committee that they had now exceeded the time limit for having the services of the translators and wondered whether there should be an adjournment until the following day.
23. The delegation of **Turkey** was agreeable to its proposal being amended ‘to encourage the States who have not developed websites, to use the Secretariat’s website as a reference’. Turkey offered to remove its amendment if it led to difficulties, but felt that this would be a pity as it was valuable for States to learn from the experience of creating their own website, even if it would possibly not be as comprehensive as the Secretariat’s website.
24. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Turkey was willing to withdraw its amendment to paragraph 6. Peru and Belgium declined to comment, and the Chairperson confirmed that the amendment was withdrawn and asked for the adoption of the decision as amended by Turkey in paragraph 5.
25. The delegation of **Latvia** reminded the Chairperson that there was still a small amendment it had proposed to paragraph 7.
26. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee take 10 minutes the following day to complete Decision 7.b. Thanking all for their participation, she declared the meeting adjourned.
27. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that on the following morning the Bureau would meet at 9 a.m., asking the Vice-Chairs – Belgium, Brazil, Hungary, India and Tunisia – and Namibia to please be on time. She cautioned members of the Committee wishing to amend or discuss draft decisions on the following day that they should make it known in advance not later than the time of the Bureau meeting.
28. The **Secretary** made some practical announcements in closing.

*[Tuesday, 1 December 2015, morning session]*

**ITEM 7.b OF THE AGENDA (continued):**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/7.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-7.b_EN.docx)

Decision *10.COM 7.b*

1. The **Chairperson** opened the day’s session, informing the Committee that the Bureau had met that morning to discuss several issues. She reminded that those wishing to submit amendments had to prepare them in advance and submit them no later than 9 a.m., and that this deadline had now passed. She advised that the Bureau had received amendments to eight nominations, details of which would be given as the meeting proceeded with their examination.
2. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the **Secretary** of the Convention for announcements relating to registration and performances when elements would be inscribed.
3. Returning to the previous day’s unfinished business, the **Chairperson** opened discussion on the adoption of Decision 10.COM 7.b, specifically Turkey’s amendment to the last part of paragraph 7. [The amendment was in fact proposed by Latvia and Turkey]
4. The delegation of Turkey advised that it had decided to fully support the proposal, and wished to amend its earlier proposal in a way that would be agreeable to all. Turkey wished to withdraw its former amendment to paragraph 6 in favour of an amendment reading ‘encourages the Secretariat and States Parties to continue exploring the possibilities of further developing online tools to broaden the outreach and networking’.
5. The Chairperson summarized Turkey’s proposed amendment and asked for comments. There were none, and paragraph 6 was adopted. Moving to paragraph 7 there were no objections and paragraph 7 was adopted. With no objections Decision 10.COM 7b was adopted.
6. The delegation of Turkey interjected with a point of order, seeking reassurance that the six discrepancies in terminology already mentioned would be rectified by the Secretariat.
7. The Chairperson thanked Turkey for the reminder, assuring them that the Secretariat would attend to the matter.
8. The Chairperson then closed discussion on the item, advising that Belgium would be chairing the next session on her behalf.

**ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA:**

**DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2016–2017**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/8*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-8_EN.docx)

Decision *10.COM 8*

1. The Vice-Chairperson (Belgium) opened examination of the Item, reminding the audience that the accomplishments of the Committee and the Secretariat over the past two years had been made possible largely with support from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, to which members and non-members of the Committee contribute every year. Noting that members of the Committee were meeting in the session prior to the next session of the General Assembly in June 2016, the Vice-Chairperson reminded them that they had to fulfil one of the Committee’s important functions, as laid down in Article 7 of the Convention, namely to prepare a draft plan for the use of the Fund’s resources, for submission to the General Assembly for approval. The Vice-Chairperson introduced the document ITH/15/10.COM/8 on which the Committee should focus, comprising two parts: (I) a report on the execution of the Plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the period 1 January 2014 to 31 August 2015 and (ii) a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the period 2016-2017 and the first semester of 2018. The Vice-Chairperson invited the Secretary to present the item in more detail.
2. The Secretary explained that, as statutory deadlines demanded the publication of the documents of a Committee session four weeks before the beginning of the session, the financial statements had to be drawn up on 31 August 2015. As work continued as normal after that date, the Secretary clarified that the General Assembly would have access to the financial statements as at 31 December 2015, which should reflect an improvement in spending in that 4-month period. The Secretary recalled the importance for the Committee to be fully aware of this document, despite its technicality, so that its recommendations to the General Assembly would be fully informed.
3. Complementing the introduction by the Vice-Chairperson, the Secretary added that the document contained three annexes and that she would explain any proposed changes to 2016-2017 Plan compared to the 2014-2015 Plan:

* Annex 1 – Draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund as the Committee may wish to introduce it to the General Assembly, presented in percentages since the fund balance on which the plan will be based will only become available on 31 December 2015;
* Annex 2 – Financial Statements of the Fund for the period 1 January 2014 to 31 August 2015 which mirrors the Plan approved by the fifth session of the General Assembly; and
* Annex 3 – Statement of Assessed Contributions as of 31 August 2015.

1. The Secretary reminded the Committee that the Fund’s resources consist of:

* *assessed contributions* from States Parties *compulsory – or voluntary* for those States having declared that they shall not be bound to Article 26.1 of the Convention related to States Parties’ contributions to the Fund –, compromising the largest source of funding;
* *voluntary supplementary contributions*, for States Parties wishing to make specific contributions for specific projects, in addition to their assessed contributions; and
* *interest due* on resources of the Fund, which are fed into the Fund.

1. The Secretary specified that three sub-annexes of Annex II dealt exclusively with additional voluntary contributions: II(a), II(b) and II(c); while two other annexes dealt exclusively with assessed contributions of States Parties: annex III and the Schedule of appropriations and expenditure in Annex II.
2. With regard to assessed contributions, the Secretary informed the Committee that, as of 30 September 2015, the ten largest debtors received reminder letters. At the date of publication of documents, 78 States Parties had not paid their compulsory contribution to the Fund, representing 13% of the total of assessed contributions for 2015. She added that while arrears concerned a significant number of States Parties, it was not a particularly large figure when presented as a percentage of the total assessed.
3. Regarding implementation of the Plan approved by the fifth General Assembly, the Secretary pointed out a drop in the rate of implementation of the Fund compared to the previous biennium when the total budget of the Fund was US$5.85 million and US$2.91 million were spent, that was around 50%. For the 2014-2015 biennium, the total available budget within the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund was US$6.42 million, of which, as at 31 August 2015, US$1.95 million had been spent, equivalent to 30%. The Secretary added that, although an improvement between 31 August and 31 December 2015 could be expected, it would probably be marginal.
4. Recognizing the undesirably low rate of implementation, when seen in light of UNESCO’s desperate funding needs and States Parties’ equally desperate needs of support, the Secretary explained that this situation was almost exclusively related to the very low implementation rate of International Assistance, which was only 3.4 %, while the Fund’s resources earmarked for this purpose accounted for 54 %. Despite the very significant funds available for international assistance, the Secretary regretted that a very small number of States Parties that submitted international assistance requests and received assistance. The Secretary pointed to a second figure for International Assistance, namely preparatory assistance for the elaboration of nominations for the Urgent Safeguarding List, extended by the Committee to the elaboration of international assistance requests. Thanks to the setting up of this new mechanism of technical assistance, the implementation rate of the preparatory assistance (13.4%) is better than that of international assistance but still very unsatisfactory. The two different modalities for International Assistance, namely Preparatory Assistance and International Assistance, constitute 60% of the Fund’s resources and are numerically important but significantly underused, because States do not yet have the capacity to mobilise those funds.
5. The Secretary continued with line 3 of the Plan for the use of the resources of the Fund representing 20 % of its resources earmarked for the ‘other functions of the Committee’ as described in Article 7 of the Convention, which consist mainly in assisting the Committee throughout the year to promote the Convention. The Committee authorizes the Secretariat to implement those activities such as the capacity-building programme or the knowledge management system. The Secretary pointed out that, contrary to international assistance, the implementation rate of that line was 90% at that time, meaning that the amount provided by the Committee for those activities was realistic with regard to what the Secretariat was actually able to implement.
6. The Secretary drew the Committee’s attention to a new line that appeared both for international and preparatory assistance under the title ‘direct administrative expenses’. She explained that that line was created in response to the Committee’s request (Decision 8.COM 11) to consistently apply the cost-recovery policy when using the resources of the Fund. The Secretary recalled that this policy was intended to recover the administrative expenses, mainly relating to the services of UNESCO’s permanent Secretariat, for the implementation of the assistances granted. For transparency purposes, those expenses were included in a separate line.
7. Turning to lines 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Plan, the Secretary recalled that in 2015 the responsibility for evaluating files was not entrusted to two, but a single body. Those lines had been charged, for example, with the fees paid to both the members of the former Consultative Body and the eligible members of the Evaluation Body. However, as this biennium was straddling two configurations, the Secretary considered that it was premature to make cost comparisons although apparently there were no substantial changes.
8. The Secretary then introduces Annex II(a) listing the voluntary contributions received under earmarked activities for the period 1 January 2014 to 31 August 2015 which, although not governed by the plan adopted by the General Assembly, constitute important information for the Committee, as the body accepting those contributions. The Secretary noted that these contributions were of very different amounts and that some of them had been paid under an interesting mechanism set up to charge for services provided by UNESCO in developed countries through contributions to the sub-fund. This was the case, for example, of the Norwegian Centre of Traditional Music and Dance, l’Associazione per la Salvaguardia del Patrimonio Cultural Immateriale, and more recently of the Hamdan Bin Mohammed Heritage Centre in Dubai. These were institutions that had paid UNESCO for capacity-building services in the form of voluntary contributions to the sub-fund for enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat.
9. Finally, the Secretary presented Annex II(b) on specific activities approved by the Committee and drew the Committee’s attention to a deficit in payments of contributions that had been offered by some States and accepted by the Committee but which had not yet been paid. This explained the figure contained in Annex II(b) as ‘funding gap’ and the Secretary added that the draft decision echoed that problem as projects could not be implemented without the corresponding funding. The Secretary distinguished two cases: while some donors confirmed that the funds would not be paid, others informed the Secretariat that funds would be disbursed but that they were not able to unlock them yet. Finally, Annex II(c) showed a forecast, based on the Secretariat’s estimates, for the future use of allocations for ongoing projects, on the basis of funds still unobligated as at 31 August 2015 and project budgets approved by the Committee. The Secretary specified that projects affected by the funding gap were marked with two asterisks in Annex II(c) while one single asterisk referred to projects whose budgets had to be revised following Norway’s announcement of non-payment of the remainder of its contribution as approved by the Committee.
10. While recalling that the financial statements and their annexes had been established by UNESCO’s Bureau of Financial Management, the Secretary moved to the presentation of the Draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund which would be the subject of the Committee’s decision. She explained that Annex I, which contained the Draft plan, also presented, for comparison, the percentages proposed by the Committee in 2013 for 2014-2015 in order to clarify the proposed changes. She reminded the Committee that its proposal to the General Assembly would cover a 24-month period from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017, but adding the period from 1 January to 30 June 2018 since the General Assembly would not be able to approve the next plan until June 2018. In order not to paralyze work, it was therefore necessary to have a provisional approval for the first half of 2018. The Secretary clarified that when the General Assembly would meet in June 2016, it would approve two-year plan, including the first half of 2016 that it had provisionally approved in 2014 and would do the same anticipation exercise for the first half of 2018.
11. The Secretary continued by repeating that, since the amount on which percentages would be based would only be known by 31 December 2015, at the time of the Committee session, only a Draft plan based on percentages could be proposed. The General Assembly, in turn, would be appraised of what the percentage represented with respect to the balance on 31 December 2015, and would therefore decide on absolute amounts and not on percentages. She also recalled that the Plan would only apply to assessed contribution, therefore excluding three type of funds: the cumulative Reserve Fund, the earmarked contributions and the sub-fund used exclusively for enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat.
12. Introducing the different lines of the Draft plan, the Secretary stressed that, once again, the majority of funds would be assigned to International Assistance. Yet, she explained that the balance to which percentages would apply would necessarily be higher than that of 31 December 2013 due to the low implementation rate of the International Assistance which meant that the annual contributions from States Parties were not absorbed in a biennium. Thus, for certain lines for which the Secretariat already knew the expected level of expenditure, it was not necessary to keep the same percentage, which would actually lead to an increased allocation. As an example, the Secretary mentioned the costs of participation of representatives of developing States Members of the Committee (line 4), which were eligible for support by the Fund. Yet, with a Committee composed of 24 States, the Secretariat knew in advance that not more than 18 States would be eligible and could therefore have an idea of the maximum amount needed to cover their participation costs. If the same percentage were to be kept for a higher balance, it could already be anticipated that a significant portion of the funds would remain unspent. This explained why the Secretariat proposed to increase the percentage of certain lines, such as International Assistance or costs of advisory services, and decrease it for others.
13. Concerning the costs of advisory services (line 7), the Secretary clarified that the increase of half a percentage point was not linked to an increase in cost of services but to a difficulty encountered at the beginning of each biennium. Eligible members of the Body must have a contract from the beginning of their work, i.e. for a period from February until the end of the next Committee session. However, on even years, only the budget for the first six months is available to the Secretariat – pending the next session of the General Assembly – which is not enough to cover all contracts for the entire year. The proposed increase therefore resulted from the need to have sufficient liquidity to cover the Evaluation Body contracts on even years.
14. The Secretary went back to line 4 (‘Participation in the sessions of the Committee and its consultative bodies of experts in intangible cultural heritage representing developing states that are Parties to the Convention but not Members of the Committee’) to explain that the proposed reduction was not only related to the fact that the Secretariat had a clear idea of the maximum cost that that line may have to bear, but also to the fact that, with the termination of the Subsidiary Body, participation costs of eligible individuals were now charged to line 5 (‘Participation in the sessions of the Committee and its consultative bodies of experts in intangible cultural heritage representing developing States that are Parties to the Convention but not Members of the Committee’). The Secretary added that even for those lines for which percentages remained unchanged, the absolute available amounts would increase.
15. Concerning the Reserve Fund, the Secretariat recalled that it had been established to meet requests for assistance in cases of extreme urgency, when funds would no longer be available in budget line 1 (‘International Assistance’). Although for now the Fund was still far from this assumption, every year the Reserve Fund increased of 5% of the available resources and was never used. The Secretariat was therefore proposing that, within the Draft plan, the Reserve Fund be increased of a fixed amount (US$24,190) in order to reach US$1 million, which was felt to be sufficient to deal with contingencies that might arise during the biennium.
16. The Secretary noted the paradox existing between the extent of the needs, the availability of funds and the low number of granted assistances. She referred to Article 21 of the Convention dealing with the different forms of international assistance which states that ‘the assistance granted by the Committee’ is ‘governed by the operational directives’ which set out very clear criteria based on which the Committee may grant assistance, and read aloud the forms that international assistance may take:
17. studies concerning various aspects of safeguarding;
18. the provision of experts and practitioners;
19. the training of all necessary staff;
20. the elaboration of standard-setting and other measures;
21. the creation and operation of infrastructures;
22. the supply of equipment and know-how;
23. other forms of financial and technical assistance, including, where appropriate, the granting of low-interest loans and donations.
24. The Secretary concluded that, although the Convention provides for a multitude of possible forms of international assistance from the Fund, thus far the only form being requested and granted was part of that provided in paragraph (g), that was ‘other forms of financial assistance’ as ‘donations’. Indeed, the only assistance granted until that time had resulted in a transfer of funds to the requesting State. Yet, on carefully re-reading of the Convention and its Operational Directives, it became clear that any State Party to the Convention could request assistance in the forms set forth in Article 21 and that, if the assistance requested met the criteria set forth in the Operational Directives, the Committee was entitled to grant that assistance. The Secretary illustrated her argument with the example of the provision of experts or the training of all necessary staff that could arise if a State wished to receive capacity-building services in the field of inventory-making and to be supported by the Fund in that regard. A State would prepare its request by describing the reasons behind it, the Secretariat would prepare a cost estimate for such services and all of these elements would be submitted to the Bureau or the Committee, depending on the amount, which would then decide on the approval of the request. In doing so, the Secretary explained that the Fund could support capacity-building activities implemented by UNESCO for the benefit of a requesting State. The Secretary considered that this more correct interpretation of Article 21 opened the possibility of discharging the States so wishing of the complexity of developing a financial assistance, allowing them to focus on the formulation of real needs and leaving it up to UNESCO to determine figures. She also specified that this modality did not preclude direct financial support to the State but not necessarily for the total amount of the request. The Secretary concluded that this was a big step forward in the way States Parties’ contributions might be usefully spent.
25. The Secretary announced a second prospect that also had the potential to greatly improve the use of the resources of the Fund, which was related to the maximum amount of the requests that could be approved by the Bureau. The Secretary recalled that, until then, requests up to US$25,000 were approved by the Bureau while requests greater than US$25,000 had to be approved by the Committee. She also recalled that files examined by the Committee were subject to an annual ceiling which required certain States having to make a choice between an international assistance request and a nomination. Therefore, the prospect that would be addressed in item 15.c of the agenda would be to increase the maximum amount of requests that would be approved by the Bureau up to US$100,000. In that case, the Bureau would be responsible – throughout the year and with no specific deadline for the submission by States Parties – for the examination of all requests up to US$100,000, regardless of their form, the Committee would focus on requests greater than US$100,000 – with the exception of emergency requests which would continue to be examined by the Bureau – and States would have the chance to see both a request up to US$100,000 and a nomination considered in the same year. The Secretary summarized the two perspectives emphasizing that they were expected to release the funds available for International Assistance, to mitigate the most tedious aspects of applying for International Assistance, allowing more direct support and less red tape for requesting States, without modifying the rules for granting laid down in the Operational Directives nor the fundamental principle that assistance is always requested by a State and must emanate from a need expressed a State through a request.
26. The last subject underlined by the Secretary concerned a particularity of line 3 (‘Other functions of the Committee’), that was subject to its own spending plan prepared by the Secretariat following a results-based approach, and whose approval was delegated by the Committee to the Bureau along with the authorisation for transfers between activities up to a cumulative amount equivalent to 2% of the total initial allocation proposed to the General Assembly for this purpose, a practice which had proved to be extremely useful to implement almost all the planned funds for a biennium.
27. The Vice-Chairperson thanked the Secretary for her detailed, clear and precise explanations and noted that the Committee had had a comprehensive overview of both the execution of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund since 1 January 2014 and the draft plan for the use of its resources for the period 2016-2017 that the Committee had to submit to the General Assembly for approval. Before adopting the draft plan and decision, the Vice-Chairperson recalled that, in accordance with article 5.1 of the Financial Regulations of the Fund, it was the Committee’s prerogative to decide on the use of the resources of the Fund on the basis of the guidelines laid down by the General Assembly and opened a general debate to allow members of the Committee to ask questions which the Secretariat would answer after the debate.
28. The delegation of Côte d’Ivoire again thanked the Government of Namibia for their hospitality and the Secretariat for the quality of their work and their courageous proposals. The delegation expressed concern upon reading the Financial Statements of the Fund as at 31 August 2015 where they saw that only 3% of the funds set aside for International Assistance had been spent, mainly for Africa and the Arab States, while noting that the Secretary had already acknowledged that it was a worrying deficiency. However, considering that low level of spending, the delegation expressed concern about the increase in funds provided for International Assistance in the Draft plan being only 59%, which the delegation considered insufficient. Another point of concern for Côte d’Ivoire was discussed that assistance for the preparation of periodic reports had not been factored in, although the day before the Committee had expressed its concern about their low submission rate. Côte d’Ivoire concluded by stressing the concern, particularly in Africa, over the low rate of implementation of International Assistance.
29. The Vice-Chairperson thanked Côte d’Ivoire, asking if other members of the Committee wished to take the floor.
30. The delegation of Turkey thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive and well-structured report and welcomed the solid balance of the Fund that currently stood at over US$10 million. Turkey understood that budget line 1 of the Fund for International Assistance continued to be underutilised and noted that expenditure on Preparatory Assistance in budget line 2 also remained low. Turkey expressed their appreciation for the Secretariat’s efforts to strengthen States Parties’ capacities for submitting international assistance requests and encouraged their further efforts in this regard. To this end, the delegation of Turkey declared that, as it did in the past, it would continue exploring the possibility of providing contributions for strengthening the human resources of the Secretariat, with a view to increasing its capacity to meet a greater share of technical assistance requests addressed to it by States Parties.
31. The delegation of Belgium was pleased to hear the Secretariat’s proposal of developing new modalities of international assistance involving less bureaucracy and higher efficacy and welcomed the possibility of collaboration between a State expressing its needs and the Secretariat budgeting them. Belgium wondered how soon such a mechanism could be put into practice and whether the Secretariat had already thought of a roadmap or any specific steps to reach this milestone.
32. The Vice-Chairperson thanked delegations who had commented and invited States to ask their questions at that time, before proceeding to the adoption of the decision.
33. The Secretary addressed the query of Côte d’Ivoire, clarifying that there was not an increase of 59% as such, but 59% of the resources of the Fund that would be devoted to International Assistance. The Secretary proposed to refer to figures, although they could only be hypothetical, as actual figures would only be available at the end of the year, once the Fund balance as at 31 December 2015 would be known. The 54% devoted to International Assistance for the 2014-2015 biennium corresponded to US$3.65 million available over that period which, as Côte d’Ivoire had indicated, showed a very low rate of implementation. The Secretary advised that, by proposing a 59%, this figure was likely to increase to US$4.5 million that would become available for International Assistance, which was more than enough to cover the needs. The Secretary continued that if there was a reason for concern, it was not about this percentage but rather about how the Secretariat would explain to States Parties that they might request assistance without having to fill out cumbersome planning and budgetary elements, which was often what made their requests failed. The Secretary added that States needing assistance in preparing periodic reports, as pointed out by Côte d’Ivoire, could actually request international assistance in this regard, by formulating that need based on which the Secretariat would then help in planning and budgeting activities.
34. Answering Belgium’s question the Secretary said that she did not think that the Operational Directives needed to be changed as they referred to ‘international assistance’, rather than ‘financial assistance’. Nonetheless it was clear that the relevant forms needed to be changed, as they mixed the different forms of international assistance while appearing to imply that it was only financial assistance that could be requested through them. She sensed that perhaps it would be necessary to develop two different forms, with one form resembling the current form devoted only to financial assistance, and another form which would not request budget details for all forms of assistance other than that provided for in paragraph g of Article 21. Since the request must be signed by a State but the State cannot take responsibility for figures provided by UNESCO, what required further reflection was a kind of second form, endorsed in that case by the Secretariat, to be submitted, along with the State’s request, to the Bureau or the Committee, depending on the requested amount, and which together would constitute a request for services for an amount to be calculated and proposed by UNESCO. In the opinion of the Secretary there would be no need to change criteria for granting of assistance in the Operational Directives, as they reflected eligibility as laid out in the Convention. Regarding deadlines, the Secretariat would have liked to present new forms during the current session but did not have sufficient time. The Secretary said that it was now a top priority since, in fact, some States had already expressed such needs, including capacity-building, and that the Secretariat had replied that, in principle, at the beginning of the following year, this new modality could be tested with them. However, the Committee’s position on item 15.c regarding the maximum amount of requests that could be examined by the Bureau, would also have a big impact on the procedure since the deadline of 31 March would no longer apply to requests up to US$100,000 which would leave a little room for setting up the procedure, for example the first half of 2016.
35. The Vice-Chairperson believed careful consideration had been given to the question and that the Committee was ready to turn to the draft decision.
36. The delegation of Senegal recalled that it had already welcomed the previous day the support and advice, in terms of assistance to States Parties, provided by the Secretariat which helped them to have better chance of receiving international assistance. The delegation believed that the diversification of possibilities of assistance proposed by the Secretariat should further help States in formulating a greater number of international assistance requests. While Senegal agreed that States Parties should be able to tell UNESCO what their needs are, that UNESCO would put a cost on them and would transmit the request to the decision-making body for a rapid granting. However, the delegate suggested that, before submitting the request, UNESCO should verify the estimated budget with the State Party concerned to see if the proposed budget would meet its requirements, as in reality the needs of each country would vary. Seeing the Secretary acquiesce, the delegate understood that this would be the actual practice.
37. The delegation of Philippines thanked the Government of Namibia for their gracious hosting and the Secretary for the comprehensive presentation. Philippines noted that the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention was unique in having funds and capacity to assist developing States and agreed that the vast potential of the Convention to further assist them had yet to be fully tapped. Philippines felt it was crucial for procedures to access international assistance and capacity-building to be more user-friendly, less bureaucratic and better-directed to the actual needs of States Parties and communities. Philippines encouraged the dissemination of more information, dialogue and consultation between the Secretariat, the Committee, Bureau, States Parties and permanent delegations in Paris. The delegate suggested that perhaps priority countries could be identified in each region and outreach made to countries that were underrepresented in the various lists. The Philippian delegation declared that they would be interested in helping this endeavour, as the Honourable Ambassador served as chairperson of UNESCO’s Group of 77 in Paris. Philippines concluded by expressing their support for efforts to reform the current system of international assistance, and believed a simplified request form with clear deadlines would be very helpful.
38. The Vice-Chairperson asked the Secretary to reply to the two previous observers.
39. In response to the Delegation of Senegal, the Secretary affirmed that the costing of such requests could obviously not be established by the Secretariat without close cooperation with the requesting State, stating that this was already the practice with projects supported by earmarked contribution, and insisted that it would be inconceivable that the request examined by the Bureau or the Committee was not made jointly on a basis of mutual consent.
40. The Vice-Chairperson returned the adoption of decision 10.COM 8 in paragraph 32 of document ITH/15/10.COM 8 for which no amendments had been received in writing. Before proceeding to the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph, the Vice-Chairperson invited members of the Committee wishing to introduce an amendment to come forward when the paragraph in question would be addressed. The Vice-Chairperson declared paragraphs 1 to 6 adopted without amendments.
41. The delegation of Côte d’Ivoire apologised for returning the discussion to paragraph 6, wishing to add at the end of the paragraph ‘taking into account of the issue of non-submitted periodic reports’.
42. The Vice-Chairperson asked the Secretary for clarification.
43. The Secretary returned to her previous response to Côte d’Ivoire to confirm that if a State Party had specific training needs on reporting, such support would fit under line 1 (‘International Assistance’) rather than under line 3 (‘Other functions of the Committee’) which was dedicated to the activities that the Secretariat proposed the Bureau which were of a cross-cutting nature. That said, the Secretary took due note of Côte d’Ivoire’s concern and affirmed that the Secretariat would try to address it although she did not believe that this addition was appropriate on line 3.
44. The Vice-Chairperson declared paragraphs 7 to 9 were adopted without amendments. Before adopting decision 10.COM 8 as a whole, the Vice-Chairperson gave the floor to the delegation of Belgium.
45. The delegation of Belgium wished to propose an amendment requiring the Secretariat to rethink Form ICH-04 (the form for applying for international assistance).
46. The Vice-Chairperson asked Belgium if they wished to include an additional paragraph in the draft decision that had just been presented, and if so, where they wanted it to be inserted.
47. The delegation of Belgium suggested that their amendment could be a new paragraph 10 where the Secretariat would be asked to start working on the proposal that the Secretary has just presented to the Committee.
48. The Vice-Chairperson confirmed that Belgium wished to create a paragraph 10 and asked Belgium to read it out.
49. The delegation of Belgium suggested ‘Requests the Secretariat to revise the Form ICH-04’ as a new paragraph 10.
50. The Vice-chairperson gave the floor back to the Secretary.
51. The Secretary asked to be allowed to propose an amendment to clarify things for those who did not follow the debate, namely ‘Requests the Secretariat to revise the Form ICH-04 in such a way that it better reflects the provisions in Article 21 of the Convention regarding the forms of International Assistance’, in order to clarify why the revision was being proposed.
52. The Vice-Chairperson asked Belgium if what was proposed by the Secretary corresponded to the intention of their amendment. The delegation of Belgium agreed that it did correspond and thanked the Secretary.
53. The Vice-Chairperson read out the new paragraph 10 as amended: ‘10.: ‘Requests the Secretariat to revise the Form ICH-04 in such a way that it better reflects the provisions in Article 21 of the Convention regarding the forms of International Assistance.’ There were no further amendments and decision 10.COM 8 was adopted as amended by Belgium with paragraph 10.

**ITEM 9 OF THE AGENDA:**

**VOLUNTARY SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/9](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-9_EN.docx)*

Decision *10.COM 9*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (Belgium) opened the discussion on Item 9: *Voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund*, reminding the delegates that the financial issues addressed in the previous agenda item and in that one were closely linked to all other business of the Committee, in particular to the implementation of activities that could not be supported with the resources of UNESCO’s regular budget, which was going through a particularly difficult time.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** recalled that, while it was the Committee’s prerogative to approve any project that might benefit from a voluntary supplementary contribution to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, in the interests of efficiency, last year the Committee authorised the Secretariat to accept any contribution of that type that would be received in favour of the overall programme of ‘Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development’, some of which results had been appreciated by participants during the side event held the night before. Regretting that there were not many offers waiting for the Committee’s approval nor many contributions of which the Committee should take note, the Vice-Chairperson asked the Secretary to present the item in more detail.
3. The **Secretary** recalled that in Decision 9.COM 7 adopted during its previous session, the Committee approved the Concept Note for the 2014-2017 Complementary Additional Programme (CAP) entitled ‘Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development’, which aimed at extending the reach and effectiveness of that global capacity-building strategy while informing donors of the financing requirements of the programme, since CAPs defined UNESCO’s programmes that sought donor support. Therefore, in approving that CAP, the Committee had integrated it to its own fundraising strategy. In that same decision, the Secretary recalled that the Committee authorised the Secretariat to accept any voluntary supplementary contribution that might be paid between two sessions of the Committee to support capacity-building activities within the scope of that programmatic framework. The Secretary added that that decision was in line with the de-bureaucratisation of procedures and put an end to situations where a contribution was proposed by a donor in January but the Secretariat had to wait until November before the Committee could accept it. Following that decision, if a proposed contribution fell within the scope of the global capacity-building strategy, whoever the beneficiary countries might be, the Secretariat could accept it – because the Committee accepted it as part of its general strategy – and could start implementing it straight away. The Secretary regretted that, since its ninth session, the Fund had received no contributions along those lines apart from an official confirmation by Spain (more specifically, the Government of Catalonia) to pay a contribution of €120,000 to continue a capacity-building project coming to an end at that time in Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia. That generous offer was mentioned in paragraph 6 of the draft decision.
4. The **Secretary** informed the Committee about another voluntary supplementary contribution proposed outside of the programmatic framework of the capacity-building strategy and which thus required the Committee’s formal approval. Amounting to US$50,000, that contribution was offered by the National Commission of the People’s Republic of China for UNESCO for the organization of a meeting that stemmed from a decision of the Committee. That decision concerned the work of developing an overall results framework of the Convention, following the recommendation of the 2013 evaluation that the Committee had examined in Baku, Azerbaijan. At that time, the Committee considered that the evaluation had begun to draw up a draft results framework but which was not yet completed nor unquestionable and that prior reflection was necessary before such a framework could be proposed to the Committee and the General Assembly. The Secretary further specified that it was about a results framework for the *Convention*, and not for its Secretariat, which already had its C/5 as approved by UNESCO’s General Conference. Hence not only States Parties would be concerned but all actors who actually contribute to the results obtained by the Convention. Consequently, at its eight session in Baku, the Committee had rightly called for a prior discussion to be organized so that consensus could be reached on the different aspects of that results framework. At the suggestion of the Secretariat, the People’s Republic of China had offered US$50,000 to organize that discussion that the Secretariat was then proposing to hold in the form of a preliminary expert meeting in 2016, as the subject was complex enough not to move directly into an intergovernmental process. The Secretary concluded by reiterating that the People’s Republic of China’s had generously proposed to host that meeting in 2016 and that its associated offer of a voluntary supplementary contribution could be found in Annex 1 of document ITH/15/10.COM/9 and required the Committee’s formal approval.
5. The **Secretary** presented Annex II of that same document which included a list of all voluntary contributions in support of the Convention received since the ninth session of the Committee, all modalities taken together, including in-kind contributions through staffing secondments. She drew the Committee’s attention to paragraph 10 of the draft decision in which all donors were thanked.
6. The **Secretary** continued by presenting the two figures included in the document that she considered to be quite meaningful and not very encouraging. Figure 1 showed the evolution of voluntary support to the global capacity-building programme where the outlook for 2016 and 2017 was cause for grave concern as, at that time, prospects were less than US$1 million, whereas in the past the programme had received much larger sums. Referring to the previous agenda item, the Secretary suspected that certain donors did not see the need of making voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund due to its significantly positive balance making them believe that the Secretariat was unable to spend the funds. The Secretary admitted the difficulty of explaining that, in fact, it was not the Secretariat who could spend the money but the States who should request it and, therefore, unless States submitted assistance requests, money could not be spent. In contrast, when the Secretariat was responsible for implementing funds, in particular through projects benefiting from earmarked contributions, funds implementation was not problematic The **Secretary** wished to once again draw donors’ attention to that issue, emphasizing that, although the broaden interpretation of international assistance mentioned in the previous agenda item would undoubtedly open new opportunities for supporting States, the request from a State would remain a prerequisite for the funds to be released. Therefore, the **Secretary** felt that it would be advisable not to confuse that *modus operandi* with voluntary supplementary contributions, earmarked for capacity-building or a specific need expressed by the Committee that the Secretariat could implement immediately upon receipt of funds. The **Secretary** urged donors to kindly consider that distinction and not to be misled into believing that the unspent balance of the Fund of several million US$ meant that the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was well-off.
7. Turning to figure 2 which showed the evolution of voluntary support to the human resources of the Secretariat, including in-kind contributions on which the Secretariat had been able to put a figure, the **Secretary** noted that it was just as disheartening as figure 1. The Secretary explained that after a burst of generosity in 2010-2012, the situation deteriorated over time and prospects for 2016-2017 (US$500,000 approximately) were extremely worrying. The Secretary recalled that those sums were used to maintain the temporary staff of the Secretariat which accounted for half of all its staff, already inadequate, in its present configuration, to meet its obligations and a barely sustainable workload. She added that it was one of the reasons for her departure. She concluded that if support to the Secretariat was reduced further, staff numbers would diminish drastically and remaining staff would be unable to cope with all the demands that the Committee put on it in addition to its ordinary obligations. The Secretary noted that, in each of its decisions, the Committee had put new demands on the Secretariat and she listed them. She finally urged States to bear in mind that half of the Secretariat was supported by extrabudgetary resources and that if those resources shrank, the Secretariat would not be able to follow up on the Committee’s many recommendations and requests. The Secretary concluded that there had been a general downturn in support, including through Funds-in-Trust – outside the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund – due to, inter alia, understandable donor mobilization on post-conflict situations.
8. The **Secretary** noted a regrettable phenomenon regarding donors having already pledged contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. One of them, Norway, had already confirmed that its outstanding contribution would not be paid and therefore the Committee had to take note that concerned projects would not be completed as planned. In another case, two voluntary supplementary contributions that the Committee had accepted from Brazil and Viet Nam had still not been received and consequently the associated projects approved by the Committee had not been implemented. The Secretary informed the Committee that, in its decision, all it could do was to take note of that situation.
9. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her clear explanation of the status of voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and the clear messages that she had wished to convey to members of the Committee. He also expressed his appreciation to the People’s Republic of China, through its National Commission and to Spain through the Government of Catalonia for showing confidence in the Committee to channel their support to the Convention. The Vice-Chairperson opened the floor for discussion. There were no requests, at which he invited the two donor countries (the People’s Republic of China and Spain) to take the floor if they so wished.
10. In the absence of requests for the floor, the **Vice-Chairperson** shared his enthusiasm over prospects enabled by the two generous contributions. Before moving to the adoption of the decision, he expressed his gratitude to those who had provided support to the Convention and its Secretariat since the last Committee session, namely the Abu Dhabi Tourism & Culture Authority, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Japan, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, the Hamdan Bin Mohammed Heritage Centre from the United Arab Emirates and the Association for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage from Italy.
11. The **Vice-Chairperson** pointed out that seven of those donors had chosen to support a funding mechanism essential to the proper functioning of the Convention in all aspects including its governance, as well as its implementation at the national level, namely the sub-fund of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to enhance the human resources of the Secretariat. Quoting the Secretary, he recalled that the sub-fund was established by the General Assembly in 2010 in response to the already modest human resources of the Secretariat at that time. The Vice-Chairperson said he was all the more grateful to the Secretariat, as the sub-fund had only received a quarter of the requirements identified by the General Assembly since its creation, leaving a significant shortfall. He thus expressed his hope that others would follow that example and that, with contributions from every State Party, each at a scale of its own ability, the Secretariat could be given the necessary resources to provide the Committee with the excellent services it had benefited from up to that time. With that note of hope, the Vice-Chairperson moved the discussion to the adoption of the draft decision, requesting the Committee to refer to document ITH/15/10.COM/9 and to the draft decision in paragraph 11 in order to proceed with its adoption paragraph by paragraph.
12. The **Vice-Chairperson** declared paragraphs 1 to 12 adopted without amendments. Having adopted each paragraph of the draft decision, the Vice-Chairperson stated that it was necessary to then adopt the decision as a whole. Seeing no objections, he **declared decision 10.COM 9 adopted.**
13. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if any of the recipient countries wished to speak, inviting Morocco and Tunisia to do so since he believed that Mauritania was not attending that Committee session.
14. The delegation of **Tunisia** wished to thank the Government of Spain for their very generous assistance, which evidenced that Tunisia was on the right track insofar as capacity-building was concerned and represented an additional incentive for the future.
15. The delegation of **Belize** recognized the Government of Japan for their support to a project initiated in Belize in 2012 under which the country had recently completed its National Culture Policy. Looking ahead, the delegation of Belize shared with the Committee its commitment to move towards implementing the National Culture Policy from 2016, for the next 10 years, and reiterated its gratitude to the Government of Japan.
16. The delegation of **Niger** seized the opportunity to thank the Government of Spain who had assisted Niger by providing support for the implementation of a capacity-building project for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage. The delegate of Niger stated that that support had enabled to the country to receive training on the 2003 Convention and participatory inventory-making as well as to equip itself with computer and audio-visual material. A whole new dynamic had been set in motion to conduct inventory work on two pilot locations that should be completed by December 2015. Niger thanked the Spanish government and UNESCO for their technical assistance and for advice received throughout the implementation of that project.
17. The **Vice-Chairperson** closed the debate by thanking again the donors and urging the members of the Committee and the distinguished delegates of the States Parties to the Convention to follow in the footsteps of those to whom they had just expressed their gratitude.

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA:**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2015**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/10](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10_EN.doc)*

Decision *10.COM 10*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Vice-Chairperson (Belgium) for chairing the meeting during the previous item and moved to examine Item 10: ‘Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2015.’ She invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr Ahmed Skounti and its Rapporteur, Ms Naila Ceribašić, to join her on the podium.
2. The **Chairperson** reminded the meeting that the Committee established the Evaluation Body at its ninth session in Paris to evaluate: nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices; and requests for international assistance greater than US$25,000. She noted no proposal for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices had been submitted for this cycle.
3. The **Chairperson** explained that discussion would begin with Item 10 – the overall report of the Evaluation Body. The Rapporteur would present the report, which raised specific issues on the Convention’s three mechanisms, namely the Urgent Safeguarding List, Representative List and international assistance. The floor would then be opened for general debate on item 10, the item would then be suspended and the overall decision (10.COM 10) adopted only after examination of the six nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List (item 10.a), 34 nominations to the Representative List (item 10.b) and two international assistance requests (item 10.c). All nominations and requests for financial assistance would be presented briefly by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and justification for the draft decisions provided.
4. Concerning draft decisions on individual files, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Bureau during its 6 October meeting it had debated how to deal with the issue of many nominations for examination. Forty-two nominations would be examined in nine hours allowing only approximately 12 minutes per file, which the Bureau felt was insufficient. To leave enough time for discussion of the files, the Chairperson invited members of the Committee wishing to discuss or amend specific draft decisions on nominations to inform the Secretariat by 9 a.m. that day – a procedure she had also explained during presentation of Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda. Decisions on draft decisions debated would be adopted paragraph by paragraph while expecting to adopt the rest of the decisions as a whole. Afterwards, as customary, submitting States would be allowed to comment.
5. The **Chairperson** informed the meeting that the Secretariat had received eight requests for debate from members of the Committee and then clarified the procedure for amendments to draft decisions on nominations. She affirmed they all agreed the spirit of consensus should prevail in the debate and reminded that the Evaluation Body had been created to assist the Committee in its work with the nominations as the Committee has no time to thoroughly go through each nomination. She further reminded that the Committee selected the members of the Evaluation Body based on candidates proposed by States Parties. She continued by underlying that the Committee should, in general, trust the work of the Evaluation Body which had been long and collegial, while a difference of opinion was permitted in some cases.
6. The **Chairperson** continued by saying that when an amendment is proposed, she would like to be able to say that it meets the broad agreement of the members of the Committee, explaining that she would ask members of the Committee to show their support to the proposed amendment and she would judge if it met broad agreement.
7. The **Chairperson** explained that as this was not a formal vote but rather a demonstration of broad agreement and consensus, the Committee would not proceed as in the case of a vote – that is counting those present and voting, those voting for or against, and those abstaining. For a decision to be taken to amend the draft decision recommended by the Evaluation Body – she would seek broad agreement, i.e. more than half of the members of the Committee. She then explained that if any member of the Committee required a formal vote, it would have to notify the Chairperson and only then would she apply the voting procedure laid down in the Committee’s Rules of Procedure.
8. As there were no comments or questions on the procedure proposed for the examination of the files the **Chairperson** moved on to recalling several points about the procedure of the debates, namely the working methods adopted by the Committee. During the general debates, priority is given to members of the Committee but the Chairperson would also give the floor to States Parties not members of the Committee and other observers, if time permitted. During the debates on draft decisions concerning specific nominations, proposals and requests participation in the debates would be limited to members of the Committee. The Chairperson then recalled Rule  22.4 of the Rules of Procedure stating that submitting States, whether a member of the Committee or not, shall only speak to reply to questions raised. She also reminded the Committee that since its sixth session in Bali in 2011, it had established a working method to not accept new information or additional evidence from a submitting State after evaluation from the Evaluation Body and that only clarification concerning information already in the file is possible. This was to ensure fair treatment between files and submitting States. Indeed, some States had already withdrawn their files while reading the recommendations of the Evaluation Body to revise them for a future cycle.
9. The **Chairperson** reminded members of the Committee and observers of the importance for the meeting to stay as close to schedule as possible and as there were no questions, gave the floor to the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, Ms Ceribašić.
10. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson, saying it was her pleasure to introduce the overall report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2015, starting with:

***A. Overview of 2015 files and working methods***

1. The **Rapporteur** provided a summary of the composition of the Evaluation Body (the names of the 12 members included in Document [ITH/15/10.COM/10](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10_EN.doc); six of whom are individual experts representative of States Parties not members of the Committee, and six representatives of accredited non-governmental organisations). Meeting for the first time in March this year, the Evaluation Body elected Mr Ahmed Skounti from Morocco as Chairperson and Ms Emily Drania Drani of the Cross-cultural Foundation of Uganda as Vice-Chairperson, and the speaker as Rapporteur.
2. The **Rapporteur** continued by saying thatas with previous cycles, the Secretariat had assessed submissions for technical completeness but not substance, apart from two international assistance requests when the Secretariat gave substantial feedback to assist the submitting States. Fifty files had been processed by the Secretariat – 45 transmitted to the Evaluation Body: eight nominations for the Urgent Safeguarding List, 35 for the Representative List, and two international assistance requests. Of those, six had been re-submissions, while one had been previously submitted for a different mechanism.
3. She explained that before the second meeting in June 2015, all members of the Evaluation Body had submitted their individual assessments and recommendations on each file using the dedicated website. During the June meeting, members collectively debated recommendations on each criterion of all submissions, deciding whether or not to recommend inscription on the two Lists or grant international assistance and discussed cross-cutting issues. After the meeting, the Rapporteur developed draft decisions for each file, as well as general observations and recommendations from the Body which met again in September to discuss, amend, validate and adopt all four documents representing the unanimous consensus of the Body members.

***B.******General observations and recommendations – Working methods and principles for evaluation***

1. The **Rapporteur** briefly outlined the Body’s working methods and principles for evaluation. She emphasised that in line with the approach of previous bodies, the 2015 Evaluation Body’s recommendations were based on analysis of the adequacy of information, argumentation and demonstration presented in the nomination files and requests not on assertion, element merit or project intentions. Any prior knowledge or information that individual evaluators may have possessed about an element or project had not been taken into account. She added, to secure neutrality a member of the Body could not participate in evaluation of a nomination submitted by his or her country, or the country of domiciliation of his or her NGO – there were four such cases.
2. The **Rapporteur** said that throughout their work, the Body frequently referred to the aide-mémoire for completing nominations to the Representative List and corresponding aide-mémoire for the Urgent Safeguarding List, which proved to be important tools particularly when seeking to maintain coherence with the precedents and recommendations of previous Bodies and Committee decisions. She underlined that the Body paid particular attention to consistency of evaluation within and across files, as well as with previous decisions of the Committee. In the case of certain resubmitted files, this was not easy to attain given the fact that intangible cultural heritage and the Committee’s jurisprudence are constantly evolving. She continued by saying that the Evaluation Body also asked for consistency within multinational nominations, considering that they should be evaluated as one and the same and assessed through the same standard of evaluation as national nominations.
3. The **Rapporteur** pointed out that to help submitting States, the Body included feedback in its draft decisions often more detailed than previously, particularly for files recommended for referral but also those recommended for inscription. Each draft decision was carefully composed and once adopted each State Party is strongly encouraged to take into account all remarks and address them in their periodic reports.
4. Regarding the international assistance mechanism, the **Rapporteur** said that the Body had to evaluate requests that lacked essential information. Given the importance of the mechanism for achieving Convention objectives, she said that the Evaluation Body considered different ways to obtain additional information and corrections in a relatively short timeframe, including substantial assistance by the Secretariat or an expert, and the delegation by the Committee of its decision-making authority to the Bureau. She pointed out that concrete recommendations are included in the draft decisions.

***C: Overview of files***

1. The **Rapporteur** moved on to the characteristics of elements nominated for the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, saying that the Evaluation Body was impressed with the rich diversity of intangible cultural heritage expressions and practices belonging to various domains and sometimes to multiple domains, as well as those that demonstrated a close connection between intangible and tangible heritage, the dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage in urban and rural contexts and the relationship between humans and the natural environment. She continued by saying that many of the elements illustrated the contribution of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development, notably in terms of conflict resolution, peacebuilding, environmental sustainability, gender equality and/or enhancement of local economies, while other nominations brought to the fore the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and organised sports, the interaction between humans and animals and other complex subjects. The submitted files illustrated the great variety of communities and groups involved in the transmission and enactment of intangible cultural heritage that included bearers, practitioners, knowledge-holders, stakeholders and audiences, in particular indigenous and minority peoples, women, youth, children and otherwise neglected or disempowered groups and communities.
2. She pointed out that the Evaluation Body was also pleased to note that a reasonable geographical balance had been maintained, with each electoral group being represented by one or two files submitted to the Urgent Safeguarding List and three or more to the Representative List. It was also good to see an upsurge of multinational nominations to the Representative List, displaying States Parties’ will to foster dialogue and international cooperation. According to an assessment of the Evaluation Body, two multinational nominations may serve as models concerning all inscription criteria, together with three national nominations while several others could serve as good examples.
3. The **Rapporteur** reiterated some concerns of previous Evaluation Bodies regarding the highest importance accorded by submitting States to the Representative List, with the other three mechanisms remaining underused. Besides a need to devise new ways of promoting and repositioning the Urgent Safeguarding List, as well as continuously debating how to identify and disseminate best practices and develop alternate, friendlier ways of information sharing, the Evaluation Body hoped that technical assistance and other support provided by the Secretariat to States Parties wishing to request international assistance would improve the situation. It also hoped that the new combined form ICH-01bis form would, beginning with the next cycle, allowing submitting States to simultaneously request inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and international assistance for the proposed safeguarding plans would bring improvements.
4. In terms of the presentation of files, the Evaluation Body regretted having to mention the variable quality of submissions and existence of deficiencies also identified in previous cycles and encouraged States Parties to take full advantage of the information and advice available in the aide-mémoires for the two Lists and a new aide-mémoire for international assistance recently prepared by the Secretariat.

***D: Cross-cutting, global themes and issues; criteria for inscription***

1. The **Rapporteur** turned to cross-cutting, and global issues raised during the evaluation process and their connection to specific criteria of the mechanisms under evaluation during the reporting cycle. Thanks to the evaluation of all mechanisms by a single body instead of the previous two, commonalities and specificities of the Convention’s different mechanisms and criteria were clear, particularly regarding the relationship between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List. Responses to criterion R.2 (at the heart of the Representative List) often appeared inward-looking, focusing on the benefits of inscription in parallel with a trend to assert rather than demonstrate. The Evaluation Body proposed to clarify in the draft decision that response to criterion R.2 is supposed to refer to information explained in greater detail in other sections of the nomination file while addressing the possible consequences of inscription regarding the List’s overall purpose.
2. Regarding the Urgent Safeguarding List, a well-elaborated safeguarding plan which responded to specific, clearly identified threats possible to mitigate or overcome (in contrast to general issues such as migration or modernisation) was crucial. The Evaluation Body had encountered difficulty with safeguarding plans already being implemented at the time of evaluation. Although commendable for a State Party not to delay safeguarding regardless of the timing of inscription, it presented an issue for the Evaluation Body concerning lack of post inscription planning, which suggested the Committee clarify that safeguarding plans and measures include a time period following inscription.
3. An adequate definition for a ‘community’ continued to be a major theme of discussion for the Evaluation Body given that participation of communities, groups and/or individuals was a criterion for the three mechanisms it had to evaluate. When communities are not well-defined, it is not surprising that their widest possible participation cannot be easily demonstrated. Defining the internal composition and contours of communities was also important for satisfying other criteria for the mechanisms.
4. Several highly visible aspects of this topic were discussed, namely:

* consistency in the definition of community throughout the nomination files;
* the agency of the community concerned, for instance as regards the issue of de- and re-contextualisation, the historical perspective and relationship between the enactment of an element and tangible objects associated with it;
* the importance of delineating contours of the involved community and its internal dynamics;
* the rationale for selecting only one part of the community concerned or, conversely, involving communities across the whole population of a submitting State;
* bottom-up approaches to safeguarding; and
* free, prior and in particular, informed consent of communities concerned to nomination of the element as formulated in the file for national and multinational nominations.

1. There were four paragraphs in the draft decision related to community involvement where the Evaluation Body introduced some new emphases or suggestions: two in relation to multinational submissions; one addressing consent demonstrating community participation; and one referring to adequate and consistent descriptions of the scope and contour of communities, groups and/or the individuals concerned.
2. The Evaluation Body also encouraged States Parties to be particularly attentive to acknowledging sensitivities of all communities within their territory when elaborating nominations that were distinctly national in their outlook to encourage dialogue among communities.
3. On the significant number of nominations involving oral traditions, in its respective draft decisions the Evaluation Body invited States Parties to ensure the translation of lyrics and verses to foster mutual respect and dialogue beyond language and national boundaries.
4. Concerning nominations that included the use of live animals in traditional games, citing one example in the current cycle which while possibly acceptable at local or national level might generate negative reaction at international level, the Evaluation Body referred to Decision 9.COM 10 and the position of the previous Subsidiary Body.
5. The **Rapporteur** continued with the subject of inappropriate vocabulary and expressions unfavourable to dialogue, which the Evaluation Body had frequently encountered in the current cycle. Despite reminders to avoid such language, for example the term ‘authenticity’, the Evaluation Body focused on nuance and implied meaning from which the term ‘inappropriate vocabulary’ in some cases seemed to underestimate the problem. Often it is a question of mind set implying negation of some basic principles of the Convention such as static conception of the element versus its constant recreation, primacy given to past forms, functions and meanings versus the living heritage of today, or disempowerment of communities through the top-down design of safeguarding measures versus their agency. In such cases, the Evaluation Body was of the opinion that submitting States need to be more explicitly reminded to adhere to the ideas, principles and objectives of the Convention and address such misconceptions in the respective draft decisions. In a few cases, ‘authenticity’ pertained to the community’s sense of identity and continuity, which for the Evaluation Body seemed more reasonable. The Evaluation Body suggested to the Committee and future Evaluation Bodies to continue reflecting on inappropriate vocabulary in particular, looking at who employs such terms, how, in what context and with what implications.
6. Several nominations that provoked discussion by the Evaluation Body concerned the involvement of children. Beyond individual file recommendations, it invited the Committee and future Evaluation Bodies to continue reflecting on the role of children in elements with added economic value or that incorporated hazards as in the case of craftsmanship and some performing arts.
7. The **Rapporteur** mentioned inventorying, namely criteria U.5 and R.5 which received significant attention from the Evaluation Body in the current cycle thanks to a new provision requiring a submitting Party to provide a relevant extract of the inventory(ies) (according to the Decision 8.COM 7.a and Decision 8.COM 8). From insight gained through comparison of inventory extracts and nomination files, as well as existing observations and recommendations from aides-mémoires, the Evaluation Body suggested a minimum standard for inclusion of an element in an inventory which formed an important part of draft decision 10.COM 10.
8. The **Rapporteur** concluded by hoping she had provided an accurate and comprehensive overview of the work of the Evaluation Body, thanking the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and its members for their support.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur saying she had raised relevant issues which should inform the debate of the Committee and welcomed the list of speakers for a general debate on the Evaluation Body’s report.
10. The delegation of **Latvia** appreciated the diversity of nominations being evaluated and expressed satisfaction that among the files submitted, the Evaluation Body had proposed several as model nominations. As this had been the Evaluation Body’s first cycle since undertaking its responsibilities, Latvia said that although the Evaluation Body had been established on an experimental basis as a single evaluation body comparing the interpretation and application of criteria against various established mechanisms, including both international lists, they believed the exercise had been fruitful. Latvia congratulated the Evaluation Body for reaching consensus on all nominations and for their efforts in maintaining consistency regarding the Committee’s decisions, especially on resubmitted nominations. Latvia concluded by saying that extension of referral decisions for nominations where technical, as well as substantial information details were missing, should continue. Regarding draft decisions proposed against the criteria, Latvia said the Evaluation Body was permitted to make decisions that had been well thought through but felt that certain decisions were probably slightly overly-critical, for example the interpretation of safeguarding measures proposed for different nominations, namely Criterion 3 in both Lists. They also wished to highlight in the report of the Evaluation Body the attention given to inventories regarding Criterion 5 and suggested that some clarity might still be missing, for example in interpretation of ‘relevant extract’ concerning annexes to be provided. In this regard, it supported the proposal of a guideline on inventories for States Parties that would be helpful for upcoming nominations. Latvia thanked the Evaluation Body for their work and the Secretariat for assisting in the complex task of evaluation. Acknowledging the extensive evaluation undertaken, Latvia stated it intended to support the draft decisions proposed, excluding aspects they would raise namely nominations proposed for the Urgent Safeguarding List.
11. The delegation of **Belgium** congratulated the Evaluation Body on their thorough, systematic and consistent analysis, as well as the accredited NGOs and experts that had worked on the files. Belgium also regretted there was no proposal for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and hoped this would not be the case in the future. It noted the recommendation on page 5, paragraph 19 about working methods, especially the principle that decisions should be based on information in the file not the merit of the element or project, and that no additional information would be considered except that available on the corresponding UNESCO web page. On page 6, paragraph 22 there were remarks on evaluation consistency within and across files with reference made to the inventory extract – the principle being that if information in the extract contradicted that of the nomination file, it could not be ignored. Belgium argued an extract could work for or against a file and disagreed with paragraph 65 on page 17 where the Evaluation Body opined the Committee could not consider information from an inventory or inventory extract, as it believed this information could be an incentive for the production of more detailed inventories. Belgium said that on page 9, paragraph 34 the reference to being consistent in defining what community is was a point it had always made. It said community is about communities, groups and where appropriate, individuals and while Belgium understood this was the case for the context of a nomination file, it would request a full and clear definition of the concept of community for the Convention as a whole that was as open as possible to allow for other interpretations and include local, closed and homogeneous communities. Belgium agreed with paragraph 35 that a monolithic conception of community should be avoided saying they would like, for instance, to refer to the notion of heritage community as presented in the Convention of the Council of Europe on the value of cultural heritage for society where the notion is broad and conceptualised as a network.
12. The delegation of **Belgium** lastly mentioned paragraph 38 referring to social and economic challenges. The Evaluation Body had noticed a strategy of submitting States to avoid discussion of tourism – a point Belgium felt should be addressed. Belgium believed States Parties should not avoid the word ‘tourism’ or touristic dimensions in safeguarding plans, and that tourism should be treated as sustainable development.
13. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed appreciation for the tremendous job undertaken by the Evaluation Body, supported the new Evaluation Body which they believed had been consistent with those before it and commended it for its expert recommendations in various fields of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation said it was impressed with the level and quality of explanations and recommendations saying it believed the Evaluation Body could develop to create more concrete and detailed criteria to assist States Parties in preparing their nominations.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the Evaluation Body on its exemplary work saying that its competence had become more independent, consistent and objective, and that this was the first time the Committee had an occasion to examine files submitted for the Lists and international assistance for an amount greater than US$25,000 via a single reporting body. Turkey said that having read the report of the Evaluation Body, confirmed that it had been a good idea to have all submitted files examined by a single body, and that while Turkey generally agreed with the report despite aspects requiring minor changes, the Turkish delegation was aware that the evaluation of the files was a difficult and sensitive task. Turkey had experienced a similar situation during the examination of files submitted for the Representative List that were examined by the Subsidiary Body, of which Turkey was a member and, therefore, understood the difficulties encountered during evaluation of the nomination files. Turkey once again congratulated the Evaluation Body on its work for the Convention.
15. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** expressed its gratitude to all members of the Evaluation Body for their thorough analytical work. Regarding the point mentioned about the use of live animals in traditional practices, it reminded the Committee about heated discussions on the subject from a year ago and asked for more explanation on the point of live animals being used in some aspects of intangible cultural heritage. It added while recognition of the use of animals could be unacceptable at certain levels it could also be part of inscriptions on UNESCO Lists.
16. The delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Evaluation Body for the quality of its report, which had gone well beyond simple description to looking at methodological difficulties and even theoretical ones. Tunisia wondered to what extent the absence of a specific definition of ‘community’ had influenced the evaluation of certain elements in the nominations.
17. The delegation of **Brazil** expressed its appreciation for the work conducted by the Evaluation Body during its first evaluation. Concerning inventorying, Brazil said it was aware that each country had its own methods and suggested that recommendations should be made on more general lines. Brazil did not believe that there should be a unique inventorying methodology and regretted that during the current cycle it would not have the opportunity to analyse a nomination for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices, to which Brazil attached great importance.
18. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil and having come to the end of the list of Committee speakers asked if any observers had a comment or question, noting that the NGO ‘Traditions for Tomorrow’ wished to take the floor.
19. The representative of the NGO **Traditions for Tomorrow** thanked the Chairperson and congratulated the Evaluation Body for its work. It said the Body’s analysis of the nominations showed how much progress had been made on the Convention. Similar to comments made by some States Parties, the delegation regretted there had been no proposals for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. Elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List were for humanity but were nonetheless local elements concerning communities – essentially groups and in some instances, individuals. Best safeguarding practices referred to in Article 18 of the Convention provide examples for all States Parties to the Convention and communities who are bearers of intangible cultural heritage, while also reflecting work done by NGOs often at the heart of the process and who in this way assist the protection of intangible cultural heritage. The representative said it hoped that at forthcoming sessions of the Committee there would be proposals for inscription on the register of Best Safeguarding Practices.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked ‘Traditions for Tomorrow’ and as there were no further observer requests for the floor asked the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body to address the issues raised by Belgium on inventories (the same question was asked by Brazil); the definition of the notion of ‘community’ raised by Belgium and Turkey; Brazil’s question regarding tourism and Kyrgyzstan’s query on the use of animals in the nominations.
21. In taking the floor, the **Rapporteur** replied to Belgium and Brazil on inventorying saying it was the first time a comparison could be made between information in the nomination files and extracts from inventories at national level. She said the Evaluation Body had relied heavily on the *aides-mémoires* and found that when comparing all the free basic information, was unsure how to proceed. Each State Party is supposed to develop an inventory in line with its specific situation, however, this had led to uncertainties regarding format and type of content to be included; at the same time, members of the Body had limited experience on how to approach things when not in possession of adequate information, such as having just an element’s name. The Convention clearly states that an inventory’s primary aim is to help safeguard an element, which begs the question how the mere name of an element might help. To achieve consistency when comparing files, a *modus operandi* was developed from discussions at the Body’s three meetings, while not going much further than the existing texts, drawing on information decided upon by the Committee and from the nomination forms.
22. Regarding the definition of ‘community’ raised by Belgium and Tunisia, the Convention does not provide this for good reason – a point that members of the Evaluation accepted unanimously despite applications where a ‘community’ is poorly-defined leading to difficulty for evaluators. The concept of community lies at the heart of the Convention; in one area of an application a community is described in one way and a different community, in another. The Evaluation Body believed that ‘community’ should be consistently defined although within a single nomination file it did not require a global definition of what ‘community’ meant.
23. Lastly, responding to the query on the use of animals in intangible cultural heritage practices the **Rapporteur** said that the Evaluation Body followed the recommendations of previous Bodies and the Committee as their position was to not pre-judge which practices might be acceptable. She added that when proposing an element for international inscription, State Parties should take into account differences in sensitivities and expand on possible controversial aspects in their nomination files.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for her responses, and gave the floor to Ethiopia.
25. The delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated the State Party of Namibia for its excellent organisation of the Committee session and warm welcome and extended its appreciation to the Chairperson and Secretariat for their diligent guidance during the meeting. It also expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Evaluation Body, saying that compared to the past the drafts showed how the work was improving. At the same time, it asked the Body to explain what level of effort had been made to obtain greater understanding of the local contexts of respective elements, as it was in principle, supposed to be the remit of the States Parties and had even noted recommendations to modify names of elements in some evaluations.
26. The **Rapporteur** assured Ethiopia that the Evaluation Body had taken the issue of local contexts into consideration during its evaluations given the Convention was about nurturing diversity of heritage worldwide. She reiterated that the basic principle had been to analyse the information provided that was based on explanations of local contexts, social functions and cultural meanings of cultural elements, which made it easier to understand the issues involved. As for names of elements, the Rapporteur said that the Committee had requested the Secretariat to solve any possible issues regarding this. The Rapporteur said community consent indicated that many communities appreciated, wanted and were in favour of keeping the local name of the element, but that it was also useful to have a short descriptive name to better communicate at the international level.
27. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur and the room for the interesting and fruitful debate, reminding the Committee that examination of the draft decision 10.COM 10 would take place after examination of the individual decisions and Items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c. She congratulated the meeting for their efficient use of time and handed the floor to the Secretary.
28. The **Secretary** reminded the room of activities taking place during lunch and later in the day: NGO meeting from 1.30 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.; and an information session on the Convention’s global capacity-building strategy for electoral group Va) and Vb) between 1.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m. The Secretary reminded those who had not registered to do so.

[*Applause*]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and closed the session for lunch, announcing the next session would start at 2.30 p.m. with the nominations**.**

*[Tuesday, 1 December 2015, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 10.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/10*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10_EN.doc)*.a + Add.*

Decision *10.COM 10*

1. The **Chairperson** opened the session addressing Item 10.a ‘Examination of nominations for inscription on the list of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.’ As shown in Document 10.a, two nominations had been withdrawn by the submitting States, namely Botswana and the Islamic Republic of Iran, resulting in only six files to be examined under the item. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that before examining the nominations, it was important to recall the criteria that would guide its decisions, what she did.
2. The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the six individual files, giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to share the conclusions of the Body on the nomination submitted by Colombia covered by draft decision 10.COM 10.a.2.
3. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson and introduced the first nomination, **Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region** [draft decision 10.COM 10.a.2], submitted by **Colombia** for possible inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that the Evaluation Body considered that the nomination satisfied criterion U.1, as traditional Vallenato music involves a range of specialised practitioners belonging to various social classes, serving as a channel of social communication for the community of the Greater Magdalena region and providing them with a sense of regional identity, cohesion and continuity. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination satisfied Criterion U.2, as the viability of Vallenato was threatened by drug trafficking, armed conflict, consequent displacement of populations, poverty, rupture of social link, scarcity of traditional performing venues and a lack of interest amongst younger generations. Criterion U.4 was also met, according to the Evaluation Body, as the nomination relied upon collaboration between numerous community representatives, researchers, promoters and officials who provided a large number of documents indicating free, prior and informed consent. Criterion U.5 was met, as traditional Vallenato music of the Caribbean region had been included since 2013 on the National Representative List maintained and updated in compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. The Evaluation Body considered, however, that Criterion U.3 was not met, as the safeguarding plan did not clearly define the desired objectives and expected results that would respond to the identified threats related to the social functions and cultural significance of the element. The geographical location of communities involved in the safeguarding was not clearly described nor how they would be involved in the elaboration and implementation of the safeguarding measures. Furthermore, no timetable had been provided in view of the planned activities. The Evaluation Body,therefore, recommended to not inscribe at that time, Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanations and informed the Committee that an amendment had been submitted by Peru.
6. The delegation of **Peru** said all delegations were aware that the nomination of Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region of Colombia referred to a cultural expression blending ancient songs of African slaves with traditional dances and rhythms of the indigenous population of the Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta. The Peruvian delegation added that those expressions were combined with poetic elements and musical instruments from Europe, especially from Spain. Music, rhythms and songs resulting from that expression of multiculturalism projected a vision of the daily life of people from that region, that combined elements of realism and fantasy typically referred to in literature as ‘Colombian marvellous realism’. Peru indicated that the Evaluation Body had diligently assessed in a positive way that that intangible cultural expression fully complied with criteria U.1, U.2 and U.5, yet had found that the nomination could be considered during a following cycle due to a lack of a clearly-defined safeguarding plan and unrealistic and ambitious budget. However, the delegation of Peru was of the view that the nomination file itself contained the necessary information to respond to the Evaluation Body’s concerns. Furthermore, Peru insisted that an ambitious budget was better than a low budget as it showed commitment by the State Party to provide maximum financial resources for the protection and preservation of Traditional Vallenato music.
7. The delegation of **Peru** continued by stating that its Government had contacted the Colombian Government and having done so proposed to introduce in the draft decision commitments for Colombian Government combined with a specific obligation not only regarding the budget for the element’s presentation but also the safeguarding plan and activity schedule to ensure Evaluation Body observations are addressed. In the draft decision, the Peruvian Government proposed to introduce a new paragraph where the Government of Colombia would commit to submitting a detailed report on compliance with the obligations. The delegation of Peru said that those draft amendments had been circulated by its delegation to other delegations and delivered to the Secretariat the previous day and asked the Secretariat to display them on the screen. The delegation drew attention to threats facing Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region that were putting its survival at risk. Peru explained that there were two extremely serious factors working against the element. Firstly, for many years armed conflict and drug trafficking in Colombia had reduced public spaces where traditional Vallenato music was usually played, sung, and passed down from generation to generation. Peru said it was essential to recover those spaces, as well as to promote and protect the revival of cultural and social practices related to the element. The peace process being developed between the Colombian government and FARC had greatly helped that process, but Peru said that urgent intervention was still necessary at social and cultural levels. Secondly, traditional Vallenato music faced newer, more commercialised forms which were diluting knowledge of traditional Vallenato and affecting the element’s integrity as an expression of cultural identity. The delegation of Peru invited other delegations to express their views on the amendment to establish a general consensus.
8. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked the Evaluation Body for the draft decision proposed and expressed appreciation of the nomination presented by Colombia being an inspiring synergy of diverse cultural influences. The delegation said that the draft decision proposed a positive evaluation of the nomination except for Criterion U.3 concerning elaboration of a safeguarding plan where the connection between threats identified and safeguarding measures proposed had been queried, as well as the budget details and timetable proposed. Latvia acknowledged safeguarding measures that concentrated on transmission of the element, strengthening regional identity and social development of communities, as well as the importance of public spaces for the element to name just a few were addressed in response to criteria U.2 and U.3. Latvia clarified although the nomination did not have a detailed timetable it did give a timeframe for the safeguarding measures proposed for a five-year period and budget indications corresponding to safeguarding activities proposed. Latvia added that the file indicated a detailed budget was included in the special safeguarding plan adopted for the element in 2013 by the National Heritage Council of Colombia. Latvia expressed its appreciation for the various financial resources being mobilised to safeguard the element, including taxes dedicated for that purpose and highlighted the existence of a committee to monitor implementation of the safeguarding measures made up of 11 community members representing the region. Latvia concluded its delegation would be in favour of recognising Criterion U.3 as having been satisfied.
9. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment proposed by Peru, believing that if the Committee decided to inscribe Traditional Vallenato Music on the Urgent Safeguarding List this would assist Colombia in promoting the element, thereby helping to prevent it from being marginalised. Brazil emphasized that Colombia had always shown commitment to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and would therefore be able to take the necessary measures in order to implement the safeguarding plan. Brazil pointed out that having an agreement with Colombia concerning promotion of their cultural heritage it knew perfectly how the country safeguarded its own heritage and would therefore support Peru’s amendment.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work and said that Belgium had closely examined the file. Concerning the safeguarding plan and criterion U.3, it said the nomination form had a series of concisely described measures in section 3.b, while the safeguarding plan in the inventory extract was more elaborate. Belgium said combing the two provided more convincing evidence than what was only described in section 3.b and that although ambitious it was a very interesting plan. Belgium was satisfied regarding the fact that a number of stakeholders and mediators had been consulted in the drawing up of the plan and added that the file presented an interesting interpretation of the notion of community that was broader than just local community, being rather a community that existed in a world of active market forces. Belgium said that the plan explored the possibility of commercial viability linked to sustainable development, and would therefore like to support the proposal by Peru and other delegations to inscribe the element.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** was pleased that such an important ritual had been proposed for nomination for the Urgent Safeguarding List and had heard directly from Colombia’s Minister of Culture about the country’s determination and commitment. It appreciated the balanced and sophisticated analysis of the Evaluation Body, however, having conducted a thorough expert examination of the file from different perspectives supported the amendment and invited Turkey’s national expert to share some observations.
12. The **expert from the Turkish delegation** informed the Committee that the Turkish national experts had thoroughly examined Colombia’s nomination file and while the draft decision suggested the file did not meet criterion U.3, they had noted that section 3 of the file included a safeguarding plan, namely past safeguarding plans. Planned measures included knowledge transfer, funding, promotion, monitoring and evaluation with visible community participation. Consequently, the expert group were of the opinion that the file satisfied all five criteria. The Turkish delegation, therefore, believed that the nomination qualified to be considered for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, but that Turkey would like to hear more from Colombia on its strategy, safeguarding plan and the expected outcomes especially relating to social functions and cultural meanings of the element.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey saying she understood there was support for Peru’s proposal but to save time asked speakers to only indicate whether or not they supported the proposal and gave the floor to the Republic of Korea.
14. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed with other delegations regarding the Colombian government’s commitment to safeguard the element and the continuing participation of the local community. It believed that the element had ample ground for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
15. The delegation of **Algeria** appreciated the Evaluation Body’s rigorous and thorough analysis of the file. Algeria expressed interest in the file which focused on a syncretic element and contained multiple safeguarding measures, especially against market forces, conducted by and for communities who identified themselves with the element. It supported the amendment submitted by Peru.
16. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** congratulated the Evaluation Body on its precise and succinct work and pointed out that by presenting the file to the Urgent Safeguarding List Colombia wanted to find further ways to safeguard its heritage. The delegation saw that in the evaluation Colombia had satisfied four out of the five criteria; there was a contradiction as the country was congratulated for involving communities while U.3 was considered not satisfied. Côte d’Ivoire therefore supported the amendment proposed by Peru but requested the Committee to give Colombia an opportunity to explain.
17. The delegation of **India** thanked the Chairperson and Evaluation Body for its examination of the files. It supported the amendment made by Peru and Colombia’s request to consider the element for nomination.
18. The delegation of **Nigeria** supported the views of the earlier speakers, noting that the Evaluation Body’s comment – ‘the budget seems to be unrealistically ambitious’ – was too general, judgemental and subjective. It supported the proposed amendment.
19. The delegation of **Hungary** was in favour of Peru’s proposed amendment and agreed with points raised by Latvia concerning criterion U.3. Hungary believed the element had a significant role for the people and communities of Colombia and supported its inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
20. The delegation of **Namibia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its review and recommendations, taking note of the efforts of the State Party and community involved in safeguarding the element. While recognizing four of the five criteria had been met Namibia suggested that perhaps the State Party could be given an opportunity to provide more information on or clarify the safeguarding plan and similar matters raised by the Evaluation Body. The delegation concluded by supporting inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List in order to help safeguard it.
21. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** thanked the Republic of Namibia for a wonderful welcome and said it felt the Evaluation Body was effective. Having listened to what had been said confirmed that Saint Lucia supported Peru’s proposed amendment and Colombia’s request.
22. The delegation of **Bulgaria** had carefully examined the file and considered that criterion U.3 was satisfied. The suggestion that Peru and the other Member States had made were legitimate and it fully supported the nomination.
23. The delegation of **Tunisia** said while taking into consideration the evaluation by the Evaluation Body, it considered the information provided by Colombia fulfilled criterion U.3 and supported Peru’s proposed amendment.
24. The delegation of **Uganda** appreciated the work of the Evaluation Body, observing that the element proposed by Colombia was threatened, but, above all, that it met four out of the five nomination criteria. Uganda strongly believed that, unless action was taken to preserve that heritage, it was likely to disappear and therefore requested that an opportunity was given to Colombia to provide further information on issues raised concerning criterion U.3.
25. The delegation of **Congo** thanked the Government of Namibia for its welcome and having considered the proposed amendment, supported nomination of the element submitted by Colombia.
26. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the list of speakers was exhausted, and gave the floor to the submitting State, Colombia, to answer the questions asked by the members of the Committee.
27. Having thanked the Chairperson, the delegation of **Colombia** acknowledged the Evaluation Body’s assessment of Colombia’s nomination concerning criterion U.3 which declared the activities and expected results unclear. However, it said the file addressed critical issues identified in the participatory diagnosis presenting four strategic lines of action to reverse processes that threatened the element:

1) transfer of knowledge: training, research and memory whose purpose was the training and formation of new generations of composers and Vallenato music players;

2) developing norms, policies and cross-sectoral organization by enabling and setting up community organizations that promote the creation, production and circulation of Vallenato music;

3) promotion, distribution and marketing: fostering of opportunities for distribution and identification of markets where traditional Vallenato music may be commercially viable; and

4) monitoring and evaluation: since during the construction of the special safeguarding plan established in 2010 and adopted in 2013, the community appointed a monitoring committee of 11 members regarding project implementation.

1. The delegation of **Colombia** added safeguarding activities listed in the file included 12 strategic lines such as ‘oversee and establish organizational, institutional and regulatory criteria for a network of Vallenato Festivals, in order to standardise policies and process’, or the creation of the ‘Observatory of the Traditional Vallenato Music and Culture’, that had been conceived for the promotion and transfer of knowledge. Referring to the Evaluation Body’s remark about a lack of clarity regarding stakeholder participation in safeguarding the element, Colombia replied that the file contained a description of work that had been undertaken with the community over three years, which ended with the formulation of the safeguarding plan adopted by the Colombian government in 2013. The delegation of Colombia further explained that that process had been possible thanks to the help of composers, performers, music teachers, culture and art managers, institutional and governmental actors with technical, financial and methodical support from the Colombian Ministry of Culture. Colombia said that extensive discussion had been carried out on the need to deal with risks that had been identified during the participatory analysis – meetings which had attracted broad participation from all sectors of the community. The delegation emphasized these meetings were essential for designing and elaborating the safeguarding plan and clarified that the required economic resources to implement the plan did not necessarily come from the national government, nor was that the purpose of the safeguarding policy for Colombia’s intangible cultural heritage. On the contrary, it emphasized that the budget also involved private and public regional economic resources. Finally, **Colombia** noted that inclusion of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List would provide direct resources from its national consumption tax on mobile funds, which the Colombian law states should be invested in the elements included on the humanity list, representing nearly US$2 million over the following five years and corresponding to the period outlined in the safeguarding plan.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked Colombia for its response and moved to adopt the decision paragraph by paragraph. She declared paragraph 1, paragraph 2 on criteria U.1 and U.2 adopted without amendments. She then declared paragraph 2 on criterion U.3 adopted with Peru’s amendment: ‘The safeguarding plan provides a comprehensive description of its strategic action lines and identifies concrete activities for its implementation aimed at: strengthening the transfer of knowledge; developing forms of community organization to enable policymaking; and evaluation and control by means of a monitoring committee, among others, to which Colombia is obliged to comply with. The allocated budget, as submitted by the State Party, shows a commitment to employing public funding tied to national taxes and other resources in order to implement the timeline of activities outlined in the existing safeguarding plan, thus ensuring the viability of the urgent measures which aim to improve the sustainability of the element’. She then proceeded to adopt paragraph 2 on criteria U.4 and U.5 and finally paragraph 2 as whole. She declared paragraph 3 adopted with the removal of ‘decides not to’ before ‘inscribes’, paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 adopted without amendments and **Decision** **10.COM 10.a.2. adopted as amended** **to inscribe** **Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Colombia and gave it the floor.
2. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Chairperson and on behalf of the Colombian Government thanked the Committee for including Traditional Vallenato music on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. It mentioned the source of the songs; myths, apparitions, indescribable landscapes and various unforeseen events, which had also inspired renowned writer Gabriel Garcia Marquez. Marquez once said his novel *One Hundred Years of Solitude* was a 400-page Vallenato piece. The delegation then shared with the room a short video on its intangible cultural heritage.

[Video]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Colombia again before giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body who thanked the Chair and introduced the next nomination on **Traditional hand puppetry** [draft decision 10.COM 10.a.3] submitted by **Egypt** for possible inscription on the List of Intangible Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
2. The **Chairperson of the** **Evaluation Body** explained that the body considered that the file had met Criteria U.1, U.2 and U.5. For Criterion U.1, the file showed the element had been passed on from generation to generation with everlasting and contemporary messages that supported social and cultural values in the interaction between performers and the audience. Concerning Criterion U.2, it showed that the element’s viability was at risk due to changes in legislation concerning public meetings and gatherings, the rise of religious radicalism, an overall decrease in interest among younger generations, the disappearance of certain techniques and the advanced age and death of some of the puppet-makers and puppeteers. Criterion U.5 had been met as Al-Aragoz had been included in the inventory of the Egyptian archives of folk life and folk traditions since 2013 accomplished with the cooperation of individuals and NGOs concerned while the Egyptian Society of Folk Tradition and an expert were responsible for maintaining and updating the inventory. However, the Evaluation Body considered the file had not met Criterion U.3 or U.4. Concerning Criterion U.3, the proposed safeguarding plan did not address several identified threats and some of the planned activities seemed not to reinforce the element’s cultural meaning for audiences and communities nor clarify how the element’s diverse and creative characteristics would be retained. For Criterion U.4, the nomination failed to detail active participation by a broader community at all stages of the nomination process, and the names of six participants were not provided in English or French which made it difficult to reconcile the description of processes and consent documents. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended not to inscribe Traditional Hand Puppetry on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and asked for confirmation that the Committee had not received a request for debate or any amendment on the file. Asking the Committee to adopt the draft decision on this nomination as a whole, she noted that Turkey requested the floor.
4. The delegation of **Turkey** said that his country had examined the nomination file submitted by Egypt and that while it was true that the file was not necessarily satisfactory in light of Criteria U.3 and U.4, they congratulated the submitting State for its efforts to preserve the element which was now practised by no more than a few elderly people. Following the loss of practitioners and elderly knowledge holders, the speaker said that if authorities, communities and future generations did not have the will to continue practicing the element, it would probably disappear and for that reason it was hoped that if the Committee did not inscribe this element this time, Egypt should be allowed to resubmit the file, completing the missing information identified by the Evaluation Body.
5. The delegation of **Tunisia** pointed out that the file had showcased an impressive element that was highly representative of traditional culture in Egypt. Tunisia agreed with concerns expressed about it meeting the requirements of Criterion U.3 in that that there was no satisfactory correspondence between the nature of existing threats and the safeguarding measures proposed but felt nonetheless that substantial information had been presented that proved community commitment and will of the Egyptian government to safeguard the element. Tunisia hoped that Egypt would be given an opportunity to present further arguments concerning these commitments.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked Tunisia and reminded the Committee that the submitting State might only have the floor if there had been a specific question asked and that, for the time being, the Chair could not accede to Tunisia’s request.
7. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Chairperson, and asked for confirmation that Turkey had the floor. The **Chairperson** disagreed, saying that Ethiopia had the floor.
8. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said it respected the opinions of the Evaluation Body but wished to echo the request of Tunisia in allowing Egypt to explain to the Committee what it felt were gaps in the reflections of the Evaluation Body to allow for further understanding of the file.
9. The delegation of **Algeria** praised the work of the Evaluation Body and turning to the file under discussion said that Algeria had studied and listened to the recommendations of the Evaluation Body especially concerning Criterion U.3 and would like to hear further arguments from Egypt and, if possible, ask its delegation if in Egypt there is a process supported by the Government, where the goal is to teach and transmit this element of intangible cultural heritage.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria for its specific question, and gave the floor to Egypt.
11. The delegation of **Egypt** stated that with regard to criterion U.3, the Evaluation Body considered that the nomination misidentified threats to Egyptian traditional hand puppetry, while also pointing out that the file had referred to the fact that fewer than 10 hand puppet practitioners were currently active – all of whom were advanced in age. The delegation also said that the Evaluation Body thought that the activities incorporated seemed unnecessary, unrealistic and imbalanced. The delegate said that the Egyptian Ministry of Culture and its fellow intendants had undertaken a number of safeguarding procedures and engaged in activities aiming to safeguard the element, for example by hosting Al-Aragoz performances at historical sites in Cairo on a weekly basis, holding workshops at the same historical sites to train children and the youth on fabricating puppet techniques used in Al-Aragoz performances, as well as holding four academic fora on puppetry art, publishing a book about Al-Aragoz in Arabic and English, documenting more than 17 hours of fieldwork on Al-Aragoz in collaboration with a specialised puppetry group and training new practitioners through knowledge transferral from older practitioners. With regard to Criterion U.4, the evaluation of the file also referred to a lack of information regarding demonstrating active…

[Interruption]

1. The **Chairperson** apologised to Egypt, saying that Belgium had a point of order.
2. The delegation of **Belgium** said that the Committee would like to hear an answer to the precise question posed by Algeria, in order to follow procedure.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium, and asked Egypt to please answer the question that had been asked by Algeria.
4. The delegation of **Egypt** responded that its current reply might respond to the question and that they would continue with it. With regard to Criterion U.4, the Evaluation Body had referred to the ‘lack of information regarding demonstrating active practitioners of broader communities at some stages of the process and it should be noted that the lack of participation of broader community emphasizes that there is a lack of interest in such kind of art in a way that would urgently require the safeguarding of this art on the Urgent Safeguarding List of Intangible Cultural Heritage.’ Egypt felt that its response may have answered questions about the file and in conclusion urged the members of the Committee to support the file during the current session, to safeguard one of the most important traditional arts in Egypt.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Egypt saying that unless she saw an amendment from a member of the Committee on the draft decision, she was going to ask the Committee to adopt the decision in its totality. Seeing no request to suggest an amendment, she therefore declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.a.3 not to inscribe Traditional hand puppetry on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**. She offered the floor to Egypt again.
6. The delegation of **Egypt** said that all Egyptians and the children of Egypt eagerly awaited the decision and thanked the Chairperson.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Egypt and moved to the next file, a nomination from Mongolia, and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the nomination.
8. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination concerned with the **Coaxing ritual for camels** [draft decision 10.COM 10.a.5] submitted by **Mongolia** for inclusion on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
9. The Evaluation Body considered that the file had met Criteria U.1, U.2, U3 and U.4. For Criterion U.1 it showed how the ritual, demonstrating the link between humans and animals in a pastoral community, contributed to the community’s sense of identity and continuity. Concerning Criterion U.2, the file showed that the element’s viability was threatened by motorbikes replacing the use of camels; mining offering a more lucrative income; and the separation of children from their parents for schooling purposes resulting in interest in the practice diminishing. There was also an exodus and decline in the number of musicians and instruments of the practice. With regard to Criterion U.3, the file demonstrated that the safeguarding plan developed with the communities included activities to raise awareness, strengthen transmission, carry out studies and documentation, and promote results. For Criterion U.4 it showed that renowned practitioners behind the nomination had participated actively in its preparation, as well as individuals from different families and communities concerned all providing statements of free, prior and informed consent.
10. However, the Evaluation Body felt that Criterion U.5 had not been met. The ritual seemed to have been on the national inventory since 2010 but instead of providing an extract as required and stipulated by Decision 8.COM 7.a of the Committee, the submitting State had only given a list of elements from the inventory. Moreover, community participation in the inventory process had not been described in the file as required. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended not inscribing the ritual on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairman of the Evaluation Body and informed the Committee that Latvia had submitted an amendment to the decision on this nomination.
12. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its appreciation of the Evaluation Body’s work in preparing the draft decision and while it recognized deficiencies in Criterion U.5 identified by the Evaluation Body, mentioned community participation had been addressed in section 4 of the file. The delegation added that the file was a resubmission of one previously evaluated by the Consultative Body of the Committee in 2011 when additional requirements of criterion U.5 had not yet been included. At this time, the Draft decision 6.COM 8.14 for the file gave a positive evaluation for criterion U.5 acknowledging ‘the element is included in the Urgent Safeguarding List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Mongolia maintained by the Cultural Heritage Centre in the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science’. Latvia reminded the Committee that the principle of consistency was being applied for cases where the Committee had previously taken a decision on particular criteria for nominations, and that in such cases the previous decision was maintained. Although at the time the Committee did not take a decision on the nomination as the State Party withdrew it mainly due to the negative evaluations of two other criteria, Latvia invited the Committee to consider whether consistency could be applied taking into consideration previous draft decisions proposed and adopted by the Committee. Latvia observed that the State Party had this time provided a more detailed response to criterion U.5 than the previous 2011 nomination and wished to invite the Committee to consider the possibility of adopting a positive decision on criterion U.5.
13. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed its support for Latvia’s proposal.
14. The delegation of **Algeria** felt that in the case of files to the Urgent Safeguarding List it was always difficult when a nomination had to be referred or rejected, as it had just been the case for Egypt. Algeria said it supported Latvia’s proposed amendment.
15. The delegation of **Uganda** agreed with Latvia that if a file withdrawn in earlier sessions had later met the criteria it would be acceptable to revise the section so the file might be accepted. It referred to Article 12 of the Convention, which stated that ‘a State Party shall draw inventories in a manner geared to its own situation.’ When Uganda consulted the file, it found that the State Party had an extract where the Minister had requested the element be included in an updated inventory and according to the State Party, the inventory consisted of a list of elements as that was the manner in which the State Party decided to have its inventory.
16. **Hungary** supported the proposed amendment by Latvia and thanked it for its respectful work.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary and gave the floor to **Kyrgyzstan,** which stated that when the Evaluation Body considered the file it judged four criteria as having been met and one being problematic. Taking into account the information given by Latvia, Kyrgyzstan said the file seemed to have been complete during the transition process from old U.5 criteria to the new one and felt the Committee should probably reconsider the decision. As the practice was reportedly in a dangerous situation, Kyrgyzstan wished to ask Mongolia if it could provide evidence of community participation since it was a small community preserving the practice.
18. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with Latvia and was in favour of the inscription of the element.
19. **The Republic of Korea**, having listened to the Evaluation Body’s explanation, said in its opinion the practice was an extraordinary example of intangible cultural heritage testifying the special connection between humans and animals. From watching the video clip on UNESCO’s website it was greatly impressed by the practice and felt sympathy that such valuable heritage is endangered due to changes in the social and cultural environment believing inscription would contribute to its sustainable safeguarding. It added an inventory for the element had been regularly updated by the Mongolian government and regarding failing to meet additional criterion introduced in 2013, reiterated the nomination had originally been submitted in 2011 and that the State Party concerned had insufficient time to reflect the Committee’s new rule. The Republic of Korea supported inscription of the element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and wanted to see further development of the inventory in the near future, as well as a report on the element in four years’ time.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked the Republic of Korea and gave the floor to **Saint Lucia,** which supported Latvia’s proposed amendment and inscription of the element.
21. The **Chairperson** thanked Saint Lucia and gave the floor to **Nigeria,** which agreed with Latvia, and wished to see the element inscribed.
22. The delegation of **Greece** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its thorough work. Greece agreed with Latvia on its point where if previous evaluations had considered certain criteria to be satisfied when re-evaluating a file those criteria would not be referred to again. However, Greece cautioned four years had passed since the first evaluation and the Committee’s position on criterion U.5 was strong requiring not only an inventory in the country concerned but in accordance with the Convention, meaning dressed by the community rather than experts. Greece said in this instance it was clear the required inventory was not there but that the element was demonstrably in danger and that this was the only reason why it should be inscribed as one of the first measures in safeguarding an endangered element was to document it. It supported Latvia’s proposed amendment but felt that the Convention’s requirements for an inventory needed to be reiterated.
23. **Bulgaria** added its support to Latvia’s proposal stating the criterion of community participation although not extensively developed in the correct section of the file was present.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria and gave the floor to **Namibia,** which expressed its support for Latvia’s proposal for the element’s inscription.
25. The **Chairperson** thanked Namibia and gave the floor to **Tunisia,** which said that despite the perceived problem of participation of local communities it was satisfied the file contained sufficient information and was in favour of inscribing the element.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked Tunisia and concluded debate on the item, but returned to the question from Kyrgyzstan as the Chairperson had the impression that Kyrgyzstan had been asking the submitting State to add information not in the file and asked the delegation to reformulate its question.
27. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** apologised, saying its expert was not in the room, but that she was returning.
28. The **Chairperson** moved to adoption of the draft decision, paragraph by paragraph and asked for it to be shown on the screen. Paragraph 1 was adopted without amendment. Paragraph 2, criterion U.1 was adopted without amendment as were criteria U.2, U.3 and U.4. Criterion U.5 had an amendment submitted by Latvia, to which there were no objections and was adopted. There were no objections to adopt paragraph 2, which was adopted. Paragraph 3 had an amendment submitted by Latvia with the insertion of the word ‘Inscribes’ at the beginning of the first paragraph; there were no objections and it was adopted, as were paragraphs 4 and 5. Paragraph 6 was an amendment submitted by Greece, with two States (Latvia and Belgium) requesting the floor.
29. The delegation of **Latvia** felt from reading the present text of the nomination the inventory had satisfied all requirements but these were not explicitly presented in the last draft of the nomination so was not convinced by the wording proposed in the amendment.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and gave the floor to **Belgium,** which said Latvia had made the same point it wished to raise.
31. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and gave the floor to **Côte d’Ivoire,** which said the French version of the text stated ‘provision’ instead of ‘prévision’.
32. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire and asked if any members of the Committee supported Greece’s proposal. The floor was given to Congo.
33. The delegation of **Congo** said taking into account the amendments submitted it supported the nomination.
34. The **Chairperson** thanked Congo and gave the floor to **Greece,** which said as its amendment appeared contrary to the first part of the decision it could not see any way for it to be reconciled and the amendment, therefore, could not stand. The **Chairperson** thanked Greece, which withdrew its amendment.
35. The **Chairperson** moved to adopt the decision as a whole, as amended. There were no objections, and therefore she declared **Decision 10.COM 10.a.5** **adopted as amended to inscribe Coaxing ritual for camels** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** declared the Coaxing ritual for camels inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. The Chairperson congratulated **Mongolia** and gave the delegation the floor. The delegation expressed its gratitude for the inscription of the element that is crucial for shepherds, saying that in Mongolia the number of camels diminished every year and on behalf of the herders, Government and the delegation, extended its sincerest thanks.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked Mongolia and moved to the examination of the next file, submitted by Portugal and the floor was given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
3. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination the **Manufacture of cowbells** [Draft decision 10.COM 10.a.6] submitted by **Portugal** for possible inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** said that the Body considered all criteria had been satisfied in the nomination file. Concerning Criterion U.1 the Body felt that was satisfied as local communities perceive cowbell-making as a collective cultural heritage providing them with a sense of identity and continuity. Criterion U.2 was considered satisfied as the file demonstrated the element is in imminent danger due to a shortage of apprentices, introduction of new grazing methods that obviate the need for shepherds and cowbells, increasing changes in market rules and practices and the mechanisation of cowbell-making. Criterion U.3 was also considered satisfied, as the proposed safeguarding plan in collaboration with practitioners and communities responded to identified threats, covered a timespan of several years and relied on realistic resources. Criterion U.4 was considered satisfied as the file demonstrated a participatory process with the remaining bearers of the elements and key community institutions providing a broad range of attestations of their free, prior and informed consent. Finally, Criterion U.5 was satisfied as the element was registered and described in detail in an inventory catalogue of the Municipality of Viana do Alentejo. The inventorying process was elaborated in compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
5. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** concluded by saying that it considered the nomination could be regarded as a model nomination and recommended the inscription of the ‘Manufacture of Cowbells’ on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
6. The **Chairperson** indicated that the Committee had not received any request for discussion or any amendment for the file, at which point Brazil asked for and was given the floor.
7. The delegation of **Brazil** wished to congratulate Portugal for the nomination, hoping that inscribing the element would help in raising awareness of the necessity to safeguarding elements threatened by economic unsustainability.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil and as there were no objections declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.a.6 to inscribe Manufacture of cowbells** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**. The Chairperson congratulated Portugal and gave the delegation the floor.
9. The delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Chair, saying that this was a happy day for Portugal and that the delegation was pleased to have its first element inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. Portugal said that the manufacture of cowbells is a practice in many countries throughout the world, demanding specific knowledge and expertise and that their production and use needed to be protected and enhanced. The delegation was glad that Portugal was making this first contribution to the safeguarding of an intangible heritage practice shared and cherished by so many and that the art of manufacturing cowbells was a fine example of how one could contribute regionally and satisfy the growing needs of visitors of different values, traditions, customs and history while protecting cultural heritage. Portugal wished to acknowledge the promoters of the nomination, in particular but not exclusively the local authorities of Alentejo, the Tourism Board of Alentejo and the region of Alentejo, and the specialists behind the scientific coordination of this application. Portugal closed by showing a short video of the practice of cowbell-making.

[Video]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Portugal and moved to the next element, submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Chair of the Evaluation Body to share its conclusions on the nomination.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chair and presented the nomination on **Glasoechko, male two-part singing in Dolni** [Draft decision 10.COM 10.a.7] submitted by the **former** **Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** for possible inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
3. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** said that the Body considered that all criteria had been satisfied in the nomination. Criterion U.1 was considered satisfied as Glasoechko transmitted from generation to generation, conveyed the values, oral history and mythology of the people of the region and provided the community with a sense of identity and continuity. Criterion U.2 was considered satisfied as Glasoechko faced a set of threats, including a lack of interest from the younger generation and adequate documentation, insufficient funding and outmigration in the wake of recent conflicts. Criterion U.3 was also considered satisfied as the safeguarding plan developed together with stakeholders included activities pertaining to the transmission, documentation and research, preservation, promotion and revitalisation of Glasoechko. Criterion U.4 was considered satisfied as the nomination file and evidence of free prior and informed consent demonstrated active participation of existing groups and communities in the preparation of the nomination. Finally, Criterion U.5 was satisfied as Glasoechko had been included since 2010 in the National Registry of Cultural Heritage maintained by the Ministry of Culture as per Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of Glasoechko male two-part singing of the Dolni Polog region on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Evaluation Body for presenting the element, pointing out that the Bureau had not received any requests for discussion or amendment of the file and requested the Committee adopt the draft decision and nomination as a whole. There were no objections and **Decision 10.COM 10.a.7 to inscribe Glasoechko, male two-part singing in Dolni Polog** **on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding was adopted.** The Chairperson gave the floor to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.
6. The delegation of the **former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** said that on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Macedonia it wished to share the delegation’s pleasure and appreciation for the inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The delegation said that the Republic of Macedonia had already inscribed two elements on the Representative List; this third element was a new experience and challenge and they were convinced that its inscription would motivate practitioners of the element to continue further practice and transmission to the younger generation, thereby contributing to increasing awareness and visibility of other endangered intangible cultural heritage elements.

[Change of speaker]

1. The **Director of the Cultural Heritage Protection Office** in the Ministry of Culture of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia wished to express his deep conviction that the inscription would strengthen the country’s commitment to implementing the 2003 Convention, as well as promoting the intangible cultural heritage of the Republic of Macedonia at national and international levels. He invited the meeting to listen to an audiovisual presentation of Glasoechko singing.

[Audiovisual presentation]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia again before giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chair and presented the day’s last nomination on **Koogere oral tradition of the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro peoples** [Draft decision 10.COM 10.a.8] submitted by **Uganda** for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
3. The **Evaluation Body** considered all criteria in the nomination were satisfied. For Criterion U.1, the nomination showed that the Koogere oral tradition conveyed value, belief systems and collective memory that offered the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro communities a feeling of identify and continuity. With regard to Criterion U.2, the nomination demonstrated the practice is seriously endangered due to the very small number of bearers, the disappearance of the social context of the practice, declining use of indigenous languages and a general loss of understanding of the element. Concerning Criterion U.3 the safeguarding plan developed with involvement of communities and relevant stakeholders who intended integrating the element into contemporary society through the introduction of new modes of transmission and education of practitioners thanks to a carefully developed budget that could be used as a model scenario. For Criterion U.4, the file demonstrated that communities and stakeholders were involved in the preparation of the nomination file, providing their free, prior and informed consent. And finally, concerning Criterion U.5, the element has been included since 2012 on the national inventory drawn up in conformity with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention maintained by the Ugandan Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the Koogere oral tradition of the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro peoples on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the presentation and informed the Committee that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendment on the file; she asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision on the nomination as a whole. Seeing no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.a.8 to inscribe Koogere oral tradition of the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro peoples on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding**. The Chairperson congratulated Uganda and gave the delegation the floor.
5. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked the Chairperson, saying that the Ugandan delegation was overjoyed for the inscription which was a clear recognition of the cherished heritage of the Ugandan people. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its efforts to understand the Koogere tradition, its coherent and systematic analysis of the nomination and favourable recommendation for inscription of the tradition. The Uganda delegation also expressed its gratitude to the Committee for its decision to inscribe the Koogere oral tradition, which forms part of the collective memory of the Basongora, Banyabindi and Batooro communities of western Uganda, emphasizing the importance of wisdom, female power and heroism. Together with the State Party, these communities are committed to ensuring the continuity of the practice and implementation of the safeguarding measures proposed.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to **Peru** which congratulated the five countries that had succeeded in getting their elements inscribed and complemented the responsible, competent work of the Evaluation Body and the Committee, saying that the afternoon’s work had been professionally carried out and that all needed to congratulate themselves for the successful conclusion of the work.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked Peru, declaring the completion of the session of nominations proposed for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Chairperson said that eight nominations had been received, of which two were withdrawn, five were inscribed and one not inscribed, and that Egypt was invited to resubmit its nomination for examination during a following cycle. The floor was given to Turkey.
3. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to express its pleasure and satisfaction of the work of the Evaluation Body and the Committee while applauding the Secretariat for its meticulous and professional work. The Turkish delegation invited all members of the Committee and Observers, participating delegations and the Secretariat, to a celebration.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey. There were no further requests for the floor, and the Chairperson moved to the next agenda item.

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA (part 1):**

**EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/10.b](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10.b+Add_EN.doc)+Add*

Decision *10.COM 10*

1. The **Chairperson** directed the attention of the room to Item 10.b: ‘Examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The Chairperson advised the meeting that as per Document 10.b+Add, one nomination was withdrawn by the submitting State of Slovenia and therefore 34 files were to be examined. She noted that consistent with Decision 9.COM 13.c the Evaluation Body had recommended to refer files in cases when the file lacked the required information whether it be of technical or substantial nature. The Chairperson reminded that this option was proposed for application to other mechanisms as it currently was only applicable for the Representative List. In the same decision it had been emphasised that referral of a nomination should not be considered as a guarantee of future inscription of that element and that any future resubmission would have to demonstrate that inscription criteria were fully met. The Chairperson also recalled discussions on the referral option during previous sessions and in particular in Bali where it had been concluded that referring a file placed no obligation on a State, which could choose to resubmit or not a nomination at any future cycle therefore allowing the State to establish its own priorities for each cycle. Hence, a nomination could be submitted during the following cycle, that is, by 31 March of the year following the year of decision for possible inscription 18 months later, or during any other subsequent cycle. In any case, there would have to be a period of 18 months between the date of file submission and its examination by the Committee which was why referral decisions always say ‘invites the State Party to submit its nomination during a following cycle.’
2. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the criteria that nominations need to satisfy for elements to be inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and listed them.
3. The **Chairperson** moved to examination of individual files and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to share its findings on Afghanistan’s nomination.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson and introduced the first nomination on **Attan** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.1] submitted **by** **Afghanistan** for possible inscription on the Representative List.
5. The Evaluation Body considered that from the information in the nomination the submitting State did not demonstrate that any of five criteria were met. Concerning criterion R.1, the Body felt that additional information was necessary to better define the contours of the communities and groups concerned, as well as the social and cultural functions and significance of the element. Concerning criterion R.2, the Body felt the nomination described the expected consequences for Attan, but not the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage in general and therefore considered that this criterion was not satisfied as descriptions of previous, current and proposed safeguarding measures lacked clarity, consistency and specificity. Criterion R.3 was considered not satisfied as participation of communities and stakeholders in planning and implementation were not discussed in sufficient concrete terms, particularly concerning the consequences of inscription. The nomination included some consent letters but the process of involvement and participation by the communities concerned was not described, especially as the element had been insufficiently defined. The Body also concluded that criterion R.5 had not been met as the nomination did not demonstrate that inclusion of the element in a national inventory was in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
6. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring this file to the State Party for additional information.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for its explanation of the different issues raised during evaluation of the file, saying that the Committee had not received any requests for debate on this nomination or amendment on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision. There were no objections and therefore the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.1 to refer the nomination of Attan to the State Party for additional information.**
8. The **Chairperson** moved to the file submitted by Algeria, and gave the floor to theChairperson of the Evaluation Body.
9. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson and presented the findings of the Evaluation Body on the nomination on **Sbuâ, annual pilgrimage to the zawiya of Sidi El Hadj Belkacem in Gourara** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.2] submitted by **Algeria** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
10. The Evaluation Body considered that the file demonstrated that all criteria were satisfied. Criterion R.1 was considered satisfied as knowledge and practices linked to the Sbuâ are transmitted from generation to generation, reaffirming a link within the Zenata communities and reinforcing their common identity and continuity. Concerning criterion R.2, the Body felt that the file demonstrated that inscription of the element could increase awareness of the capacity of intangible cultural heritage to contribute to peace and reconciliation and visibility of other elements in the region, thereby encouraging their safeguarding. With regard to criterion R.3, the Body felt the file demonstrated that proposed safeguarding measures were developed with the participation of communities in full awareness of possible involuntary consequences of inscription. For criterion R.4, the Body considered the file clearly described how members of the village communities of Gourara and the custodians of the mausoleums were involved in the entire process of nomination and gave their free, prior and informed consent to it. The Body felt that criterion R.5 was satisfied as the Gourara Sbuâ has been included on the national database of intangible cultural heritage since 2005, maintained and periodically updated by the National Centre for Prehistoric, Anthropological and Historical Research.
11. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
12. The **Chairperson** said that no requests for debate on the nomination or amendment on the draft decision were received and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and therefore the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.2 to inscribe Sbuâ, annual pilgrimage to the zawiya of Sidi El Hadj Belkacem in Gourara** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Algeria and gave it the floor.
2. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work and expressed its thanks to the members of the Committee for the inscription of the element. Algeria explained that Sbuâ comes from an Arabic term for the number seven indicating the seventh day of the birth of the Prophet Mohammed. It is a pilgrimage lasting seven days that celebrates renewal and tightening of social ties and not simply for populations in south-western Algeria but the whole population of Algeria as people come from all over the country to the Gourara region. The element involves other aspects of heritage such as dance, music and the upkeep of mausoleums.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria and offered her congratulations, before moving to the next file submitted by Andorra, Spain and France and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination on **Summer solstice fire festivals in the Pyrenees** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.3] jointly submitted by **Andorra, Spain and France** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The Evaluation Body considered the nomination met all criteria. Concerning criterion R.1 the Body felt that solstice fire festivals express social and family links, promoting benevolence and hospitality and strengthening the continuity, identity and belonging of the Pyrenees communities within the three submitting States. For criterion R.2 the Body felt that the inscription of the element would ensure the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage in general and raise awareness about its importance, testifying cultural diversity and guaranteeing sustainable diversity. With regard to criterion R.3, the Body considered the information in the file demonstrated that the nomination was developed through a long process involving all stakeholders primarily communities, with the elaboration of global as well as cross-cutting safeguarding measures. For criterion R.4, the Body found that the file showed that communities, groups and individuals were largely involved throughout the nomination process, and gave a wide range of attestations of their free, prior and informed consent. Concerning criterion R.5, the Body found that the nomination demonstrated that the element was included in the inventories of the three submitting States in conformity with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
6. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended that this element be inscribed on the Representative List and that this multinational nomination be considered as exemplary.
7. The **Chairperson** confirmed the Committee had not received requests for debate on the nomination or amendments on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections, and **Decision 10.COM 10.b.3 to inscribe Summer solstice fire festivals in the Pyrenees** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity was adopted**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three submitting States and gave the floor to Andorra.
2. The delegation of the **Government of the Principality of Andorra** thanked the Committee for inscribing the Summer solstice fire festivals on the Representative List, saying that this was the first element it had inscribed and was appreciative of the positive recommendation of the Evaluation Body. Andorra said it celebrated the inscription together with France and Spain and thanked those two countries for the confidence they had given to Andorra, and stated that cooperation between the three States had been exemplary at both the government and regional authority levels, and especially between the communities. Inscription of the element on the Representative List recognised the coherent cultural unity and the long exchanges among communities found in the Pyrenees, clearly illustrating that intangible cultural heritage is capable of weaving linkages between peoples, and the Principality of Andorra would further contribute to that by safeguarding this common heritage. The delegation of Andorra closed by asking the representatives of Spain and France and then Mr Juan Reguant, the coordinator of the nomination and representative of the communities, to take the floor.
3. The delegation of **Spain,** on behalf of the Ministry of Culture, Education and Sport of the Kingdom of Spain, expressed its gratitude to the Committee for its support and the Evaluation Body for its clear and positive report. Spain added that the communities of Spain from Catalonia and Aragon were very pleased as they saw that the Evaluation Body clearly recognised in the draft decision the wide participation of communities, groups and individuals, through a long collaboration process; on behalf of those communities as well, Spain thanked all concerned.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **France** said it was proud to celebrate the inscription of a long tradition shared with its friends and neighbours in Andorra and Spain, thanking all who shared the tradition and all participants who had carried the project up to its inscription. France assured the meeting that they would guarantee the safeguarding of this centuries-old tradition and would perpetuate it for future generations.

[Applause]

1. Mr Juan Reguant, the **coordinator of the nomination**, on behalf of the 63 Pyrenees communities, thanked the Committee for the inscription and for having considered it as a model nomination. He said it was the result of an investment by all participating communities who, thanks to retransmission of the meeting, had been watching proceedings and were now celebrating the Convention as the nomination’s preparation enabled them to rediscover their shared heritage and build links among themselves to better know each other, encouraging them to embark on a shared and common future. He thanked the representatives of the States Parties, non-governmental organisations and other observers and Namibian volunteers on behalf of the bearers and practitioners of the Summer solstice fire festivals of the Pyrenees, and invited everyone to experience the practice one day.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three States involved and thanked them for their invitation before moving to the next nomination, submitted by Argentina, where the floor was again given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Filete porteño in Buenos Aires, a traditional painting technique** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.4] submitted by **Argentina** for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered the nomination file met all criteria. For criterion R.1, the Body felt that the painting technique represented a shared heritage of Buenos Aires’ inhabitants that was transmitted informally through apprenticeship and was undergoing a recent revival. Concerning criterion R.2, the Body considered that the file demonstrated that inscription of the element could contribute to the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage, to dialogue, mutual respect and cooperation between different generations, communities from different origins or sharing similar artistic expressions. With regard to criterion R.3, the Body felt the nomination also showed that safeguarding measures were proposed aiming at revitalizing the element and reducing risks related to the possible unintended consequences of its inscription on the list. Concerning criterion R.4, the Body believed the nomination also demonstrated that it had been elaborated by a team of experts and community members who gave their free, prior and informed consent. With regard to criterion R.5, The Body found that the nomination demonstrated the element had been included in 2006 in an inventory named Cultural Heritage of Buenos Aires following a process in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** said that the Committee had not received any requests for debate nor amendments related to the file and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. Seeing no objection, the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.4 to inscribe Filete porteño in Buenos Aires, a traditional painting technique** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**. The Chairperson congratulated Argentina and gave it the floor.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Argentina** thanked the Committee for inscribing its first national element as the Tango had been submitted together with Uruguay. Argentina expressed its happiness in receiving the inscription because Filete was a traditional technique. The delegate of **Argentina** explained that workshops had been undertaken with communities and was very pleased for them because it was communities who were those to be thanked for preparing the nomination. The delegation considered the inscription was good news for Buenos Aires, the experts who had worked to submit the project, the Minister of Culture of Buenos Aires and the mayor of the city recently-elected President of Argentina. She was pleased to bring the good news back to Argentina to be shared with all those people and with the country in general and thanked all concerned for the recognition and trust.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Argentina before drawing the attention of the meeting to its conclusion for the day reminding that the Bureau would meet on the following day at 9 a.m. and asking the Vice-Chairpersons of Belgium, Brazil, Hungary, India and Tunisia to be on time. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention for an announcement.
2. The **Secretary** issued a last reminder to delegates who had not yet registered to do so the following morning and informed the room of the activities taking place that evening: UNESCO-trained facilitators would be meeting immediately after the end of the session; and at 5.30 pm the NGOs would be hosting a Heritage Life symposium.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and declared the day’s session closed.

*[Wednesday, 2 December 2015, morning session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA (part 2):**

**EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/10.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10.b+Add_EN.doc)*+Add*

Decision *10.COM 10*

1. The **Chairperson** welcomed all participants to the morning session of the third day, informing the room that the Bureau had met that morning for the second time. She said that the Bureau was pleased with progress achieved thus far thanks to the working methods adopted to request a debate or amendment of a specific draft decision by members of the Committee, which proved to be efficient during the examination of nominations. She said that the Bureau had received eight amendments and requests for debate which would be examined by the Committee during the day. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention for some announcements.
2. The **Secretary** informed delegates that an information session on the Convention’s global capacity-building strategy would be held for Electoral Group III: Latin American and Caribbean States, between 1.30 and 2.30 p.m. and that the Committee meeting was being widely followed on social media, including one well known celebrity figure from Colombia, Shakira, who had shared UNESCO’s post on the inscription of Traditional Vallenato music of the Greater Magdalena region with her 35 million followers.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the previous day a total of 10 nominations had been examined: six nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List resulting in five inscriptions and one non-inscription, and four nominations for inscription on the Representative List which resulted in three inscriptions and one referral. The day’s programme required the examination of 30 nominations to the Representative List plus two requests for international assistance; of the 30 nominations, more time would be required for eight of the nominations for which the Committee had received requests for debate or amendment. The Chairperson recalled that, during the debate, submitting States could only respond to a question posed by a member of the Committee, and it was not to be seen as an opportunity to highlight information not contained in the file. She appealed to members of the Committee to pose specific questions to submitting States to allow them to respond precisely to questions. She highlighted the time constraint factor and asked submitting States to keep their statements as brief as possible. The next nomination was submitted by Armenia and the floor was given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present it.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination on **Kochari, traditional group dance** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.5] submitted by **Armenia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered the information in the nomination file was insufficient to determine whether the criteria had been met. For criterion R.1, the Body felt that the nomination did not clearly identify the nature and scope of the element, outline of the communities and groups concerned nor the modes of transmission in families and dance ensembles. For criterion R.2, the Body considered the file focused on Kochari itself, its communities and national identity in the home and among the diaspora, rather than on the visibility of the intangible cultural heritage in general or on awareness of its importance. For criterion R.3, the Body found the ongoing and proposed activities were mainly oriented towards promotion and not enough on the potential unintended consequences of inscription and even less about the viability of the specific variants of Kochari. The Body judged criterion R.4 to have a top-down structure and that proof of participation and consent of communities was insufficient, especially as it was limited to representatives residing in the capital city. According to the Body, criterion R.5 lacked information on inclusion of the element in an inventory, in particular regarding the participation of communities in identification and definition of the element and regular updating of an inventory.
4. The Evaluation Body recommended referring this file to the State Party for additional information on all criteria.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Secretariat had received an amendment by Greece on criterion R.1 and gave the floor to Greece to explain its amendment.
6. The delegation of **Greece** said that although the Evaluation Body’s recommendations were valuable it believed that in criterion R.1 at least, the file presented the merits of possible inscription. Greece felt that group dance is a culturally important marker of identity in Armenia being transmitted to younger generations through familial groups and gatherings and variety of formal and non-formal settings and organisations. Greece pointed out that in this collective expression of the community there were no restrictions of age or sex or social status and that all people in a given community or event participated in the dance. It was performed everywhere in Armenia during holidays, pilgrimages and any sort of festive occasion, as well as in urban and rural communities and Greece was sure that the requirements of the Convention had been fulfilled for criterion R.1 at least and proposed an amendment.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Greece for its proposed amendment to criterion R.1 and opened the floor to the members of the Committee to comment.
8. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Evaluation Body for its evaluation, but suggested that from the descriptions provided it felt that the element might constitute intangible cultural heritage as defined in Article 2 of the Convention. Brazil supported the amendment presented by Greece and addressed a specific question to the submitting State concerning criterion R.1: ‘How is the nominated element presented in the practising communities and groups, as well as the forms of transmission within families and dance ensembles?’
9. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** said that the nomination appeared to it to demonstrate a popular practice transmitted within families to the younger generations and that the mode of transmission seemed clear. With regard to criterion R.5, the delegation requested the submitting State to clarify how the element appeared on the national inventory.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed support for the proposal of Greece, agreeing that criterion R.1 was met in the dossier but wished to see the amendment proposed by Greece.
11. The **Chairperson** continued the debate while the technical problem of displaying the draft decision on the screen was being remedied, giving the floor to Ethiopia.
12. The delegation of **Ethiopia** mentioned the Evaluation Body’s reference to the submitting State’s top-down organisation as outlined in the nomination and asked the delegation of Armenia to clarify what was meant by ‘top-down organisation.’
13. The delegation of **Uruguay** expressed its support for the amendment proposed by Greece for criterion R.1.
14. The delegation of **Congo** referred to Greece’s proposed amendment suggesting it was sufficient to enable acceptance of the file and requested that Armenia present further explanations.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Congo and referred to the proposal by Greece on the screen. Looking at criterion R.1 in relation to the amendment by Greece, the Chairperson first gave the floor to Armenia to respond to the two questions posed as the question by Ethiopia was more specifically addressed to the Evaluation Body.
16. The delegation of **Armenia** thanked Namibia for its hospitality and organisation of the meeting. The delegation had listened closely to the Evaluation Body’s presentation of work in which it was mentioned new working methods were being established that would set standards for its future work. It was mentioned that these new criteria were not applicable for evaluating earlier nominations, yet it seemed to Armenia that at least some of the new criteria and methods had been applied to its current nomination. On 2 November when the recommendation came out, Armenia carefully reviewed the five criteria and for at least for three criteria if felt that they responded to the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. Armenia agreed with the Evaluation Body there was a possibility to improve the other two criteria but that while there was always the possibility of improving any document this wasn’t the task of the Committee. To avoid any possible misunderstandings or misinterpretations that might have been possible from the nomination file, the delegation offered the floor to the Deputy Minister of Culture of the Republic of Armenia to clarify the questions.
17. The **Chairperson** pointed out that she would prefer interventions to be restricted to responses to the two questions asked, but gave the floor to the Deputy Minister of Culture of the Republic of Armenia as requested.
18. The **Deputy Minister of Culture of the Republic of Armenia** responded to the questions raised, the first of which was about criterion R.1 and practising communities and groups and forms of transmission within the families and dance ensembles. Under paragraph 1(ii) the contours of practising communities and groups were mentioned thus: ‘Today, the Kochari is the most widely spread dance in Armenia. There are also practitioners in the diaspora. People dance in villages, urban areas, almost at every holiday, family events and national festivals. In many villages (besides the well-known dancers) there are functioning children's and adult groups of song and dance that are considered as the main practitioners in local environment.’ ‘Kochari is one of the rare folk traditional dances which is especially popular amongst the youth.’ ‘The bearers are different compatriot unions functioning in various regions of Armenia, young, middle-aged and old individuals also involved in traditional dance groups, in the dancing programs of which Kochari has its steady position.’ ‘In the urban environment, during different meetings of young people in the clubs and public places Kochari is danced as a celebrative culmination and epilogue of the joyful gatherings.’ The Deputy Minister referred to transmission in families and dance ensembles where it was mentioned under paragraph 1(ii) of the nomination: ‘The chain of transmission from generation to generation was never interrupted’, as well as under paragraph 1(iii): ‘The Kochari passes to the next generation mainly in families through the elder bearers. The young people learn at family events, weddings, celebrations, through formal and informal education in the traditional folk ensembles, cultural, art and aesthetic educational centres, as well as at professional educational institutions’. ‘The Armenian traditional dance ensembles carry out different educational projects where the teaching of Kochari and its variations is of high popularity [sic]’. After bringing particular examples, the following is mentioned under the same paragraph of the nomination: ‘Presently, Kochari is widely performed not only during regular celebrations, but it has also been included in the dancing programs of professional and amateur dance groups’. The Deputy Minister said that this was in response to the first question.
19. The second question was about how Kochari was included in the inventory with the **Deputy Minister** responding. Information concerning inscription of the element in the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, confirmed by Decision No. 310 adopted in 2010 by the Government of the Republic of Armenia, was complete as all defined criteria had been met – localisation, contours, bearers, a brief historical review of the element, its vitality and description of cultural elements necessary for inscription on the List. In the fourth column of the List it was mentioned Kochari is practised in communities all over the territory of Armenia and in the seventh column, a brief historical description is given of community participation. The Deputy Minister continued regarding regular updating of the inventory it should be mentioned that neither in the Convention nor the legislation of the Republic of Armenia were deadlines or periodicity set up for updates of the inventory and that once an element was included on the List it was considered inscribed. Although updating inventory was mentioned in Article 12 of the Convention there was no need for periodic updates after the 2010 for nominations submitted in 2014. Moreover, information about the List, according to the same paragraph of the Convention, had to be submitted in the periodic report by States Parties on the implementation of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage adopted at the ninth session of the Intergovernmental Committee in 2014.
20. The **Deputy Minister** said the third question related to a comment on the fourth criterion about top-down organisation where the Armenian delegation would like to mention that there is...
21. The **Chairperson** interrupted the Deputy Minister, saying he had responded to the two questions posed, and that before he spoke further she would give the floor to the President of the Evaluation Body for comment.
22. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the delegation of Ethiopia for the question on the top-down process of preparing the nomination, recalling that the working methods used by previous bodies was to build a consensus of opinion among the 12 members of the Body. When the Body met in Paris, it was to pool the various views of its members towards agreement on recommendations for each criterion. The impression that emerged among members of the Body with regard to criterion R.4 after close examination of the consent documents was that of a top-down process.
23. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that she had referred the question to him as the question from Ethiopia was ‘What does top-down organisation mentioned under criterion 4 mean?’ She gave back the floor to the Deputy Minister of Culture for his comment on issue.
24. The **Deputy Minister of Culture of the Republic of Armenia** mentioned that all accompanying letters were from NGOs registered in the capital city of Yerevan, where half of the population of Armenia now lives and that these NGOs implemented their projects in the regions and villages of the Republic of Armenia. He said it was important to note that neither the Convention nor the questions in the nomination required the involvement of organisations residing outside the capital and that the accompanying letters written by the educational and scientific organisations revealed that the field of study of the above-mentioned organisations was primarily on the culture of the regions and villages of the Republic of Armenia.
25. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Minister of Culture saying that Greece’s proposed amendment was specifically for criterion R.1 and that she would turn to the Committee to establish whether there was broad agreement for it then gave the floor to Belgium.
26. The delegation of **Belgium** asked for the amendment to be shown on the screen and proposed different wording for the first sentence to remain closer to the definition in Article 2 of the Convention by saying that ‘Kochari group dance actually provides a sense of identity’ which would apply also to the diaspora, which was emphasized in the file. Belgium asked to delete ‘is an important marker of identity in Armenia’ and to replace it with ‘provides a sense of identity’, which would be the wording as in Article 2 in the Convention.
27. The **Chairperson** asked Belgium where they would prefer the full stop to be in the first sentence, to which Belgium answered after the word ‘identity’.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and asked Greece for its opinion on the proposed amendment by Belgium, which Greece said it agreed. The Chairperson asked members of the Committee supporting the amendment proposed by Greece as amended by Belgium to show their nameplates. Sixteen name plates were counted out of the 23 members of the Committee, indicating that the amendment had broad support from the Committee. The floor was given to Latvia.
29. The delegation of **Latvia** said that if the proposed amendment was going to be accepted, it would first like to see it on the screen. Coming back to the observations proposed by the Evaluation Body and in order to be more consistent with the proposed evaluation, Latvia suggested putting a full stop after the words ‘rural communities’ and deleting the text at the end of this amendment as the major difficulty expressed by the Evaluation Body was the scope of the element and the definition of communities and groups.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and having asked if there were any objections to the proposed amendment, gave Côte d’Ivoire the floor.
31. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** said it had no objection but wished to point out that to comply with Article 2 of the Convention, the wording should be ‘urban and rural’, not ‘urban or rural’.
32. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire for the clarification replacing ‘or’ with ‘and’ and gave the floor to **Belgium**,which pointed out that the English version should read ‘performed during holidays’ not ‘in during’.
33. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and moved to adopt the paragraph as amended. There were no objections and paragraph 1 was adopted. The nomination was, therefore, referred to the submitting State for additional information and resubmission to the Committee for examination during a following cycle. The Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.5 as amended to refer the nomination of Kochari, traditional group dance to the State Party for additional information**. She then offered the floor to Armenia.
34. The delegation of **Armenia** thanked the delegations that had supported the amendment and the members of the Committee for their consideration of the draft decision, adding that regardless of the statutes of the inscription Armenia was already carrying out relevant safeguarding measures and teaching the element in secondary schools in Armenia.
35. The **Chairperson** thanked Armenia for its positive comment and introduced the next file from Austria, giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
36. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Classical horsemanship and the High School of the Spanish Riding School Vienna** submitted by **Austria** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.6] for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
37. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all the criteria. Under criterion R.1, the Body found the nomination demonstrated that the proposed element continues a long relationship between urban and rural centres for breeding and riding, providing a sense of identity and continuity to groups involved in its practice and transmission. Under criterion R.2, the Body believed the nomination showed that inscription of the element was likely to raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage, including a close relationship between humans and animals as well as respect for cultural and biological diversity while contributing to intercultural dialogue. Under criterion R.3, the Body thought the nomination clearly described past and present efforts for safeguarding the element and proposed measures to strengthen its transmission and promotion. Under criterion R.4, the Body found the nomination had proven that groups of the Spanish Riding School Vienna and other relevant institutions participated in the nomination process and provided their free, prior and informed consent. Under criterion R.5, the Body believed the nomination showed that the item was registered in March 2010 in the Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage maintained by the Austrian Commission for UNESCO and updated every year.
38. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
39. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Committee had not received any requests for debate on the nomination or amendment to the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.6** **to inscribe** **Classical horsemanship and the High School of the Spanish Riding School Vienna** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.
40. The **Chairperson** congratulated Austria and gave the delegation the floor.
41. The delegation of **Austria** thanked the Chairperson and Committee saying that Austria’s third element had now been inscribed on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, which gave Austria a sense of pride and satisfaction and showed that it was well on its way to implementing the Convention. Austria felt that national implementation was the core of the Convention. Since Austria had ratified the Convention in 2009 it had entrusted the Austrian Commission for UNESCO with establishing networks between official bodies, experts, communities and NGOs to carry out safeguarding measures and awareness-raising activities, and draw up an inventory. The inventory presently included 86 elements, one of which was the subject just inscribed. ‘Classical horsemanship and the High School of the Spanish Riding School’ was among the first elements to be inscribed on the national inventory showing its importance to Austria as an important part of its culture and providing the community with a sense of identity and continuity. The traditional art and practice of breeding, keeping, training and riding Lipizzaner horses had been practised for more than 400 years and the close relation between humans and animals, the maintenance of cultural and biological diversity and the values of respect, patience and strong empathy were at the heart of the tradition. Austria concluded by thanking the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Intergovernmental Committee for their work and dedication that had helped to safeguard so many living traditions and strengthen so many communities’ identities.
42. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Austria and moved to the next nomination by Azerbaijan, giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
43. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Copper craftsmanship of Lahij** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.7] submitted by **Azerbaijan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
44. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all criteria. For the Body, criterion R.1 showed that the crafting of copper gave local communities a sense of belonging and continuity while providing a source of income. The Body believed that concerning criterion R.2 the file demonstrated that inscription of the item reflected a dialogue between communities and their creativity and contributed to cultural diversity in the region. Concerning criterion R.3 the Body found that the nomination demonstrated a full set of safeguarding measures developed by communities with the help of an NGO to better understand the element, its transmission and promotion. For criterion R.4, the Body found the nomination was developed by tradition bearers and a group of experts, representatives of local NGOs and a municipality, all of which provided their free, prior and informed consent. The Body believed criterion R.5 was met as the item was included in 2014 on the Azerbaijani register of intangible cultural heritage held by the Board of Inventory and Documentation.
45. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The Body also recommended that the submitting State be congratulated on a well-developed, exemplary case that could serve as a model of nomination.
46. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that no requests for debate on the nomination had been received by the Bureau, and asked if the draft decision could be adopted as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.7** **to inscribe Copper craftsmanship of Lahij on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Azerbaijan and gave it the floor.
2. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** thanked Namibian authorities for their excellent organisation of the tenth session of the Committee, and the Chairperson and the Intergovernmental Committee for its decision to inscribe Copper craftsmanship of Lahij on the Representative List and the Evaluation Body for recommending the inscription. The delegation and the community of Lahij copper craftsmen and bearers extended their gratitude, joy and pride at seeing their art recognised at the international level. Lahij copper craftsmanship is the expression of a long-living cultural practice and bears the cultural values of the Azerbaijani people as a whole. The inscription was the result of years of hard work carried out by an excellent team that prepared the file, working together with the Tat community of Lahij and that inscription would encourage copper craftsmen to continue practising the element and passing it on to future generations. The delegation thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government of Azerbaijan for its efforts resulting in the inscription, as well as the Secretariat of the Convention for its support. The delegation said that the inscription would reinforce safeguarding measures of intangible cultural heritage and support awareness-raising and implementation of the Convention in Azerbaijan.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Azerbaijan and moved to the next file submitted by Bangladesh.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Jatra traditional performing arts** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.8] submitted by **Bangladesh** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered the information provided in the nomination file as insufficient regarding meeting the five criteria. The Body believed criterion R.1 was not met as the nomination failed to explain the scope of the Jatra traditional performing arts and characteristics of its communities, bearers and practitioners, as well as the relationship between transmission in the home and that offered by Bangladesh Shilpakala Academy programmes, the function of Jatra for different segments of society, and nature or level of threats. The Body considered criterion R.2 was not met as the element was not clearly defined and its inscription on the Representative List was not likely to improve the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general or to raise awareness of its importance. The Body found criterion R.3 was not met through the nomination’s intention to protect Jatra defined as ‘original’, ‘moral’ and ‘healthy’ where promoting it as an industry remained insufficiently explained. The evidence of commitment by the submitting State to support safeguarding deserved greater visibility. The Body judged criterion R.4 as not met as the nomination did not show which communities were involved in the nomination process and whether the bearers and practitioners took part or which aspects of the element were or were not protected by customary practices. The Body believed criterion R.5 was not met as the nomination provided no clear explanation about inclusion of the element in an inventory drawn up in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, and found difficult to evaluate if the extract reflected such an inventory.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State for additional information.
5. As the Committee had not received any requests for debate on or amendment to the file, the **Chairperson** asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.8 to refer the nomination of Jatra traditional performing arts to the State Party for additional information.**
6. Having enquired if Bangladesh was in the room and would like to take the floor; as there were no requests, the **Chairperson** moved to the next nomination by Bosnia and Herzegovina, and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Konjic woodcarving** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.9] submitted by **Bosnia and Herzegovina** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
8. The Evaluation Body considered that from information contained in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4 and R.5. The Body found criterion R.1 was met as the nomination showed that Konjic woodcarving is an engine of sustainable development, a traditional interior design marker in Bosnia and Herzegovina and a symbol of identity and continuity of the local community. The Body believed criterion R.2 was met as inscribing the element is likely to contribute to interethnic dialogue, intergenerational cooperation, gender equality and visibility of traditional crafts in the world today, as well as respect for creativity and cultural diversity. The Body considered criterion R.4 was met as the nomination was initiated by a government agency and enthusiastically supported by the community concerned whose representatives, in addition to various stakeholders, provided their free, prior and informed consent. The Body found criterion R.5 was met as the element has been included since 2012 on an open, preliminary list of intangible cultural heritage of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina maintained by the Ministry of Culture and Sports.
9. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Body considered that criterion R.3 was not totally satisfied as the nomination insufficiently demonstrated the relevance and adequacy of proposed safeguarding measures to improve the element’s viability, including advanced measures to mitigate the unintended consequences of possible inscription, as well as insufficient information provided on community involvement in developing such measures. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination of Konjic woodcarving to the State Party for additional information.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and after mentioning the Committee received no requests for debate on the file or proposed amendments noted Turkey wanted to take the floor.
11. The delegation of **Turkey** once again expressed its appreciation of the enriched vision of the Evaluation Body as its critiques were not only indicative of what was needed in line with the Convention’s requirements but were becoming more and more conducive to serving as a guideline for States Parties to follow. Regarding criterion R.3, where in paragraph 3 of the Evaluation Body’s report it said the information in the file was insufficient for the Committee to determine if the criterion was satisfied, the delegation and its national experts believed the information was sufficient and upon due reflection the Committee might wish to recommend the first inscription of the submitting State.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and asked the members of the Committee to react to Turkey’s proposal to inscribe the element: ‘The nomination demonstrates that pertinent and adequate safeguarding measures are proposed in order to improve the viability of the element, including advanced measures in parallel with the involvement of bearers and various segments of the local communities in the planning and implementation is also sufficiently developed.’ The Chairperson asked for a show of name plates to determine support for the proposal and concluded the proposal did not enjoy broad support, the original text of the decision was retained and the Chairperson moved to the adoption of the decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.9 to refer the nomination of Konjic woodcarving to the State Party for further information**. The delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was given the floor.
13. The delegation of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** thanked the Chairperson and Committee saying that it respected the statement and would prepare a new nomination file for submission during a next cycle.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked Bosnia and Herzegovina and proceeded to the nomination by Bulgaria, asking the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present it.
15. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Surova folk feast in Pernik region** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b10] submitted by **Bulgaria** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
16. The Evaluation Body considered that criteria R.1, R.2 and R.4 were met. The Body found criterion R.1 was satisfied as the nomination showed the Surova feast was passed down through generations providing its participants with a sense of identity and continuity while contributing to mutual respect between communities. The Body believed criterion R.2 was met as the nomination showed inscription could improve visibility and awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general, particularly in regions and countries where similar masquerade traditions were practised. The Body judged criterion R.4 as met as the nomination was prepared with participation of communities, groups and cultural institutions concerned and a considerable number of Survakari group leaders and secretaries of community centres had provided their free, prior and informed consent.
17. However, the Evaluation Body considered that criteria R.3 and R.5 were not fully satisfied. It felt that Criterion R.3 focused on safeguarding activities already undertaken and the few measures proposed did not address possible unintended consequences of inscription and were not oriented towards threats to the element’s viability. The Body found criterion R.5 showed that the element had been included on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage since 2002 but its compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention remained to be seen.
18. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body then mentioned the Committee had received a request for amendment from the delegation of Ethiopia, which was given the floor.
20. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said it had carefully reviewed the nomination and while it respected the Evaluation Body’s opinion found its referral unsuitable in view of the file’s quality, the element’s viability and the wide community participation in its safeguarding. The Ethiopian delegation strongly supported the proposed amendment to the draft decision and suggested an additional paragraph encouraging the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring safeguarding measures regarding public attention following inscription and depopulation in the country that might impact the element’s future viability. It proposed the following amendments as submitted to the Secretariat: deletion of paragraph 3, a new text of R.3 to paragraph 2, a new text of R.5, adding a new paragraph to encourage the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring the safeguarding measures are implemented, and changing the element’s status from referral to inscription.
21. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia and asked the Committee to move to adopt the decision, paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 was adopted without amendment, as were criterion R.1 and R.2 of Paragraph 2. Ethiopia’s amendment to criterion R.3 would be a new paragraph reading, ‘The nomination presented an elaborated set of safeguarding measures designed as a result of collaboration between communities and groups of the Surova folk feast, local municipalities and public institutions which have proved their efficiency. They have been applied systematically, successfully and without interruption by communities in the region for many decades’. The Chairperson said a list of speakers on the revised criterion R.3 was being prepared, of whom Kyrgyzstan was the first.
22. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** supported the amendment by Ethiopia and having explored the file, found abundant evidence of the involvement of different stakeholders in preserving and maintaining the practice. Kyrgyzstan asked Bulgaria if it could further clarify what the involvement of communities had been in the inclusion of the practice in the national inventory, and how the national representative list was organised and updated.
23. The **Chairperson** thanked Kyrgyzstan, asking the delegation to keep its question on criterion R.5 until the discussion dealt with that part of the paragraph, and gave the floor to Belgium.
24. The delegation of **Belgium** said that after looking at the different elements in the file, it agreed with the Evaluation Body’s analysis. There was an element of decontextualization as Survakari participated in different celebrations throughout the year according to their attractiveness and political nature, and disagreed with Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
25. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** expressed its support for the inscription of the element as it demonstrated participation which encouraged social cohesion while giving people a sense of identity. The delegation supported the proposal by Ethiopia as it felt that criterion R.3 had been satisfied, especially as the element was well known and continuously practised by communities.
26. **Algeria** said it supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
27. The delegation of **Greece** supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment as it felt there were some safeguarding measures that might create confusion among reviewers, but that the community’s voice could be heard, as well as their distress over the danger of depopulation. Greece said that this was what it wanted to see in the files, the voices of the people even if their distress and agony were shown in a way that might create confusion. In Greece’s view, the safeguarding measures were rightly developed and applied.
28. The delegation of **Hungary** welcomed the rich living tradition expressed in the nomination from Bulgaria, commenting on the delegate’s personal experience participating in the festival of masquerade games twice at which time she realised a huge number of mask-bearer communities practised their own cultural heritage. The delegate felt that the festival was a good occasion for meeting and socially interacting with local communities and on that basis asked Bulgaria to clarify what the relation was between the feast and the festival of masquerade games.
29. The delegations of **India, Congo and Turkey** expressed their support to Ethiopia’s recommendations.
30. The delegation of **Mongolia** supported Bulgaria and followed Congo’s lead saying the nomination on the Surova feast in the Pernik region was a very traditional annual practice transmitted from generation to generation and encouraged the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring that the safeguarding measures responded adequately to its increased public visibility.
31. The **Chairperson** thanked Mongolia and gave the floor to **Tunisia** which said it believed the communities were involved in one way or another in the safeguarding measures and therefore supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
32. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said Bulgaria’s detailed plans on accommodating the Evaluation Body’s comments gave firm ground to believe the element would be safeguarded well and expressed support for the proposed amendment.
33. The delegation of **Belgium** asked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body if after the Body’s careful analysis of the file it had found information that said something about measures addressing possible unintended consequences of inscription such as decontextualization, and the future relationship between the local feast and the festival, as Belgium had been unable to find it.
34. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Bulgaria to respond to the question posed by Hungary.
35. The delegation of **Bulgaria** presented its compliments to the member of the Committee. Regarding the question about the relationship between the feast and the festival of masquerade games, Bulgaria said that for communities in Pernik region there was a clear separation between the Surova feast in the villages and the festival of masquerade games in the town. The festival is part of urban culture and dates back to the 1960s, while Surova is a folk custom that has been maintained for many generations in villages of Pernik. The relationship between the Surova folk feast and the festival of masquerade games has continued for 50 years without negative consequences on the viability of Surova as an element of intangible cultural heritage. On the contrary, the festival has contributed to raising awareness about the Surova folk feast and has facilitated efforts to maintain its viability and thus far no community members have noted that the festival might impact negatively on the Surova folk feast. The ongoing expectation was that the positive relationship between the Surova folk feast and the festival of masquerade games would continue in the future.
36. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
37. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the representative of Belgium saying that as could be seen in the evaluation, two things stood out with regard to criterion R.3: the safeguarding measures proposed did not address possible consequences of inscription, nor were they sufficiently oriented towards factors threatening the viability of the element. Regarding point 3.b.(i) of the nomination form on proposed measures to mitigate the possible consequences of inscription, the evaluation found that information in the form did not infer the criterion had been met.
38. The delegation of **Latvia** said it entirely supported the concerns of the Evaluation Body with regard to criterion R.3.
39. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and asked that members of the Committee supporting the amendment to criterion R.3 as proposed by Ethiopia raise their name plates. She declared that 16 members of the Committee were showing support for the amendment and that the paragraph was, therefore, adopted. Continuing with criterion R.4, there were no amendments proposed and criterion R.4 was, therefore, adopted. Criterion R.5 was the subject of a proposed amendment from Ethiopia.
40. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said its proposed amendment was to do with paragraph 5, which was on the screen and, therefore, didn’t need to be read aloud.
41. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia and read it aloud on its behalf: ‘The nominated element was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Bulgaria, compiled with regular updating mechanism and with full participation of the communities concerned as required by Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention’, and opened the floor for commentary on this particular part of the paragraph.
42. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** said that it saw a contradiction between the evaluations of criteria R.4 and R.5 by the Evaluation Body and, therefore, supported Ethiopia’s amendment on criterion R.5.
43. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to clarify the observation made by Côte d’Ivoire.
44. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** said that if he correctly understood the question raised by the honourable delegate of Côte d'Ivoire, criterion R.4 concerned the participation of a community or communities in the nomination, while the R.5 concerns the participation by communities in the process of inventory development, which are two different questions. The Evaluation Body had considered that for criterion R.4, the community had indeed participated; for criterion R.5, information contained in the nomination file did not support the conclusion that communities had participated in the development of the initiative in accordance with Article 11 of the Convention.
45. The delegation of **Latvia** returned to the general debate before the evaluations, during which there was an observation by the delegation of Belgium that the Committee might proceed to a discussion of criterion R.5 in order to take into consideration the information provided in the Annex. Latvia said that its reading of the nomination did not locate all the required answers to criterion R.5, yet when looking at the Annex of this particular criterion, on page 5 of that document it found the answers to both community involvement and updating aspects of the nomination. If the Committee was willing to adopt a more flexible interpretation of the nominations during the day, it might be a good moment to start to apply it, taking into consideration information given in the Annexes. Latvia concluded by showing support for the criterion’s positive evaluation.
46. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said it had already asked a question relating to criteria R.3 and R.5 and would like to hear from Bulgaria, supporting Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
47. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to again ask the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body whether a desire for consistency was one of the motivations for its conclusion on the current element. As Latvia has said, the Committee was perhaps moving towards a new interpretation of the evaluation, where if strictly applied, information should be put in the right section in the file. Belgium wished to see if the notion of consistency was important and whether the Committee was moving in a different direction to the evaluation.
48. The delegation of **Algeria** said that during previous sessions, there had been issues with having the right information in the right place and that Algeria believed that if information was in the file, it must be taken into consideration which was why it supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
49. The delegation of **India** supported Ethiopia’s recommendation and agreed that if the required information had been provided in the file, the evaluation should take note of that.
50. The delegation of **Congo** supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
51. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed with Latvia concerning the application of criterion R.5 and supported Ethiopia’s proposed amendment.
52. The delegation of **Peru** expressed support for Ethiopia’s proposed amendment saying that on the basis of the proposed changes to criterion R.3 it was able to support the amendment of criterion R.5.
53. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the amendment proposed by the delegate of Latvia, while suggesting that perhaps the Committee should discuss certain criteria for the preparation of national inventories as Turkey had not seen such information in the Operational Directives. A few years ago, Turkey had proposed an amendment to the preparation of national inventories specifically with the participation of communities concerned at the national level. Turkey felt that if criterion R.4 was to be adopted, the result would be a conflict between two criteria; for example, the conditions attached to criterion R.4 might be considered to have been met but there was not enough community participation in criterion R.5. This is why Turkey proposed a working group on the issue, as future nominations might have the same problem.
54. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and called on Bulgaria to respond to the question asked by Kyrgyzstan.
55. The delegation of **Bulgaria** responded that community participation in inclusion of the practice on a national inventory was extensively presented in Section 4.a. of the nomination file which was the reason for briefly remarking on it in Section 5. Bulgaria quoted: ‘The idea of adding the Folk Feast of Surova to the National Representative List of the intangible cultural heritage was taken up by the communities themselves – by the bearers of the element.’ ‘An orderly organisation of collecting signatures for the free and informed consent of each participant in the Survakari group was implemented in the villages. Within a week only, several thousand signatures were collected from 31 villages in the region.’ Another justification of community participation was provided on page 7 of the inventory, which clearly stated support from community representatives for the element’s inclusion in the national inventory. In section 5 of the nomination, the file clearly stated the national network of Bulgarian community centres which represent community organisations, and that it was involved in the preparation of the national inventory together with other stakeholders, in conformity with Article 11.b of the Convention.
56. Regarding the question about the organisation of the National Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, **Bulgaria** pointed out that information about its updating was present in the nomination file. The list showed the regular biennial inscription of such elements and was updated every three years, which was reflected on the website provided and maintained by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Bulgaria. As for the inventory of intangible cultural heritage in the applying country, Bulgaria informed the Committee that it was updated following the logic of the Living Human Treasures system, which envisioned periodical actualisation, inscribing new elements and modifications at the request of communities.
57. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
58. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the representative of Belgium and continued to say the Evaluation Body required two types of information from the criteria; information given by the State Party to justify inclusion of the element in the inventory, which was evident in the first part but that the second part concerned data on development of the inventory process; and inventory information contained in the database of the State Party. The Evaluation Body was unanimous in considering that the inventory information was not in the form so it was now up to the Committee to determine if what was contained in the inventory could be used to complete the information given by the State Party in its nomination.
59. The **Chairperson** said that of the 23 members of the Committee who took the floor, 11 were in favour of the amendment and asked for another show of name plates to see if the amendment had broad support from the room. The second showing of name plates indicated the amendment was supported and criterion R.5 was adopted as amended. The Chairperson asked to adopt Paragraph 2 in its entirety, to which there was no objection and Paragraph 2 was adopted. In the last paragraph, ‘Decides to refer’ had been changed to ‘Decides to inscribe’, and Belgium was given the floor, ostensibly regarding paragraph 3.
60. The delegation of **Belgium** clarified that its comment was not on paragraph 3 but wanted to suggest having the discussion on the linkage between the file and what was in the annex of the inventory information in the context of the Evaluation Body’s report later in the day or the following day.
61. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and confirmed that the Secretariat had taken note, and gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire.
62. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** agreed with Belgium, saying that there was a reason that the Committee reviewed work accomplished by experts as it helped the experts to reflect on possible problems. Regarding the question of information not being in the right section of the nomination form, the delegation felt that the question of Belgium was timely and did not detract from the quality of the Bulgarian case.
63. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire and suggested adopting Paragraph 3 as amended by Ethiopia; there were no objections and Paragraph 3 was adopted. As Paragraph 4 still needed to be adopted or studied, the Chairperson called on Ethiopia to take the floor.
64. The delegation of **Ethiopia** felt that the paragraph, in line with the preceding discussions and the review, encouraged the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring that safeguarding measures would respond adequately to increased visibility and public attention that would follow from inscription on the Representative List, as well as depopulation in the country that might impact the element’s viability in the future.
65. The delegation of **Belgium** said it was still very concerned about the processes of decontextualization and associated threats and wished to add a phrase about them just after ‘Representative List”, inserting ‘to processes of decontextualization and depopulation in the country’ to assist the State of Bulgaria with its reflections on the dangers of decontextualization as expressed by the Evaluation Body.
66. The **Chairperson** acknowledged the small amendment proposed by Belgium, noting that Belgium wished to add to it.
67. The delegation of **Belgium** said it would like to repeat ‘processes’ twice, as the processes of decontextualization and depopulation are completely different.
68. The delegation of **Turkey** supported Belgium’s proposed amendment but felt there should be a small correction after ‘visibility’, querying the ‘visibility’ of what, and suggesting that perhaps ‘the Convention’ could be added.
69. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and gave the floor to the delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** which supported Belgium’s proposed amendment, agreeing that there are two processes involved, namely decontextualization and depopulation.
70. The delegation of **Peru** supported Belgium’s proposed amendment.
71. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary to comment on the proposal and talk about visibility in the paragraph.
72. The **Secretary** said while Ethiopia’s proposed amendment seemed clear on element visibility, with the submitting State having to pay particular attention to safeguarding measures where there is higher element visibility, she could not see how the Convention could be integrated in the paragraph as suggested because visibility of the Convention was not the issue.
73. The delegation of **Turkey** suggested inserting ‘to the increased visibility of the element’, saying that Turkey supported the proposal by Belgium.
74. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** felt that Turkey had raised a substantial issue, which it too had been working on, and asked that the discussion later focus on R.2 as it was an issue of visibility versus the element and the Convention.
75. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire and moved to adopt Paragraph 4 of the draft decision, to which there were no objections and Paragraph 4 was adopted. The Chairperson requested the Committee adopt the entire draft decision; there were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10 COM 10.b.10 as amended to inscribe Surova folk feast in Pernik region** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Bulgaria and gave the delegation the floor.
2. The delegation of **Bulgaria** expressed its gratitude and appreciation for the inscription of Surova folk feast in Pernik region on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Safeguarding the element was extremely important to the Surova masking groups and communities in Pernik region because it maintained their sense of identity and continuity, it was like a religion for them and they were truly dedicated to ensure its transmission from generation to generation. The inscription of the Surova folk feast on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity would encourage communities in the Pernik region with their efforts to safeguard the tradition to continue.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria and congratulated it again before moving to the next nomination. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body was given the floor to present the nomination by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Romania to the Committee.
2. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body introduced the joint nomination on **Cultural practices associated to the first of March** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.11] submitted by **Bulgaria**, the **former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**, the **Republic of Moldova** and **Romania** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered the nomination satisfied criterion R.1 as the practice was widespread in the four submitting States; it had social functions and meaning such as an expression of affection, wishes of good health and prosperity; and provided communities with a sense of identity and continuity.
4. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination did not meet criteria R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5. For criterion R.2, the Body felt the nomination did not clearly describe how inscription of the practice would contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. At the same time, in its inventory one of the submitting states mentioned contaminating influences from neighbouring communities and that those customs should not be allowed to interfere, which was not felt to contribute to dialogue. Regarding criterion R.3, the Body considered the proposed safeguarding measures did not appear to have sufficiently involved communities, while safeguarding measures and possible unintended consequences of inscription were insufficiently described with one of the submitting States omitting its description of past and current efforts to safeguard the element. Regarding criterion R.4, the Body found two of the submitting States did not describe what steps had been taken to ensure that selected communities were involved in the practice and the nomination as a whole. Letters of consent of two of the submitting States did not appear to reflect an awareness of the multinational character of the nomination. Regarding criterion R.5, the Body thought the element was included in an existing inventory in all four submitting States, but information on compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention was, depending on the State Party concerned, either missing, incomplete or ambiguous.
5. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the submitting States Parties for further information.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Committee had not received any requests for debate or proposals to amend the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10 COM 10.b.11 to refer the nomination of** **Cultural practices associated to the first of March** **to the States Parties for additional information**. She gave the floor to Romania, representing the submitting States.
7. The delegation of **Romania**, on behalf of the four submitting States Parties and as the initiating country of the multinational nomination expressed their appreciation for the Committee’s recommendations, assuring the Committee of their commitment to improve the file in order to resubmit it for examination during a following cycle.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Romania before moving to the next multinational nomination, giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
9. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the multinational nomination on **Tugging rituals and games** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.12] submitted by **Cambodia, Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
10. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. For criterion R.1, the Body found the nomination showed that the tugging rituals and games were an effective sociocultural mechanism that showcased specificities of each community and that related skills are transmitted in formal and non-formal ways. The Body considered that criterion R.2 demonstrated that inscription of the element was likely to promote the role of intangible cultural heritage in sustainable development and human creativity and that the nomination itself, prepared by several communities from four countries, was evidence of dialogue between cultures. The Body felt that criterion R.3 on safeguarding measures followed a well-developed participatory approach that was felt to be adequate in dealing with potential adverse consequences resulting from the inscription of the element. Regarding criterion R.4, the Body believed the nomination was prepared with the full participation of communities, groups, individuals, safeguarding associations, experts and other relevant stakeholders concerned, who all provided proof of their free, prior and informed consent.
11. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Body considered that criterion R.5 was not satisfied at this stage as two of the four submitting States did not provide relevant extracts from their inventories in conformity with Decision 8.COM 8 of the Committee.
12. Therefore the Evaluation Body recommended referring the nomination to the submitting States Parties for further information.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Committee had received a request from Brazil for an amendment to the draft decision by adding a paragraph 4.
14. The delegation of **Brazil** once again expressed its appreciation for the work of the Evaluation Body. Regarding the nomination, it recalled that Article 13 of the Operational Directives encouraged States Parties to submit multinational nominations despite the difficulties inherent in coordinating efforts to prepare a file of this kind. However, Cambodia, Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam had succeeded with their multinational nomination. As could be seen from the proposed draft decision, the nomination received a very positive response from the Evaluation Body, which said that ‘inscription of the element could help to elucidate the important role of intangible cultural heritage in sustainable development’. Brazil said that later in the session the Committee would discuss how to integrate the 2030 Agenda in the 2003 Convention, and Brazil believed that inscription of the nominated element might be a good example of how to do it. While the Evaluation Body considered that only criterion R.5 was not fully satisfied, saying that two of the submitting States had not provided relevant extracts of their inventories, Brazil felt the documentation showed that in all of the inventories of the four submitting States the element was shown as being present. Brazil proposed an amendment to the draft decision on criterion R.5, inscription of the element and requested Cambodia update its inventory.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil and opened the floor for debate to establish whether Brazil’s proposed amendment had the room’s broad support starting with Peru.
16. The delegation of **Peru** considered the proposed amendment relevant for the reasons mentioned but also because the States were developing inventories and adapting them to comply with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, which they were currently working on and took time. As the Committee had taken this situation into account for previous nominations examined during the session, it should do the same with the current nomination and support Brazil’s proposal.
17. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** supported Brazil’s proposed amendment pointing out that the issue related to the inventory of just two countries despite the fact that the file showed all communities in the four countries were actively involved in the inventory-making process. Kyrgyzstan said that a multinational nomination was a difficult task to undertake and complete, but that in this instance it was successful and congratulated the four countries for their nomination, proposed to inscribe the element.
18. The delegation of **Mongolia** supported Brazil’s proposed amendment. Although Mongolia considered the inventory extracts not relevant enough, as pointed out by the Evaluation Body, it considered the situation satisfactory taking into account the documents submitted by States concerned except Cambodia. Again, this had to do with the issue of consistency raised earlier by Algeria. Regarding criterion R.5, the discussion was still about the same problem that had been talked about since the day before. Mongolia said it favoured inscription of the element.
19. The delegation of **Uganda** wanted to thank the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for its hard work in evaluating all the nominations. Referring again to Article 12 of the Convention which gives States Parties the ability to develop their inventories in a way they think best, and the fact that Ccriterion R.4 was met through adequate community participation, Uganda thought evidence of community participation and involvement in developing the inventory might have been missed at the time of writing the nomination. Uganda felt that at a later date there would be a need to have clear Operational Directives on what an extract should consist of to be able to meet the criterion. Uganda supported the proposed amendment in order that the State Parties’ file might be inscribed.
20. The delegation of **Uruguay** supported Brazil’s proposed amendment, as well as Turkey’s proposal for future discussion on the criterion.
21. The delegation of **Nigeria** acknowledged the difficulty of four countries having a minimum benchmark for a file and believed the submitting States had done sufficient preparation providing adequate inventories. It supported Brazil’s proposed amendment.
22. The delegation of **Algeria** said that as the nomination was a multinational file, Algeria was very satisfied that the element was included in relevant inventories. In view of arguments advanced by the honourable delegate of Brazil, Algeria wished to support the amendment proposed by Brazil.
23. The delegation of **Latvia** returned to its previous considerations concerning the connection between the text included in the nomination file and information provided in the annexes. It acknowledged that information provided within the file was insufficient to be able to say the criterion was satisfied. Within the annexes, additional information was found to be able to say that the criterion was met for three out of the four countries expressing some concern regarding one participating country. If the Committee was willing to adopt a measure of flexibility concerning the particular multinational nomination, Latvia believed that the wording proposed in the positive evaluation of criterion R.5 needed to be changed as the information provided was insufficient to allow the criterion to be considered satisfied according to Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
24. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** returned to the issue of form. Looking at the Convention, it was not Articles 11 and 12 that refer to inventories but only Article 12. So as regards R.5 as drafted, there would be no mention of Article 11.
25. The delegation of **Ethiopia** echoed the amendments proposed by Brazil and supported them.
26. The delegation of **Bulgaria** supported Brazil’s proposed amendment and expressed its satisfaction with the nomination file.
27. The delegation of **Congo** supported the amendment proposed by Brazil.
28. The delegation of **Belgium** said that concerning Article 11, they felt it should be included as the reference to Article 11 was because 11(b) mentioned that States Parties should involve communities, groups and relevant non-governmental organisations in making the inventory, so Article 11 should be included. Referring to the proposal by Latvia, Belgium felt that perhaps the wording should be changed to refer to the fact that at least one of the countries involved in the nomination had not completely satisfied the criterion.
29. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the amendment proposed by Brazil, and found the nomination file to be satisfactory.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and returned to the question asked by the Ambassador of Côte d’Ivoire on Articles 11 and 12, reading criterion R.5 aloud as it appeared in the basic text: ‘The element is included in an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in the territory(ies) of the submitting State(s) Party(ies), as defined in Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention’. The Chairperson felt that the text was clear and that maybe the wording proposed by Brazil could be retained. The Chairperson asked Côte d’Ivoire if it wished to maintain its view expressed earlier, assuring the delegation that she would return to the question after giving Latvia the floor.
31. The delegation of **Latvia** thought that if a decision was pronounced on all four cases of the four countries then it could not be said that the four inventories responded to either Articles 11 or 12 as in the case of Cambodia where the Committee lacked information on updating and the involvement of communities. If the decision to inscribe was maintained, Latvia would propose the paragraph only said the tugging rituals and games were included in inventories and to then say in which countries and which years without mentioning Articles of the Convention.
32. The **Secretary** understood from Latvia that their proposal was to delete ‘in line with Articles 11 and 12’ but wanted Latvia to confirm that they actually wanted to quote those States that had provided an extract of the inventory, or not.
33. The delegation of **Latvia** confirmed they did not want that, saying that the idea was that if the information given from all four countries, specifically years when the nomination was included in the registers of all four countries, then the information could be maintained and reference to the Articles deleted. In that case, the wording of the beginning of the paragraph would need to be changed saying that the tugging rituals and games were included in inventories of the four submitting States and then deleting ‘has been conducted’.
34. The **Chairperson** informed Latvia that its proposal was being looked at and in the meantime gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire.
35. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** said it supported Latvia’s proposal and the deletion of ‘in compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention’. Secondly, that as the paragraph on criterion R.5 referred to Cambodia, the following paragraph proposed by Brazil requesting Cambodia update its inventory would be contradictory.
36. The delegation of **Brazil** offered that, with the new text proposed by Latvia, Cambodia could be maintained in criterion R.5 and also in the new paragraph 4, as in paragraph 4 Brazil had said that when Cambodia updated its inventory it needed to pay attention to the element. It was not that the element was not present in the inventory it was just that when updating the inventory, Cambodia should pay special attention to the element. Brazil agreed with the new text suggested by Latvia that the ritual was inscribed in inventories not in accordance with Articles of the Convention, and then in paragraph 4 just requesting Cambodia to pay attention when updating it.
37. The **Chairperson** wished to propose to concentrate on criterion R.5 and to try and adopt, as and more to paragraph 4 latter.
38. The delegation of **Turkey** posed a question to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body: on occasions when the Body draws attention to Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention it occasionally does not mention this in its recommendations even if the element was recommended for inscription or if it was not. Turkey wondered what factor/s persuaded the Evaluation Body to draw attention to the Articles of the Convention in specific cases.
39. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the delegate of Turkey for his question, replying that the draft decisions sometimes referred to Articles of the Convention concerning the inventory. Regarding how the decision may have been drafted, the Body’s rapporteur might suggest a report and draft decisions, a meeting would follow to adopt the report and through consensus of the Body the draft report would be adopted. There was no differing treatment of any nomination file as to whether or not the relevant Articles of the Convention were mentioned.
40. The **Chairperson** said that she felt that criterion R.5 now contained too many names, and read it aloud as shown on the screen: ‘Tugging rituals and games have been included in inventories of the four submitting States’ and asked if the Committee accepted it up to that point. There were no objections, and she continued with the names of the submitting countries: ‘Cambodia, Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam’ and then the dates of inclusion for each country.
41. **Latvia** supported by **Côte d’Ivoire** wished to delete ‘has been conducted’.
42. The delegation of **Turkey** apologised for speaking again, saying that Turkey, following the clarification of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, supported the proposal of Latvia.
43. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and asked whether there were objections to adopting criterion R.5 as amended; there were no objections, and criterion R.5 was adopted. The Chairperson returned to paragraph 4, saying she wished to finish with the amendments and then adopt the decision. She read paragraph 4 aloud: ‘Requests Cambodia to pay particular attention to safeguard the element by updating inventory and its extracts by May 2016 as planned.’
44. The delegation of **Belgium** said that as the Evaluation Body had remarked, there were problems with two of the submitting States, and that Belgium would like to change the proposed amendment to a more general comment: ‘Requests the submitting States to pay particular attention to updating the inventories’ whereby the four submitting States would be requested to collectively and singularly pay particular attention to updating their inventories and not just focus on Cambodia.
45. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and having asked the floor if there were any objections to having the general amendment instead of focusing on Cambodia alone to which there were none, read paragraph 4: ‘Requests the submitting States to pay particular attention to updating inventories’ and no dates. There were no objections to the proposed amendment and paragraph 4 was adopted. The Chairperson asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10 COM 10.b.12 as amended** **to inscribe** **Tugging rituals and games** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to one of the submitting State Parties, the Republic of Korea.
2. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, on behalf of the submitting States Parties of the Tugging ritual and games of Cambodia, Philippines, the Republic of Korea and Viet Nam, expressed its deepest gratitude to the members of the Committee for their warm and sincere support in inscribing the Tugging ritual and games on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The joint nomination was an exemplary form contributing to enhancing international cooperation and promoting the spirit of the 2003 Convention. The nomination of Tugging rituals and games practised in agricultural societies among the four submitting countries contributed to solidarity among communities and promoted cultural diversity in different sociocultural and geological contexts. Tugging rituals and games in the Republic of Korea was practised among communities to not only ensure abundant harvests but play a significant role in community cohesion and cooperation from generation to generation. The delegation congratulated the many communities, cities and provinces for their efforts in safeguarding and passing down this precious intangible cultural heritage to the next generation. The Republic of Korea invited its partners of Cambodia, Philippines and Viet Nam to share their pleasure of the inscription of the nomination file.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Republic of Korea and appealed to the other three submitting States to keep their inputs as brief as possible.
2. The delegation of **Cambodia** thanked the Chairperson and members of the Committee, saying that the inscription had not only shown international unity and collaboration for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, but that the inscription encouraged and inspired full participation by civil society organisations, individual committees and local governments in Cambodia for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The delegate said that Cambodia aimed to have a complete updated national inventory by May 2016 and once again thanked the Chairperson, members of the Committee and the Evaluation Body for their support.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of the **Philippines** thanked all members of the Committee and the Evaluation Body for their support, saying that for Philippines the inscription represented the ties connecting its people with their land and crops, their ancestors and traditions and to one another not only within their own communities but also across cultures and borders, thereby promoting the spirit of the 2003 Convention. Philippines invited other countries to nominate similar tugging rituals and games, reflecting values such as social inclusion, solidarity and sustainable development, and the celebration of life and living together throughout the world. The inscription celebrated the ties of human community, united in diversity and committed to safeguarding the shared intangible cultural heritage of our world for peace and sustainable development.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Viet Nam** wished to associate itself with the sentiments of its Korean, Philippines and Cambodian colleagues while sincerely thanking the Evaluation Body and members of the Committee for inscription of the element on the Representative List which was the first multinational nomination for Viet Nam. Viet Nam wished to underline its surprise at the similarities in terms of the rituals of the game in different social, political and cultural arenas of the four submitting countries despite not being immediate neighbours but nonetheless with interesting values in common, which should be encouraged in the context of the emergence of extremists and nationalists. Viet Nam took the opportunity to thank the Republic of Korea for initiating the multinational nomination, knowing that the challenge of coordination between submitting countries is huge and takes time and resources. Viet Nam concluded by saying that it believed that great priority should be given to multinational nominations.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the speakers and moved to the next joint nomination, proposed by Colombia and Ecuador. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body introduced the next nomination of **Marimba music, traditional chants and dances from the Colombian South Pacific region and Esmeraldas Province of Ecuador** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.13] submitted **by Colombia and Ecuador** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the information in the nomination file demonstrated that all the criteria were met. In criterion R.1, the file attested that marimba music, traditional chants and dances were transmitted from generation to generation, being constantly recreated by Afro-descendants and thereby giving them a feeling of belonging. For criterion R.2, the Body felt the file showed that inscription of a shared element by two States Parties could contribute to raising awareness on the role of intangible cultural heritage in consolidating cooperation and strengthening the promotion of cultural diversity and human creativity. For criterion R.3, the Body found that safeguarding processes and plans developed in each of the submitting States were described with a view to ensuring the element’s viability and the promotion of cross-border community integration and mitigation of unintended results of inscription. For criterion R.4, the Body considered the nomination had been elaborated with the participation of communities, groups and individuals who gave their free, prior and informed consent in the form of film clips. Finally, the Body felt the file met criterion R.5 as the element had been included in the inventories of the two submitting States since 2010 in Colombia, and since 2009 in Ecuador in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body. Since the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision, the Chairperson asked the Committee to adopt draft decision 10.COM 10.b.13 as a whole. Seeing no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.13 to inscribe** **Marimba music, traditional chants and dances from the Colombian South Pacific region and Esmeraldas Province** **of** **Ecuador on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to one of the two submitting States to make a statement.
2. The delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Chairperson, saying that on behalf of Colombia and its sister country the Republic of Ecuador, the National Institute of Cultural Heritage of Ecuador and the community of the Colombian and Ecuadorian Pacific, the extension of the binational cultural element of Marimba music and traditional chants from Colombia’s South Pacific region already inscribed on the Representative List in 2010, to include the Province of Esmeraldas in Ecuador was received with ‘fraternal joy’. According to the Colombian delegation, the new inscription would strengthen the presence of the element in the world in union with the neighbour country of Ecuador, with whom Colombia shared much more than a border as evidenced by the element itself which embodied a shared spirit in male and female descendants of the African diaspora who settled in the New World and planted a culture that deeply enriched the ethnic and cultural diversity of the two countries. The delegation thanked the Convention for allowing the possibility of the two countries, united by history and culture, to work together to safeguard this cultural expression.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Colombia. She pointed out that the Committee had now concluded examination of 13 files, and that as previously informed there was a total of 30 files to be reviewed which left 17 files remaining to be considered during the afternoon, plus two requests for international assistance. The Chairperson said she would try to speed up the work during the afternoon and asked the Secretary to make some announcements before lunch.
2. The **Secretary** mentioned an information session on the Convention’s Global Capacity-building Strategy for Electoral Group III - Latin American and Caribbean States from 1.30 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.; NGOs would meet between 1.30 p.m. and 2.30 p.m.; the University of Namibia would be launching a book on indigenous knowledge from 5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m.; and there would be a meeting of intangible cultural heritage experts from Southern Africa at 5.30 p.m.
3. The **Chairperson** closed the session for lunch saying the meeting would resume at 2.30 p.m.

*[Wednesday, 2 December 2015, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** started the afternoon session by recalling that at closure of the morning session at 12.30 p.m. the Committee had just adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.13 and the afternoon session would proceed with a nomination submitted by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the floor being given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the item.
2. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body introduced the nomination on **Tradition of kimchi-making in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.14] submitted by the **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that from the information included in the nomination all criteria had been met. Concerning criterion R.1 the Body felt that the file showed that the preparation of kimchi, which has many variants, provided a sense of identity and continuity and promoted mutual respect among different groups and communities. With regard to criterion R.2 the file showed that inscription of the element was likely to improve the visibility at international level of traditional foodways as intangible cultural heritage, encourage dialogue between communities and promote human creativity through interaction with nature. The Body felt that criterion R.3 was met being based on a structured safeguarding plan developed with active participation of communities, government agencies and professional organisations. Criterion R.4 was considered met as the nomination was developed with the active participation of parties concerned, including institutional and professional representatives who provided consent to the nomination. The Body considered criterion R.5 was met as the element had been included since 2012 on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage, maintained and updated regularly by the national authority for the protection of cultural heritage.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the tradition of kimchi-making on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, said the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole, to which there were no objections. The Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.14 to inscribe Tradition of kimchi-making** **in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. As there was no State representative from the submitting State in the room and therefore the Chairperson moved to the next nomination, and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Son** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.15] submitted by the **Dominican Republic** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that information contained in the nomination file was insufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether criteria had been met. Regarding criterion R.1, the Body felt the file did not determine the nature or scope of the element, that of its bearers and practitioners, nor the modes of transmission and cultural and social meanings. For criterion R.2, the Body found the answers did not address how possible inscription could contribute to ensuring visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general either to raise awareness regarding its importance or encourage dialogue. For criterion R.3, the Body considered the proposed safeguarding measures showed a gap between ambitions and feasibility and did not include commitment by the submitting State to support their implementation. For criterion R.4, the Body believed that even though participation by members of the Club Nacional de Soneros in the nomination was demonstrated, the process seemed to have been misunderstood as collecting signatures from entities outside the club to obtain a recognition from UNESCO. For criterion R.5, the Body judged that although the element was included in an inventory in 1998, it was not able to find adequate proof as to the inventory’s conformity with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring of this nomination to the submitting State for additional information.
5. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had received no requests for debate or proposed amendments and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. Seeing no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.15 to refer the nomination of Son to the State Party for additional information**.
6. The **Chairperson** moved to the next nomination, submitted by Ethiopia.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination on **Fichee-Chambalaalla, New Year festival of the Sidama people** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.16] submitted by **Ethiopia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
8. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination file met criteria R.1, R.4 and R.5. The Body felt that for criterion R.1, the file showed the element was celebrated by the entire community, including women, youth and children, while associated knowledge and practices transmitted promoted social cohesion, equity, equality, good governance and peace. The Body believed criterion R.4 was met as community participation in the nomination process was adequately documented and evidence of their free, prior and informed consent was given. The Body found criterion R.5 was met as the item was included on the national register of intangible cultural heritage in July 2013, in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
9. However, the Evaluation Bodyconsidered that the information presented did not fully meet criterion R.2 as the file relied solely on addressing the contribution of potential inscription to the visibility, awareness-raising and dialogue concerning the element and not its contribution to intangible cultural heritage in general. Regarding criterion R.3, The Body felt that the nomination gave no concrete measures to ensure viability of the element in the face of threats such as over-commercialisation and tourism, nor did it describe participation of the Sidama community in the planning and development of the proposed measures.
10. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the submitting State Party for additional information.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Committee had received a request from Bulgaria for amendment to criteria R.2 and R.3, as well as suggestions for additional paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 to the nomination. Bulgaria was given the floor.
12. The delegation of **Bulgaria** said it had examined the file in detail and while it appreciated the Evaluation Body’s draft decision, found the proposal to refer as unjustified in view of the thorough information provided. Despite the Body’s opinion that criteria R.2 and R.3 were incomplete, Bulgaria felt the file presented adequate evidence on the impact of inscription in enhancing intangible cultural heritage visibility and strengthening intercultural dialogue between communities, as well as a range of concrete safeguarding measures maintaining the element’s viability and countering possible negative consequences of inscription. The file also demonstrated wide participation by community members in safeguarding the element particularly the Sidama people concerning continuity of knowledge transmission and planning and implementing safeguarding measures. Bulgaria considered the nomination file satisfied all criteria for inscription on the Representative List and proposed the following amendments in the draft decision: with regard to criterion R.2: ‘Inscription of the element could increase awareness concerning the capacity of intangible cultural heritage to contribute to a culture of peace and reconciliation through symbolic acts and festive spirit. It could also contribute to the visibility of other elements in the region and encourage their safeguarding, in particular given that the enactment of Fichee-Chambalaalla incorporates various domains of intangible cultural heritage.’ For criterion R.3 Bulgaria proposed the following: ‘Although the proposed safeguarding measures rely strongly on past and current efforts, the proposed safeguarding measures encompass a set of concrete and extensive activities aiming at ensuring the viability of the element in contemporary society, with priority given to making progress in legislation while stressing awareness-raising and training activities involving clan institutions, *chimeesa* (competent elders), community members and relevant groups concerned, as well as knowledge transfer towards the communities and the public. They are elaborated involving a wide range of actors, including bearers and practitioners of the element.’ In Bulgaria’s proposed amendment it also added under paragraph 4: ‘the Committee encourages the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring that safeguarding measures respond adequately to the social dynamics on the ground and increase visibility and public attention that will follow the inscription on the Representative List.’ Bulgaria closed by proposing inscription the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Bulgaria and opened the floor for debate on the proposed amendment.
14. The delegation of **Turkey** supported Bulgaria’s proposals and inscription.
15. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed with the amendments proposed by Bulgaria and favoured inscription. Hungary felt that tourism as such was not necessarily a cause for safeguarding and that if a State Party used tourism sensibly, it could assist with broader visibility. As the nomination had already stated that the State Party would establish an appropriate system and measures to safeguard against over-commercialisation, Hungary supported the inscription.
16. The delegation of **Uganda**, referring to criterion R.2, found that awareness-raising activities on TV, radio and public dialogue were indicated as a way of ensuring that the element’s visibility would became known to the Sidama people, as well as within and outside Ethiopia. It supported Bulgaria’s suggestion regarding criterion R.2.
17. The delegation of **Belgium** referred to page 5, section 2, point (i) where submitting States should convey clearly how cultural heritage in general would be promoted, and fully agreed with the Evaluation Body’s assessment that based on this specific point the nomination only demonstrated the element was promoted not cultural heritage in general which was an important point regarding consistency. As in previous Committee meetings, a whole series of files had been rejected for not giving this kind of information. Belgium felt it would be unfair for previously-rejected files to start treating the criterion in a different way and that perhaps in the future rules and criteria should be changed but that currently consistency should remain and therefore supported the Body’s opinion. As far as criterion R.3 was concerned, Belgium directed the Committee’s attention to page 8, 3.b.(i) of the form where concrete measures were asked for, saying that its delegation agreed with the Body’s evaluation of the relative lack of concrete safeguarding measures and that the participation of the Sidama people in the planning and elaboration was not described. Belgium looked forward to seeing a revised nomination form with all issues addressed. It questioned why in paragraph 6 of the draft decision the Body suggested that the State Party consider changing the name of the file in the event it resubmitted it.
18. The delegation of **Latvia** again expressed its appreciation of the Evaluation Body’s work. Regardless of the submitting State’s efforts with its file, Latvia recognised the draft decision corresponded to the file’s evaluation. Regarding criterion R.2 on cultural diversity, it agreed the criterion had been partially met as reflected in the draft decision, however, other parts responding to the criterion might still be questioned. For criterion R.3, Latvia believed that the draft decision raised all relevant issues and was in favour of maintaining it. Latvia also agreed with Belgium’s question concerning the proposed paragraph 6.
19. The delegation of **Algeria** supported the arguments presented by Bulgaria and Bulgaria’s proposed amendment.
20. The delegation of **Namibia** congratulated the submitting State Party for presenting the element, as the festival of the Sidama people was centuries old and the fact that it was still ongoing demonstrated the success of measures taken to safeguard and preserve it. Namibia felt that the element promoted intercultural and interreligious dialogue, which UNESCO advocated at the global level, and supported Bulgaria’s proposed amendments for the element’s inscription.
21. The delegation of **Nigeria** believed that criterion R.2 had been satisfied, quoting: ‘The inscription of this element would also motivate other ethnic groups to preserve and promote their own traditions and culture and enhance respect for cultural diversity’ which Nigeria felt satisfied criterion R.2. Citing 3.b.(i) regarding over-commercialisation, Nigeria quoted: ‘The State Party will establish a proper system of measures that tourists have no ability to over-commercialise the element, and the concerned members of the Committee will be in charge to keep the festival in its original standards.’ Nigeria believed the two specific criteria had been met and supported Bulgaria’s proposed amendment.
22. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** congratulated the Evaluation Body on the quality of its work and asked the submitting State to shed some light on the safeguarding measures that had been taken.
23. The delegation of **India** supported the proposed amendments by Bulgaria and also asked Ethiopia to elaborate on certain methodologies expressed in the nomination to counter over-commercialisation and on the contribution of the element to broader visibility of intangible cultural heritage.
24. The delegation of **Egypt** felt that Ethiopia had followed most of the criteria for inscription and that shortcomings identified by the Evaluation Body were to be found in the file, thereby supporting the element’s inscription.
25. The delegation of **Tunisia** believed that some of the information presented proved that the listing could encourage visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and in that regard believed that criterion R.2 had been met. While it was true that for criterion R.3 there were some reservations about the nature of safeguarding measures and how to develop them, safeguarding measures did exist and Tunisia considered that the criterion was satisfied.
26. The **Chairperson** had no more requests for the floor and asked Ethiopia to respond to the two questions posed: the first by Côte d’Ivoire and the second by India.
27. The delegation of **Ethiopia** presented its compliments to the Committee. With regard to concerns about promoting broader visibility of the element, as explained in the Fichee-Chambalaalla nomination file, page 7, point 2(iii): ‘The inscription of this element would also motivate other ethnic groups to preserve and promote their own traditions and culture and enhance respect for cultural diversity.’ It was further indicated on page 2(ii) that inscription of the element would enhance intercultural dialogue between communities with the intention of promoting the spirit of the Convention in general. The nomination file also described how inscription would assist recognition of values such as mutual respect, human rights, equity, as well as social coherence, peaceful coexistence, environmental conservation, the green economy and contribute to intangible cultural heritage visibility in general by enhancing intercultural dialogue between communities and raising awareness of its importance. With regard to safeguarding, the nomination file had indicated measures that ensured visibility of the element and the spirit of the Convention. These measures had been given serious attention and as explained in the nomination file page 9, 3.b(i), ‘The State Party will establish an appropriate system and measures that tourists have no ability to over-commercialise the element and concerned community members would be in charge of keeping the festival in its original standard.’ On page 9, 3.b(i) of the nomination file, it was shown that awareness-raising within the community would promote the importance of the element through different mechanisms such as formal and informal education, and print and electronic mass media would be used to counter misuse of the celebration for any motives and to protect the element from threats of excessive tourism. It was also cited on page 9, 3.b(i) of the nomination file that safeguarding measures would be gazetted and that the public would be informed through various media to safeguard celebration of the festival at the family and community level. Regarding the third question on the name, Ethiopia advised that it was a compound name: Fichee-Chambalaalla and wondered how it could be recommended to shorten it and how one could shorten a name that has been there for centuries.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia and turned to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to respond to the questions posed by Belgium and Latvia.
29. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the delegations of Belgium and Latvia, saying that the Evaluation Body had been confused by the varied use of the names Fichee and Fichee-Chambalaalla in the nomination file. He added that the Evaluation Body had the impression that Fichee was a much larger complex of events, leading the Body to make such a recommendation. The Chairperson said that the recommendation was to ensure that the name was the same in all parts of the form.
30. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said that having listened to the explanation of the submitting State and the answer of the Chairperson, Kyrgyzstan wished to join the countries supporting inscription of the element on the Representative List.
31. The **Chairperson** turned to the Committee to establish whether Bulgaria’s proposed amendment had broad agreement from the room, asking members in support to show their name plates. The proposed amendment showed a majority support in the room and the Chairperson declared the paragraph on criterion R.2 adopted.
32. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to show its support for criterion R.3, concluding that it had broad support from the room and was, therefore, adopted. Turning to paragraph 3 where Bulgaria proposed to change ‘Decides to refer’ to ‘Decides to inscribe’ there were no objections and paragraph 3 was adopted. Paragraph 4, which reads: ‘Encourages the State Party to pay particular attention to ensuring that safeguarding measures respond adequately to the social dynamics on the ground and the increased visibility and public attention that will follow the inscription on the Representative List’ was adopted in the absence of any objections. The Chairperson asked the Committee to adopt draft decision 10 COM 10.b.16 as a whole; and in the absence of any objections, she declared **adopted** **Decision** **10 COM 10.b.16 to inscribe** **Fichee-Chambalaalla, New Year festival of the Sidama people on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Ethiopia and gave it the floor.
2. The delegation of **Ethiopia** sang the name of ‘Fichee-Chambalaalla, Fichee-Chambalaalla’ to demonstrate why the name couldn’t be split from Fichee-Chambalaalla into Fichee.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the Chairperson, expressing its satisfaction and delight with the inscription saying that the inscription would motivate and enhance cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue between communities in the spirit of the 2003 Convention with relevant organisations and stakeholders undertaking activities necessary to ensure that safeguarding measures would be implemented and that the element continues to showcase the spirit of the Convention. The delegation invited Her Excellency Madam Meaza Gebremedhin Gebreegzi, the State Minister for Culture and Tourism of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, to make a few remarks on the inscription.
2. Her Excellency **Madam Meaza Gebremedhin Gebreegzi, the State Minister for Culture and Tourism**, thanked the Chairperson, the Committee and the Secretariat assuring them that their decision had not only acknowledged a practice of intangible cultural heritage that truly embraced great efforts made by the Sidama people to conserve the indigenous festival of Fichee-Chambalaalla but also all Ethiopian people. The State Minister said she had had the privilege to celebrate the most recent festival with proud, welcoming and hardworking Sidamas who promoted hard work, respect for nature, and a culture of tolerance for the young helping to ensure the preservation of other indigenous traditions in the future. The State Minister again thanked the Committee and invited everyone to the festival the following August (saying that as the Ethiopian calendar would only be 2009, everyone would be at least seven years younger).

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister for the invitation and moved to examine the nomination by Greece, by giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Tinian marble craftsmanship** [draft decision10.COM 10.b.17] submitted by **Greece** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all criteria. The Body found that criterion R.1 was met as the nomination showed that for local communities, Tinian marble craftsmanship provides a strong connection to their history, natural environment and cultural identity, and is based on a transmission model from master to apprentice and hierarchical organisation specific to marble sculpture workshops. The Body believed criterion R.2 was met as the nomination demonstrated that inscription of the element was likely to contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage, including craftsmanship, to increase knowledge about the cultural diversity of South East Europe and illustrate how creativity evolved within traditional norms. The Body felt the file met criterion R.3 as the proposed safeguarding measures, while strengthening existing ones, aimed to strengthen the transmission, protection, documentation and research of the element, and addressed the problem of unintentional over-commercialisation. The Body considered criterion R.4 was met as the nomination was prepared with the participation of the local community of artisans, local authorities, municipal museums, marble-carving school and individual experts, all giving their free, prior and informed consent. Finally, The Body found the file met criterion R.5 as the item was included on the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage with the participation of the community concerned in 2013. The inventory would be updated by the Ministry of Culture at least once every five years.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended that the element be inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and informed the Committee that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision** **10.COM 10.b.17 to inscribe Tinian marble craftsmanship** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**. The Chairperson gave the floor to Greece.
6. The delegation of **Greece**, on behalf of the craftspeople and inhabitants of Tinos island in the Cyclades said that they were honoured by the Committee’s decision and the evaluation of the Evaluation Body. Greece said it believed that inscribing the element would contribute to enhancement of the tradition, which had managed to unite two religious communities over one popular art form – that of craftsmanship, renowned not only in the Cyclades and Southern Greece but beyond the borders of Greece.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Greece, and proceeded to examination of the next nomination file submitted by Indonesia, giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
8. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Three genres of traditional dance in Bali** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.18]submitted by **Indonesia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
9. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all the criteria. The Body believed the file met criterion R.1 as the three genres of traditional dances in Bali are characterised by their affiliation to religious and secular contexts, providing communities and groups of practitioners, stakeholders and spectators with a sense of cultural identity and continuity. For criterion R.2, the Body felt the nomination demonstrated that the element was likely to contribute to raising the visibility and importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage at the local, national and international levels while encouraging respect of cultural diversity and human creativity. With regard to criterion R.3, the Body considered that in addition to past and present efforts to safeguard the element the nomination included measures developed in cooperation with communities and groups to continue the inventory, enhance transmission and further promote the element in respect of its social functions and cultural meanings. For criterion R.4, the Body believed the nomination showed that a large number and variety of bearers, practitioners and stakeholders participated in the process of drafting the nomination, providing their free, prior and informed consent. For criterion R.5, the Body found that the nomination showed that a total of nine dances in the three dance genres had been included in the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of the province of Bali since 2010 as part of the inventory drawn up at the national level in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
10. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body; informed the Committee no requests for debate or proposed amendments had been received by the Bureau and, therefore, asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.18 to inscribe Three genres of traditional dance in Bali** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**. The Chairperson offered congratulations and gave the floor to Indonesia.
12. The delegation of **Indonesia** on behalf of the Indonesian Government, thanked the Chairperson, the Evaluation Body, the Secretariat, the members of the Committee and all States Parties to the 2003 Convention for their support to the nomination of the three genres of traditional dance in Bali, Indonesia. The delegation said it was a great honour for Indonesia to have had their traditional dances inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity and that the inscription would further guarantee the safeguarding of traditional dances in Bali. To celebrate the inscription, Indonesia had planned to have four Balinese dancers perform in the session, but unfortunately they were unable to be present. Instead, the delegation presented a short video of the nine dances inscribed on the List, and extended an invitation to the room to enjoy dances during their next visit to the Island of the Gods in Bali, Indonesia.

[Video]

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Indonesia and gave the floor to the Secretary.
2. The **Secretary** wished to inform the delegates that Indonesia had very generously offered lunch to all NGOs present during the session.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the next nomination submitted by Italy and the floor was given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the nomination.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** said the following nomination was the **Celebration of the Celestine Pardon** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.19] submitted by **Italy** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that criteria R.1, R.3 and R.4 were satisfied. The Body found the file met criterion R.1 as the nomination showed that the Celebration of Celestine Pardon is a symbol of reconciliation, social cohesion and integration for the people of L'Aquila and Abruzzo, providing them with a sense of shared identity and secular continuity. The Body believed the file met criterion R.3 as the nomination provided safeguarding measures designed with the participation of communities that strengthened existing cultural meanings and social functions of the celebration including artistic and recreational activities. The Body thought the file met criterion R.4 as the nomination demonstrated that a number of associations and municipalities had been actively involved in the nomination process and gave it their free, prior and informed consent.
4. However, the Evaluation Body considered that criteria R.2 and R.5 were not fully satisfied. Regarding criterion R.2, the Body believed the nomination focused on outcomes expected from the inscription of the Celebration of Celestine Pardon on the city of L'Aquila and its communities but did not show evidence of encouraging dialogue and promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. Regarding criterion R.5, the Body found that the nomination did not provide an adequate extract of the inventory in which the element is included. It was hence difficult to assess the conformity of the inventorying process with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
5. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Committee had received requests for amendments from two members, namely Greece on criterion R.2 and Turkey on criterion R.5.
7. The delegation of **Greece** said that reading the nomination file and the evaluation it seemed that there was a positive recommendation for criterion R.1 meaning that the Evaluation Body had found sufficient evidence for the nomination to be considered as an element of intangible cultural heritage; a positive recommendation for criterion R.3 meaning that safeguarding measures are adequate and for criterion R.4 meaning that the bearers of the element participated in the whole process. Greece felt that criterion R.2, although badly written in the nomination file, had been met and proposed the following amendment: ‘The performance of the element fosters appreciation of traditions that are rooted in the past and promotes solidarity and tolerance. The celebrations that are regularly attended by representatives of cities that have faced civic strife in the past encourage dialogue and promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.’
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Greece for presenting the proposed amendment to criterion R.2 and gave the floor to Belgium.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** broadly shared the conclusions of the Evaluation Body. However, on the basis of information in the file questioned whether criteria R.3 and R.4 had been fulfilled regarding safeguarding measures and the participation and consent of communities. Belgium expressed its concern about the strong dramatization of the element as a safeguarding measure and lack of updated information provided for the two criteria. For criterion R.3, Belgium noted that under item 3 (ii), the permanent theatre of L'Aquila was given the task of proposing the ritual, dramaturgical and symbolic elements of the event in their original form; item 3.b (iii) dealt with the formulation of ideas to make the event even more solemn and spectacular. Belgium wondered if dramatization is an appropriate safeguarding method and welcomed clarification on the merits of the safeguarding method. Concerning the lack of updated data, it seemed that the nomination form was written in 2010-11, thus one read in point 3.b(i) ‘the allocation of funds for 2012 remains to be determined.’ Other examples of lack of updated data were noted in the file and the problem was also encountered in point 4.a, where it was noted that 12 meetings were organized by the committee of L'Aquila between April 2010 and December 2011. In the past four years, changes could have taken place and it was important that an updated status be given to the Committee for correct analysis of the file. Belgium wished to avoid setting any precedent and recalled the previous day’s decision on Mongolia's file concerning the criterion regarding the inventory, adding that criteria that received favourable opinions from the Evaluation Body in 2015 on the basis of information in a file should not be automatically approved during a future evaluation of the same element in particular when it came to criteria R.3 and R.4. It would be logical that criterion R.3 on safeguarding measures with a timetable and budget, and criterion R.4 on the consent of communities, groups and individuals be reassessed entirely. Belgium submitted these concerns to the Committee and wished to propose an amendment on the necessity of updating data for criteria R.3 and R.4 in the case of a referral and resubmission of a nomination in a future cycle. Belgium expressed its sincere hope that the city of L’Aquila could recover from damage caused by the recent earthquake and thought that perhaps it could be suggested to Italy to submit a file for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium, saying that considering Belgium’s intervention on criteria R.3 and R.4 the Committee would examine the draft decision paragraph by paragraph. The floor was given to Turkey to present its amendment on criterion R.5.
11. The delegation of **Turkey**, having taken into consideration that morning’s discussions on the need for further clarification and maybe an expert workshop on criterion R.5, noted that the submitting State had provided sufficient information and proof of inscription of the element on the national inventory. Turkey was of the opinion that the file was prepared with strong community participation, and that there was sufficient proof of cultural diversity provided by the submitting State as demonstrated by references to participation from a variety of communities involved. Although Turkey was fully in favour of inscription, the delegation still wished to hear more from Italy on the inventorying process and its conformity with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and gave the floor to Italy to respond to Turkey’s question.
13. The delegation of **Italy** wished to make some points and also answer Belgium regarding criterion R.3 and R.4.
14. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order by Belgium and gave the floor to Belgium.
15. The delegation of **Belgium** clarified that it had made a number of remarks but had not asked any questions to Italy.
16. The **Chairperson** asked Italy to continue answering the question by Turkey.
17. The delegation of **Italy** said it would answer the question of Turkey concerning criterion R.5, where Italy wished to point out that the extract of the inventory annexed to the file was revised following adoption of Decision 8.COM 8 paragraph 17. The extract clearly summarised the system and the methodology of the inventorying process used in Italy for intangible cultural heritage and the extract attached was prepared in summary form to provide an example of the cataloguing system that was easier for the evaluators to read. The extract contained a link to the website of the official database, 10 cards with pictures and simplified and complete descriptions. As for other Italian elements already inscribed, the element was included through initiatives of the communities concerned in the general catalogue of cultural heritage maintained by the Central Institute for Cataloguing and Documentation under the Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Cultural Activities and Tourism. The Italian cataloguing procedures changed at the beginning of 2015 in line with the national implementation process of the Convention. The inventory cards dedicated to intangible cultural heritage were under the control of the national authority for safeguarding cultural heritage through field survey and support of communities, groups, individuals and anthropologist cataloguers. Italy concluded by saying that it believed that the system and processes fully complied with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
18. The **Chairperson** thanked Italy and moved to the adoption of the draft decision paragraph by paragraph, beginning with paragraph 1 to which there was no objection. Paragraph 1 was adopted. Moving to paragraph 2, criterion R.1 was adopted without objections. Moving to criterion R.2 the Chairperson noted that the amendment proposed by Greece did not enjoy broad support from the Committee, and that the initial text would then be retained. Criterion R.2 was adopted as initially proposed. Criteria R.3 and R.4 were separately adopted without amendments. Moving to criterion R.5 the Chairperson noted an amendment proposed by Turkey and asked for a show of support. Noting that the amendment had broad support within the Committee, criterion R.5 was therefore adopted as amended. Looking at the entire paragraph 2, there were no objections and paragraph 2 was adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 was adopted as amended without objection. For paragraph 4, Latvia requested the floor.
19. The delegation of **Latvia** referred to observations expressed by Belgium concerning information that would need to be updated if the file was going to be resubmitted. Latvia thought that if attention was going to be paid to that aspect, then paragraph 4 would be the most appropriate place to mention it within the decision.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia for its contribution, and having asked the delegation whether it had a concrete amendment to propose invited Belgium to propose a text.
21. The delegation of **Belgium** declined saying it would like to add an amendment to the general decision in the Evaluation Body’s report concerning the relation between the examination of resubmitted files and approved criteria so that what the Body had suggested would not have future consequences especially where safeguarding plans were concerned. If an evaluation by the Body stated that criterion R.3 had been met, upon resubmission of the file Belgium would like to have a revised safeguarding plan submitted.
22. The **Chairperson** said that if there was no amendment, then the Committee would adopt paragraph 4 as it stood; there were no objections, and paragraph 4 was adopted as was paragraph 5. The Chairperson asked the Committee if it would adopt draft decision 10.COM 10.b.19 in its entirety. There were no objections, and the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.19 to refer the nomination of Celebration of the Celestine Pardon to the State Party for additional information**. The nomination was, therefore, referred to the submitting State for additional information and possible resubmission for examination during a following cycle. Italy was given the floor.
23. The delegation of **Italy** thanked the Chairperson and Committee for allowing Italy to express its comments on the file, and thanked the members of the Committee who had supported Italy.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked Italy, and proceeded with a joint nomination submitted by the two States Parties of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, and requested the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the file.
25. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** said that the following nomination was on **Aitysh/Aitys, art of improvisation** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.20] submitted by **Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
26. The Evaluation Body considered that the file had fulfilled all criteria. The Body found that the file met criterion R.1 as Aitysh/Aitys works as a social communication platform within communities and society at large, its transmission occurring mainly through music schools and studios installed by home teachers. The Body believed that the file met criterion R.2 as the nomination demonstrated the contribution of potential inscription to awareness of the significance of oral traditions and expressions in general and the visibility of intangible cultural heritage. The Body considered the file met criterion R.3 as practising communities and the two governments have developed activities including strengthening of formal and informal transmission, documentation and research, promotion and continuous monitoring of implementation by granting special attention to the multinational nature of the item and coordination between submitting States. The Body believed the file met criterion R.4 as the nomination evidenced active participation of all stakeholders in its design and development providing a wide range of evidence of free, prior and informed consent. The Body considered the file met criterion R.5 as Aitysh/Aitys was included in the inventories of two submitting States, from 2013 for Kazakhstan and 2007 for Kyrgyzstan, in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
27. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body. As the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision, the Chairperson suggested that the Committee adopt the draft decision in its entirety. There were no objections and the Chairperson declared adopted **Decision 10 COM 10.b.20 to inscribe Aitysh/Aitys, art of improvisation** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the submitting States.
2. The delegation of **Kazakhstan** said it was a great honour to speak on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the occasion of the inscription of this multinational nomination on the Representative List. The delegate expressed special gratitude to the partners who took part in preparing the dossier, particularly: the Kazakhstan National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee; the National Commission for UNESCO, Kyrgyzstan; UNESCO experts and the Secretariat of the Convention for their constant support and consultation, the Category 2 Centre ICHCAP and the governments of Korea and Norway for their contribution to the capacity-building of intangible cultural heritage experts in Kazakhstan and the region of Central Asia as a whole. The delegate also thanked the Chairperson and all members of the Committee for their endorsement of the recommendation of the Evaluation Body to inscribe the element, and thanked and congratulated the Chairperson and the Government of Namibia for their warm hospitality provided during the meeting. The inscription confirmed Kazakhstan’s commitment to safeguard, protect and popularise Aitysh, especially among the youth, pledging Kazakhstan’s full support for UNESCO’s important mission.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Kazakhstan, and gave the floor to Kyrgyzstan.
2. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** on behalf of the community of intangible cultural heritage bearers in Kyrgyzstan, offered its thanks for the hard work by and positive decision of the Evaluation Body. The delegate imagined that if all the nomination debates were conducted in poetic form they would be Aitysh, which has to do with all types of human communication, dealing with all aspects of human life. Even in contemporary times, people could still use Aitysh as a channel to reach their rulers when all other channels were closed. The inscription of Aitysh enhanced unity and affinity between two neighbouring countries. She continued by saying that both countries were faced with concepts of nationalistic and cultural exclusiveness and the inscription would assist promotion of the idea of cooperation and spiritual unity. She also said that inscription will also help the two submitting states have a special day for Aitysh as they already had a special day for Manas inscribed on 4 December 2013.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the two States Parties and moved to the next nomination, by Kyrgyzstan and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Kok-boru, traditional horse game** submitted [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.21] by **Kyrgyzstan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination file fulfilled criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5. The Body believed for criterion R.3, the file contained an extended set of safeguarding measures designed in collaboration with communities and groups to strengthen the transmission, protection, documentation and promotion of Kok-boru, ensuring sustainability. Regarding criterion R.4, the Body felt the file showed the community of Kok-boru players played an active role in each stage of the nomination preparation process while giving its free, prior and informed consent. The Body considered the file met criterion R.5 as Kok-boru was inscribed in 2008 on the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage, prepared in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention and maintained by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism.
4. However, the Evaluation Body considered that criteria R.1 and R.2 were not satisfied at this stage. The Body found criterion R.1 was not fulfilled as the nomination failed to demonstrate the intangible cultural heritage character of Kok-boru especially since it is a practice that might offend the sensibilities of other communities around the world as it presented health risks to humans, the horses were played in extreme conditions and goat carcasses used as an object of competition between the two teams. The Body considered criterion R.2 was not met as the nomination did not sufficiently demonstrate how Kok-boru constituted an element of intangible cultural heritage, and it was unclear whether inscription would help to improve the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general or awareness of its importance.
5. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
6. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments to the draft decision and asked it to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections so the nomination was, therefore, referred to the submitting State for additional information and possible resubmission during a following cycle. The Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.21** to **refer the nomination of** **Kok-boru, traditional horse game** **to the State Party for additional information,** and gave the floor to Kyrgyzstan for comment.
7. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** thanked the members of the Evaluation Body for their analysis and feedback, saying they respected the decision and would resubmit Kyrgyzstan’s nomination during a following cycle. However, Kyrgyzstan wished to express concerns about the nature of intangible cultural heritage and the contents of the Representative List. Intangible cultural heritage consists of elements of usually older cultural heritage; if one talks about the past of a nomadic, mountainous, totally landlocked country or people it would probably consist of one culture differing significantly from for example, agricultural or ocean-based cultures. Kyrgyzstan continued by saying that cultures adhere to different standards and have different levels or possibly even types of sensitivity, the key issue being how to harmonise different understandings and different standards in terms of sensitivity. Kyrgyzstan said they were reflecting on comments provided by the Evaluation Body about respect for sensitivities of diverse communities on an international scale. Kyrgyzstan said that this was actually the second case over the past two years when a file was rejected because of such sensitivities, and that these cases could encourage countries to develop and provide less conflicting nominations, which was acceptable but that if one thought about the mission of the Representative List which contains the huge diversity of all practices, Kyrgyzstan definitely felt that it was necessary to harmonise the Committee’s understanding of those kinds of issues. Kyrgyzstan had had informal conversations with a few other countries in their region, and proposed that the Secretariat or UNESCO centres in the region would take an initiative to collaborate through workshops or consultations to specifically focus on such issues.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Kyrgyzstan and moved to the following nomination from Namibia. The Chairperson (as a Namibian) could not now chair the Committee and left the Chair to one of her Vice-Chairpersons, India, to chair the Committee during discussion of the file.

(India takes the Chair.)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (India) moved to examination of the next nomination submitted by Namibia and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to share the findings of the Evaluation Body on the nomination.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Oshituthi shomagongo, marula fruit festival** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.22] submitted by **Namibia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that all criteria were fulfilled. The Body found that criterion R.1 was met as the nomination showed that the Oshituthi shomagongo festival celebrated the new marula harvest and the knowledge, skills, practices and oral traditions associated with it functioning as a catalyst for cohesion and mutual respect among Aawambo and the society in general. The Body believed criterion R.2 was met as the nomination showed that the festival aspects could help to improve the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and raise awareness of its importance due to interaction of the element with nature, appreciation of sociocultural and economic functions and creativity in the use of natural resources. The Body judged criterion R.3 as met, as the proposed safeguarding measures attested to the significant role played by the communities in developing ongoing safeguarding measures and the commitment of the submitting State to provide technical, organisational and material support to the implementation of all activities. The Body thought criterion R.4 was met as the nomination showed that the communities concerned participated in the four years of preparation of the nomination during which several development workshops and consultations were held while providing their free, prior and informed consent via a traditional leader appointed to represent them. The Body considered criterion R.5 was met as the item was included in the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage in 2012 by the Ministry of Youth, National Service, Sports and Culture of Namibia, under Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** (India) thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body. As the Bureau had not received any request for debate or amendments on the draft decision it was asked to adopt the draft decision as shown on the screens. There were no objections and, therefore, the Vice-Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.22 to inscribe Oshituthi shomagongo, marula fruit festival on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (India) congratulated Namibia, and gave it the floor. The Vice-Chairperson took the opportunity to thank everybody for giving India the possibility to share the beautiful moment with Namibia.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Namibia** thanked the Vice-Chairperson for the congratulatory remarks and thanked the States Parties to the 2003 Convention for entrusting Namibia with the responsibility of hosting the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee. Namibia’s appreciation was also due to the Secretariat of the Convention for assisting Namibia in making the meeting a reality. Namibia was delighted to have the marula fruit festival of Oshituthi shomagongo inscribed on the Representative List which was a special honour for Namibia, as this was Namibia’s first nomination to this very important List. The successful documentation and the eventual nomination of the element would not have been possible without know-how acquired through the capacity-building programme funded by the Flanders Government to whom Namibia offered a special appreciation, and also appreciated all assistance received from experts in the SADC region. The delegation of Namibia asked the Chairperson to permit a community representative to take the floor on behalf of the bearers of the practice.
2. The **Aawambo community representative**, on behalf of the Aawambo communities who are the bearers and the custodians of the element, expressed the excitement felt for the inscription of the element on the Representative List. The festival serves not only as entertainment but also plays an important role in sociocultural development in communities, promoting peace and unity. The representative wished to reassure the members of the Committee and the States Parties to the Convention that in cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Namibia the Aawambo community would ensure that Oshituthi shomagongo would be sustained.

[Applause]

[Video]

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Namibia** invited all delegates for a cocktail for the following afternoon to celebrate.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked her colleague from India for having stood in for her as Vice-Chairperson, and congratulated Namibia. She moved to the next nomination submitted by Nigeria and asked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present it.
3. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination on **Eyo masquerade festival** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.23] submitted by **Nigeria** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
4. The Evaluation Body considered that the file had satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4 and R.5. The Body felt the file met criterion R.1 as it showed that the Eyo masquerade festival was an event that expressed deep spiritual beliefs and integrated all community members in the city of Lagos. The Body deemed criterion R.2 as met, as the nomination demonstrated that inscription of the element on the Representative List was likely to improve the visibility of culture of peace embodied by intangible cultural heritage, promote dialogue and foster mutual respect. The Body considered the file met criterion R.4, as the Eyo groups and custodians of the festival were represented through the process of preparing their representatives who provided their free, prior and informed consent. The Body judged criterion R.5 as met as the Eyo masquerade festival had been inscribed in 2006 on the inventory of cultural resources maintained by the National Committee on Oral and Cultural Heritage for Nigeria.
5. However, the Evaluation Body considered that criterion R.3 was not fulfilled. The proposed safeguarding measures pertaining to research and promotion activities were considered as being unlikely to fully ensure the element’s viability, especially as community participation in planning and implementation deserved to be more clearly defined, as well as support provided by the submitting State for their implementation.
6. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
7. The **Chairperson** said that the Bureau had received no requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and suggested the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole as it appeared on the screens. There were no objections and the nomination was, therefore, returned to the submitting State for further information and possible resubmission during the next cycle. The Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.23 to refer the nomination of Eyo masquerade festival to the State Party**, and gave the floor to Nigeria.
8. The delegation of **Nigeria** took note of the perceived gaps and inadequacies highlighted by the Evaluation Body. Nigeria did not contest the recommendation of the Evaluation Body, and said it would take the appropriate steps to address the shortcomings and resubmit the file in the next cycle for consideration and nomination to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the next nomination submitted by Peru and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination on **Wititi dance of the Colca Valley** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.24 ]submitted by **Peru** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the file fulfilled all criteria. For criterion R.1, the Body felt the nomination illustrated that the courtship was a practice of intangible cultural heritage of the communities of the Colca Valley of sacred, playful and artistic nature passed down through families and encouraged by various public institutions. For criterion R.2, the Body believed the nomination demonstrated that inscription of the element was likely to contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage, raise awareness regarding its importance and illustrate shared values of creativity, festive joy, respect for nature and gender equality. For criterion R.3, the Body found the nomination showed that the community of practitioners and team of researchers had identified five safeguarding measures that may support increased viability of the element, systematic promotion, annual seminars in the form of meetings between bearers and researchers, production of a documentary, creation of a digital archive and research on the origins and history of the dance. The Evaluation Body had found in the nomination file evidence of support for those measures by regional and national government agencies. For criterion R.4, the Body felt the nomination provided a clear description on how the development process had evolved over many years in close collaboration with communities and groups concerned and provided ample evidence of their free, prior and informed consent. For criterion R.5, the Body believed the Wititi dance of Colca Valley had been included in the inventory entitled ‘Declaration of the cultural heritage of the Nation’ developed by the Directorate of Intangible Heritage of the Ministry of Culture in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The **Evaluation Body**, therefore, recommended inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** said the Bureau did not receive any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked if the Committee could adopt the draft decision as a whole. Seeing no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.24 to inscribe Wititi dance of the Colca Valley** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

[Musicians play an excerpt from the dance]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Peru.
2. The **Governor of the Arequipa Region** greeted all the members of the Committee introducing herself as Ms Delgado, Yamila Osorio, Regional Governor of Arequipa. She began by saying it was a true honour to be at the prestigious gathering of the Intergovernmental Committee in the beautiful country of Namibia. The delegate expressed her pleasure in representing Peru, and took pride in the listing of the Wititi dance as an element of intangible cultural heritage. She described Wititi dance as one of the most widespread cultural manifestation practised in the Colca Valley - the folklore capital of Arequipa. The Governor explained that the Colca Valley is the home of multiple and diverse traditions of cultural expressions, most notably dance and music, colourful vestments with emblematic patterns and rites and legends. That region houses two native ethnic groups, the Collaguas and the Cabanas, as well as the Apus mountain spirits that protect the local people. The Governor said that Wititi traditional dance expresses happiness, courage, love and the pride and history of the communities of the Colca Valley simultaneously. She highlighted that the dance was not only beautiful but had also been enriched as the dances have developed and built upon each other with specific touches added over time. The delegate continued that the dance forms part of their cultural heritage which passed from generation to generation, which they were committed to protect and promote. In conclusion, she again thanked the room, especially the Evaluation Body, and spoke a few words in Quechua that meant ‘You are welcome to Colca. We are going to wait for you.’

[Applause]

[Video]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Peru and moved to the next nomination submitted by Romania and presented by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Lad’s dances in Romania** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.25] submitted by **Romania** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that all criteria had been met. The Body felt for criterion R.1 the file showed that the dance, performed on festive occasions and transmitted to boys informally through observation and practise, was used to express gender, as well as social and local identity in addition to being a means of intercultural communication in a multi-ethnic region. The Body believed for criterion R.2 the file demonstrated that inscription of the item was likely to contribute to better visibility of dance as an artistic and creative expression, which could in turn encourage other countries and communities to recognize, promote and safeguard comparable elements of their intangible cultural heritage. The Body felt criterion R.3 on current and proposed safeguarding measures intended to ensure the viability of the element in its different contexts had been developed with the participation of community representatives and local non-governmental organizations, as well as local and central authorities pledging to support their implementation. The Body found criterion R.4 demonstrated that cultural associations, community representatives and owners and practitioners of the element were involved in the nomination process and provided their free, prior and informed consent. Finally, the Body believed for criterion R.5 the element was included in 2009 on the Inventory of Elements of Intangible Cultural Heritage maintained by the National Centre for the Preservation and Promotion of Traditional Culture, in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the Lad’s dance of Romania on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** advised the Committee that the Bureau had received a request for an amendment by Hungary adding a new paragraph. Hungary was given the floor.
6. The delegation of **Hungary** congratulated Romania on its submission of a successful nomination earning a positive evaluation by the Evaluation Body. Hungary supported the element’s inscription as it was a cultural asset that deserved international recognition. At the same time, it believed the nomination file had not sufficiently emphasized the element’s multinational and transborder character since Lad’s dances was a fairly good example of multi-ethnic cultural heritage with transborder linkages. Hungary had submitted a proposed amendment as an additional paragraph to the draft decision encouraging Romania and the neighbouring countries to prepare a joint multinational nomination in future embracing the whole scope of the element, which would enhance mutual understanding and respect of local communities and nations in the region.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary and read the text aloud in French: ‘Paragraph 4: Reminds that the tradition of Lad’s dance is shared by communities in the region, recalls that the inscription on the Representative List does not imply exclusivity and encourages the submitting State Party to include communities practising Lad’s dance when implementing safeguarding measures. To ensure closer cooperation among States Parties in line with UNESCO's efforts, further encourages the submitting State Party and the States Parties concerned to extend the file to a multinational nomination.’ Latvia was given the floor.
8. The delegation of **Latvia**, referring to Hungary’s proposed amendment, said it understood the concerns behind it and wished to raise some observations for the Committee’s attention starting with the second sentence encouraging the elaboration of potential multinational nominations. Latvia referred to a Committee discussion the previous year on certain nominations that had the potential to be multinational nominations. The Committee’s position was not to invite or express invitation for every nomination where such potential existed. Latvia’s position was to keep the Committee’s position of the previous year, and therefore, did not support the second sentence. For the first sentence proposed, it wished to refer to the nomination text submitted where certain parts refer to different communities within the territory of the submitting State, all of which equally practise the element. As an example, Latvia quoted: ‘in communities where several ethnic groups live, the element contributes to intercultural communication. It also provides a context for learning more about cultural diversity, witnessing, for example, local performers dancing at regional events or observing choreographic ethnic styles of Romanian groups dancing alongside Hungarian and Roma groups’. Latvia said there were other examples where other, different communities were also mentioned. Latvia said Hungary’s proposal was probably not really based within the nomination, which was quite open to different communities, but that the first sentence could be maintained and propose certain amendments be made to make it more precise.
9. The delegation of **Bulgaria** congratulated Hungary for highlighting the multicultural aspects present in the file, affirming that in Central and Eastern European regions where most cultural practices are shared across borders, paying due attention to multinational and multicultural aspects is important and gives a good basis for international cooperation in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the region. Bulgaria affirmed that they supported the positive spirit expressed in the proposal made by Hungary.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** appreciated the idea put forward by Hungary but agreed more with Latvia’s remarks that the nomination file sufficiently addressed the issue of multiculturality, with open references to other communities. Turkey said that while it traditionally promoted multinational files, it didn’t think that should create a prerogative preventing perfect files positively reviewed by the Evaluation Body from being inscribed.
11. The delegation of **Greece** also wished to recognize the positive spirit of the Hungarian proposal, recalling long discussions about multinational nominations and saying it was good to have reminders of multinational nominations submitted by States in areas of many shared elements. Regarding the current proposal for amendment, Greece felt that when discussing multinational nominations it shouldn’t stop with the roles of the States, and Greece would rather see references to the communities of the bearers on both sides of the border rather than the initiatives of the States in enhancing the intangible cultural heritage value of the elements of the area. Greece wished for the last part of the sentence about the roles of States to be rephrased to mention communities rather than States, whether the Hungarian proposal was supported or not.
12. The delegation of **Nigeria** shared Latvia’s position for two reasons: firstly because multicultural files were voluntary not forced and most countries usually had difficulty in accepting them or were not interested, secondly Nigeria was part of the session last year, which that Latvia referred to where these aspects should not be mentioned as part of the file if it is good enough for inscription. Nigeria concluded by expressing support for the Latvian position.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Nigeria and asked members of the Committee supporting Hungary’s proposed amendment to show their name plates. The Chairperson concluded that the amendment did not enjoy broad support within the Committee and that the previous text would be retained. There were no objections to the adoption of the draft decision as it stood, and the Chairperson, therefore, declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.25 to inscribe Lad’s dances in Romania** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Romania.
2. The delegation of **Romania**, on behalf of the Government of Romania, expressed its gratitude for the recognition granted for Lad’s dances in Romania, one of the most valuable elements of its cultural identity and the fifth element inscribed by Romania on the Representative List. Romania took the opportunity to stress its debt to the bearers and practitioners whose talent, dedication and courage were noted and valued, as well as the authorities and professionals appointed to bring their scientific contribution to a successful outcome.

[Applause]

[Video]

1. The **Chairperson** informed the room that the Speaker of the National Assembly of the Republic of Namibia had joined the meeting, and extended a welcome to him, thanking him for showing interest in the work of the Intergovernmental Committee of the 2003 Convention.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** drew the meeting’s attention to the time (5 p.m.) and as Item 10 was far from being finished said that the work would continue until 7.30 p.m. at the latest to catch up with the schedule. The Chairperson moved to the next nomination: Alardah Alnajdiyah dance, drumming and poetry in Saudi Arabia, submitted by Saudi Arabia. Before giving the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body she gave the floor to the Secretariat for some explanations concerning the file.
2. The **Secretary** said she had felt it necessary to justify the somewhat exceptional situation of this nomination. As seen in Document 10.COM 10 which introduced the work of the Evaluation Body, the Committee was informed that during the evaluation process three States withdrew their candidature and two files remained incomplete which is why the Secretariat had decided to include Saudi Arabia’s nomination originally submitted for possible inscription in 2016. The Secretary pointed out that at the Committee during its ninth session in November 2014, had invited the submitting State to resubmit this file for examination during a next cycle, as is the case with all referred files, which it had done on March 31, 2015. The fact that the Evaluation Body had not completed its work and that five nominations were missing from its workload led the Secretariat to consider that this file could, exceptionally, be considered by the Committee at its tenth session. In addition, considering that Saudi Arabia had no national inscriptions on any of the Convention’s mechanisms it was considered a priority in terms of paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives. The Secretariat had given the submitting State feedback on how their nomination could be completed, and Saudi Arabia resubmitted its revised application on May 11, 2015.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination on **Alardah Alnajdiyah, dance, drumming and poetry in Saudi Arabia** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.26] submitted by **Saudi Arabia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met criteria R.4 and R.5. The Body felt the file met criterion R.4 as the nomination was prepared with participation of dancers of Alardah and other practitioners and stakeholders who gave their free, prior and informed consent. The Body found criterion R.5 indicated that the element was included in 2012 on the inventory of intangible cultural heritage maintained by the Ministry of Culture and Information in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
6. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information in the file did not meet criteria R.1, R.2 and R.3. For criterion R.1, the Body believed additional information would be necessary to clearly identify the nature and scope of the element, in particular its location in the Najd region or elsewhere in the submitting State; the roles of practitioners and professionals as from those of ordinary citizens; the relationship between formal and non-formal education; and the transformation of cultural meanings of the element. For criterion R.2, the Body thought that the file lacked information to demonstrate how inscription of the element could contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and raise awareness of its importance, especially regarding the aesthetic sensibility of each community or tribe contributing to the promotion of respect for cultural diversity. For criterion R.3, the Body believed additional information was needed to understand how the proposed safeguarding measures would ensure the element’s viability once its nature and reach were clearly identified, including the role of Al Janadria festival a clearly important event not sufficiently explained and the role of the Preservation Society of Saudi Heritage in the safeguarding process also not clearly explained.
7. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended referring the nomination to the submitting State for additional information.
8. The **Chairperson** said having heard the Secretariat’s explanation why the nomination was being presented at the tenth session of the Committee and not the eleventh and the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body explaining the Body’s recommendation wished to inform the Committee that the Bureau had received amendments to all three criteria proposed by Turkey, to whom the floor was then given.
9. The delegation of **Turkey** said it was short of words because the Secretary had stolen the words from its text. It agreed with what she had said and wished to reiterate and complement her explanation. Turkey expressed its deep appreciation and general agreement with the findings and observations of the Evaluation Body which Turkey found very useful when preparing its own files, yet had a slightly different view of this nomination file. Turkey believed the way the bearers and communities transferred the knowledge and skills, and the social functions and cultural meanings of the community the element currently constituted was an important chapter of the nomination file. In that regard, Turkey wished to underline its observation that the nomination contained sufficient information on transmission of the element between generations and also multi-governmental and non-governmental institutions, especially through public education and non-formal education. Turkey said it was also clear from the nomination file that the element’s viability was promoted by Saudi Arabia’s citizens regardless of their educational, social and cultural backgrounds; that the submitting State had had no files inscribed; and that Saudi Arabia had been very enthusiastic about and committed to promoting UNESCO ideals in general, and those of the Committee in particular. Turkey felt the nomination file was not only linked to local groups practising the rituals but to Saudi Arabia itself.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** said it should be considered that Saudi Arabia had taken advice to resubmit the file and that whether or not the resubmitted file still had shortcomings believed it demonstrated Saudi Arabia’s commitment to align with the Convention’s requirements. The element’s viability was definitely being promoted and its inscription would not only contribute to raising awareness and recognition of intangible cultural heritage values at local and national levels but also build greater respect for cultural diversity by raising awareness of elements practised by different communities in different parts of the world. Such awareness, supported by non-commercial ways of transmission, was consistent with the main goals of the Convention. Regarding criterion R.3, the delegation believed that the element’s viability was ensured by the submitting State’s financial and technical commitment and support by government, as well as community involvement in related events and NGO efforts. Measures proposed by the safeguarding plan included a well-defined framework, timetable and clear financial commitment by the submitting State. Turkey said it would like to hear from Saudi Arabia about its continuing commitment to submitting missing information and requested the floor be given to the representative for Saudi Arabia to further explain its cause. Turkey was in favour of inscription of the file.
11. The delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated Saudi Arabia for repeatedly working on the nomination, which demonstrated its relentless and continued commitment, recalling lengthy and constructive discussions on the element the previous year. Ethiopia said it was clear from the file that Alardah is practised by citizens of different ages, and educational and cultural backgrounds, especially those who lived in Najd. Schools as well as associations and civil society organizations are strongly concerned with the element, and Ethiopia felt it was difficult to differentiate between practitioners and bearers, who are the citizens themselves, and the professional practitioners. In the nomination it stated that every practitioner belonged to a certain tribe and at the same time might be affiliated to a troupe which practised different performing arts, one of which is Alardah. Ethiopia, therefore, felt it would be difficult to demarcate between a professional practitioner and another citizen who considers the element part of his intangible cultural heritage and practises it in any event or ceremony. With these considerations, Ethiopia seconded and supported the amendment proposed by Turkey.
12. The delegation of **Tunisia** said that the Alardah Alnajdiyah is a widespread practice in the society of Saudi Arabia with shared memory of history and symbols, and this variety of popular poetry is an identity marker of the whole society and its psyche. However, Tunisia felt that the complex aspect of the element might pose problems in identification, which is why it would like clarification on the scope of the element as contained in the nomination.
13. The delegation of **Uganda** wished to thank Saudi Arabia for resubmitting the file and having read it felt the information provided for criterion R.1 was met as it indicated the element’s practitioners – people of all ages, different social and cultural backgrounds, mainly men but also women who practised privately. It said indicating the characteristics of the different practitioners might not be possible since the practitioners were essentially the whole community. When looking at scope, it can be seen that the element is practised in Najd region but also in three other regions such as Ha’il, AlJouf and Alahsa which are to the northeast. The element is also practised at local, regional and national events. The national events show the element’s scope and Uganda felt that the information in criterion R.1 was sufficient. Regarding criterion R.2 Uganda noted Saudi Arabia indicated the element would be promoted at festivals, as well as using broadcast recordings and the internet. Uganda wished to requested Saudi Arabia present further information on criterion R.3, which was still a grey area.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked Uganda, appealing to colleagues and members of the Committee to formulate precise questions to the submitting State. The floor was given to Bulgaria, to be followed by Egypt.
15. The delegation of **Bulgaria** supported the amendments proposed by Turkey, finding the argument justified and well-grounded and although not having a specific question, supported the proposed amendments and inscription of the nomination.
16. The delegation of **Egypt** thanked Saudi Arabia for its work in resubmitting the file and insisting on inscription of the element. Egypt was in full agreement with the suggestion by the Turkish delegation and supported inscription of the element.
17. The delegation of **Belgium** said it was clear that Saudi Arabia attached great importance to the recognition of Alardah, and had provided a significant budget to support it. Analysis of the nomination had been difficult, however, as the information provided was not placed in the correct sections of the form and that when a nomination was resubmitted the different sections should be completed. Belgium stressed the need to draft nominations properly, providing the right answers to questions in the appropriate sections so that the Evaluation Body and Committee could work effectively.
18. The delegation of **Algeria** said that with reference to criterion R.1, it did not understand why the criterion had not been satisfied since the meaning of Article 2 of the Convention was that it was communities, groups and individuals who recognised intangible cultural heritage. Criterion R.4 had been satisfied as communities had given their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination of what they consider to be their intangible cultural heritage. The question remains as to what the communities had given their free, prior and informed consent to. For obvious reasons, Algeria supported the amendment introduced by Turkey.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria and gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire before excusing herself on a point of order from Turkey.
20. The delegation of **Turkey** said that the Secretariat had omitted to indicate on the screens that Egypt was in favour of the proposed amendments, and asked for the omission to be corrected.
21. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and apologising, asked Côte d’Ivoire to continue.
22. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** noted that the Evaluation Body had mentioned additional information was required although several speakers had said the required information had been provided. Côte d’Ivoire would, therefore, like the submitting State to explain the additional information required to satisfy criterion R.3.
23. The delegation of **Congo** felt that considering the proposed amendments by Turkey, the file could be inscribed.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked the members of the Committee and gave the floor to Saudi Arabia to respond to the questions asked by the members of the Committee.
25. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the Chairperson. Regarding criterion R.3, it stated the element’s nature was clear from the description, and what was mentioned in criterion R.1 highlighted its nature and function in modern Saudi society. The suggested safeguarding measures and their importance were comprehensively developed to ensure the element’s viability. These measures would be accomplished through cooperation between the government and communities varying from interviews, research studies and documentation, as well as transmission modalities through to different educational means, reinforcement, development, legal protection and others. Each safeguarding measure had been specified and an important and accurate budget for ensuring viability and sustainability had been allocated to avoid any negative results consequent to the inscription. The Al-Janadria Festival was one of the safeguarding and transmission venues of the element, information on which was given and to which the government allocates $16 million yearly. It stated the number of festival visitors sometimes reached three million yearly from Saudi Arabia and other countries. It asserted that involvement of Alardah in the festival would increase and clearly showed the role of the implementing NGO (the Saudi Heritage Preservation Society) which played an important part in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The Society represented local communities through a large project that included inventorying performing arts in the country and identifying the practitioners, researchers, groups and poets. The Society took the lead in holding workshops on community-based inventorying and can be considered as the first NGO in the Middle East which followed the safeguarding philosophy established by the 2003 Convention.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked Saudi Arabia and gave the floor to Tunisia for the second time.
27. The delegation of **Tunisia** believed that information needed to fulfil the three criteria was not lacking, and that there was a small problem with the interpretation of the information which is why Tunisia supported Turkey’s proposed amendment.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked Tunisia and moved to adopt the decision paragraph by paragraph. There were no amendments proposed to paragraph 1, which was adopted. In paragraph 2, criteria R.1, R.2 and R.3 the Committee supported amendments proposed by Turkey, which were adopted. Criteria R.4 and R.5 were without amendments, and were both adopted. The Chairperson moved to adopt paragraph 2 as a whole, there were no objections and paragraph 2 was adopted. In paragraph 3, Turkey had proposed deleting ‘Decides to refer the nomination of’ and replacing it with ‘Inscribes’; there were no objections to adoption of the paragraph and paragraph 3 was adopted. Turkey had proposed to delete paragraph 4, to which there were no objections and paragraph 4 was deleted. The Chairperson asked if there were objections to adopting the draft decision as a whole; and as there were no objections, declared **adopted Decision 10 COM 10.b.26 as amended to inscribe Alardah Alnajdiyah, dance, drumming and poetry in Saudi Arabia** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Saudi Arabia to respond.
2. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the Committee for its support and Turkey for the proposed amendments to the nomination of Alardah Alnajdiyah. As a very popular Saudi performing art, the decision to inscribe Alardah Alnajdiyah will spread the national dance more widely, beyond Saudi Arabia and her neighbours. The delegation thanked the Chairperson for her warm hospitality, and again thanked the members of the Committee for their support.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Saudi ambassador and moved to examine the next nomination by Slovakia.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Bagpipe culture** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.27] submitted by **Slovakia** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The Evaluation Body considered that the file had met all criteria. The Body believed the file met criterion R.1, as the nomination showed that the culture of bagpipes in Slovakia was handed down over generations, offered its practitioners and fans a source of nostalgia and was a counterweight to the pressures of globalisation while evoking a sense of identity and continuity. The Body felt the file met criterion R.2 as the nomination demonstrated that inscription was likely to contribute to visibility of a larger group of similar items particularly those rooted in rare musical instruments; encourage exchange of information and experiences between practising communities at the national and international level; and raise awareness of links between long-standing traditions, creativity and innovation. The Body believed the file also met criterion R.3 as the nomination contained well-developed safeguarding measures, including responses to possible unintended consequences of inscription that had been developed in close collaboration with experts and two of the main organisations of pipers and makers of bagpipes. The Body considered the file met criterion R.4 as it convincingly demonstrated the broad participation of a wide range of stakeholders in the nomination process who gave their free, prior and informed consent. Finally, the Body felt criterion R.5 was met as the element had been included since 2008 in the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Slovakia maintained by the Ministry of Culture in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
6. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the Bagpipe culture on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and announced the Committee had received a proposed amendment from Hungary and as the amendment was the same as that proposed for Romania asked Hungary if it wished to retain the proposal.
8. The delegation of **Hungary** confirmed that it wished to keep the proposal, drawing the Committee’s attention to the fact that Hungary had within the past two hours submitted revised proposals, from which the last sentence concerning the new nomination had already been deleted. Hungary expressed its support for inscription of Bagpipe culture, which it said was cultural heritage shared between many communities in Central and Eastern Europe and that in Hungary it was practised by Slovaks, Croatians and of course Hungarian communities. While Hungary understood that the main focus of the submitted nomination was specifically the Bagpipe culture within Slovakia, it believed that if dealing with elements that transcended borders and was practised by communities living in neighbouring countries and the related instruments, customs, songs and tunes were the same or very similar in neighbouring countries, it might be argued that the name of the element should be that of the Bagpipe culture itself. Besides supporting inscription, Hungary wished to insert an amendment to the draft decision in the agreed language of UNESCO as could be seen for example in decision 9 COM.10.3 and 9 COM.10.6. Hungary invited members of the Committee to consider and support its proposed amendment. Hungary emphasised that it was not speaking specifically about the nomination of the element in Slovakia, but about the transborder aspect of the element.
9. The delegation of **Peru** said that in previous sessions, texts proposed by Hungary had been introduced. Peru agreed with the first part off Hungary’s statement as it was fair to recognize that the element was shared and that inscription did not always imply exclusivity especially when there are other countries or communities in other countries that share the element that will be inscribed on the List. Peru did not however agree with the second part of Hungary’s paragraph that encouraged the State Party to include communities from other countries. The communities practising the element in the country had already been involved in the safeguarding plan.
10. The delegation of **Turkey** said that as highlighted earlier and was repeated now by Hungary, it had indicated that as a policy it supported multinational files and welcomed that States Parties should specifically include all communities within their territories. Turkey recalled that in earlier debates, the Committee had adopted decisions along similar lines as in the case of Lavash, and that was why it was in favour of Hungary’s proposals.
11. The delegation of **Nigeria**, while prepared to accept the first part of Hungary’s proposal despite some reservations, wished to join Peru in showing strong reservation about the second part of the sentence, due to issues of sovereignty. It explained that one cannot enforce something or a plan in another person’s territory.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked Nigeria and asked for a show of name plates from the Committee in support of Hungary’s proposed amendment. The proposal did not receive support in the room. The Chairperson asked for a show of support for the Hungarian proposal as amended by Peru, for which there was no broad support in the room, so the original text of the draft decision was retained. The Chairperson proposed adoption of the draft decision as originally proposed to which there were no objections and therefore declared **adopted** **Decision 10 COM 10.b.27 to inscribe Bagpipe culture on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**. The Chairperson congratulated Slovakia, and gave it the floor.
13. The delegation of **Slovakia** thanked the room, and the organisers of the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for their warm welcome to their beautiful country and organization of the meeting. The delegation of **Slovakia** (new speaker) appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, saying that evaluation of such complex elements, including musical traditions but also dancing and storytelling customs required not only expert knowledge but an ability to look at the element from the point of view of the communities involved. In the name of the practitioners and communities, Slovakia once again thanked the Committee for the inscription of the bagpipe culture, and gave the floor to two pipers who were present.

[Bagpipes performance]

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the next nomination submitted by Tajikistan and gave the floor the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the nomination on **Art of Chakan embroidery in Kulob** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.29] submitted by **Tajikistan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination file met criteria R.1 and R.4. The Body felt the file met criterion R.1 as it showed the art of Chakan embroidery, transmitted by older to younger women, was widely practiced by the population of Kulob, functioning as a means of socialisation and additional source of income. The Body believed the file met criterion R.4 as the nomination was the result of extensive consultation between bearers, practitioners, local cultural organisations and production companies, experts and government officials, some of whose representatives provided their free, prior and informed consent.
4. However, the Evaluation Body considered that based on information in the file, criteria R.2, R.3 and R.5 were not satisfied. For criterion R.2, the Body felt the nomination focused on promoting Chakan embroidery without much information on the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, encouragement of diversity and creativity it embodied, nor prospects arising from its inscription. For criterion R.3, the Body believed the proposed safeguarding measures focused on further promotion, and stricter organisation of maintenance and modes of transmission, diffusion of the element in other districts of Khatlon region and the proliferation of production companies. It neglected the effects on the element of excessive commercialisation or industrialisation and did not clarify the role of the bearers and the benefits that could be derived from the safeguarding. Although the Body found criterion R.5 did indicate that the item had been included on the national list of intangible cultural heritage, no evidence was provided on the participation of communities, groups and non-governmental organisations in the identification and definition of the element. In addition, if felt that a conformity was required between the inventory data, year, reference number, name of the inventory, the entity responsible for its maintenance and frequency of updating.
5. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
6. The **Chairperson** indicated that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. There were no objections and the Chairperson **declared adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.29 to refer the nomination of Art of Chakan embroidery in Kulob to the State Party for additional information**.
7. As Tajikistan was not represented in the room, the Chairperson moved to the next file, submitted by Turkmenistan.
8. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Epic art of Gorogly** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.30] submitted by **Turkmenistan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
9. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination file had met all the criteria. The Body believed the file met criterion R.1 as the nomination showed that the epic song Görogly operated as a strong symbol of Turkmen society, in which epics play a role in the education of new generations, with expertise transmitted through a student-teacher relationship. The Body found the file met criterion R.2, as the file demonstrated inscription of the item could promote intercultural dialogue and exchange of experiences at regional and international levels, increase awareness of oral cultural heritage and promote respect for cultural diversity and creativity. The Body felt criterion R.3 was met as the proposed safeguarding measures included diverse concrete activities to ensure viability of the element in contemporary society through legislative advocacy and training measures developed with the participation of several players, including bearers and practitioners of the element. The Body considered the file met criterion R.4 as it was prepared in collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders including a number of bearers of the element and a key academic institution whose representatives provided their free, prior and informed consent. The Body believed the file met criterion R.5 as it showed that the item was included on the national inventory of intangible heritage since 2013, which was regularly updated by the Ministry of Culture with the participation of parties concerned.
10. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the element on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage.
11. The **Chairperson** indicated that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and, therefore, requested adoption of the draft decision on the file as a whole. As there were no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted Decision 10.COM 10.b.30 to inscribe Epic art of Gorogly on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson**, before allowing Turkey to speak, gave the floor to the submitting State.
2. The delegation of **Turkmenistan**, on behalf of the Government of Turkmenistan, thanked the Intergovernmental Committee for the inscription of the Epic Art of Görogly on the Representative List. This was Turkmenistan’s first successful nomination, which would stimulate and motivate the safeguarding and promotion of all elements of the intangible cultural heritage of Turkmenistan, including capacity-building for inventorying, documentation and safeguarding. The delegation continued by saying that the element would serve as a source of knowledge and skills for the younger generation and a tool for the promotion of intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding, as well as cultural peace. The delegation once again thanked all the members of the Evaluation Body for their decision, as well as the authorities of the Republic of Namibia for hosting and successfully organising the meeting.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkmenistan and gave the floor to Turkey.
2. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to wholeheartedly congratulate its sister country of Turkmenistan on the inscription of the Epic Art of Görogly as its first nomination to the Representative List, in which Turkey shared the country’s joy and satisfaction. Turkey shared the considerations and observations of the Evaluation Body in suggesting that the inscription could contribute to intercultural dialogue and exchange of good practices on a regional and international level. Görogly is a legend celebrated across Euro-Asia by over 250 million people, whether they are coming from Turkic ancestry or not and diverse cultures recognise and share this very important tradition. As Turkey is home to some of the same or similar cultural elements, and having inscribed the same legend on the Turkish national inventory, Turkey fully promoted the inscription of such elements as multinational files and believed that this would bring the nations, States and regions and continents closer.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey, moving to the joint nomination by the United Arab Emirates and Oman.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Al-Razfa, a traditional performing art** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.31] submitted jointly by the **United Arab Emirates and Oman** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The Evaluation Body considered that the file had satisfied all criteria. The Body found the file met criterion R.1 as it showed that al-Razfa strengthens the sense of belonging, identity and continuity of the communities concerned, its main practitioners being male artists trained by interested community members although other groups of people can take part regardless of age, social status or gender. The Body felt for criterion R.2, the file demonstrated that inscription of Al-Razfa could further promote awareness of the dialogic nature of intangible cultural heritage, contributing to the visibility of the arts in general while the value of the item with its fusion between music and poetry could promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. The Body believed for criterion R.3, the nomination proposed measures including research and documentation, educational programmes, support for bearers of the element and promotion through festivals, competitions and other public events supported by the commitment of participating governments. For criterion R.4, the Body considered that the file demonstrated active and innovative community involvement in the nomination process with free, prior and informed consent provided by artists troops, individuals and NGOs and government. The Body felt criterion R.5 was met as the element had been included since 2007 on the inventory of intangible cultural heritage of Abu Dhabi and since 2010 on the list of the Omani national inventory, both inventories having been prepared in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
6. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
7. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had received no requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. As there were no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.31 to inscribe Al-Razfa, a traditional performing art** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that as the two current submitting countries were also part of the next two files, they would be given the floor after the next two nominations. The Chairperson moved to the next nomination, submitted by the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman and Qatar.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Arabic coffee, a symbol of generosity** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.32] submitted by the **United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman and Qatar** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all criteria. The Body believed the file met criterion R.1 as it showed that the preparation, serving and consumption of Arabic coffee was an expression of hospitality, generosity and social etiquette, practised and transmitted at all levels of society. The Body considered the file met criterion R.2 as it demonstrated that inscription of the item was likely to contribute to visibility of intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its importance, encourage dialogue and promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. The Body felt the file met criterion R.3 as the proposed safeguarding measures developed with stakeholder participation included educational initiatives on the importance of the element as a sign of hospitality and as part of the intangible cultural heritage of the four submitting States. For criterion R.4, the Body believed the submitting States had provided information on communities, groups and individuals in the nomination process, even if only some of the letters indicated free, prior and informed consent that testified that the communities were aware of the nomination’s multinational character. Finally, the Body felt criterion R.5 showed the inclusion of the element in the inventories of the four submitting States, in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had received no requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and asked that it adopt the draft decision as a whole. As there were no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.32 to inscribe Arabic coffee, a symbol of generosity** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** moved to the next draft decision, submitted by the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman and Qatar.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Majlis, a cultural and social space** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.33] submitted by the **United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Oman and Qatar** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination had met all the criteria. The Body felt the file met criterion R.1 as the element is transmitted from generation to generation through non-formal means and is closely interwoven in the daily lives of communities concerned. The nomination demonstrated that a *majlis* encouraged socialising, conversation, negotiation and reconciliation and entertainment, as well as promoted community ties and a sense of belonging and continuity. The Body considered the file met criterion R.2 as the nomination demonstrated that the element is used as a meeting space that supports the practice of other elements and is a junction point between tradition and modernity. Its inscription might well encourage dialogue, promote respect for cultural diversity and raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage, while the multinational nature of the nomination could contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The Body found the file met criterion R.3 as the proposed safeguarding measures were designed with the participation of stakeholders and focused on advocacy, research, documentation, training social etiquette and associated traditions to attract younger generations. The Body considered the file met criterion R.4 as it demonstrated that a wide range of stakeholders including communities, non-governmental organisations and regional local authorities had participated in the nomination process and provided their free, prior and informed consent, although few of them mentioned the multinational nature of the nomination. For criterion R.5, The Body believed the file showed that majlis was included in the inventories of the four submitting States, in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended inscribing the Majlis, a cultural and social space, on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
5. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had received no requests for debate or proposed amendments and requested the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. As there were no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.33 to inscribe Majlis, a cultural and social space** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to the submitting States, beginning with the United Arab Emirates.
2. The delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** thanked the Evaluation Body for its positive evaluation of the important and special element, thanking the Committee for endorsing the decision for inscription. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat, which was always ready to assist and identify the role of the partners in this international cultural process. The United Arab Emirates were not only delighted by the inscription of the three elements – important as they were for the Emirates – but were also honoured that they represented multinational elements. The Emirates thanked their three partners in the nomination who were very supportive, participating positively with each entry. The delegation said that it had been coordinating a total of so far seven multinational files, which demonstrated its understanding that one of the main roles of the Convention is to show how much is shared in common. The delegation said it was happy to continue in the future with this way of working and for such multinational cooperation to be extended not only for its region but other regions, as was the case for the multinational file on Falconry – a shared human heritage with 13 countries included so far, and five more joining in the coming cycle hopefully next year. The delegation thanked the communities involved and hoped that the submitting States would enjoy the inscription and feel more encouraged to safeguard their own intangible cultural heritage. The delegation closed by saying that today was the United Arab Emirate’s 44th National Day and that the inscription was, therefore, a gift for its country.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Oman** reiterated that it had a total of seven elements inscribed on the Representative List, five as multinational files and two as national files. Oman said it was not about the number of files inscribed, but more an indication of the high level of awareness between the community members about the Convention and its goals.

[Thanks stakeholders in Arabic]

1. The delegation of **Oman** advised the meeting that it was obliged to thank all stakeholders involved in preparing the files in Arabic, their common language, and closed thanking the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat of the Convention for their efforts through the process of inscribing the three elements that day.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked the Government of Namibia for its warm hospitality and the Evaluation Body for its efforts and precise work. The delegation also expressed its thanks and gratefulness to its partners, the states of Oman, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Qatar** thanked the Namibian Government for its hospitality and the Evaluation Body for its great work.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** moved to examination of the next nomination submitted by Uzbekistan.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** introduced the next nomination on **Ropewalking** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.34] submitted by **Uzbekistan** for possible inscription on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that the file met criterion R.5 as the element was included in 2013 in the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and Sport, in compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.
4. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the file had not met criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 due to a lack of information provided. For criterion R.1, the Body believed the nomination did not clearly describe the element’s scope, community and cultural values, nor explain how the art incorporating a high degree of danger may be adequately presented and understood in an international context particularly regarding the involvement of children and especially as it includes claims referring to similar arts in other countries. For criterion R.2, the Body thought the nomination should have stated how inscription would have a positive impact on the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general not only on the item itself especially since danger to children is not addressed and how the element could promote dialogue and respect for cultural diversity internationally. For criterion R.3, the Body found the proposed safeguarding measures were too general and repetitious with unclear language and misplaced information. Furthermore, it considered the involvement of communities, stakeholders and governments was insufficiently explained. Finally, for criterion R.4 the Body believed the element’s scope was not clearly defined or its relevant community and the community’s involvement in the nomination process difficult to assess especially as the tightrope families and relevant non-governmental organisations had not provided their consent for the nomination, while those who had provided consent received little mention.
5. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended referring the nomination to the State Party for additional information.
6. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had did received requests for debate or amendments on draft decision and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. As there were no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.com 10.b.34 to refer the nomination of Ropewalking to the State Party for additional information**.
7. The **Chairperson** moved to the following nomination submitted by Venezuela.
8. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body introduced the last nomination on **Traditional knowledge and technologies relating to the growing and processing of the curagua** [draft decision 10.COM 10.b.35] submitted by the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** for possible inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
9. The Evaluation Body considered that the nomination met all criteria. The Body believed criterion R.1 was met as the nomination showed that the element was transmitted orally, by observation and imitation. The practice promoted cohesion within families and communities, intergenerational cooperation and complementarity of genres, as well as the sustainable use of natural resources. The Body found criterion R.2 was met as the nomination demonstrated that inscription of the element was likely to contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and raising awareness because of its creative nature and transformative capacity and the importance of collective work, solidarity, cooperation and respect between genders, ethnicities and generations. The Body felt criterion R.3 was met as the nomination had been elaborated following a collective deliberation process while tradition-bearing communities had developed strategies to strengthen the element to deal with possible negative consequences of inscription, all with the support of local and national authorities. The Body judged criterion R.4 as also met as the nomination process had materialized from several participatory activities, including the file’s validation and the development of a document containing the free, prior and informed consent for the nomination by 33 people including farmers and curagua weavers. Finally, for criterion R.5, the Body found the element was included in the National Inventory in 2014 as well as in the database for the register of cultural heritage, testifying to a close collaboration between communities and the institutions responsible for maintaining inventory.
10. The Evaluation Body, therefore, recommended the inscription of the element on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
11. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendments on the draft decision and, therefore, asked it to adopt the draft decision as a whole. Seeing no objections, the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.b.35 to inscribe Traditional knowledge and technologies relating to the growing and processing of the curagua** **on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.
2. The delegation of the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** expressed its thanks to the Committee, saying that the recognition it received from the inscription acknowledged integration in Venezuela of the State and community as it believed in living heritage and respect for human rights. On behalf of the Ministry of Popular Power for Culture and the Centre for Cultural Diversity, the delegation thanked the Evaluation Body’s positive recommendation for the Venezuelan nomination. It highlighted that the element was testimony to Venezuela’s interculturality, strengthening the creative abilities of its peoples. The delegation welcomed that knowledge on curagua was now shown to the world as an example of tradition and technology only found in one of the 335 municipalities of Venezuela – the municipality of Aguasay, where curagua is transformed from its natural condition to an element of high quality aesthetic and utilitarian values thanks to the efforts of men and women, farmers and artisans. It considered that government and community safeguarding of the traditional knowledge and technology related to the growing and processing of curagua was now endorsed by the nomination’s inscription and noted the element’s highest value was the commitment of people to maintain the legacy for future generations. The delegation wished to make a symbolic gesture of appreciation from the bearers, communities and all the people of Venezuela, distributing small curagua gifts to delegates.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for its statement and wonderful gift. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan asked for and was given the floor.
2. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** alerted the Chairperson that an opportunity to take the floor was not given to the representative of **Uzbekistan** saying that even if the country’s file was not inscribed it had the right to express its opinion.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Kyrgyzstan, saying that she thought she had checked whether Uzbekistan was in the room.
4. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** advised the Chairperson that she had checked **Tajikistan**, a different country in Central Asia.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Kyrgyzstan, and gave the floor to Uzbekistan.
6. The delegation of **Uzbekistan** thanked the Government of Namibia for its warm reception and the Secretariat for the successful organisation of the meeting. Taking into consideration the fact that their nomination had shortcomings and therefore not been inscribed on the Representative List, the delegation wished to say that the nominated element was a living heritage and Uzbekistan was encouraged by the fact that in the territory of Uzbekistan there were still many performing groups of bearers of the art and that they accepted that they had omitted to include all aspects of the element. Uzbekistan said that they would prepare a new nomination file, taking into account all the comments made by the Evaluation Body and resubmit it to the Committee for examination during a following cycle.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Uzbekistan for its statement and offered her sincere apology for not giving it the floor earlier, thanking Kyrgyzstan for its kind reminder. The Chairperson summarised the completed work on the nominations to the Representative List: Of the 35 nominations on the agenda, one file was withdrawn, leaving 34 nominations to be examined of which 23 files were inscribed and 11 were referred, bringing the session on Item 10.b to a close.

**ITEM 10.c OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/10.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10.c_EN.doc)

Decision *10.COM 10*

1. The **Chairperson** moved to Item 10.c, the examination of Requests for International Assistance, advising the meeting that the following that item the Committee would examine the Draft decision 10COM 10 concerning a number of transversal issues common to the three different mechanisms. The Chairperson was confident that the Committee shared her regret that there were only two international assistance requests to examine, which was surprising when the global needs for assistance for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage were taken into account.
2. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Evaluation Body had considered different ways of supporting this important mechanism and that concrete recommendations were included under 10COM 10. She recalled that the Body’s job was to evaluate to what extent the requests for international assistance met the criteria as a whole. In other words, it was not necessary to meet every criterion for the assistance to be granted. Before examining the requests, she reminded the delegates of the criteria (A.1 – A.7 indicated in paragraph 12 of the Operational Directives) as well as two factors indicated in paragraph 10 of the Operational Directives that would guide their decisions.
3. Before moving to the examination of the requests the **Chairperson** recalled that the Secretary had recently reminded the Committee of all possibilities of international assistance not yet exploited under the Convention. She noted that the two requests to be evaluated were ‘old fashioned’ in the sense that they were under Article 21(g): ‘Financial Assistance’ and that, therefore, any amount granted by the Committee today would result in a contract between UNESCO and an agency designated by the State as responsible for the implementation of the project, for the entire amount.
4. The **Chairperson** moved to examination of the first international assistance request submitted by Malawi and gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to share the findings of the Body on the request.
5. The **Chairperson** of the Evaluation Body presented the first request for international assistance on **Safeguarding of Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa proverbs and folktales** [draft decision 10.COM 10.c.1] submitted by **Malawi**. He explained that the *Evaluation Body* found that information in the file fulfilled the criteria for international assistance as defined in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Operational Directives. For Criterion A.1 the Body felt that request revealed a strong indication of participation by **Nkhonde, Tumbuka** and **Chewa** communities in the project from the initial proposals by traditional chiefs to the multi-party consultations between experts, traditional authorities, local governments and community heritage organisations. When developing the project, community members were selected to be research assistants. Two coordinators and six external researchers were responsible for top-priority activities regarding research and documentation for the publication of nine books. For Criterion A.2, the budget was clear with a detailed structure based on planned activities and expected results, however, discrepancies remained. There was a lack of precision between proposed activities and budgetary breakdown particularly concerning staffing and the duration of activities for which costs seemed very high and an imbalance existing among project participants. For Criterion A3, project feasibility was supported by a systematic implementation strategy and monitoring and evaluation system, although a top-down structure was evident. The Body felt that there was a lack of activities to revitalise oral transmission of the elements and a lack of information on levels of literacy to see if selected strategies and apriori decisions on the number of proverbs were relevant, as well as a low number of fieldwork days. For Criterion A.4, aside from publications on proverbs and folk tales six national researchers and six field assistants would be trained in inventorying techniques with community participation and coordinated by national and public institutions, traditional authorities and community heritage organisations. This would be expected to demonstrate high sustainability potential. Nothing indicated, however, that the project would strengthen the sources of creative, traditional knowledge; community learning spaces; and/or oratory skills. Concerning A.5, the State Party committed itself to funding seven percent of the total budget, most of which was earmarked for publishing expenses. Given the partners involved, the Body felt that it would have been useful to identify in kind or other contributions. For Criterion A.6, besides general awareness of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, the safeguarding capacities of communities concerned would be reinforced by the work of the research assistants, as well as other community members involved in management of the project. Although the idea was to have general capacity-building through community participation including follow-up and evaluation of the project, no concrete activities were defined. Regarding Criterion A.7, Malawi was one of the beneficiaries of three projects supported by the UNESCO Flanders Funds-in-Trust for Southern Africa. Work on these projects was in accordance with UNESCO’s regulations and all projects were completed. Regarding Consideration 10.a, the project had local scope and involved national implementing partners. For Consideration 10.b, according to the request the project would involve universities, television and radio stations, telecommunication operators and the Ministry of Education getting them to create programmes with stories for children, for instance. Moreover, individual and institutional capacity-building and cooperation established between different national institutions could lead to future safeguarding projects and financial contributions.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** concluded by saying that the Body therefore, recommended that the Committee approve this request for international assistance made by Malawi and to grant the submitting State an amount of US$90,533.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and, informed the Committee that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate on this request or amendment to the draft decision. She asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision on the request as a whole. With no objections the Chairperson declared **adopted** **Decision 10.COM 10.c.1 to approve international assistance in the amount of US$90,533 for Safeguarding of Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa proverbs and folktales**.The floor was given to Malawi.
8. The delegation of **Malawi** thanked the government of the Republic of Namibia and the Secretariat for their excellent organisation of the meeting. On behalf of the Oral Traditions Association of Malawi (OTAMA), the Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa communities and the people of Malawi, the delegation thanked the Committee for approving the project. The approval would assist Malawi in moving forward on safeguarding its intangible cultural heritage. The project intended to build capacity, as well as document in audiovisual and book format the proverbs and folk tales of the three communities which, the delegate pointed out, were already part of an inventory of intangible cultural heritage created by communities using guidelines from the Department of Culture and assistance given through the project funded by the UNESCO/ Flanders Funds-in-Trust cooperation. Since the purpose of an inventory was not to document the intangible cultural heritage elements in detail, the 2011 inventory only broadly referred to the existence of proverbs and folk tales as part of community traditions, and the dangers they faced due to dwindling numbers of practitioners. The delegate said that the project intended to document these individual proverbs and folk tales in detail and that the Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa proverbs and folk tales embodied the knowledge, wisdom and culture of their respective societies, and were therefore vehicles for the cultural values and philosophical orientations of those communities.
9. The delegation of **Malawi** also thanked the UNESCO Secretariat for its invaluable guidance on technical requirements before the request was forwarded to the Evaluation Body, asking the Committee to ensure that the Secretariat continued with this important process of dealing with files. Although it did add to the Secretariat’s workload, preliminary technical examination and guidance was essential as it helped submitting States Parties to fill in gaps and correct inadequacies in their applications. Malawi had taken note of the grey areas in the request and would address them in collaboration with the Secretariat as advised by the Evaluation Body and Committee. Malawi closed by acknowledging the generous support of the Belgian Government through the UNESCO Flanders Funds-in-Trust, which supported and continued to support the project on strengthening national capacities for implementing the 2003 Convention in Southern Africa, and Malawi was grateful to be among its beneficiaries.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked and congratulated Malawi.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to share its findings on the second request submitted by Kenya.
2. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body introduced the second and final request for international assistance on **Safeguarding of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community** [draft decision 10.COM 10.c.2] submitted by **Kenya**.
3. The Evaluation Body considered that based on information contained in the file, the request met the criteria for granting international assistance set out in paragraph 12 and in the supplementary considerations of paragraph 10 of the Operational Directives as follows. Concerning Criterion A.1 the Body felt that the file failed to demonstrate active involvement of the Maasai community in the preparation, implementation, evaluation and monitoring of the project especially as the central role was assigned to a governmental department and a national non-governmental organisation. With regard to Criterion A.2 the file showed divergences between objectives, activities, timeline and parties involved in the project, with top-down organisation and differences between planned activities and expected results. For Criterion A.3, the project oscillated between capacity-building for safeguarding and inventorying without linkages between the two clarified. Moreover, descriptions of the rites lacked sufficient detail for evaluators to understand the importance or identification of spaces and places to be entrusted under the protection of the communities concerned. Regarding Criterion A.4, the proposed project did not adequately demonstrate its contribution to the sustainability of the three male rites. In Criterion A.5, the file stated that the State Party committed to covering the costs of four officials at all meetings and workshops and identifying places and spaces, while the contribution by the community included meetings to educate young people about the importance of the rites. Regarding Criterion A.6, the Body found that the request required further explanation on ways the project could help build community capacity in either inventorying its intangible cultural heritage or safeguarding the element. Regarding Criterion A.7, Kenya had twice received international assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. Work on the contracts was carried out in accordance with UNESCO regulations and the projects completed except one on the safeguarding of the traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda to be completed in 2015. For Consideration 10.a, the project had local scope and involved national and local implementation partners. Finally, on Consideration 10.b the request did not address whether the project would have a multiplier effect or promote technical or financial contributions from other sources. Additional information would be necessary to explain the multiplier effects that could emerge from partnerships between the project and another project mentioned in the request on the culture and reproductive health of the Maasai.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body**, therefore concluded by saying that the Body’s recommendation was to invite the State Party to promptly submit a new revised request in accordance with the recommendations of the Body’s evaluation. The Body also recommended that the Committee delegate authority to the Bureau to take appropriate decisions on the revised assistance request for the Safeguarding of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng'esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, saying that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or proposed amendments and asked the Committee to adopt the draft decision on the file as a whole. There were no objections, and the Chairperson **declared adopted Decision 10 COM 10.c.2 to invite the submitting State to resubmit a request and delegate its authority to the Bureau to take any appropriate decision on such revised request received from Kenya for** **Safeguarding of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community.**

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Kenya to respond.
2. The delegation of **Kenya** took note of the Evaluation Body’s recommendations to revise its request for international assistance and would resubmit the request to the Bureau for further consideration. It thanked the Evaluation Body for recommending that the Committee delegate authority to the Bureau to take any appropriate decision on the revised request.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Kenya and gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire.
4. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** wished to express its gratitude to the Bureau of the Committee for its favourable response in June 2015 regarding Côte d’Ivoire’s request for funding an inventory on intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding ([**10.COM 1.BUR 2.1**](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM_1.BUR-Decisions-EN.doc)). Côte d’Ivoire had gone through a decade of political and military crisis, which put existing efforts in jeopardy – why the request for assistance had emerged. It had appreciated encouragement to implement the project in close cooperation with UNESCO and United Nations operations in Côte d’Ivoire where there would be complementarity of different projects set up with the assistance of the United Nations. Concerning intangible cultural heritage as a lever for reconciliation and dialogue between communities, Côte d’Ivoire wished to express its gratitude to the Secretariat for assisting in the preparation of the request.
5. The **Chairperson** reminded the meeting that as decided the previous day, the general Decision 10.COM 10 be addressed. Noting the tiredness of delegates, she suggested an adjournment until 9.30 a.m. when a start would be made on consideration of the overall decision. Armenia asked for and was given the floor.
6. The delegation of **Armenia** told the Chair that it had not been its intention to take the floor at this stage. However, certain developments over the last couple of days had forced it to voice concerns regarding an issue that could be very dangerous for and detrimental to UNESCO, in particular for the Committee. Armenia mentioned that it had systematically opposed any politicisation of UNESCO, recalling that the Committee, under Agenda item 6.a., adopted the reports of States Parties on the implementation of the Convention the day before yesterday. On an unrelated item, 10.b, the Committee decided today, after relevant amendments, to refer the nomination by Armenia. What connected these two issues was the reaction by one of the Member States, Azerbaijan, namely by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism as well as most of the media of that country, who often quoted the Ministry. The delegation of Armenia read some headlines and quotes for the room: ‘UNESCO has not recognised Kochari as Armenian’ with the delegation saying it was surprised and wondered if the Committee had said anything like that as it had no recollection of it; ‘Azerbaijan delegation thanked UNESCO and called on the Armenian side to respect the cultures of other nations’; ‘UNESCO session adopts report on the so-called Armenian occupation’ with the delegation saying it did not recall the Committee adopting any such report. The delegation recalled that last year, after Lavash (‘[Lavash, the preparation, meaning and appearance of traditional bread as an expression of culture in Armenia](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/RL/lavash-the-preparation-meaning-and-appearance-of-traditional-bread-as-an-expression-of-culture-in-armenia-00985" \o "00985)’) had been inscribed on the Representative List, the same ministry of the same country (Azerbaijan) circulated information that the Committee rejected Armenia’s request for inscription of Lavash and had requested Azerbaijan to present a new nomination for its inscription, which Armenia suggested was distorted information. Armenia believed that a policy of systematic total falsification and blatant dangerous lies through manipulation, with the name of the organisation and illegal use of the UNESCO logo and colourful photos of the Headquarters was nothing but a total disregard of the organisation and its noble goals and values. It said such manipulation could not be tolerated, not to mention that it could be very harmful for the image of UNESCO and the Convention. Armenia continued saying that it was probably possible in Azerbaijan to mislead its own public through continuing falsification of history and today’s news, but it was impossible to lie to the world in this age of information and communication technology. Armenia hoped that the Secretariat would take the issue seriously into consideration and requested that its statement be included in the official records of the present session.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked Armenia and gave the floor to Azerbaijan.
8. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** advised that it was obliged to respond to the provocation and blackmailing of Armenia, as it was not for the first time. The delegation said it understood the frustration of the Armenian delegation, as the Armenian element had not been inscribed on the List, and that it wanted to go home heroically hence its blackmailing and provocation. It was clear for all members of UNESCO to see that Armenians still occupied 20 percent of Azerbaijani territory, which was condemned by four UN Security Council resolutions and resulted in one million refugees and internal...
9. The delegation of **Armenia** interjected, saying this was what it called politicisation.
10. The delegation of **Azerbaijan** continued by saying that concerning the culture issue, Azerbaijan had always respected the Convention’s internationally recognised principles, as well as the procedures of the Committee. Based on this, it stood by information given to its media that the Azerbaijani delegation expressed concerns to the members of the Committee and delegations. It supported the decision of the Evaluation Body, which was fair and right, as Azerbaijan knew that Armenia had presented the Kochari dance because of its aggressive policy related to an ancient Azerbaijan region. Azerbaijan wondered to the Committee how long it would suffer from Armenian provocation and attempts of nationalising heritage which did not belong to it, or not only to it; and how long Armenia would not respect its neighbour country. The Azerbaijan delegate reminded the Committee that the previous year the Armenian Deputy Minister, ‘probably Arev Samuelian,’ gave an interview on Lavash in which she misinterpreted the decision of the Committee and said that she didn’t care what Azerbaijan said but that it had a (cultural) bomb for Azerbaijan next year. The delegate of Azerbaijan called on the Armenian delegation to follow the Convention, which promoted dialogue, social cohesion and mutual respect, concluding with a quotation from Eldridge Cleaver: ‘If you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem’ and expressing Azerbaijan’s belief that Armenia was always part of the problem.
11. The **Chairperson** reminded the meeting that the following day would be adoption of the general decision of Item 10 COM 10 at 9.30 a.m. She announced that the Bureau would meet at 9 a.m. in the usual venue, and that the University of Namibia was waiting for them in the food court to launch a book on indigenous knowledge. The Chairperson then declared the day’s session closed.

*[Thursday, 3 December 2015, morning session]*

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA: (continued)**

**EXAMINATION AND ADOPTION OF DRAFT DECISION 10.COM 10**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/10](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-10_EN.doc)*

Decision***10.COM 10***

1. The **Chairperson** greeted the members of the Committee and continued by saying that thanks to the extended session the previous evening, Items 10.b and 10.c had been successfully concluded, and examination and adoption of Draft decision 10.COM 10 would now be addressed. The timetables had been adjusted, starting the day’s session with Item 10 and then continuing with Item 11. The Chairperson informed that the Committee would only be able to establish the Evaluation Body for the 2016 cycle with information on the renewal of the accredited non-governmental organisations and this is why Item 16 would be treated before examining Item 12. The morning session would conclude with the examination and adoption of Item 13. The afternoon session would be devoted to examinations of draft amendments to the Operational Directives and three related items on the agenda treated: Items 14.a, 14.b and 14.c.
2. The **Chairperson** proceeded to examine Draft decision 10.COM 10. The Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body had reported the previous day on the working methods and procedures of the Body, and presented common and specific comments and recommendations on all three mechanisms examined. The result of those observations was the proposed Draft decision 10.COM 10, which addressed a number of issues discussed over the past two days during debates of individual files.
3. The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee whether there were any general considerations they felt were not reflected in the draft decision proposed, that should be included, informing that Turkey and Belgium had proposed amendments to the Secretariat and would take the floor to explain them.
4. The delegation of **Turkey**, referring to paragraph 16 of the draft decision, wished to insert ‘in their varied contexts’ after ‘traditions’.’ Turkey commented that as the Convention was working with living cultures that were often transnational with many communities and many variations, reference could not be made to single elements that didn’t indicate possible variance of and among communities. Turkey wished to add those few words to help future examinations by the Evaluation Body and the work of the Committee, as Turkey felt that the Committee should accept multinational nominations involving varying contexts of elements. Secondly, Turkey said that NGOs were of course very important to the Convention and reminded delegates that the Convention mentioned the need for research institutes and expertise, and that if the Committee would accept it, in paragraph 20.b) to insert ‘and if necessary, research institutes and centres of expertise’ after ‘groups and relevant non-governmental organisations’.
5. The delegation of **Belgium** said it wished to comply with the official wording of the Convention, suggesting the insertion of ‘or groups’ after ‘among communities’ in paragraph 17 and a new paragraph 22 about inventories reflecting earlier discussions on the files of Columbia and Bulgaria.
6. The delegation of **Belgium** (change of speaker) asserted that it would like to make several amendments. It first addressed the proposed paragraph 22, referring to the previous day’s discussion on the Evaluation Body’s review of Italy’s submission. Belgium wished to propose that if a file had been referred while the criteria had been satisfied on the basis of the information in the original file, then a positive evaluation would not automatically be considered in future examination of the resubmitted file, especially where safeguarding plans required updating as it was logical that safeguarding measures should be updated and the consent of communities, groups and individuals be secured. That is the philosophy behind new paragraph 22.
7. The delegation of **Belgium** (different speaker) wished to add a sentence and change the wording of paragraph 22 to: ‘Further decides that, if a file has been referred, a criterion having been satisfied, on the basis of the information contained in the original file, will not automatically be so considered in the future examination of the resubmitted file; in this regard(s), particular attention should be paid to updating the information regarding criteria U.3 and U.4 and criteria R.3 and R.4.’ Belgium also inserted a new paragraph 21, reading: ‘Decides that criterion R.5/U.5 will not be considered satisfied if the relevant extracts of inventories do not respect the above-mentioned guiding principles. The information contained in this extract should be considered as information included in the nomination file and therefore cannot be taken into account for evaluation’.
8. The delegation of **Belgium** (different speaker) also wished to reaffirm the need for submitting States to take greater care when completing files, such as putting answers to questions in the appropriate sections, so they can be analysed by the Evaluation Body and members of the Committee. Belgium requested the insertion of a new paragraph 17, to read: ‘Reaffirms the necessity to elaborate nominations with greater care by giving the required answers to the questions included in the appropriate sections’.
9. The **Chairperson** asked for further comments and additions before the examination of the draft decision. There were no requests from the floor and the meeting proceeded with the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 11 were adopted without comments. Paragraph 12 had a small amendment by Belgium to insert ‘groups or, if applicable, individuals concerned’, which was adopted without objection. Paragraphs 13 to 15 were adopted without objection. Paragraph 16 was adopted as amendmented by Turkey, with no objection. Paragraph 17 was the subject of an amendment proposed by Belgium, where the Secretary of the Convention wished to take the floor.
10. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that in Decision 7.COM 11, the Committee had drafted a paragraph that addressed much the same question worded slightly differently. She wondered whether the Committee wished to move towards greater flexibility by virtue of the amendment or whether the Decision already taken should merely be recalled. She read Decision 7.COM 11 paragraph 17, aloud: ‘Decides that information placed in inappropriate sections of the nomination cannot be taken into consideration, and invites States Parties to ensure that information is provided in its proper place.’ The Secretary wished to know whether the Belgian amendment aimed at reaffirming Decision 7.COM 11, in which case perhaps it should be worded in exactly the same way.
11. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked the Secretary, saying it agreed that it was a very good idea to copy the formulation as expressed in Decision 7.COM 11 paragraphs 17 and to reaffirm what had been established by that decision.
12. The **Chairperson** asked for a short delay while the Belgian amendment was replaced with what was stipulated in Decision 7.COM 11. And she then read aloud new paragraph 17: ‘Reaffirms the necessity to elaborate nominations with utmost care and as emphasised in Decision 7.COM 11 that the information placed in inappropriate sections of the nomination cannot be taken into consideration, and invites States Parties to ensure that information is provided in its proper place.’ The Chairperson asked whether there were any comments on the new paragraph 17 in its current formulation, and Ethiopia asked for and was given the floor.
13. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said it understood that the paragraph was obviously aimed to bring nomination files into a standard framework. Ethiopia wished to raise the point that there were maybe a hundred countries with thousands of different languages and that all nominations were being written and submitted in either English or French in respective sections of the file. Ethiopia wished Belgium to clarify what was really meant by inserting the paragraph. In Ethiopia, there were about 80 languages spoken and that people without French or English should not be judged on the clarity and quality of their submissions in the nominations. Nominations should be judged on their essence, and discussed and embraced in response to the value they were judged to bring. Ethiopia said it had trouble accepting the spirit of the ‘mechanical’ assessments they were observing and thought it would lead nowhere as it drove people to be too mechanical – focusing on trying to understand the languages of the Convention and giving more priority to the precision of their inputs – when the evaluation could do better to focus on the essence and real value of the people making the nomination. Ethiopia thought that the nomination files being brought to the Committee sessions were probably from people who might not even understand the language being used, and wanted to know from Belgium what the spirit of its paragraph was.
14. The **Chairperson**: thanked Ethiopia, saying that before giving the floor to Belgium, her own understanding of the paragraph was about where particular types of information were being inserted in the nomination files, and asked Belgium to clarify its amendment in response to Ethiopia’s question.
15. The delegation of **Belgium** observed that the Chairperson had just expressed what it wished to say – being a question of transparency when dealing with complex files which have to be evaluated on a number of criteria and, by putting requested information in the correct place. This way, the Evaluation Body and members of the Committee who study the files would find the information more easily so it was merely a question of transparency and efficiency.
16. The delegation of **Brazil** said it was uncomfortable with Belgium’s amendment because the forms sometimes did not provide sufficient space and some of the criteria related to one another. As one could not provide information on one criterion and not the other, for example regarding communities, the information would appear in different sections of the form. Also, when the Evaluation Body evaluated a nomination, it was obliged to use only the information it had, which was what was written in the files. Brazil understood regarding the issue of transparency that it would be better if all information required could be fitted within specific sections of the nomination form, but felt that even if the information was presented in not exactly the precise sections of the form, and if everything was present in the file, then the restriction might be viewed as being too harsh.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil, adding that she thought the issue was important and it was good that these kinds of questions were raised and clarified.
18. The delegation of **Ethiopia** was grateful for the input from Brazil, wondering why the Committee should evaluate a nomination when the Evaluation Body was going to analyse things mechanically on a one to one basis. Ethiopia felt that if the Committee was to evaluate nominations, it had to have fully-fledged flexibility allowing it to understand the spirit of the file. Ethiopia understood that the Evaluation Body was obliged to follow its established guidelines but that the Committee should be allowed flexibility to deal with explanations about nominations from States Parties, for which Ethiopia would like the Committee to have absolute power. Ethiopia said that, without adopting the paragraph under discussion, there were adequate guidelines for the operation of the Evaluation Body, but that the Committee should not need that level of guidance to operate. Ethiopia told the Committee that, if the paragraph was adopted, it would lead the Committee to procedural conclusions to which no State Party would dare object, so that in effect there was limited rationale for the discussions of the Committee meetings.
19. The delegation of **Greece**, having listened carefully to Ethiopia and Brazil, began by responding to the last point made by the delegation of Ethiopia about absolute power, saying that the Committee had been delegated power by the General Assembly and did not in fact have absolute power; it had a limited power to examine files and to elaborate guidelines to ensure that the mechanisms of the Convention ran smoothly. One of the guidelines found to be valuable was the one being discussed and it was not a matter of limiting flexibility, or about limiting the freedom of expression of those who filled in the nomination files. However, if they expressed themselves in places that resulted in the Committee and Evaluation Body being unable to find the appropriate information, it made the nomination less useful. Greece said that evaluations were complicated and information had to be located where it could be easily found – a simple requirement that had nothing to do with curtailing of powers and everything to do with things running more smoothly when properly applied. Greece, therefore, fully supported the reinstatement of the point of Belgium in the decision.
20. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to emphasize that Hungary was much in favour of what was said by Brazil because it was of course important to prepare the files carefully but felt that the point concerning information not being in the right place should not be considered as it was too hard to define criteria against the questions and answers. Hungary understood that this was a decision that had been taken in the past and believed that it was not necessarily a good decision, and that it should perhaps be reconstructed to reflect Ethiopia’s point of view. Hungary concluded by saying that it agreed that the files had to be carefully prepared, but was not in favour of a nomination not being considered if information was placed in the wrong part of the file.
21. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked the Chairperson, agreeing with the Ethiopian and Brazilian delegates that the nomination files had to be drafted carefully and Algeria knew how complex it was to develop a file for UNESCO. Files were submitted to the Evaluation Body for evaluation and to the Committee for decision, and it was good that the Evaluation Body had a clearly-defined methodology to deal with the files. However, Algeria said it was the Committee that was really the last resort that should have some flexibility when deciding whether or not to inscribe an intangible cultural heritage element on a given list. Algeria said it might have added something to the amendment proposed by Belgium to the effect that information was taken into consideration by the Evaluation Body and that the Committee should have the flexibility to make a final decision.
22. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** said that its delegation had already mentioned that as the Committee met to review nomination files following evaluation by experts of the Evaluation Body, there had to be a good reason for it and that was because the Committee had an added level of flexibility. Côte d’Ivoire agreed with the amendment of Belgium and also with Algeria, saying that once the Evaluation Body had completed its evaluation, the Committee should then have the flexibility to decide whether the required information was indeed included in the file.
23. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said that it supported the philosophy and spirit behind the interventions of Brazil and Ethiopia but that any evaluating body would be dealing with human beings and human input, which could be wrong from both sides – from the State submitting the nomination or the Body doing the evaluating – which was why there were general guidelines clear on what States should or should not do and that if these were relied upon, should be sufficient.
24. The delegation of **Tunisia** said it fully understood that it was necessary to organise information, but that it had to be taken into consideration that some files had to deal with complex realities within the intangible cultural heritage field in general, which was why there was often some overlap between the various sections. Tunisia felt that this meant that the approach should not be too formal and show some flexibility so that the spirit of the element could be seen as a whole.
25. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked its colleagues and members of the Committee for their comments, saying that what was important was that in no way did Belgium intend to limit the terms of reference of the Committee. On the contrary, Belgium was trying to facilitate the work of the Committee. Given amount of information submitted the Committee, the Committee received recommendations of the Evaluation Body concerning nomination files, therefore information had to be presented in a prescribed way to make the work easier and limit the Committee’s responsibility in that regard. As many members of the Committee did not seem to support the amendment, Belgium was prepared to withdraw the entire paragraph.
26. The delegation of **Hungary** agreed with Belgium but reminded the Committee that unfortunately, Decision 7.COM 11 required information to be placed in appropriate sections of the nomination file. Hungary felt perhaps this decision was wrong and that States did not appear to be in favour of Belgium’s proposed paragraph.
27. The **Chairperson** wished to give the floor to the Secretariat to explain, as a number of issues were coming up. The Chairperson said she understood that the information might be in the file but in the wrong place and wondered what happened after that. Brazil was talking about not enough space in the form. Ethiopia was talking about the language issue and the flexibility of the Committee. And then while discussing the nominations the day before, the Committee also talked about no new information should be admitted when in session. The Chairperson called on the Secretary to clarify the issues before proceeding to the next round of speakers.
28. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of the background to the decision, which went back to the seventh session of the Committee in 2012 when Estonia was Chairperson of the first Subsidiary Body. The first Subsidiary Body, evaluating nominations, was faced with the same dilemma of evaluating them against a set of five criteria, all of which had to be met to be considered acceptable for inscription. There was initial agreement on having the five criteria, which meant having five sections in the form which one by one would be evaluated to determine whether each criterion had been fulfilled. To evaluate whether a criterion had been fulfilled, each section in the form would be evaluated with respect to its criterion and then a decision would be taken on whether or not the criterion had been fulfilled.
29. The **Secretary** said that the problem began when assessing the first criterion, when one asked oneself whether to take into account everything presented in the nomination or only what had been filled in corresponding to a specific criterion. Unfortunately, sometimes information was elsewhere in the form than where it should have been or there were contradictions between one criterion and another. There are no differences between the rules guiding the assessments made by the Committee, or by the Evaluation Body. She pointed out that it was no accident that certain members such as Greece, that had worked in the Evaluation Body, understood that the work of the Evaluation Body was made more difficult by having to look through the entire nomination to evaluate each criterion.
30. The **Secretary** mentioned the issue of language, saying that the work of drafting the nominations was often made by people who hadn’t mastered French or English but that that was not the problem as both the Evaluation Body and the Committee were very tolerant in this regard as what was required was just information, not literature; the right questions must be answered in the right places. The Secretary said that the second thing mentioned was the available space for responses, which of course is not established in the guidelines. She suggested that if it was felt that any of the spaces were insufficient, to just say so and space would be added. The majority of problems found in the nominations was that there was not enough information, rather than too much. More recently, the Secretariat had to introduce minimum word counts rather than ceilings, as in the technical assessments of nominations, the problem is generally that of not enough information, and minimums are not complied with. There were also questions about completing cross-cutting issues for example community participation was an important aspect of all the criteria, but the forms provided for that. The Secretary said she had just wanted to sketch out the background of the debate and by no means to make the assessments by the Committee or the Evaluation Body stricter but rather to remind States just how important it is to read the instructions. This was why an aide-mémoire had been drafted for preparing nominations to the Lists, so that for each criterion the State would understand what sort of information was being asked for.
31. The delegation of **Algeria** said that in light of what the Secretary had just recalled about the background to the debate, where she said that it was the Subsidiary Body at the time that asked for that to be added, Algeria was confident that in 10, 15 or 50 years, the forms would always have spaces to fill out and that there would always be text and literature in those forms. Algeria continued that Decision 7.COM 11 had to be as clear as possible, as the background just provided showed that it was a question of the working methodology of the Evaluation Body and not just the Committee that was why the amendment tabled by Belgium was necessary. It had to be made clear that this was for the purpose of the proper management of the bodies – the Subsidiary Body in the past and the Evaluation Body now.
32. The delegation of **Estonia** said it understood that it was exceptional for it to be given the floor but that as the prior questions and concerns had referred to Estonia’s previous experience of an evaluative body which was originally the Subsidiary body, Estonia wished to reflect the issue at hand for the benefit of members of the Committee especially for those who might be new to the task. Estonia concurred completely with the sentiments expressed by Algeria; the nomination files are the Evaluation Body’s sole source of information when evaluating applications, which was the same case with the Subsidiary Body a few years ago. What was different at that time was the high number of files that had to be attended to, probably exceeding 100 in number, requiring the creation of a system and methodology that would be understandable to others regarding on what basis decisions had been made. The creation of the methodology did not come easily, and was the result of serious and lengthy debate on concerns that have been repeated here this morning. Estonia said they had to reach agreement on how to work on particular texts which set the baseline for future nominations. Estonia understood that current concerns might be raised by members of the Committee again and again because they do touch on the core of the problem of making judgments upon living practices, living environments, people and their lives based on written documents.
33. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** regretted that Belgium had withdrawn its amendment as, according to Côte d’Ivoire, it would have rationalised the work of the Evaluation Body and facilitated the work of the Committee as well. States Parties submit nominations following clear guidelines so they know exactly where information should be provided. The delegation asked the Chairperson to ask the Committee for a show of support for the amendment.
34. The **Chairperson** thanked Côte d’Ivoire, reminding it that from what the Chairperson understood, Belgium had withdrawn the amendment. The delegation of **Belgium** confirmed that it had withdrawn it.
35. The **Chairperson** said that while Belgium had withdrawn its amendment, she reminded the Committee that Decision 7.COM 11 was still applicable. The Chairperson moved to paragraph 17 with a small amendment from Belgium, adding ‘or may provoke misunderstanding among communities or groups and effect dialogue and mutual respect.’ There were no objections, and Paragraph 17 was adopted as amended. Paragraphs 18 and 19 were adopted without amendments. Latvia was given the floor to comment on paragraph 20.
36. The delegation of **Latvia** said that as for the reading of the current text, it believed that additional clarification was needed and the main question was whether the principles as stated needed to be responded to both within the corresponding section of the nomination, as well as within the relevant extract. The question was what emphasis to give the relevant extract and what might be the balance of the information given within the text of the nomination and within the extract. As for the preamble of the paragraph, at the end it stated that the extract of the inventory was provided in the nominations and the corresponding section in the nomination file. It might happen that somebody reading this decision would think that the information should be the same both in the nomination and within the extract. Latvia suggested that some information might be given in a descriptive manner within a nomination file and then some additional information within the extract, but that it probably shouldn’t be the same text in both cases. Regarding the proposed amendment, Latvia would add ‘taken together’ before the word ‘should’, so that information in both the nomination and the relevant extract could be evaluated as one single complex of information.
37. The **Chairperson** requested Latvia to advise the Committee what it wished to add to the preamble paragraph, after which subparagraphs (a), (b) would be addressed paragraph by paragraph and that Latvia could submit its other amendments at the appropriate time.
38. The delegation of **Latvia** said it wished to insert ‘taken together’ before the last word ‘should’ as the information within the nomination file and extract could be taken together for evaluation without the necessity to replicate the same information within both the nomination and relevant extract.
39. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia, and confirmed its proposed amendment. There were no objections, and the preamble paragraph was adopted as amended by Latvia. Moving to paragraph 20.a, there were no objections and it was adopted. Paragraph 20.b had received a proposed amendment by Turkey, adding ‘and if necessary research institutes and centres of expertise.’ There were no objections and paragraph 20.b was adopted. There were no objections to paragraphs 20.c or to 20.d and they were adopted. The floor was given to Latvia concerning paragraph 20.e.
40. The delegation of **Latvia** wished to make an observation concerning wording, namely the final text provided within paragraph (e): ‘not contradict those described in the nomination form.’ If that principle was proposed in both the nomination form and the relevant extract and the paragraph remained as it was, it might invite contradiction and Latvia proposed adding ‘contain’ after the first word, to maintain preciseness in the extract of the inventory provided.
41. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and asked the Committee if there were any objections to the proposed amendment by Latvia and paragraph (e) as amended by Latvia was adopted. Belgium had proposed an amendment to paragraph 21, saying that adding the information contained in the extract should be considered as information included in the nomination file and can, therefore, be taken into account for evaluation.
42. The delegation of **Latvia** said that it had not seen the amendment proposed by Belgium and that was considering keeping the same idea it had just expressed in paragraph 20, in that criteria R.5 and U.5 could be fulfilled using the relevant extracts and the information provided within the nomination, taken together. Latvia proposed including after ‘the relevant extracts of inventories’ ‘and corresponding section in the nomination taken together.’
43. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and read the paragraph and the two amendments aloud to see how it sounded: ‘Decides that criterion R.5 will not be considered satisfied if the relevant extracts of the inventories and corresponding section in the nomination taken together do not respect the abovementioned guiding principles. The information contained in this extract should be considered as information included in the nomination file and therefore can be taken into account for evaluation.’ The Chairperson wondered if the amendment seemed okay, and gave the floor to Saint Lucia.
44. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it had no objection, and was just suggesting that it would read better if it said: ‘Decides that criterion R.5/U.5 will not be considered satisfied if both the relevant extracts of the inventories and corresponding section in the nomination do not respect the abovementioned guiding principles.’
45. The delegation of **Latvia**, responding to the proposal of Saint Lucia said it was the same argument put forward again concerning the previous paragraphs, on whether to ask that these principles should be satisfied for the nomination text as well as the relevant extracts in an equal manner, or that they should be satisfied through consideration of nomination text and inventory extract that complement each other. Latvia proposed maintaining the wording adopted for paragraph 20, saying that relevant extracts and nomination would be considered together, as Latvia felt that there was some difference of the content in both cases.
46. The **Chairperson** asked Latvia if it agreed with the amendment of Saint Lucia or if it would prefer to retain the original text. **Latvia** said it wished to retain the original text, and the Chairperson asked Saint Lucia whether, since this was really a vocabulary issue, it would still insist on keeping its amendment.
47. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** said it understood what Latvia was saying, and withdraw its amendment.
48. The **Chairperson** thanked Saint Lucia and asked whether the Committee was now ready to adopt paragraph 21 as amended by Belgium and Latvia and Latvia asked for the floor.
49. The delegation of **Latvia** said it wanted to ask the delegation of Belgium if the proposal could be changed slightly within the context of the paragraph and whether it should say that information contained in the extract should be considered as complementary to information included in the nomination, by taking the nomination as the text which could, therefore, be taken into account for evaluation. Latvia understood that the extract as annexed would form part of the nomination file but within the first sentence the nomination was understood as the text provided and with annexes being something different, so that is why Latvia proposed the amendment.
50. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia, asking Belgium if it was in agreement with the addition from Latvia (Belgium was in agreement), and moved to adopt paragraph 21. There were no objections, and paragraph 21 was adopted as ameended. The Chairperson continued with paragraph 22 and gave the floor to Turkey.
51. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed a small change to Belgium’s amendment, which said ‘decides’ but Turkey suggested using the word ‘reaffirms’ as it had already been decided. Secondly, Turkey suggested stopping with ‘resubmitted file as criteria 1, 2 and 5 were also important in this matter.
52. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and gave the floor to Belgium.
53. The delegation of **Belgium** said it was unsure whether this had been decided before by a Committee meeting, and preferred to retain the word ‘decides’ if possible.
54. The **Chairperson** advised Turkey that Belgium was insisting on retaining the word ‘decides’ and not ‘reaffirms.’
55. The delegation of **Turkey** wondered whether recent decisions to refer some files had been through a Committee decision.
56. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to offer her opinion.
57. The **Secretary** explained what she understood from the Belgian amendment, as it was a problem that the Evaluation Body and the subsidiary bodies faced. As an example of community consent, the information for criterion 4 that was received was sufficient but criterion 1 was not sufficient, so the nomination was referred. The information on community consent was considered satisfied by the Committee and was not referred but criterion 1 had been referred. If the element was resubmitted two or three years later and the contours of the element had changed, the nomination would have to address criterion 4 again. Sometimes, some States believed that criterion 4 had been accepted and that it could no longer be challenged since it wasn’t rejected previously. The other aspect is duration, as safeguarding plans that have been accepted by the Committee three years later might no longer be valid and would have to be updated even though they were accepted before. When faced with criteria that had been accepted and a nomination was resubmitted, the Body had an issue with the former criteria because they felt these criteria were no longer met but three years earlier they had been accepted by the Committee. The Secretary said that an idea which might help is that as soon as a file has been referred, due to whichever criteria, to please update each one of the criteria and not just the one which was referred. She didn’t think that the Committee had ever been that strict however, and that maybe the word ‘decide’ would be clear enough.
58. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the Secretariat’s explanation and asked if the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body could give an explanation about the topic.
59. The **Chair of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson and the delegate of Turkey for the question, saying he didn’t have much to add to what the Secretary had already expressed, but that it was clearly always better for information to be updated when a nomination was referred to a State Party, and when that nomination was resubmitted for a new cycle. That was a difficulty which arose in the examination of some files, and even though the criterion had been accepted in the past it seemed to the members of the Evaluation Body that the information should have been updated if, for example, one was talking about a timeline for safeguarding measures or any facts or information concerning any of the evaluation criteria.
60. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, confirming that the decision had been taken to retain the word ‘decides’ and remove ‘reaffirms’, with the second proposal of Turkey being to stop the paragraph at ‘the submitted file,’ full stop and delete the rest of the paragraph. Belgium was in agreement, so that part was deleted. The Chairperson moved to approve paragraph 22; there were no objections, and paragraph 22 was adopted as ammended. Paragraphs 23 to 25 were adopted without objections. The Chairperson moved to the adoption of the decision as a whole. There were no objections, and the Chairperson declared **Decision 10.COM 10 was adopted as amended**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** asked for applause for the Evaluation Body and in particular its Chairperson and Rapporteur for jobs well done, and the floor was given to the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Committee and other States Parties and expressed his appreciation of their work, as well as colleagues, members of the Evaluation Body with whom he had the pleasure to work with during the current cycle and congratulated them for their commitment to the spirit of the Convention. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body thanked the Secretary and the team of the Secretariat with whom he, Rapporteur and the rest of the members of the Evaluation Body, had the pleasure of working alongside. He also offered his apologies in the event that he had failed to correctly pronounce names of elements or other vernacular words contained in the nominations.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Sudan** said that it wished to express its sincere thanks and appreciation to all members of the Committee as well as the Bureau for the approval in October 2015 of international assistance to develop inventory in the two states of South Kordufan and Blue Nile to serve as a flagship in developing an inventory list of intangible cultural heritage for Sudan ([Decision 10.COM 2.BUR4](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM_2.BUR-Decisions-EN.doc)). Sudan also wished to thank the Secretariat for its availability and cooperation shown during all stages of the preparation of Sudan’s file reiterating its commitment to work together with the Secretariat to achieve their goals. In conclusion, Sudan thanked Namibia, congratulating it on its excellent organisation of the meeting.
2. The **Chairperson** thanked Sudan and announced the completion of the very long session, congratulating the Committee for its long and successful work.

**ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA:**

**MODIFICATION OF THE NAME OF AN INSCRIBED ELEMENT**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/11](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-11_EN.docx)*

Decision***10.COM******11***

1. The **Chairperson** introduced Item 11 and invited the Secretary to present it.
2. The **Secretary** informed the meeting that this item concerned the modification of the name of an element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2013, namely the ‘Paach ceremony’ of Guatemala. She reminded the members of the Committee that the procedure for doing this was described in paragraph 41 of the Operational Directives and quoted that a State ‘may request the name by which an element is inscribed be changed. Such a request shall be submitted at least three months prior to a Committee session.’
3. She continued by saying that in November 2014 Guatemala informed the Secretariat of its wish to change the name of the already inscribed element the ‘Paach ceremony’ to the ‘Nan Pa’ch ceremony’ and the Committee was asked to approve this name change. The Committee was also asked to approve a French translation of the new name as proposed by the Secretariat: ‘La cérémonie de la Nan Pa’ch’.
4. Since there were no comments, the Chairperson **declared Decision 10.COM 11 adopted**.

**ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ACCREDITATION OF NEW NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND REVIEW OF ACCREDITED NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

Documents [*ITH/15/10.COM/16*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-16_EN.docx)

[*54 accreditation requests*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=770)

[*69 contribution reports*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=765)

Decision***10.COM 16***

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (Hungary) introduced item 16 that, as explained by the Secretary on Day 1, had been moved after item 11 to ensure the Committee did not appoint non-accredited non-governmental organizations to the Evaluation Body. The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the document consisted of two distinct parts:
   1. new requests for accreditation; and
   2. a review of non-governmental organizations accredited in 2010, for the possible renewal of their accreditation.
3. She continued that part A of the document deals with requests for accreditation presented by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), this being the sixth time the Committee has had to examine such requests for accreditation. The General Assembly had accredited a total of 178 NGOs during its third, fourth and fifth sessions, and the geographical distribution of the NGOs was shown on the screens. In this regard, the Secretary mentioned that three electoral groups were particularly well represented. In 2014 the Secretariat was unable to process the 31 applications received, and the Committee had decided to only consider requests for NGO accreditation at its regular sessions in odd-numbered years since NGOs could only be accredited by the General Assembly, which meets only in even-numbered years. The Committee therefore had suggested amending the Operational Directives accordingly. These proposed changes would be considered under item 14.c.
4. The **Secretary** further explained that part A of document 16 showed that requests from 54 entities were received and processed by the Secretariat in the biennium, including:

* twenty-four NGOs that appeared to meet the criteria set out in the Operational Directives that the Committee may wish to recommend to the General Assembly for accreditation in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention (paragraph 6 of the document);
* fifteen NGOs that did not appear to have met the accreditation criteria based on information transmitted to the Secretariat (paragraph 7);
* seven NGOs that had submitted incomplete requests for accreditation and that therefore could not be considered by the Committee during that session (paragraph 8) - the Secretary specified that these NGOs could complete their applications and submit them during a future cycle;
* seven NGOs that had submitted requests for accreditation that were considered incomplete and that did not respond for over a year to requests for additional information from the Secretariat (paragraph 9), possibly indicating that they had abandoned their wish to be accredited; and
* one entity that wished to suspend its application during the process (paragraph 10).

1. The **Secretary** confirmed that all the above-mentioned entities had the possibility to resubmit requests for accreditation in the future.
2. The **Secretary** explained that part B of the document dealt with the review of non-governmental organizations that had previously been accredited, this being the first time that the Committee had to engage in this exercise. In accordance with paragraph 94 of the Operational Directives the Committee was requested to review the contribution and commitment of the 97 NGOs accredited by the General Assembly during its third session in 2010, taking into account the perspective of the NGOs concerned. She reminded the Committee that a form to assess the contribution of accredited NGOs was presented to the Committee during its eighth session in 2013 and had subsequently been revised on the basis of the Committee's discussions at that time. In October 2014 this form was sent by email and post by the Secretariat to the 97 NGOs concerned, establishing the submission deadline as 15 January 2015. Simultaneously, the launch of this exercise was announced on the main page and the NGO page of the Convention's website, where a reminder of the deadline was published in January 2015.
3. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that a total of 69 reports had been submitted to the Secretariat by 15 January 2015, all of which were available on the website. Each report had been carefully studied on the basis of information submitted for each of the following five fields of action:
4. contribution by the organization to the implementation of the Convention at the national level (as described in Chapter III of the Convention);
5. bilateral, sub-regional and international cooperation;
6. participation in the work of the Committee;
7. capacities of the organization for evaluation of nominations, proposals and requests; and
8. cooperation with UNESCO.
9. The **Secretary** explained that each report was reviewed separately by two staff members of the Section of Intangible Cultural Heritage before being collectively discussed with a view to preparing recommendations of the Secretariat in accordance with paragraph 92 of the Operational Directives as follows:

* Paragraph 17 reported that 59 NGOs had been considered by the Secretariat to have sufficiently demonstrated their commitment and contribution to the work of the Committee since accreditation, and the Secretariat recommended that the Committee maintain their accreditation. The Secretary took the opportunity to clarify that the NGO Norwegian Crafts Institute (NGO-90022) mentioned in the next point on the agenda concerning the establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2016 cycle, was listed in the paragraph under its former name 'Norwegian Crafts Development'.
* Paragraph 18 reported that 10 NGOs had been considered by the Secretariat as not having sufficiently demonstrated their commitment and contribution to the work of the Committee since accreditation and that the Secretariat recommended to the Committee to terminate their accreditation.
* Paragraph 19 reported that 28 NGOs had not submitted their quadrennial reports and the Secretariat recommended to the Committee to terminate their accreditation.

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her presentation and opened the floor.
2. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed satisfaction over the continuous worldwide interest shown by NGOs in committing to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sometimes advising the Committee on its decisions. Latvia welcomed the 54 requests received from NGOs during the biennium, saying it would be pleased to observe a gradually more balanced geographic distribution. As for the proposed decisions on these requests, Latvia relied on the evaluations and well-thought conclusions of the Secretariat. Regarding the review of accredited NGOs, Latvia referred to paragraphs 92 and 95 of the Operational Directives where it is stated that, at the time of review, the Committee may take three decisions: to maintain; to terminate; or, if circumstances require, suspend relations with NGOs. The delegation of Latvia regretted that, of an anticipated 97 reports, only 69 were submitted, 59 of which were recognized as sufficiently demonstrating the contribution and commitment of the NGOs in question. Latvia expressed regret over the substantial deficiencies of the ten reports mentioned in paragraph 18 of the working document that had been assessed by the Secretariat, in which the NGOs concerned had failed to demonstrate their commitment. Latvia acknowledged that the reports were insufficient to serve as a basis for maintaining the accreditation of the organizations concerned and as for the decisions to be taken on whether to terminate or suspend these organisations, Latvia believed that where accreditation was terminated, certain organisations might wish to resubmit their accreditation requests in order to maintain their connections with the Convention. In cases where respective NGOs considered that their activities and commitment merited acknowledgment by accreditation to the Convention, Latvia would encourage these organizations to resubmit their accreditation requests.
3. The delegation of **Estonia** said it had participated in and followed the work of the Intergovernmental Committee for nearly 10 years, and reaffirmed that the role of NGOs could not be overestimated in the context of implementing the Convention, as NGOs are often the entities carrying out tasks crafted by the Committee. Estonia regretted the unfortunate failure of some accredited organizations to provide appropriate communication or to adhere to reporting standards, indicating a failure of organizational management regardless of individual explanations and remaining as a lesson for everyone concerned. Estonia said that an important point was the role played by NGOs in providing reflection, analysis and feedback on the relevant process, particularly due to the diversity of locations and concerned communities around the world. Estonia felt that researchers and NGOs were needed to provide versatile research and feedback on the impact of this Convention and the Committee’s decisions and guidelines, which would ultimately be necessary to carry out the goals of the Convention.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor for comments from the Committee or States Parties, but as there were none asked the NGO representative to take the floor.
5. On behalf of the Intangible Cultural Heritage NGO forum, the delegate of the **ICH NGO Forum** welcomed the newly-accredited NGOs and hoped that they would be actively involved in networks and cooperation through the Intangible Cultural Heritage NGO Forum of accredited NGOs. The representative said that the review under scrutiny was closely followed by the Forum, as it represented the accredited Intangible Cultural Heritage NGOs and the decision of the Committee would be of great importance when considering the Intangible Cultural Heritage NGOs’ individual and collective contributions to the future work of the governing bodies of the Convention. The **ICH** **NGO** representative said that the Forum wished to foster further NGO requests for accreditation especially in regional groups where a limited number of NGOs has been accredited so far, which would ensure a more representative reality of the work of NGOs in future safeguarding work.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson** added the thought that this was a very important part of the Committee’s work and moved the discussion to draft Decision 16, asking the Committee to adopt Decision 10.COM 16 as shown. Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted without amendments.
7. The **Vice-Chairperson** presented the amendment from the delegation ofLatvia in paragraph 6 with the insertion of ‘and encourages these organizations if they so wish to resubmit their requests for accreditation to be examined by the Committee’ at the end of the paragraph.
8. The **Vice-Chairperson** confirmed that as there were no further comments, paragraph 6 was adopted as amended. Paragraph 7 was adopted without amendments, and **Decision 10.COM 16 was adopted as a whole as amended**.

**ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA (Part I):**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2016 CYCLE**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/12](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-12_EN.docx)*

Decision***10.COM******12***

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (Hungary) moved to item 12 by giving the floor to the Secretary to present it.
2. The **Secretary** thanked the Vice-Chairperson and said that the Committee was now invited to do three things: first to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body as contained in Annex 1 of ITH/15/10.COM/12, secondly to appoint two NGOs and one expert for the three seats that are to be replaced this year as per Decision 9.COM 11, these are Electoral Group I – non-governmental organisation, Electoral Group II – non-governmental organisation and Electoral Group V(a) – expert, and lastly to reappoint the nine members that had been elected last year; the Secretary reminded the Committee that the term of office for an Evaluation Body was one year, so even if it was decided that only three of those members would be newly appointed, it would be necessary to appoint the nine former members with a term longer than 2015.
3. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that candidates were proposed by States Parties to the Convention and that the Chairperson of each electoral group of UNESCO had the task to coordinate the proposals, sending the Secretariat a minimum of two and a maximum of three candidates for each vacant seat. The Secretary indicated that the names of the candidates could be found in Annex 2, with links to their Curricula Vitae (in the case of experts) or their web sites and applications for accreditation (in the case of NGOs).
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and proposed that the Committee proceed in the order in which the Secretary introduced the work that is to first look at the Terms of Reference; and then proceed to the appointment of the three new members of the Evaluation Body.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** reminded that in 2014 during its ninth session the Committee suspended Rule 39 year and elected members of the Evaluation Body by secret ballot. He further reminded the Committee that on the Monday they had adopted amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Committee to include provisions governing voting by secret ballot and there were therefore several options available when electing new members of the Evaluation Body: consensus, secret ballot or a show of hands and the Committee had to decide on how to choose the new members of the Evaluation Body.
6. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed a secret ballot and the delegation of Latvia seconded the Belgium proposal.
7. The **Vice-Chairperson** indicated that, as a secret ballot had been chosen and given the decision on Monday the Chairperson had no role to play in choosing the three members of the Evaluation Body. He suggested that the Committee first proceed to the adoption of the Terms of Reference as shown on the screens, and asked for comments.
8. The delegation of **Latvia** said they would appreciate a more in-depth explanation regarding paragraph 4.e as during the agenda the Committee would be deciding on the application of referral option not only for the Representative List but other mechanisms that might, if the General Assembly so decided, take effect in the Operational Directives in June 2016 and Latvia wondered whether this might affect the workings of the Evaluation Body.
9. The **Secretary** agreed with Latvia that functioning of the Evaluation Body during the next cycle might be affected and proposed that the session deal with that issue under ‘Other business’ where she said they would propose dealing with the specifics of the situation together with the proposal linked to the transfer of an element. She was aware that if the Committee adopted the terms of reference in that way they might need adjusting later in the week and suggested that, for the time being, keeping the current terms of reference and revising them when the proper opportunity presented itself.
10. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the adoption of the Terms of Reference.
11. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed their thanks to Latvia for focusing their attention on the document, pointing out that they would not make any changes to 4.d which dealt with assessing the conformity of international assistance requests greater than US$25,000 and that the Committee had to make a decision in a later document to change the amount and that the matter could be discussed then.
12. The **Secretary** clarified that the 2016 files that the Evaluation Body would be evaluating had been received by March 2015, but that if the Committee was adopting an item proposed on the transfer of an element it might be necessary to add this as an additional task to the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body for the 2017 cycle. For the time being, the US$25,000 ceiling would apply to the 2016 cycle of the Evaluation Body. This is because the new ceiling has to be approved by the General Assembly, since it is a proposal of an amendment to the Operational Directives and the Committee cannot decide the amount.
13. The **Vice-Chairperson** again suggested the adoption of the Terms of Reference; there were no further interventions and he **declared the Terms of Reference adopted**. Having adopted the Terms of Reference, the Vice-Chairperson asked the Secretary to explain the procedure of voting by secret ballot to the Committee.
14. The **Secretary** detailed the voting procedure explaining that the Secretariat will distribute three ballots to each members of the Committee - one for each vacant seat, and one envelope. Each member of the Committee must make their intention clear for each of the three vacant seats, not only for the vacancy concerning their own Electoral Group. She further explained that each ballot carried the names of all candidates for each seat and that members of the Committee were invited to circle the names of candidates for whom they wish to vote by circling only one name per vacant seat otherwise their vote would be considered invalid in regard to this seat. The Secretary also requested the Committee not to write on the envelope, nor fold the ballot papers, and to put them in the envelope that was handed to them and seal it. The absence of a circle for a seat would be considered an abstention as regards that seat. After a five-minute break to allow the members to prepare the ballots, the Secretariat would conduct a roll call of the members of the Committee so that they could deposit their envelopes in the ballot box at the podium. The candidate with the highest number of votes would be elected.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and asked the Committee for two volunteers willing to assume the role of tellers for the elections. The delegations of Côte d’Ivoire and Latvia volunteered and were invited to the podium.

[**President** gives them the list of States entitled to vote and the list of candidates for the tellers.]

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** ensured that all members of the Committee had received their ballots and envelopes, saying they now had five minutes to circle the names of candidates for whom they wished to vote, before the call to deposit the ballots.

[5 minutes break]

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** established that all members of the Committee had completed their ballots, and invited the Secretary to conduct a roll call to collect the ballots from each delegation.
2. The **Secretary** advised the Committee that the roll-call would be in French alphabetical order of the States Parties member of the Committee and to save time, members were invited to approach the podium in advance. To help them in doing so, the list would be shown on the screens along with the State called and the ones immediately following it.
3. The following twenty-three States Parties members of the Committee voted: Algeria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire; Egypt; Ethiopia, Greece, Hungary, India, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, Uganda, Peru, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Tunisia, Turkey and Uruguay.
4. **Afghanistan** was absent.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** announced the successful collection of all envelopes, and told the Committee that while these were being counted the session would proceed with the examination of Item 13: Number of files submitted for the 2016 cycle and number of files that can be treated in the 2017 and 2018 cycles.

**ITEM 13 OF THE AGENDA:**

**NUMBER OF FILES SUBMITTED FOR THE 2016 CYCLE AND NUMBER OF FILES THAT CAN BE TREATED IN THE 2017 AND 2018 CYCLES**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/13](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-13_EN.docx)*

Decision*10.COM 13*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (Hungary) informed the Committee that Item 13: *Number of files submitted for the 2016 cycle and number of files that can be treated in the 2017 and 2018 cycles* would be examined while the votes were being counted and asked the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** said that the document addressed two issues, firstly taking stock of the experience of implementing Decision 9.COM 12 for the 2016 cycle files submitted at the end of March 2015 and inform the Committee about those files; and secondly concerning the number of files to be processed during the next two cycles (2017 and 2018).
3. The **Secretary** said that the deadline for submissions for the 2017 cycle was 31 March 2016, explaining that a cycle year is the year of inscription by the Committee while the submission deadline was 18 months earlier. She reminded that concerning the 2016 cycle that begun on 31 March 2015 the Committee decided that 50 files would be treated (Decision 8.COM 10 in December 2013 and, reconfirmed by Decision 9.COM 12 in November 2014). In addition, by the same decisions the Committee had requested that at least one file per submitting State be processed per biennium within the agreed number of nominations per year. She went on by saying that files processed for the 2016 cycle were divided into four priority categories instead of three as suggested in the Operational Directives. A ‘zero’ category was added this biennium to accommodate the request of the Committee for States whose national files had not been processed in 2015 because they fell beyond the threshold of 50 submissions.
4. The **Secretary** went on by saying that for the 2015 cycle more than 50 files were submitted and therefore 11 States did not have their files processed for that cycle. She explained that given the Committee’s request to examine at least one file per submitting State every two years, these 11 States were now at the top of the priority list for examination in 2016 even though they had several elements inscribed. Belgium, China, Croatia, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Republic of Korea, Spain, Turkey and Vietnam formed the 11 countries in the so-called ‘zero’ category. The rest of the files received by 31 March 2015 for the 2016 cycle were prioritised according to the Operational Directives.
5. The **Secretary** presented the list of nominations falling: into category (i) i.e. States Parties that had no elements inscribed and those that nominated elements for the Urgent Safeguarding List, into the second category (ii) i.e. multinational files, and finally as per category (iii) in ascending order, those with the least elements inscribed until the 50 file threshold had been reached. She explained that, in 2017 all States who submitted files by 31 March 2015 for the 2016 cycle and fell beyond the 50 file threshold, such as Algeria, Armenia and Morocco will be at the top of the priority list at the ‘zero’ category for the 2017 cycle.
6. The **Secretary** pointed out that 198 files were receivable for the 2016 cycle, consisting of 58 new submissions received by 31 March 2015, and 140 files in the ‘backlog’ (nominations submitted over previous cycles but which were not deemed to be priorities by submitting States when asked to identify priority files). She informed the Committee that the Secretariat processed 51 files rather than 50, so as to not split a category into two parts applying the request of the Committee to the Secretariat to exercise flexibility, hence the 51 nominations. The annex to the document offered a summary of the results of the application of these priorities for the files to be examined in 2016:

* 11 files from States whose national file had not been treated in 2015;
* 12 files from States having no elements inscribed (2 of the multinational files) and 6 nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List (priority (i));
* three multinational files(ii);
* the rest of the files in ascending order of the number of previously inscribed items; the ceiling of 51 records is achieved; and
* 12 States therefore would have their nominations examined as priority for the 2017 cycle.

1. She further pointed out that the document also included a table in paragraph 10 presenting the files submitted to earlier sessions of the Committee and those anticipated for coming sessions. The **Secretary** underlined that the total number of files processed by the Secretariat during this cycle, despite the ceiling of 50 submissions per year, had never been higher, namely 229 (mainly due to NGO-evaluations).
2. With respect to the 2017 and 2018 cycles, the **Secretary** said that the Committee was called upon to decide the overall number of files to be treated in 2017 and 2018 given its available limited resources and capacities, and the Secretariat had proposed to continue with the current ceiling of 50 files per year. She continued by explaining that paragraph 7 of the draft decision reproduces the text of Decision 9.COM 12, confirming the principle whereby ‘at least one file per submitting State should be processed during the two-year period 2017 - 2018’; and she recalled that the ceiling applied to all combined mechanisms. She explained that if the amount of international assistance delegated to the Bureau was to be increased as would be discussed under Item 15.c, this would lessen the pressure on States which could then decide to submit requests to the Bureau as well as nominations to the Committee.
3. The delegation of **Brazil** noted the excellent work of the Secretariat despite their increasing workload. It continued by asking whether, considering the significant backlog as mentioned by the Secretary and that if in the current cycle there were incomplete nominations, it was possible to increase the upper file limit of the next cycle by introducing files from 2017 and include them within the limit, or to increase the limit in order to reduce the existing backlog.
4. The delegation of **Greece** wished to congratulate the Secretariat on their very competent and thorough work and felt that the Committee might wish to hear directly from the distinguished delegate from Italy about a proposition they had to make, in which regard Greece was asking for the floor to be given to Italy.
5. The delegation of **Turkey** appreciated the Secretary’s statement, while being conscious of the burden of restrictions placed upon the Secretariat it sympathised with the proposal of Brazil. It went on by saying that the proposal might be supported provided that the Secretary could reassure the Committee that they could create additional capacity as extra files would be a heavy burden.
6. The delegation of **Algeria** congratulated the Secretariat for their excellent work and the support it provided to States. It expressed support for Brazil’s suggestion to increase the number of files examined, saying that in that respect they believed that Italy had a suggestion to make and it would request the Vice-Chairperson to give Italy the floor.
7. The **Vice-Chairperson** agreed to give Italy the floor, but had to first offer it to members of the Committee, inviting Belgium to speak.
8. The delegation of **Belgium** commended the Secretariat for its work, saying it had learned from the budget discussion that the Secretariat’s resources and capacities were so low that what they were managing to do with their limited personnel and finances was much appreciated. Belgium emphasised that when the Committee talked about the ceiling for international assistance, it also had a bearing on the capacity of the Committee.
9. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said they had listened to the point made by Belgium which was absolutely correct, saying that the exceptional case of Viet Nam to transfer from one list to another may have to be examined the following year, and wondered if there was some consensus on this.
10. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked the Secretariat for their work, noting that there were zero requests for international assistance in 2016 and possibly in 2017 as well. Knowing that the International Assistance mechanism had produced very good results for some countries in helping them deal with issues of capacity, Uganda wanted to request that for 2016 (which deadline has passed) the Committee might consider some flexibility for States Parties that still wish to make requests for international assistance. This would also assist the Secretariat to absorb funds falling under international assistance. Uganda agreed with other States Parties that it would be important to consider the backlog, with a few other files to be examined.
11. The delegation of **Tunisia** commended the Secretariat’s hard work despite their limited capacity, saying that if possible they would like to hear Italy’s suggestion.
12. The delegation of **Italy** expressed support for proposals made by States such as Brazil, Turkey and Uganda about the number of files to be examined in the next cycle. It said that if the Committee would consider the possibility of examining more files, Italy would be willing to support the Secretariat’s work with its evaluation process over next cycle by sending an intangible cultural heritage expert to Paris to assist the Secretariat in examining the files.
13. The **Secretary** began by responding to Uganda’s question feeling it might be outside the scope of the current item, and that this question would be addressed the following day; if the Committee supported the idea of a higher ceiling for a request to go to the Bureau. The fact that there was no international assistance request above US$25,000 during 2016 could be offset by the fact that the General Assembly would adopt this higher ceiling and therefore in 2016 international assistance requests below US$100,000 could be granted by the Bureau. The Secretary agreed with Uganda that it was a pity that requests for international assistance were not submitted in 2016 and that this confirmed her believe that a new system had to be introduced.
14. Regarding Brazil, the **Secretary** mentioned that she had anticipated their proposal as this was suggested by the Committee on various occasions in the past. The Secretary said that, because the Committee was frustrated when files were referred and had to wait two years before they were resubmitted, she had drafted a chart that illustrated what a cycle of inscriptions looked like. Starting on 31 March, a cycle lasts for 18 months. Submissions are made by 31 March, when the Secretariat starts examining the nominations and has three months to contact the submitting States about missing elements on their nominations. This may have to be done for all 50 nominations and usually happens at the same time as the General Assembly of the States Parties to the Convention and the Executive Board of UNESCO. Additional information letters are sent by 30 June and generally 99 percent or even 100 percent of the submitted files are incomplete. States are permitted three months to complete their files but many of them are unable to complete them by the required deadline.
15. The **Secretary** continued by saying that the Secretariat was committed to help submitting States and was hence flexible with deadlines for completion, not wanting files to be withdrawn from the cycle because of missing information underlying that this flexibility made much more difficult the completion of the whole task in the three months available. She went on by saying that, from 1 October to 1 January the 50 files had to be translated while the Committee meets in late November. So for example, for the 2016 cycle this work had been done while at that session the 2015 files were being examined. In January the new Evaluation Body is entrusted with evaluating the translated files. It convenes for a first meeting February or March and works until June when it meets again to decide on its recommendations to the Committee. The Evaluation Body meets again that summer to finalize its report and in November the Committee makes their decisions where they might decide to refer certain nominations, at which point the previous cycle is already half-finished.
16. The **Secretary** said that suddenly nine months would disappear when submitting on 31 March and having 6 instead of 18 months to rework files which might need to be completely overhauled (involving new consultations, new community consents and new inventories) would give not only the Secretariat but also the submitting States insufficient time. The Secretary said it was obvious that this situation could become unworkable since none of the steps could be eliminated or avoided. The volume of files to be processed and any extra files put additional pressure on the States, some of which might not wish to resubmit. The only times when referred files were submitted to the Committee the next year after referral was the first year because the Secretariat was very late to send the reminder letters and instead June they were sent in January. This was never done again apart from a single exception in the case of Saudi Arabia for this cycle (2016), with the good reason that the body had not reached the end of its cycle. She explained that this was possible because it concerned only one file but if 11 countries wished to resubmit this would be impossible.
17. The **Secretary** suggested that the States Parties might not be entirely aware of the depth of work undertaken by the Secretariat, pointing out that the more work given to the Secretariat the more likely it might fail bearing in mind that 50 files are a tremendous workload. She explained that World Heritage delegates its work to ICOMOS and IUCN while Intangible Cultural Heritage even though has a very competent Evaluation Body has far more work. She expressed appreciation for Italy’s offer while emphasizing that her call for support applied across the board, not only with regard to nomination files, but for capacity-building or any other help extended to States Parties or Member States not party. At the same time she regretted that one expert would be insufficient as the system is on the verge of collapse.
18. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary, saying he felt sure that the States Parties greatly appreciated the work of the Secretariat and that there was a need to achieve a balance.
19. The **Vice-Chairperson** moved to the draft decision.
20. The delegation of **Peru** appreciated the presentation by the Secretariat but wished to continue discussing the first part of the proposal from Italy, to increase the number of files to be examined as they felt this was an important discussion.
21. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended the Secretary of the Convention for her work and presentation, saying that it did not think it would be a good idea to change the cycle. It emphasised that inscriptions should not be the only important thing in the Convention, observing that most of the nominations appeared to be for the Representative List and not for the Urgent Safeguarding List. It underlined that the Secretariat should be working on capacity-building rather than just inscriptions and that the former was what the experts were needed for.
22. The delegation of **Nigeria** felt that the issue was not about changing the cycles, the issue was about taking note of exceptional cases; the delegation noted that there should be some flexibility about this.
23. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked the Committee to proceed paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 9 were adopted without amendments. A new paragraph 10 by Peru was inserted and read aloud by the Secretariat at the request of Belgium: ‘Encourages States Parties to retrieve at the Secretariat the files submitted four years ago or more that have not been examined by the Committee, due to the limited number of files that can be treated in the course of a cycle, so that they can be updated for a subsequent cycle, particularly in light of the technical requirements adopted by the Committee and any other relevant considerations’.
24. The delegation of **Peru** said the amendment aimed at a realistic solution to the backlog of nomination files, as Peru had learned from the Secretariat that there are at least 100 files needing updating and submitted in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Following the discussion over past few days on the number of files to process, Peru emphasized that it would be useful if States withdrew those files that cannot be processed because of not having been updated.
25. Since there were no comments the **Vice-Chairperson** adopted as amended paragraph 11.
26. Having adopted each of the paragraphs the **Vice-Chairperson** declared **Decision 10.COM 13 adopted as amended**.

*[Thursday, 3 December 2015, afternoon* session]

**ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA (Part II):**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2016 CYCLE**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/12](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-12_EN.docx)*

Decision*10.COM 12*

1. The **Chairperson** welcomed the delegates to the afternoon session, thanking her Vice-Chairperson (Hungary) for acting on her behalf during the examination of Items 11, 16, 12 and 13.
2. Regarding amendments to the Operational Directives, the **Chairperson** was pleased to announce that the counting of the ballots to choose the new members of the Evaluation Body had been completed, with 23 members of the Committee present and having voted. The following candidates received votes as follows:

* For Electoral Group I – a seat for one accredited NGO. The NGO Tapis plein received 8 votes, the NGO, Norwegian Norsk håndverksinstitutt, Norwegian Crafts Institute received 11 votes and was elected. The NGO Simdaire Italian Society of Ethnographic Museum Studies and Heritage received 4 votes.
* For Electoral Group II – a seat for one accredited NGO, the NGO Czech Ethnographical Society received 15 votes and was elected, the Polish Ethnographical Society received 7 votes and there was a blank vote.
* For Electoral Group V(a) – seat for one expert. The expert John Moogi Omare from Kenya received 17 votes and was elected. The expert Mr Munukayumbwa Munyima from Zambia received 6 votes.

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three new members of the Evaluation Body and thanked all the candidates.
2. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if they were ready to proceed with the adoption of the draft decision, directing their attention to document ITH/15/10.COM/12 and its draft decision in paragraph 9. She then asked the Committee to proceed with the examination of draft decision 10.COM 12 as shown, paragraph by paragraph.
3. Having adopted each of the paragraphs without any objections or amendments the **Chairperso**n **declared Decision 10.COM 12 adopted**.
4. The **Chairperson** congratulated again the new members appointed to the Evaluation Body and wished them luck in the task ahead. A delegate from the ICH NGO Forum wished to take the floor.
5. The representative of **Contact Base**, speaking on behalf of the Steering Committee of the Forum, wished to congratulate and welcome the newly established Evaluation Body and to once again assure the Committee of their full cooperation as highlighted in the ICH NGO Forum statement. The ICH NGO Forum underlined the invaluable contribution of the work of the Evaluation Body, which deserved careful consideration because of the recognised quality of its recommendations. The delegate also took the opportunity to encourage the States Parties to prepare proposals to the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices in the next cycle, as this was an important safeguarding tool.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the representative of the ICH NGO Forum.

**ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA: DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES**

**ITEM 14.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES ON SAFEGUARDING INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/14.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-14.a_EN.docx)*

Decision ***10.COM*** ***14.a***

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the objective of the item was to examine three issues related to amendments to the Operational Directives and asked the Secretary of the Convention to present the first of these, item 14.a.
2. The **Secretary** informed the meeting that the item followed on from the ninth session of the Committee in 2014, at which the Committee took note of the outcomes of the category VI expert meeting on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level held in Istanbul, Turkey from 29 September to 1 October 2014 at which an initial set of draft Operational Directives was examined. The Committee decided to include this topic on the current agenda with a view to examining a new draft chapter of the Operational Directives as revised, in order to submit it for adoption to the General Assembly in June 2016.
3. The annex of document 14.a consisted of a draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level, building on a draft presented at the previous Committee session and reflecting a number of specific remarks and suggestions made by members of the Committee at that time, as well as recent developments in intergovernmental negotiations leading to the report *Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*[[23]](#footnote-24) on which draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives was based. The report was the draft outcome document prepared for the United Nations Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda, reflecting the indivisibility and interrelation of three dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) while integrating protection of and respect for human rights as an overarching principle, and peace and security as a requirement.
4. The **Secretary** said that since the ninth session of the Committee in 2014, the draft Chapter VI had been revised in several aspects:
   1. it followed the sequence of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted in September 2015 at the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development;
   2. it underlined the need for cooperation with non-governmental organizations, experts in sustainable development and cultural brokers for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and its integration into non-cultural policies (Paragraphs 170, 171 and 175);
   3. it highlighted the importance of ethical considerations in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage (Paragraph 171); and
   4. it introduced the notion of equitable development, thereby taking into consideration similar work carried out within the framework of the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Paragraph 194).
   5. The proposed draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives demonstrated how safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is conducive to the improvement of the social and cultural wellbeing of communities, and to mobilisation of innovative and culturally appropriate responses to various development challenges, thereby complementing the 2005 *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*[[24]](#footnote-25).
5. It also responded to the recommendations of the recent draft evaluation of the Internal Oversight Service of UNESCO’s work on Culture and Sustainable Development, by expanding considerations of gender equality (Paragraph 181) and the role of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in urban and rural sustainable development (Paragraph 170). This draft chapter of the Operational Directives was hereby presented to the Committee for adoption, with the intention of submitting it for discussion and approval to the sixth session of the General Assembly in June 2016 in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her presentation and opened the floor for discussion.
7. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the independent experts who took part in the category VI expert meeting in 2014, and the Secretariat for their remarkable efforts. Turkey pointed out that the second paragraph of the preamble and Article 2.1 of the Convention for the Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, and the various articles accepted by the General Assembly of States Parties during the preceding sessions concerning the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and the use of the emblem of the Convention under the Operational Directives, all drew attention to the significance of sustainable development in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Turkey recalled that the 2013 International Conference on Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Chengdu recommended that States Parties and the international community should make efforts in that regard and reminded delegates that as an outcome of the Rio+20 Conference, the post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda, the decision of UNESCO’s Executive Board and the decisions of the Intergovernmental Committee, the Committee examined the possibility of amending the Operational Directives about sustainable development and decided during its eighth session in Baku in 2013 for a category VI expert meeting on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level convened in Istanbul in 2014. At the ninth session of the Committee in 2014 it was decided to re-examine this draft during the tenth session and the Secretariat was required to suggest draft amendments. The Turkish delegation believed that the draft was an accurate reflection of those deliberations and that draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives would help States Parties to identify links between sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage at the national level. Turkey agreed with the Secretariat that the proposed draft would help States Parties integrate the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in the implementation of national development policies and strategies and concluded by again thanking the experts and the Secretariat and declaring Turkey’s support for the draft decision as a whole, including the annex.
8. The delegation of **Brazil** commended the Secretariat for its work in developing the draft amendment to the Operational Directives and agreed that the proposed annex reflected what the participating States had multilaterally agreed to when adopting the 2030 Agenda. Brazil said that the proposed amendments are also in line with suggestions it made when States Parties amended the Operational Guidelines of the 1972 Convention, in Paris in November 2015. Regarding the explanatory document by the Secretariat, Brazil suggested that when presenting the draft amendment to the General Assembly of the States Parties to the 2003 Convention, the Secretariat should remove or minimize references to the document *Realizing the Future We Want for All*[[25]](#footnote-26) mentioned in paragraph 6, as this was an information document that had not been endorsed by UN Member States and, since the 2030 Agenda had been approved, Brazil considered it unnecessary to mention it.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed its satisfaction with the document prepared by the Secretariat for the Intergovernmental Committee and congratulated the Secretariat and the category VI expert working group on the quality of the document. The choice was made to use the new 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development adopted recently at the UN Summit on Sustainable Development, which was modelled on economic, social and environmental dimensions although Belgium mentioned that it would have been equally legitimate to work within the model of the four pillars of sustainable development, namely economic, ecological, social and cultural. In the final sentence in paragraph 6 of the report, attention was given to the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions where there was also reference made to Article 13 of its Operational Guidelines on the integration of culture in sustainable development. Belgium felt that it would be an interesting and promising challenge for Member States that had ratified both Conventions to combine the future chapter of the Operational Directives of the 2003 Convention and Article 13 of the Operational Guidelines of the 2005 Convention.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** continued that the report emphasized the challenges in integrating the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage into policy both inside and outside the cultural sector. Recent research has shown that cooperation with experts in sustainable development and cultural brokers are critical to success in many projects, plans and policies, and cultural brokerage, mediation and translation are crucial processes in this regard as was stressed on page three of the report. The importance of cultural brokerage and mediation were also emphasized in the 2013 evaluation of the 2003 Convention by the Internal Oversight Service. Belgium proposed a number of small amendments to the draft proposal, asking that where appropriate the word ‘groups’ should be added to ‘communities’ to be closer to the language of the Convention. Belgium also proposed systematic replacement of the adjective ‘traditional’ used in UNESCO’s 1989 Recommendation for Traditional Cultures and Folklore[[26]](#footnote-27) by the language of the 2003 Convention that refers to ‘phenomena recognized by communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals as part of their intangible cultural heritage’[[27]](#footnote-28). This emphasized the roles of communities, groups and individuals, a point also made in item 15.a on a model code of ethics. Belgium said it would discuss the smaller amendments when the document was being reviewed paragraph by paragraph and concluded by congratulating the Secretariat for its excellent work.
11. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked the Secretariat for the draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives and welcomed the wide diversity of clearly-presented issues in the main document, such as the significance of community involvement, including mentions regarding scientific studies and research methodologies, as Latvia acknowledged that various encouraging examples concerning this particular aspect are already existing in different countries. Latvia observed that the document proposed a twofold structure that firstly invited States Parties to foster scientific studies and research methodologies, and secondly to adopt appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures. With this in mind, Latvia drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 173 of the draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives, believing it would be equally relevant to apply the same twofold structure to it and that, before encouraging States Parties to adopt the appropriate legal, technical, administrative and financial measures for the protection of the various rights of communities, groups and individuals, to first encourage them to foster scientific studies and research methodologies aimed at understanding the different aspects and complexities connected to these rights. The delegation of Latvia believed that the content of this paragraph was intended to detail a paragraph already existing in the Operational Directives, namely paragraph 104 that dealt with issues of intellectual property and other rights and Latvia proposed to maintain the general wording of paragraph 104 in the draft Operational Directives. Latvia said its proposal respected the diversity of positions that States Parties might have on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through intellectual property regimes and acknowledged the complexities of implementing such regimes.
12. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** welcomed the draft document and expressed its appreciation for the stakeholders’ inputs. Pointing out that culture can be a driver and an enabler of sustainable development, that culture was included as a cross-cutting issue in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and that intangible cultural heritage is an essential part of a culture, the Republic of Korea stated that the draft document helped to define the relationship between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development and welcomed the discussion on sustainable development being effectively incorporated into countries’ policies on intangible cultural heritage. The Republic of Korea said having understood the decision made in a previous session, but found that the content of this document was more policy-oriented than technical and as the Operational Directives dealt mainly with technical issues, the Republic of Korea was unsure whether the entire document should be included as an independent chapter in the Operational Directives. The Republic of Korea’s viewpoint was that it would be better to keep the draft text as an annex rather than as an independent chapter and welcomed input on the subject from the Secretariat.
13. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond to the Republic of Korea and Brazil.
14. The **Secretary** first responded to the request by Brazil, clarifying that the document was presented in three main sections: the introduction by the Secretariat, the decision that will be taken by the Committee and the annex to be taken forward to the General Assembly for eventual adoption and integration within the Operational Directives. The Secretary said that amending the text of the Secretariat was not possible, as it had already been published, and that there were no references to any document sources in the proposed chapter or in the decision, and that while understanding Brazil’s point of view, the Secretary reassured the meeting that the introduction by the Secretariat had no legal status.
15. Answering the Republic of Korea, the **Secretary** advised that it was the responsibility of the members of the Committee to decide on such issues rather than the Secretariat and that the Secretariat had responded to Committee requests at the 8.COM and 9.COM sessions to draft the chapter. The Secretariat was assisted by twelve experts, some of whom were sitting on the Committee, to assist with the drafting of the document, which was produced at the request of the Committee. An annex to the Operational Directives has never been created and the Secretary did not know to what extent the annex might have a less valid legal status than the main document, but that this was up to the Committee to decide.
16. The delegation of **Brazil** requested clarification on its earlier request andrepeated its plea to omit the reference to the UN Task Team Report *Realizing the Future We Want for All* when presenting the document to the General Assembly, as the specific document referred to the four pillars of sustainable development which was not approved in the 2030 Agenda and which Brazil did not agree with, which is why Brazil asked if it was possible to only mention the document that was approved.
17. The **Chairperson** said that the Secretariat had received three series of amendments to the proposed Chapter VI of the Operational Directives from the delegations of Belgium, Brazil and Latvia and asked the Committee to examine the annex paragraph by paragraph.
18. The **Chairperson** began with a proposed new paragraph 170, from Brazil: ‘The provisions of this chapter should be interpreted in line with the UN Charter, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’ and asked if there were any objections.
19. The delegation of **Latvia** asked the delegation of Brazil about its reference to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, wondering what the legal connection to this particular document was for the States Parties of the 2003 Convention and whether it was equally binding to them, in order to make this very direct connection of interpretation of the content of those documents.
20. The delegation of **Brazil** said it proposed this amendment as the annex contained diverse references to concepts provided in the UN Charter, the UNFCC document and the 2030 Agenda and in order to avoid the possibility of these concepts being interpreted differently, Brazil preferred to make a reference to documents which have previously been multilaterally agreed. It was just a reference for interpretation, as for example the document dealt with sustainable development – which was not defined in the annex – and Brazil thus proposed to refer to an existing definition.
21. The delegation of **Belgium** understood the proposal by Brazil, but felt that maybe it should be moved to the draft decision and become a Committee decision as hopefully the Operational Directives would remain for a long time and other documents might follow so that, when deciding on specific interpretations within the document, the decision could be referenced.
22. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the delegation of Brazil indicated its approval for moving the proposed paragraph 170 to the draft decision.
23. The **Chairperson** asked for objections to the original paragraph 170; there were none and it was adopted. There were no objections to paragraphs 171, sub-paragraphs 171 (a) or 171 (b), or to sub-paragraph 171 (c), which were all adopted. The Chairperson opened the floor for objections to sub-paragraph 171 (d) including the proposed amendment by Belgium to insert ‘sustainable development experts and cultural brokers for the appropriate integration of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage into plans, policies and programmes, including outside the cultural sector.’
24. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** asked for clarification of the wording used in Belgium’s amendment, specifically the term ‘cultural brokers’ as the Republic of Korea was unsure whether this was commonly used in the language of intangible cultural heritage,
25. The **Chairperson** asked Belgium to clarify the expression ‘cultural brokers’.
26. The delegation of **Belgium** said that the concept was mentioned in the report and the IOS report and that in heritage studies it was a term used to describe the roles of mediators and culture brokers, a concept well known in public folklore in the United States of America and now used in development theory in many countries. Belgium felt that it was a useful concept to introduce as it had significant potential and would be a useful addition to the vocabulary and working methods of the Convention, which was why Belgium proposed to introduce it.
27. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Republic of Korea accepted the explanation and paragraph 171 (d) as amended by Belgium was adopted.
28. The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 172 to which Belgium wished to add ‘economic and cultural impact assessment processes’. There were no objections to the proposed amendment by Belgium, and paragraph 172 was adopted as amended.
29. There were no amendments to the introduction of paragraph 173 and it was adopted. Two amendments by Latvia were introduced, with revised sub-paragraph 173 (a) reading: ‘foster scientific studies and research methodologies, including those conducted by the communities themselves, aimed at understanding the diversity of issues linked to protection of various rights of the communities, groups and individuals, connected to the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’.
30. The delegation of **Turkey** had one comment, suggesting that ‘if applicable’ could be added before ‘individuals’.
31. The **Chairperson** asked Latvia whether it had any objection to this amendment by Turkey.
32. The delegation of **Latvia** responded that in its draft submission it was adhering to language used in the other sub-paragraphs, including the following one concerning the rights of communities, groups and individuals. Latvia said it would prefer to retain the first version if that was acceptable to Turkey.
33. The delegation of **Belgium** agreed with Turkey that it would be useful to adhere to the language of the Convention relating to intangible cultural heritage but that in this instance it had a broader connotation relating to ‘rights’ and that, although it was usually preferable to use the same intangible cultural heritage terminology, it would be better to not use ‘if applicable’ but to keep it to individuals as a whole because individuals were always deemed to have rights.
34. The **Chairperson** asked Turkey if it was willing to withdraw its amendment to sub-paragraph 173 (a).
35. The delegation of **Turkey** said that its aim was to be consistent in the wording, but that if the Committee did not agree with the proposed amendment then it would withdraw it.
36. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the original text as proposed by Latvia would be retained, to which there were no objections and sub-paragraphs 173 (a) and 173 (b) were adopted as amended.
37. The **Chairperson** said that the delegation of Brazil had suggested an amendment to paragraph 174 exchanging the word ‘marginalised’ with ‘vulnerable’, to which there were no objections and paragraph 174 was adopted as amended.
38. The **Chairperson** said that in paragraph 175 the delegation of Belgium had suggested saying ‘by the communities or groups themselves and by non-governmental organizations’, ‘and it was preferable to standardise intangible cultural heritage terminology' and ‘as a resource for dealing with development problems’ and to append ‘if possible’ to the end of the paragraph. There were no objections and paragraph 175 was adopted as amended.
39. The **Chairperson** confirmed that there were no changes to paragraph 176, which was adopted, as was paragraph 177.
40. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of **Belgium** explained that in paragraph 178 and subsequent paragraphs, it had attempted to avoid the word ‘traditional’, as the central concept under discussion was not ‘tradition’ but ‘intangible cultural heritage’, by replacing it by the phrase used in the definition given in the Convention, emphasizing the communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals that recognize phenomena in reality as part of their cultural heritage. Belgium also wished to emphasize the importance of food preparation in addition to food gathering and food preservation.
41. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to Belgium’s amendments to paragraph 178; there were none and paragraph 178 as amended was adopted.
42. In sub-paragraph 178 (a) **Belgium** had suggested inserting ‘or groups’ after ‘communities’, and sub-paragraph 178 (a) was adopted.
43. In sub-paragraph 178 (b), at the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of **Belgium** specified that one of the conclusions of the item on codes of ethics, which would be discussed later during the session, was that codes, as well as toolkit of ethics would be needed. Based on this, Belgium suggested the inclusion of ‘or other tools’ after ‘including codes’.
44. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the amendments proposed by Belgium; there were none and sub-paragraph 178 (b) was adopted as amended.
45. The **Chairperson** mentioned that Belgium’s amendment in sub-paragraph 178 (c) repeated its previous amendments. There were no objections to the amendment, and sub-paragraph 178 (c) was adopted as amended.
46. Paragraph 179 reflected the same amendments by Belgium as sub-paragraph 178 (c), as well as the proposed insertion by Brazil of ‘genetic resources’ after ‘their related knowledge’.
47. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** had a question about the inclusion of the term ‘genetic resources’ in paragraph 179, as it felt that knowledge, practices, expressions, rituals and beliefs are containers of intangible cultural heritage and that the concept of genetic resources was quite different to those groups and therefore the Republic of Korea was asking the Brazilian delegation for clarification.
48. The **Chairperson** asked Brazil to clarify what they meant by ‘genetic resources’ in paragraph 179.
49. The delegation of **Brazil** responded that there are examples of intangible cultural heritage in the field of health care with traditional medicine knowledge and practices associated with the genetic resources of communities, which Brazil was trying to promote and preserve, explaining that Brazil’s focus on the topic resulted from dealing with cases of bio-piracy.
50. The **Chairperson** thanked Brazil and confirmed that the Republic of Korea was satisfied with the response. There appeared to be no further amendments, and paragraph 179 was adopted.
51. Moving to sub-paragraph 179 (a) where similar amendments by Belgium had been proposed as in previous related sub-paragraphs, the delegation of **Turkey** asked what the difference was in the French version of the annex between ‘in some cases’ and ‘if appropriate’, saying that if there was no appreciable difference, the terminology of the Convention could be used.
52. The delegation of **Belgium** replied that ‘in some cases’ [used in the Convention] would be acceptable in the French version.
53. The delegation of **Turkey** said that if the Committee accepted their proposal, the wording in French could be changed throughout the text.
54. The **Chairperson** asked for further comments on sub-paragraph 179 (a); there were none and the sub-paragraph was adopted as were the amended sub-paragraphs 179 (b) and 179 (c). Paragraph 180 was adopted without amendment as was sub-paragraph 180 (a). Sub-paragraph 180 (a) (i) had an amendment by Belgium and was adopted, as was paragraph 180 (a) (ii) without amendment. Sub-paragraph 180 (a) (iii) had an amendment proposed by Belgium.
55. The delegation of **Belgium** took the floor, explaining that as the Convention was about safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, it felt that if programmes on the subject were developed in schools they should include the notion of safeguarding and that formal education should start explaining the Convention, its activities and methods of working with communities, groups and individuals.
56. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections from the Committee to Belgium’s amendments.
57. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully understood Belgium’s intentions, but had difficulty understanding the amended phrase ‘importance next to innovative safeguarding methods’, suggesting that the wording of this could be improved upon.
58. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Republic of Korea had a problem with ‘next to’ and asked the delegation of Saint Lucia for assistance.
59. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested ‘along with’ to replace ‘next to’.
60. The **Chairperson** confirmed the change of ‘next to’ to ‘along with’ and asked if the paragraph could be adopted as amended; there were no further changes, and sub-paragraph 180 (a) (iii) was adopted as were sub-paragraphs 180 (b) and 180 (c), the latter reflecting the same changes proposed by Belgium as in previous paragraphs, and 180 (d).
61. The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 181 to which minor amendments had been proposed by Belgium.
62. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that the proposed amendment might merit discussion as it pertained to the content. Belgium asked whether it was ‘safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’ which would lead to greater equality, or the concept of ‘intangible cultural heritage’ itself, as the Convention deals with safeguarding methods. Belgium hoped that there would be some feedback on the question.
63. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary for her thoughts on this discussion.
64. The **Secretary** fully understood Belgium’s proposal, but felt that maybe to preserve both aspects, as was the case elsewhere, it could be agreed that there were contributions from both intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding, and by so doing both contributions could be retained.
65. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Belgium agreed and that the paragraph now read: ‘States Parties shall endeavour to foster the contributions of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding’.
66. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to make the same change in sub-paragraphs 181 (a), 181 (b) and 181 (c).
67. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Committee shall first examine paragraph 181, which was then adopted. The Chairperson proposed the adoption of sub-paragraph 181 (a) with the same amendment from Belgium as in paragraph 181.
68. The delegation of **Belgium** proposed to put the word ‘potential’ first so that the sentence would read ‘…take advantage of the potential of intangible cultural heritage…’.
69. The **Chairperson** confirmed that there was no objection and sub-paragraph 181 (a) was therefore adopted. Sub-paragraph 181 (b) contained the same amendment from Belgium as sub-paragraph 181 (a) and was adopted. Sub-paragraph 181 (c) was amended with the insertion of ‘and groups’ after ‘communities’, as was sub-paragraph 181 (d); and sub-paragraph 181 (e) received no amendments. There were no further amendments and no objections and all three sub-paragraphs were adopted individually.
70. In paragraph 182, the **Chairperson** recalled that the proposed insertion by the delegation of Belgium was the same amendment as in paragraph 178 and that there was no need for further explanation. With no further amendments paragraph 182 was adopted. Sub-paragraph 182 (a) was amended in the same way and was adopted. Sub-paragraph 182 (b) had no amendments and was adopted. Paragraph 183 had no amendments and was also adopted.
71. The **Chairperson** mentioned that Belgium had proposed a minor amendment to paragraph 184, adding ‘and equitable’ before ‘economic development’, which was adopted. Paragraph 185 had no amendments and was adopted; sub-paragraph 185 (a) had an amendment by Belgium, inserting ‘and groups’ after ‘conducted by the communities’ and was adopted; sub-paragraphs 185 (b) (i) and 185 (b) (ii) which had no amendments were adopted. Paragraph 186 had no amendments and was adopted. Sub-paragraph 186 (a) had a minor amendment by Belgium similar to a previous amendment and was adopted, while sub-paragraph 186 (b) had no amendments and was also adopted. The Chairperson then proposed to move on to examining the heading VI.2.3 for which Belgium had proposed to add ‘and vice-versa’.
72. The delegation of **Belgium** felt that this worked in both directions as one could speak of the impact of tourism on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, but that if safeguarding was taken seriously it in turn should impact sustainable tourism. Belgium thought that this was an opportunity to start talking in the Operational Directives about the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage impacting the way tourism is developing, suggesting that this seemingly minor change was in fact a major change.
73. The **Chairperson** asked for the Committee’s reaction to the amendment. There were no comments, and the amendment was accepted.
74. Paragraph 187 had no amendments and was adopted; sub-paragraph 187 (a) had an amendment by Belgium inserting ‘the potential of intangible cultural heritage for sustainable tourism and the’ before ‘impacts of tourism’, to which there were no objections and the paragraph was adopted; there were no amendments to paragraph 187 (b), which was adopted.
75. Asked by the Chairperson to elaborate about the amendment proposed to paragraph 188, the delegation of **Belgium** said it had not fully understood the concept of ‘the space environment and natural resources’, which it asked to be changed to ‘environmental and natural resources’, as well as asking for deletion in the last line of ‘to limiting the human, social and economic costs’, as the resilience of people is essential for a lot of things.
76. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objection to Belgium’s amendment; there were none, and paragraph 188 was adopted.
77. Paragraph 189 had an amendment by Belgium inserting ‘sharing of’ after ‘respect for’ and the same phrase used in previous amendments; paragraph 189 was adopted. Sub-paragraph 189 (a) had an amendment proposed by Belgium deleting ‘traditional’ before ‘knowledge’ and was adopted. Sub-paragraph 189 (b) repeated the insertion by Belgium of its usual amendments, which was adopted. Sub-paragraph 189 (c) had no amendments and was adopted.
78. The introduction of paragraph 190 was adopted without amendments; sub-paragraph 190 (a) was amended by Belgium with its usual insertion of ‘and groups’ after ‘communities’; sub-paragraph 190 (b) was adopted without change;
79. The introduction of paragraph 191 was adopted without amendments; sub-paragraph 191 (a) was adopted without changes; sub-paragraph 191 (b) had the usual proposed amendments by Belgium inserting ‘and groups’ after ‘communities’, and ‘that are recognized by communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals as part of their intangible cultural heritage’ after ‘mitigation’, which were adopted; sub-paragraph 191 was adopted as proposed; sub-paragraph 191 (c) (i) had an amendment by Belgium, striking out ‘traditional’ before ‘knowledge’, and inserting ‘that are recognized by communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals as part of their intangible cultural heritage’ after ‘the earth and the climate’.
80. The delegation of **Belgium** wondered if the phrase ‘is recognized’ should be changed to ‘are recognized’.
81. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium for the amendment to its amendment and without any objection, sub-paragraph 191 (c)(i) was adopted. Sub-paragraph 191 (c) (ii) had no changes and was adopted.
82. Paragraph 192 had an amendment from Belgium inserting ‘or catalysts’ after ‘prerequisites’.
83. The delegate of the **Republic of Korea** said they believed that the intention of the amendment was to highlight the role of intangible cultural heritage as a prerequisite for sustainable development as well as a catalyst for it, so believed it would be better to change ‘or’ to ‘and’.
84. The **Chairperson** found that Belgium approved this proposal, and paragraph 192 as amended by Belgium and the Republic of Korea, was adopted.
85. Paragraph 193 was adopted without amendments.
86. Paragraph 194 had a minor amendment from Belgium, inserting ‘and deal with’ after ‘transcend’.
87. The delegation of **Belgium** explained that the idea was to suggest to ‘deal with it’ in an active way, ‘transcend’ being a transcendent concept, and dealing with issues of gender, ethnicity and colour seemed closer to reality.
88. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported inserting a new concept of ‘dealing with’, but felt that terminology on this had to be more aggressive and suggested changing ‘deal with’ to ‘resolve’. The Republic of Korea clarified that the new sentence would read ‘and individuals to transcend and resolve differences’.
89. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed some difficulty with this, saying it understood resolving class issues for example, but used with ‘resolving gender differences’ was in its opinion not clear, and that it preferred its original amendment.
90. The **Chairperson** asked the delegation of Saint Lucia to help out.
91. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** understood what Korea was proposing and suggested inserting ‘transcend, deal with and/or resolve’ issues of gender, instead.
92. The **Secretary** thought that difference of gender was not a problem but a reality, and suggested a more neutral term such as ‘address’ instead of ‘deal with’.
93. The delegation of **Belgium** agreed that ‘address’ was a better term, but that especially in a Convention dealing with cultural diversity it would be strange to present a message wishing to resolve differences, so it would prefer to delete ‘resolve’ and keep ‘address’.
94. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** had a preference for ‘address’ over ‘deal with’ which gave the impression that ‘we are dealing with them’, so to allow progress to be made, was willing to accept the Secretariat’s suggestion.
95. The **Chairperson** received confirmation from Turkey that it supported the Secretariat’s suggestion and the use of the phrase ‘and individuals to transcend and address’; with no further objections, paragraph 194 was adopted as amended.
96. The introduction of paragraph 195 was adopted without change; sub-paragraph 195 (a) was amended by Belgium with the insertion of ‘and groups’ after ‘communities’ and was adopted; and sub-paragraph 195 (b) was adopted without changes.
97. Paragraph 196 had no changes proposed and was adopted; sub-paragraph 196 (a) had the usual amendment by Belgium, with ‘groups’ inserted after ‘communities’, which was adopted; sub-paragraph 196 (b) was adopted unchanged.
98. Paragraph 197 had no amendments but the delegation of **Brazil** said that in the interests of consistency, it asked to change ‘marginalized’ to ‘vulnerable’, as in previous paragraphs.
99. This was accepted and the **Chairperson** confirmed that paragraph 197 was adopted.
100. The Chairperson announced that all paragraphs in the annex had been adopted, and now it remained to adopt the annex as a whole.
101. The delegation of **Latvia** took the floor, asking that in the amendment proposed by Belgium in places where ‘communities’ are mentioned, along with the Belgian plea for consistency, the terms ‘communities’ and ‘groups’ be used.
102. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia and asked the Committee to adopt the draft chapter of the Operational Directives on ‘Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage and Sustainable Development at the national level’ as shown in the annex and on the screen; there were no further comments and the **annex was adopted**.
103. The **Chairperson** returned to the draft Decision 10.COM 14.a as shown in paragraph 10 and on the screens and asked the Committee to adopt it paragraph by paragraph as there were amendments.
104. Paragraph 1 had no objections and was adopted; paragraph 2 was adopted without changes; paragraph 3 was adopted unchanged.
105. A new paragraph 4 was proposed by **Hungary**: ‘Thanks the Turkish National Commission for UNESCO for generously hosting and co-financing the expert meeting on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development which took place…’. There were no objections, and the new paragraph 4 was adopted.
106. The delegation of **Turkey** appreciated the kind gesture of the Hungarian delegation and, encouraged by the attitude of the Committee, had taken the liberty of encouraging its National Commission and its president to work constructively on organizing a second round, possibly with broader participation. Turkey said it could not commit to anything more at that stage, as it had to report back to the national authorities, but gave an assurance that it would continue backing the Secretariat’s endeavours in this regard.
107. The **Chairperson** confirmed that paragraph 5 was adopted without amendment.
108. The delegation of **Brazil** made a suggestion regarding the position of paragraph 6, proposing that paragraph 9 should be inserted after paragraph 5 and that the new paragraph 6 needed a verb at the beginning of it.
109. The **Chairperson** said the Secretariat was proposing to insert ‘Underlines that’ at the beginning of the new paragraph 6. Paragraph 6 as amended, was adopted. Paragraph 7, with a verb at the beginning, was adopted.
110. The delegation of **Belgium** referred to the use of the adjective ‘non-cultural’ in the now paragraph 8, as everything could be seen in a ‘cultural’ context and suggested rephrasing it.
111. The **Secretariat** suggested a wording used previously by Belgium in the annex, in sub-paragraph 171 (d), ‘outside the cultural sector’.
112. The **Chairperson** expressed her concern over the structure of paragraph 8.
113. The delegation of **Belgium** said that everything expressed in the paragraph was required, as it related not only to legislation but also to policies and development strategies. The paragraph now ended with ‘as well as in legislation, policies and development strategies outside the cultural sector’.
114. The **Chairperson** agreed that it was acceptable if everyone else felt it to be so, but noted that the delegate of Saint Lucia did not look convinced.
115. The delegation of **Latvia** suggested that, in order to avoid repeating ‘in legislation, policies and development’ it might be possible to use ‘safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in legislation policies and development strategies within and outside the cultural sector’.
116. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee seemed to be in agreement on paragraph 8 as amended, and it was adopted. Paragraph 9 had no amendments and was adopted.
117. The Chairperson now called upon the Committee to adopt the decision as a whole; there were no objections, and **Decision 10.COM 14.a was adopted**.
118. The delegation of **Palestine** took the floor on a technical issue. Referring to the Operational Directives, Palestine pointed out that Decision 10.COM 14.a recommended their adoption by the General Assembly, but that this paragraph had been drafted based on discussions at the last Committee session and at the working group of experts in Turkey. The delegate felt that there was a problem in that the General Assembly would be asked to adopt it without having the right to intervene in it, so in the future it suggested that it might be better to create a working group as was the case for the 1972 Convention. This would mean that instead of the Committee reviewing and adopting it as it had just done, there would be an open-ended working group outside of the room since the beginning of the session that would work with all States Parties. Palestine continued by saying that at the end of the day all the States Parties would have to adopt the Operational Directives that have been adopted at the Committee. The delegate considered that such modality would avoid future complications. Palestine continued by saying that it did not want to complicate things, but just wanted this request to be noted in the minutes.
119. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegate of Palestine for his observations.
120. The delegation of **Belgium** responded by inviting Palestine to consult Article 7 of the Convention under *Functions of the Committee*, where in point (e) it is stated that the Committee’s function is to prepare and submit Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention to the General Assembly for approval, which is what the meeting was required to do and what the members of the Committee have done.
121. The **Secretary** clarified the differences in working methods between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions, which were and are quite different with regard to their respective Operational Directives. Under the 1972 Convention, the Committee could amend and adopt the Operational Guidelines, whereas under the 2003 Convention the Committee could only propose the adoption of Operational Directives to the General Assembly, which will discuss them. This was not the case for the 1972 Convention where there were indeed no other solutions than open-ended working groups elaborating these directives, which would otherwise be imposed without discussion. It was because the States Parties did not like this and in order to fix this shortcoming, that under the terms of the 2003 Convention there is a period of general debate following more limited discussions within the Committee, and then again a debate during the General Assembly. The idea of the working group was particularly warranted in the case of the 1972 Convention because States Parties had no other opportunity to state their opinions, which is not the case for the 2003 Convention.
122. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her clarification.

**ITEM 14.b OF THE AGENDA:**

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES ON REFERRAL OPTION**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/14.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-14.b_EN.docx)

Decision ***10.COM******14.b***

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present Item 14.b.
2. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that the General Assembly at its fourth session in June 2012, requested that the Committee to begin an analysis of experiences gained in implementing the referral option. The Committee launched this process at its seventh session, continuing it at its eighth and ninth sessions. She further reminded that at its ninth session, the Committee decided that the referral option should be extended to the Urgent Safeguarding List, and that the four-year waiting period should be deleted[[28]](#footnote-29), while retaining the possibility not to inscribe an element when a nomination provides evidence that clearly demonstrates that the criterion is not satisfied.
3. The **Secretary** summarized the above, saying that three options would be kept: Inscribed; Not Inscribed; and Referred, but that the four-year period would no longer apply to the Representative List as was the case with the other mechanisms. Given that nominations to both lists were now evaluated by a single Evaluation Body, it was appropriate that the respective procedures be aligned. In the interests of coherency and simplicity, document ITH/15/10.COM/14.b proposed to extend the Referral option to proposals for the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices and to requests for international assistance. She explained that this would ensure that the Committee and Evaluation Body and the Bureau will always have three options for all mechanisms proposed to them, while knowing that ‘No’ is to be a restricted choice whereas Referral can encompass both technical and more substantial issues. The Secretary concluded by saying that revisions were proposed to paragraphs 30 to 37 of the Operational Directives that were included in the annex to Document ITH/15/10.COM/14.b.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened the floor to the Committee for discussion. There were no comments and the Chairperson moved the draft decision, beginning with the proposed revision of paragraphs 30 to 37 of the Operational Directives.
5. Paragraph 30 of the amended Operational Directives was adopted without any comments or objections. Since there were no amendments to paragraphs 30 to 34 the Chairperson moved to paragraph 35.
6. The delegation of **Brazil** informed the Committee that they had received a proposal from the delegation of Spain, who was worried about a situation that happened during a vote last year. Spain proposed to amend paragraph 35 to read similarly to Rule 12.2 of the Rules of Procedure, with the proposed wording (reads in French): ‘Decisions are taken usually by consensus or, as the case may be, by a simple majority of the members of the Committee present’.
7. The **Secretary** said she didn’t fully understand the spirit of the proposed amendment, as the Rules of Procedure applied at all times to any work of the Committee and to any paragraph of the Operational Directives, so she didn’t see why in the specific case of paragraph 35 there would be a need to repeat a Rule of Procedure which already applied to any action and work, or any line of the Operational Directives.
8. The delegation of **Brazil** said that they understood that Spain wanted the Operational Directives to reflect the question of adopting something by consensual decision, which as it was not written the Rules of Procedure and as such they would like it to be included in paragraph 35.
9. The **Secretary**, seeking clarification, asked if what was being proposed was to not choose a specific modality of the adoption of decisions concerning nominations, and whether it was suggested to suspend the Rules of Procedure for inscriptions.
10. The delegation of **Brazil** said that was not the case, rather that the proposal by Spain was intended to indicate somewhere in the Operational Directives that decisions should be consensual which is not currently the case when looking at the voting procedures.
11. The **Chairperson** thought that it was complicated, and asked Brazil if they could propose a concrete amendment for inclusion in the paragraph that the Committee could see on the screens.
12. The delegation of **Turkey** raised a point of order, saying that any member of the Committee may have consultations with any third party, but that in this instance this proposal should be owned by Brazil.
13. The **Chairperson** agreed with the point raised by Turkey, confirming that the proposed amendment was procedurally Brazil’s rather than Spain’s. The Chairperson asked Brazil where they would like to insert the amendment.
14. The delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the amendment be inserted as a new sub-paragraph at the end of paragraph 35, as ‘decisions are generally taken by consensus or, in some cases, by a simple majority of present members of the Committee’.
15. The delegation of **Turkey** wished to understand from Brazil what the logic of the proposed amendment was, saying that the decision-making process in the Committee was stated very clearly in the Rules of Procedure and wondered why another paragraph was required just to repeat what was already in effect.
16. The **Chairperson** advised that she would ask the Committee whether they supported the amendment, but first gave the floor to Latvia.
17. The delegation of **Latvia** believed that paragraph 35 dealt mainly with the different types of decisions that might be taken, for example, decides to inscribe, not to inscribe or to refrer a request, but said that looking at what was proposed and taking into consideration the additional explanation given by the Secretary, Latvia would procedurally be in favour of retaining the existing Rules of Procedure.
18. The delegation of **Belgium** shared the same view and favoured the deletion of the proposed amendment.
19. The **Chairperson** advised Brazil that the feeling of the Committee was that the proposed amendment did not belong in the Operational Directives, but rather in the Rules of Procedure. Brazil accepted the deletion of the proposed amendment. The remaining amendments to paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Operational Directives were adopted without any objections.
20. Without any objections the **Chairperson** declared the Annex as a whole and **Decision 10.COM 14.b adopted**.

**ITEM 14.c OF THE AGENDA:**

**DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES ON SCHEDULE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ACCREDITATION**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/14.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-14.c_EN.docx)

Decision ***10.COM******14.c***

1. The **Chairperson** turned to Agenda Item 14.c and invited the Secretary to present it.
2. The **Secretary** began by referring to Article 9 of the Convention: ‘The Committee shall propose to the General Assembly the accreditation of non-governmental organisations to act in an advisory capacity to the Committee’. She continued, saying that in recent years the Committee had been faced with an ever-larger agenda and felt it necessary to prioritise the workload of the Secretariat to make better use of its available resources. For example, in 2014, due to limited capacity the Secretariat was unable to attend to 31 requests submitted for accreditation and therefore these requests did not reach the Committee in time for its ninth session (but did for the current session). In Decision 9.COM 14 taken last year, the Committee decided to postpone examination of the accreditation of non-governmental organizations to its tenth session. Examining the accreditation of NGOs in odd-numbered years, the Committee noted that if this was regularised, it could reduce the duration and agenda of Committee meetings, as welcomed in Decision 8.COM 5.c.2 taken in Baku in 2013. The Secretary said that this change would not affect the accreditation process because the NGOs will in any case need to wait for the accreditation at the General Assembly, which only convenes in even-numbered years. In Decision 9.COM 14 the Committee further decided to examine requests for accreditation from NGOs at its ordinary session in even-numbered years and invited the Secretariat to submit draft amendments to the Operational Directives to that effect for its examination at the tenth session. The Secretary directed the Committee to find the draft amendments to the Operational Directives to reflect the change in the modalities of accreditation, as an annex to the document.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened the floor for questions or comments. There were none, so the Chairperson moved to the draft decision, beginning with the proposed amendment in paragraph 98 as shown in the annex and on the screen. There were no changes to proposed amendments III, III.2 or III.2.2; the revised paragraph 98 read: ‘Requests for accreditation shall be prepared by using the Form ICH-09 (available at www.unesco.org/culture/ich or on request from the Secretariat) and shall include all the information requested and only that information. Requests shall be received by the Secretariat by 30 April of odd-numbered years for examination by the Committee at its ordinary session in that same year’. There were no objections, and paragraph 98 as amended was adopted. The Chairperson requested the Committee to adopt draft Decision 10.COM14.c as a whole. There were no objections and **Decision 10.COM 14.c was adopted**.
4. Before closing for the day, the **Chairperson** advised the meeting that as usual the Bureau would meet at 9 a.m. the following day to continue its work and the Committee session would start at 9.30 a.m. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Secretary of the Convention for some announcements.
5. The **Secretary** congratulated the committee for finishing early, saying she was impressed at the early end to a session on Operational Directives on really complex matters. The Secretary informed delegates that Burkina Faso and Mali would like to show two films about the way international assistance was implemented in their countries. It was their pleasure to show how the Committee’s decisions have a very significant impact on their everyday lives in terms of intangible cultural heritage. Namibia invited all delegates to a function scheduled after the films to celebrate the inscription of their element on the Representative List.
6. The **Chairperson**, expressing great pleasure, declared the day’s session closed.

*[Friday, 4 December 2015, morning session]*

**ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA: FOLLOW-UP TO DECISIONS AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT THEIR PREVIOUS SESSIONS**

**ITEM 15.a OF THE AGENDA:**

**EXPERT MEETING ON A MODEL CODE OF ETHICS**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/15.a](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-15.a_EN.docx)*

Decision ***10.COM*** ***15.a***

1. The **Chairperson** welcomed delegates to the last day of the current session of the Committee, saying that good progress had been made the previous day and congratulating all present. She informed the Committee that the Bureau had met that morning for the fourth and final time and had discussed several issues.
2. The **Chairperson** directed the Committee’s attention to a set of three sub-items following up on decisions and resolutions adopted by the Committee and the General Assembly at their previous sessions, starting with item 15.a: Expert meeting on a model code of ethics; followed by item 15.b: Guidelines for the treatment of correspondence with regard to periodic reports; and finally item 15.c: Follow-up on audits and evaluations. The Chairperson advised the Committee that following the examination of item 15 the discussion would move to item 19: Other business since the debate to find a solution to Viet Nam’s request for the transfer of an element could require a more substantial debate. During the lunch break, the Secretariat would prepare a list of all decisions adopted to date, printed copies of which would be found upon returning to the room at 2:30 p.m. The Committee would then have half an hour to read through the decisions after which the meeting would start with item 20 to adopt the list of decisions. Before closing the session, the Committee would have to examine the last items, item 17: Date and venue of eleventh session of the Committee, for which Ethiopia had kindly offered to host the Committee in 2016, before moving to item 18: The election of the Bureau. The Chairperson was pleased to inform the Committee that the Bureau had examined and approved a preparatory assistance request from the Philippines to prepare a nomination to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.
3. The **Secretary** wished to inform members of the Committee that the last meeting of the Convention’s global capacity building programme would be held for Electoral Groups I and II between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and moved on to open item 15.a and the Secretary was invited to present that item.
5. The **Secretary** advised the meeting that the item followed up discussions made at the seventh session of the Committee in 2012, during which the Committee invited the UNESCO Secretariat ‘to initiate work on a model code of ethics and to report on it to a next session of the Committee’. This request was made in the context of a debate on the increasing concern over the commercialization of intangible cultural heritage and reflected the growing awareness among States Parties of the need to provide guidelines on ethical approaches to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Responding to the Committee’s request, the Secretariat organized an expert meeting in Valencia, Spain from 30 March to 1 April 2015, generously co-funded, hosted and co-organized by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of the Kingdom of Spain, with additional funding from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. The meeting brought together eleven experts (including five women), who were selected to represent a wide range of expertise, experience and sectors from the six UNESCO electoral groups. In preparation for this meeting, the Secretariat had prepared a reference document around key issues to be considered during the development of a code of ethics, proposing ten initial ethical principles that could constitute the basis of a code of ethics for intangible cultural heritage.
6. The **Secretary** said that the expert meeting in Valencia constituted the first important step in a global discussion on the relevance, content and modalities of developing a potential model code of ethics for intangible cultural heritage:
7. At the meeting, consensus was reached on a need for ethical principles for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, founded on fundamental principles embodied in the Convention and key normative instruments in the field of human rights, including the importance of free, prior and informed consent of local communities and respect for the right of the people concerned to full and fair participation in any processes, projects and activities that affect them, and recognition of their key role in maintaining and managing their culture and heritage.
8. Experts also considered that such ethical principles could provide guidance to Member States and development actors with concrete ethical procedures applicable to all kinds of activities related to intangible cultural heritage or that could potentially affect its viability.
9. The **Secretary** continued that taking into account the broad tendencies of the debate at the expert meeting and specific comments and proposals, the Secretariat had incorporated improvements proposed by the experts in a revised version of the ethical principles, annexed to document 15.a and the twelve proposed ethical principles were now submitted to the Committee for general debate and adoption. It was also proposed that the Committee reaffirm the importance of ethical principles for all organizations and individuals who directly or indirectly affect the viability and thereby safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.
10. The **Secretary** concluded by pointing out that the draft decision also included provisions requesting the Secretariat to develop an online toolkit based on the ethical principles annexed to the decision, comprising practical guidance and examples of existing codes of ethics to facilitate the development of specific codes by national and local entities, as well as to continue integrating ethical considerations in the global capacity-building programme.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her presentation and opened the floor for discussion. The Chairperson informed the Committee that two amendments had been received from Brazil and Turkey, before giving the floor to Kyrgyzstan.
12. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** advised the Committee that it had also submitted an amendment the previous day and that it wished to give the floor to the NGO Forum to propose one more ethical principle for consideration.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Kyrgyzstan, and before giving the floor to the two countries that had submitted amendments, first gave the floor to Belgium.
14. The delegation of **Belgium** congratulated the Secretariat and the Spanish government for the results of their efforts in facilitating the reflection on possible codes of ethics for the 2003 Convention. The expert meeting organised in Valencia in March 2015 by the Secretariat and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports of the Kingdom of Spain was interesting and an important milestone in that reflection. In the opinion of Belgium, document ITH/15/EXP/2[[29]](#footnote-30) prepared for the meeting was of a very high standard and could henceforth be used as a reference text, with many links provided in the document to other instruments, tools and codes of ethics, and as a basis to build on when developing an online platform. The experts that participated in the Valencia meeting had discussed a whole series of issues and, abandoned the idea of one overarching code of ethics and explored several other possibilities and alternatives. Belgium considered that the Secretariat had done a wonderful job in processing all ideas and suggestions and coming up with a pragmatic conclusion in document 15.a. Belgium found the suggestion to select a series of principles to be a pragmatic one based primarily on Article 15 of the 2003 Convention. On the other hand, Belgium supported the proposal to develop an online toolkit where codes, forms, guidelines and protocols could be shared and accessed, especially if it could be organised as an online platform in a participatory manner. Belgium said there were abundant instruments for toolkits available in and across the different disciplines, networks and fields both within and outside the cultural sector, for instance the development of the Convention on Biodiversity or the Convention on Bioethics. The lesson learned was that in practice, it is not only codes but also forms and other tools that could be useful, especially if they were interlinked. The ICH NGO Forum had just organised a symposium on codes of ethics and the roles accredited NGOs could play. Belgium would therefore like to join Kyrgyzstan who had requested the ICH NGO Forum to share some of their ideas and conclusions. Accredited NGOs could offer valuable services and inputs on constructing and updating a platform, a suggestion also expressed in several of the NGO review reports. The annex listing the twelve ethical principles included several interesting ideas such as the notion of ‘sustained consent’, a recurring concern in the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium and gave the floor to Turkey.
16. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked the experts and congratulated the Secretariat for its efforts. Turkey also wished to thank the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport of the Kingdom of Spain for generously hosting and co-funding the expert meeting. Neither the Convention nor the Operational Directives had given ethical considerations any form of consideration until now, apart from a few mentions in the Operational Directives, and for this reason Turkey welcomed this initiative and supported the draft document as a whole including the annex, saying it would be proposing some linguistic revisions to the annex.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and offered the floor to members of the Committee; there were no comments and the floor was given to the ICH NGO Forum.
18. The representative of the **ICH NGO Forum** thanked Kyrgyzstan and Belgium for their generous comments, saying that the ICH NGO Forum had held a symposium before the Committee meeting, dealing with the development of a code of ethics, a subject very close to activities carried out by NGOs. The delegate said that the NGO Forum had closely examined the different provisions proposed in the annex of document 15.a and had welcomed the approach that the Secretariat, the group of experts and the Intergovernmental Committee had used in defining clear, consensual and operational lines of action for future safeguarding activities for intangible cultural heritage. One of the purposes of this normative initiative remained to formulate certain principles and objectives guiding the implementation of the Convention and of the Operational Directives, reinforcing its scope and strengthening peoples’ understanding of it. The delegate said the NGO Forum was pleased to see the central focus given to communities, groups and individuals in the principles and that their aim was to see intangible cultural heritage flourish in all corners of the world. The delegate wished to draw the attention of the Committee on the necessity to complement these general orientations with an ethical principle reflecting, through the imperative of sustainable development, the necessary partnership between civil society and institutions that represent it at local and national and national levels, which constitute one of the main drivers in the safeguarding of living traditions. He continued that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the context of sustainable development should be supported by public policies that enhanced cultural activities and respect for environment and here in particular, should take into account the equitable allocation of scarce resources, if deemed necessary through exchange of information, subsidies, individual scholarships, technical assistance, educational initiatives, publication of statistics ,as well as support for the creation, promotion and dissemination, consistent with the specificities of the various cultural elements concerned. He concluded by saying that groups, communities, artisans, artists, cultural associations and other stakeholders and mediators of living cultural heritage would be pleased to see such principle based upon sustainability, collaborative action and equity in the ethical prescriptions linked to the Convention.
19. The delegation of **Greece** supported all the positive comments expressed for the hard work of the Secretariat and the working group on ethical codes and the work under discussion, believing it would be a good foundation for further development of a code of ethics. In this respect Greece believed that there should also be a small addendum to paragraph 5 and mention of cases of armed conflicts. Referring to the Hague Convention and its protocols, the delegate mentioned that there are international UNESCO conventions dealing with the protection of tangible heritage in the case of armed conflicts, but the protection of intangible cultural heritage in the case of armed conflicts is also of utmost importance and Greece felt that the Committee should deal with this issue, to try to have the matter in the open for discussion because intangible cultural heritage in conflict areas is in many cases in grave danger. Greece believed that in the paragraph 5 of the ethical principles the final phrase could be amended and read ‘customary practices governing access to intangible cultural heritage should be fully respected even where it may limit public access and even in case of public armed conflict’. Greece suggested that the NGO Traditions for tomorrow would be in a better position to explain this issue.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Greece, adding that since the Committee would be examining the annex paragraph by paragraph, those issues would be dealt with on the understanding that only members of the Committee could propose amendments to the annex.
21. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed appreciation for the debate on ethical principles connected to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, and believed these needed to be continued. Latvia welcomed the draft decision proposed to encourage continuous exchange of information, examples and ideas on relevant ethical issues as well as the twelve ethical principles proposed in the annex of the draft decision. Meanwhile, Latvia believed that its support for principle 7 would need to be explained, in connection to the amendment proposed by Latvia for paragraph 173 of the draft Chapter VI of the Operational Directives that was recently debated and adopted by the Committee. Although Latvia thought that adoption of legal instruments for the protection of various rights, specifically within the regime of intellectual property, could be a questionable option for States Parties, it acknowledged that national legislation would not solve all the relevant issues and could have various effects on safeguarding processes. Latvia said that these issues needed to be emphasized within the context of ethics and welcomed the issue of research and documentation mentioned in paragraph 7, believing that different ethical challenges existed for research in disciplines dealing with aspects of intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding. Latvia concluded by saying it entirely support principle 7 as defined.
22. The **Chairperson** thanked Latvia. There were no further comments, and the NGOs were given the floor in their capacity of observers.
23. The delegate of the **NGO Forum** from the NGO Traditions for Tomorrow said that his organization was extremely interested in the adoption of ethical principles for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, all the more so since it would contribute to legitimizing the actions of NGOs and of UNESCO. Referring to a concern expressed by the delegation of Greece, by many on several occasions during the current session and emphasized by the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO during his opening address, the delegate mentioned that intangible cultural heritage being embedded in tangible heritage, among other things; the destruction of tangible heritage – whether they are well publicized or not – is becoming ever more serious, but intangible cultural heritage is being similarly attacked in both conflict and post-conflict situations. The delegate said that NGOs have expressed their support for the Unite4Heritage campaign launched by UNESCO as they know that it is not limited to tangible heritage and that cultural heritage is not limited to buildings being destroyed by barbarous acts. The delegate hoped that the ethical principles that would be endorsed by the Committee would serve as a reference in those situations.
24. The **Chairperson** saw no more requests for the floor, so invited the Committee to start examination of the annex paragraph by paragraph.
25. In the introductory paragraph there was a minor amendment from Turkey, inserting ‘intangible cultural’ after ‘ensure the viability of’ and before ‘heritage’, and one from Belgium inserting ‘and tools’ after ‘specific codes of ethics’. There were no objections, and the paragraph was adopted.
26. In paragraph 1 Turkey wished to insert ‘in some cases’ after ‘Communities, groups and’. Belgium had submitted an amendment but the Chairperson indicated that Belgium had withdrawn it before the discussion.
27. The delegation of **Belgium** interjected, saying it had not withdrawn its amendment, rather that the idea had been to delete the last part of the sentence ‘particularly as it regards its identification, transmission and revitalization’, as it felt that communities, groups and individuals should be involved in all aspects of safeguarding. The idea was not to limit it to the three processes of safeguarding, but to enlarge it.
28. The **Chairperson** thanked Belgium, confirming that Belgium’s amendment was to delete the last part of the sentence after ‘cultural heritage’. There were no objections to the amendments proposed by Belgium and Turkey and paragraph 1 was adopted.
29. In paragraph 2 there was a similar amendment from Turkey, inserting ‘in some cases’ after ‘communities, groups and’.
30. The delegation of **Hungary** apologized for sending up its amendment in a delayed manner, and proposed to insert ‘with a special attention given to the rights of indigenous peoples’ after ‘recognized and respected’. Hungary felt that this was an important dimension of the Convention as it was important to inform indigenous people and minorities about the code of ethics.
31. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary for its observation relating to indigenous people and minorities.
32. The delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the concern expressed by Hungary in the first part of its proposal, pointing out that as per the second part of its proposal the word ‘minorities’ is not used in the text of the Convention and difficulties might be created *vis a vis* the text of the Convention if the term was now used. Turkey suggested that if Hungary wished to withdraw this term, it would be satisfied.
33. The delegation of **Hungary** said that the terms were related and that national and ethnic minorities were important parts of communities, so was in favour of keeping the sentence and references to both elements.
34. The delegation of **Greece** agreed with the Turkish delegation on the subject of minorities, saying that the Convention as written was rightly concerned about the cultural heritage of communities. There was a sense of wisdom that made the people who drafted the Convention choose the word communities. Greece continued that, although the Committee was of course concerned about the rights of minorities, the Convention made no reference to the word ‘minorities’ and the Committee should keep that in mind and not introduce precedents that might endanger its work. Greece concluded that it would be in favour of keeping the wording of the Convention and hence deleting the Hungarian amendment.
35. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the idea of giving special attention to the rights of indigenous peoples but was in favour of leaving out the term of ‘minorities’. Saint Lucia also suggested a small amendment to remove the ‘a’ in front of ‘special attention given’ to improve the language of the text.
36. The delegation of **Turkey** reminded the Committee of the text of the Convention, which read: ‘States must safeguard heritage which exists on its territories, dealing with peoples, communities and individuals’. Turkey said that this was why, during the drafting stage of the Convention, the Committee had discussed at great length such subjects and Turkey felt that a problem could be created here between the current text and legislation of other commitments made by the UN. Turkey further stated that it wished to safeguard heritage present on its territory, be it heritage of communities, groups and, in some cases, minorities or majority groups. Turkey concluded by saying that the Committee could not take the insertion of an adjective lightly.
37. The delegate of **Belgium** advised that the Committee should follow as closely as possible the text of the Convention and the terms it used, as many terms such as ‘minorities’ can have very different meanings in different settings, which Belgium had noted had happened in other Conventions. As these terms had not been operationalized in any way, Belgium believed that the terminology used should remain within that used by the Convention.
38. The delegation of **Peru** felt that the proposal focusing on indigenous people and minorities was valid, but at the same time agreed that minorities and indigenous people were included in discussions on communities, groups and individuals. When speaking about individuals one might also be speaking about minorities or within groups and communities, and indigenous people would be included in this. Peru felt that the wording should adhere to the wording of the Convention.
39. The delegation of **Tunisia** thought that if the Committee started going into the detailed classification of social groups it would face problems, mentioning that the issue of minorities would change the whole vision of the Convention regarding social structures. Tunisia felt that the concept of ‘community’ was wide enough to include all types of structures, organizations and groups and for that reason preferred to avoid including the word ‘minority’.
40. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** felt that the proposal by Hungary was legitimate, but the wording of the Convention should be followed and suggested using ‘communities, groups and individuals’, which would incorporate the concept of minorities in a way.
41. The **Chairperson** said that members of the Committee did not want to use the wording ‘minorities’ or felt that the reference did not reflect the language of the Convention.
42. The delegation of **Hungary** expressed confusion, as most of the speakers had said that this was a legitimate and important question, but that on other hand that there was a strict necessity to adhere to the language of the Convention. Hungary understood that this was a sensitive question that needed time to resolve, saying that a colleague from the NGO Forum had suggested that Hungary use this phrasing. Hungary asked the Chairperson to again give the floor to the representative of the NGO Forum and concluded that if the reference to ‘minorities’ was going to be deleted it would accept the decision of the Committee.
43. The **Chairperson** reminded Hungary that the Committee was in the process of adopting an annex, a process only members of the Committee could participate in and that therefore she could not give the floor to an NGO.
44. In line with the opinion from the delegate of Peru, the delegation of **Algeria** expressed a preference for the categories mentioned in the Convention, saying that if new categories started being used it would mean adding to the Convention new conceptual fields which are attached to these new categories and Algeria preferred to delete the whole amendment, not just the word ‘minorities’.
45. The delegation of **Tunisia** asked one brief question to Hungary: if the word ‘minorities’ was included, would it be possible to then include also the phrase ‘marginalized groups’?
46. The **Chairperson** noted Belgium had a point of order.
47. The delegation of **Belgium** asked the Secretariat to please include on the screen the Belgian proposal to delete the entire Hungarian amendment, as also proposed by the delegates of Algeria and Peru.
48. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee for a show of plates on Hungary’s amendment, advising Hungary that its amendment did not enjoy broad support in the room and was therefore deleted (the **Secretary** interjected, saying that was not yet the case, at which the Chairperson reversed the deletion). The Chairperson said there was a proposal to only delete ‘and minorities’ in the amendment proposed by Hungary. She noted that the amendment by Hungary without the reference to minorities had also no broad support in the room and was therefore deleted. The Chairperson asked if there were any objections to the Turkish amendment, there were none and paragraph 2 was adopted.
49. Turkey had an amendment to paragraph 3, wishing to insert ‘in some cases’ after ‘communities, groups and’ as in paragraph 2. There were no objections and the **Chairperson** confirmed that the paragraph 3 was adopted. There were no amendments to paragraph 4, but Turkey wished to take the floor.
50. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed the same insertion as it had proposed in paragraph 3.
51. The **Chairperson** confirmed that there were no objections, and paragraph 4 was adopted.
52. The **Chairperson** noted that Greece proposed an amendment for paragraph 5, inserting ‘in conflicts situation’ at the end of the paragraph, and there was also an additional amendment proposed. The delegation of Hungary announced that it was withdrawing this additional amendment. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Secretary.
53. Addressing Greece’s amendment, the **Secretary** wished to ask if it could be moved as the principle of access covered two parts: a first sentence, which reaffirmed the fact that principle of access of communities, groups and individuals should be guaranteed, and a second part which mentions the rights of communities to restrict access in order to respect customary practices. The latter part was referring to the right of privacy for certain practices and thus to the restriction of access. The Secretary continued, saying that the amendment proposed by Greece should be rather inserted at the end of the first sentence, so as to state that access should be granted even in a situation of conflict. She noted that Greece seemed to agree with the proposal.
54. The delegation of **Turkey** believed that the new concept did not fall in line with traditional setting and wording of the Convention, and that the 1954 Convention directly dealt with these issues, so this particular text was not merited.
55. The delegation of **Greece** was fully aware of the Hague protocols and had examined them, but felt that the protection they gave to cultural property was written in a way that favoured tangible heritage, such as monuments and cultural assets. Greece said that under international conventions accepted by the majority of the UN member countries, it was difficult to make room for the kinds of cultural heritage referred to in the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention. Greece was unsure that this was the right place to start talking about the protection of intangible cultural heritage in the case of armed conflicts, but thought that it was a good opportunity to start thinking about it and that mention of it should be retained despite being aware that there were other legal instruments protecting cultural heritage in conflict situations, which were however limited to tangible heritage.
56. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the intervention made by Turkey, saying that if the amendment passed it believed that it would be better to include ‘armed conflicts situations’ because the term ‘conflict’ might be too broad.
57. The delegation of **Belgium** wanted to draw attention to the fact that the French version included the terms ‘in some cases’, whereas the English version did not, and that in this instance it would prefer to keep the English version as the text is not dealing with safeguarding. It thought that all individuals should have access to all those places, so Belgium proposed to retain the English version, as it is not about safeguarding but about access.
58. The delegation of **Nigeria** believed that conflict situations were not the exclusive preserve of any Convention, and that concerning intangible heritage one could ask for protection in conflict situations, so it supported Greece’s amendment.
59. The delegation of **Turkey** said that given the Secretariat’s proposal and Brazil’s explanation, and as the armed conflict concept is included in paragraph 50 of the Operational Directives, it would second Brazil’s proposal.
60. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee who was in favour of Greece’s amendment in its current formulation, including ‘in armed conflict situations’. There were no clear responses, and the Chairperson repeated the question, underlining its importance. Following another show of plates, the Chairperson concluded that the amendment from Greece had received broad support in the room and the amendment was accepted. There were no objections to adopt paragraph 5 with amendments from Greece and Turkey and **paragraph 5 was adopted**.
61. The **Chairperson** noted that in paragraph 6 there was an amendment by Brazil, proposing to delete the last part of the sentence after ‘its own intangible cultural heritage’.
62. The delegation of **Brazil** explained that it had difficulties with the wording. Brazil agreed that intangible cultural heritage should not be subjected to external evaluations, feeling that ‘judgment’ might be a difficult word in this instance and saying that ‘this is intangible cultural heritage of humanity’ for example or the different levels of local or national heritage in some countries could constitute a kind of judgement, and Brazil was hence in favour of changing the wording.
63. The **Chairperson** asked Brazil to think of suitable text to replace the text proposed for deletion.
64. The delegation of **Latvia** said that according to its understanding of the proposed paragraph, if the second part was deleted the paragraph would significantly lose its meaning so its position would be to retain the paragraph as it was proposed in the draft decision, reminding the Committee that the content of the paragraph could be found in the definition of intangible cultural heritage and that previous decisions of the Committee already considered that external judgements of value were not welcomed. So Latvia was in favour of keeping the original text.
65. The delegation of **Algeria** had a single editorial question on the wording in the French version of the text, saying that ‘it belongs to each community, group or individual to judge the value of its intangible cultural heritage and the latter should not be subject to external judgments of value or worth’ would be smoother.
66. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to echo the comments made by Latvia, especially as it strongly supported the second part of the paragraph. Belgium did not think that intangible cultural heritage should ever be subject to external judgement of value and that this might be one of the core aspects of the Convention and also at the same time that it is linked maybe to a common misunderstanding, because what the Committee never did is judge the value or worth of intangible cultural heritage, and neither should anyone else. Belgium felt very strongly about keeping the sentence intact.
67. The delegation of **Greece** supported the opinions of Latvia and Belgium, believing that this was a key phrase in the code of ethics. Greece said that if external evaluations were accepted, paragraph 6 would have no meaning at all and therefore Greece was strongly in favour of keeping the text as it stood.
68. The **Chairperson** returned to Brazil, asking if Brazil had created text for replacement of text item it had wanted deleted.
69. The delegation of **Brazil** asked to replace the second part of the sentence with ‘which should not be evaluated externally’.
70. The **Chairperson** said that she felt at this point that many members of the Committee were in favour of the original text. She asked members for a show of plates in favour of the original text and reminded the Committee about the amendment from Algeria in the French version.
71. The delegation of **Belgium** said it would prefer seeing the text in both languages.
72. The **Chairperson** agreed that the English translation should be shown on screen and read the English text as it stood.
73. The delegation of **Belgium** expressed some confusion about the insertion of the word ‘latter’, feeling that in the structure of the sentence its meaning was unclear. It wondered whether the latter referred to ‘its intangible cultural heritage’ or to ‘the value of its own intangible cultural heritage’.
74. The **Chairperson** understood Belgium’s concern and explained that it was the reason why the initially proposed text had the repetition of the terms ‘intangible cultural heritage’.
75. The delegation of **Algeria** agreed to the repetition of the words ‘intangible cultural heritage’.
76. The **Chairperson** moved to adopt paragraph 6, at which point there was an intervention from Peru.
77. The delegation of **Peru** apologized for taking the floor again. Referring to the French text, it suggested that in the first line ‘each community group or individual should judge the value of its own intangible cultural heritage’, ‘establish’ might be a better wording than ‘judge’. Peru felt that the word ‘judge’ was adequate in the second part of the sentence as it referred to an external judgement.
78. The **Chairperson** asked Belgium if it wanted to react to Peru’s comment, but Belgium declined.
79. The delegation of **Algeria** agreed to the proposal from Peru.
80. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the proposal by Peru to replace ‘judge’ with the word ‘establish’ in the French version.
81. The delegation of **Belgium** said that it was difficult to understand how one could ‘establish’ a value. It could understand ‘assess’ a value, but considered ‘establish’ a value to be strange terminology.
82. The **Chairperson** asked the delegation of Saint Lucia for its opinion on this language issue.
83. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested that maybe the wording should be ‘each community, group or individual should assess the value of its own intangible cultural heritage for the purpose of safeguarding.’’, because it felt that the text is not dealing with a value system.
84. The **Chairperson** clarified that the problem was choosing between the words to ‘assess’ or ‘establish’ a value, then gave the floor to the Secretary.
85. The **Secretary** felt that it was more of a problem in French than in English; the word ‘assess’ seemed to work in English, and the Committee needed to find a French word that would be closer, for example ‘ to determine’, and noted approval from the French-speaking delegates.
86. The **Chairperson** agreed that the English text was better with ‘assess’ and the French version with the word ‘determine’ and asked the floor if there was agreement. There were no objections, and paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.
87. There were no amendments or objections to paragraph 7, which was adopted.
88. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to make an amendment to paragraph 8, replacing ‘concerns’ by ‘unquestioned obstacles’. Belgium pointed out that ‘authenticity’ was the subject of many debates on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and reading the document that inspired the idea, it felt that the idea was that authenticity should not be an obstacle to allowing the phenomenon to evolve. So in effect authenticity should not be a claim to not change anything or not to change anything on how to deal with intangible cultural heritage, that is why authenticity can be the object of debate but not be an obstacle in safeguarding, or at least not an unquestioned obstacle. Belgium expressed its difficulty with the word ‘concerns’, because it would be avoiding or not taking into account reality, as there is a lot of debate on authenticity and exclusivity which Belgium suggested expressing with a phrase such as ‘unquestioned obstacles’.
89. The delegation of **Latvia** appreciated the explanation by Belgium, but felt that regarding the proposed amendment the substance would be read with difficulty by someone just reading the paragraph as amended. Latvia felt that the proposed text was probably more generic and easily understood and that it would be more in favour of keeping the decision unchanged.
90. The delegation of **Algeria** wished to try improving Belgium’s amendment in French by changing the verb to ‘constitute’ instead of ‘être’.
91. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** suggested that the sentence could mention both concerns and obstacles in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage.
92. The delegation of **Peru** supported the proposal made by Kyrgyzstan, which it considered as being a clear wording.
93. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** wished to make a proposal to remove the words ‘unquestioned’ in French to make the sentences more fluid.
94. The delegation of **Bulgaria** wanted to add support to the amendment made by Kyrgyzstan and the amendment made by Côte d’Ivoire, as in their opinion it would help avoid possible lack of clarity.
95. The delegation of **Belgium** considered the last few proposals as excellent.
96. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** agreed with deleting the word ‘unquestioned’.
97. The delegation of **Algeria** advised the Chairperson that the French and English versions did not match.
98. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretary to read the texts in both languages.
99. The **Secretary** first read the text in French: ‘The dynamic and living nature of intangible cultural heritage should constantly be respected. Authenticity and exclusivity should not constitute concerns or obstacles in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’ and then in English: [First sentence remains unchanged]. ‘Authenticity and exclusivity should not constitute concerns and obstacles in the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage’.
100. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if they were satisfied with the text in both languages. There were no further objections and paragraph 8 was adopted.
101. In paragraph 9, the **Chairperson** noted the minor amendment proposed by Belgium with the insertion of ‘groups’ after the first mention of ‘Communities’. There were no objections, and paragraph 9 was adopted.
102. The **Chairperson** noted that paragraph 10 had received four amendments. The first was made by Turkey, inserting ‘in some cases’ after the opening ‘Communities, groups and’; the second from Brazil, changing ‘crucial’ to ‘relevant’ before ‘role in determining’; the deletion of ‘and museification’ by Belgium; and inserting ‘folklorization’ after ‘misrepresentation’ by Turkey. There was no objection to the first amendment proposed by Turkey.
103. The delegation of **Latvia** observed that the use of the word ‘crucial’ was important, but that if any amendment to that was made it felt that the French version was slightly different from the English one with the use of the word ‘significant’, and in that case it would prefer the French text as it had trouble with the use of the word ‘relevant’ in English.
104. The **Chairperson** asked Brazil to explain why it wanted to replace ‘crucial’ with ‘relevant’.
105. The delegation of **Brazil** replied that it had proposed the amendment due to the situations regarding various elements of intangible cultural heritage from indigenous people in Brazil, which were being threatened because of natural hazards, constructions and other developments and that communities did not have the tools to determine those threats. Brazil explained that those indigenous peoples unfortunately did not play a crucial role but a relevant one because they could not identify and address these threats and this is why Brazil had proposed this amendment.
106. The **Chairperson** understood from Latvia that it wanted ‘relevant’ or ‘crucial’ to be replaced by similar wording as in French, such as ‘significatif’.
107. The **Secretariat** advised that it had translated from the English to the French and gave more content to the French than to the English, so maybe ‘significatif’ should be translated into ‘significant’.
108. The **Chairperson** asked if Brazil’s proposal as amended by Latvia was now acceptable. As there were no objections, the discussion moved on to the amendment proposed by Belgium. Looking at Belgium’s proposed deletion of the word ‘museification’, the Chairperson gave the floor to Greece.
109. The delegation of **Greece** fully supported the proposition by Belgium to delete the word and for the same reason could not agree to the Turkish amendment for the word ‘folklorization’. Greece felt that the work ‘museification’ meant that something is taken out of living culture and has become an exhibit in a museum, which would be better expressed with the words used before and that there was no need to use a degrading word to refer to museums. On the other hand, Greece felt that in some parts of the world, the word ‘folklore’ was the study of peoples’ culture and was not considered negatively. It thus felt that ‘folklorization’ trivialized people’s cultures and that such judgement should be avoided. Greece felt in closing that both words should be deleted.
110. The **Chairperson** suggested dealing with Belgium’s proposition to delete the wording if the Committee felt it to not be suitable, and to then move to the Turkish suggestion.
111. The delegation of **Turkey** said that when it came to use the word ‘folklorization’, in its opinion it indicated ‘decontextualization’ of intangible cultural heritage, a term already used several times in the process of developing the Convention. The speaker said that it was during the second session of the General Assembly of the States Parties that the Chairperson had said that folklorization of intangible cultural heritage must be avoided. Turkey wished to use that word in order to avoid decontextualization of intangible cultural heritage and that if that word was understood as decontextualization, then it would agree to Belgium’s proposal.
112. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether anyone had any comments on the proposal by Belgium.
113. The delegation of **Tunisia** said it felt that the term ‘museification’ was pejorative to museums and their role in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and ‘folklorization’ to the processes of folklore. Tunisia supported Greece and proposed to delete both words and to use a different adjective after presentation, such as ‘frozen’ in French.
114. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee seemed to wish to address both amendments from Belgium and Turkey at the same time.
115. The delegation of **Nigeria** wanted to talk about the proposition about ‘folklorization’, saying that folklore is indeed part of the living traditions of people and in this context it had a negative connotation so Nigeria did not support its use, suggesting ‘culturization’ would be a much better word to use in this context.
116. The delegation of **Belgium** pointed out that it was its feeling that ‘decontextualization’ was broad enough to cover all the preceding ideas and sensitivities and proposed the deletion of ‘folklorization’ and ‘museification’.
117. The delegation of **Bulgaria** wished to support the comments made by Greece and Belgium, saying that the terms themselves were complex enough, with multivarious and predominantly negative connotations that were inadvisable to use in the text, stressing that ‘decontextualization’ would largely incorporate the meanings of the other words proposed.
118. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** was in favour of keeping the initial wording with museification and folklorization, even though the two words are used as threats and constitute negative ideas in terms of intangible cultural heritage, pointing out that in two previous sessions the terms were used several times, so it would be reasonable to keep a specific point with these concepts appearing.
119. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to support the last Belgian suggestion about ‘decontextualization’ covering already the two other words proposed.
120. The delegation of **Turkey** strongly supported the Belgian suggestion, saying that it was not in favour of prolonging the discussion any further.
121. The **Chairperson** thanked Turkey and suggested the deletion of the two words. She reminded the Committee that there was a proposal by Tunisia in French relating to ‘its erroneous and frozen presentation’, which appeared in English as ‘misrepresentation and freezing of it’. The Chairperson proposed the adoption of paragraph 10 with the understanding that the Secretariat would make the necessary linguistic revisions afterwards.
122. The delegation of **Latvia** responding to Tunisia, said that ‘misrepresentation’ would be sufficient.
123. The **Chairperson** asked for support of the Tunisian amendment on ‘freezing’; there was none, and the proposal was rejected.
124. The delegation of **Belgium** wondered if the word ‘and’ should be inserted between ‘commodification’ and ‘misrepresentation’.
125. The **Chairperson** confirmed this insertion and that paragraph 10 was adopted.
126. In paragraph 11, the **Chairperson** noted that the delegation of Turkey suggested the same minor amendment seen in other parts of the annex, inserting ‘in some cases’ after communities, groups’.
127. The delegation of Turkey also suggested that considering the earlier discussion on minorities, and in order to avoid any misunderstanding, the French text could refer to ‘community membership’ instead of ‘ethnicity’.
128. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** suggested the insertion of ‘including’ before ‘specific attention’ and of a semi-colon between ethnicity and equality.
129. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** asked why, when talking about cultural diversity, there should be the phrase ‘in some cases’ when relating to individuals.
130. The delegation of **Belgium** advised that this was to keep within the language of the Convention, as they would like to repeat ‘groups and in some cases, individuals’, adding it to the second sentence ‘recognised by communities’.
131. The **Chairperson** read out the amended paragraph 11.
132. The delegation of **Algeria** was agreeable to Turkey’s amendment to replace ‘ethnicity’ with ‘community’, but felt that ‘ethnicity’ could also be retained if ‘identically, in some cases’ was inserted before that point.
133. The delegation of **Peru** wished to keep the word ‘ethnicity’, as it was important to make the point that ‘ethnicity’ is not the same thing as ‘community’. So Peru would prefer to keep the word ‘ethnicity’ as in the original text.
134. The delegation of **Latvia** agreed with the concerns expressed by Kyrgyzstan, in that adding the words ‘in some cases’ in the first sentence would be irrelevant and to keep the original text.
135. The delegation of **Brazil** supported the intervention by Peru, to keep ethnicity.
136. The **Chairperson** said that the Committee had made as many amendments as it wanted to, and that it would now be adopting them step by step.
137. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** wanted clarification whether the subject of ‘should be’ in the second part of the sentence was ‘equality’ or ‘special attention’. It noted that due to the revision proposed by Saint Lucia, now ‘equality’ seemed to the subject of ‘should be’, and was therefore not sure if this understanding was in accordance with the original meaning of the author.
138. The **Secretary** agreed with the Republic of Korea and noted that the amendment of Saint Lucia was cutting the sentence between the subject and the verb. The Secretary read the first sentence again: ‘It was in the respect of values recognized by communities and sensitivity to cultural norms, specific attention to gender equality, youth involvement and ethnicity equality, should be included in the design of implementation of safeguarding measures’.
139. The delegation of **Saint Lucia** responded that in that case, it should not be ‘ethnicity’ but ‘ethnic equality’.
140. The **Chairperson** confirmed the deletion of the amendment from Saint Lucia and moved to adopt the paragraph step by step. Firstly, she mentioned the Turkish amendment to insert ‘in some cases’ before ‘individuals’ in the first line and asked for objections.
141. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** reiterated its concerns that ‘identity’ and ‘individual’ are interconnected concepts, so to put ‘in some cases’ here seemed strange.
142. The **Chairperson** cautioned that if the debate was re-opened the session would never finish, and asked who supported the amendment of Turkey.
143. The delegation of **Turkey** said its wish had been to follow the terminology of the Convention. However, if the Committee did not agree with Turkey’s wording, there would be no necessity to vote, and that it would withdraw its amendment.
144. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Turkey was withdrawing its amendment.
145. The delegation of **Belgium** wished to delete ‘in some cases’ in its proposed amendment to the second part of the sentence.
146. The **Chairperson** confirmed that Belgium wished to modify its amendment, and wondered if the discussion should now accept the Belgian amendment without ‘in some cases’. Seeing no apparent objection to the amendment by Belgium, the Chairperson said that there had initially been an amendment from Turkey proposing to replace the wording ‘ethnicity’ by ‘community’, and that now there was the amendment from Saint Lucia proposing to say ‘ethnic equality’ instead of ‘ethnicity’.
147. The delegation of **Algeria** said that it did not really understand what the concept of ‘ethnic equality’ actually meant. Algeria believed that ethnic groups are precisely different and that is where differences occur, so perhaps one could talk about respect for or equality between ethnicities, but one could not speak about ethnic equality because ethnic groups are precisely groups that differ from each other.
148. The **Secretary** advised that the original proposal in French spoke of ‘ethnicity’ and ‘equality of ethnicity’, and offered that perhaps the problem here was one of translation into English. She thought that the idea expressed by Algeria seemed included in the proposed French text and if the Committee decided to keep the word ‘ethnicity’ and if the proposed insertion by Turkey of the word ‘community’ was not retained, the Committee might wish to keep the original French version but would need to find a proper English translation.
149. The delegation of **Algeria** entirely agreed with the Secretary’s comments.
150. The **Chairperson** wondered how to find the right translation in English of the French wording, suggesting ‘equality of ethnic belonging’, or ‘equality of ethnicity’.
151. The delegation of **Turkey** supported the original text but of course with its amendment to include the word ‘community’. The speaker said that in his quality as expert in intangible cultural heritage, who has published for thirty years a journal called *Folklore*, he had nothing against folklore, but had to admit that ‘folklorization’ had a negative connotation that could lead to misunderstandings. He further explained that the word ‘ethnic’ was not used in the text of the Convention, be it for the elaboration of inventories at the national level, nominations to the Representative List, etc. As the Convention used the terms ‘communities’, ‘groups’ or ‘individuals’, there was no explanation for the word ‘ethnic’ and he therefore did not understand how such word could be introduced here. He concluded by saying that Turkey wished to maintain its opinion despite acknowledging the reality of ‘ethnicity’ around the world.
152. The delegation of **Peru** recalled that the Committee had more or less agreed to keep the word ‘ethnicity’ and what it was trying to find the right way to translate the terms ‘ethnic belonging’ in English. She continued that it was not about discussing a word that is or is not in the Convention, and that in ethical principles mentioning gender equality and youth, one could also perhaps include ‘ethnic groups’. She had understood that the difficulty was the English version and that maybe if the correct formulation could be determined in French, which could be ‘respect for ethnic belongings’, the Committee could more easily find a translation in English to match the French wording.
153. The **Chairperson** summarized the current state of discussion, with two possible English translations of the French wording and now a third one, which would be ‘equality of ethnic identity’. She noted that Bulgaria did not look convinced and clarified that the end of the sentence would read ‘youth involvement and respect for ethnic identity’.
154. The delegation of **Belgium** asked if the wording could be kept general through reference to ethnicity without qualifications. With the amendment proposed by Algeria, this would read ‘specific attention to gender equality, youth involvement and, in some cases, ethnicity’.
155. The **Chairperson** asked Belgium to repeat their statement.
156. The delegation of **Belgium** said it wished to keep the Algerian proposal but that it could also be just ‘ethnicity’, without ‘in some cases’ and wanted to hear Algeria’s point of view.
157. The **Chairperson** confirmed that ‘in some cases’ was proposed for deletion.
158. The delegation of **Algeria** specified that with its proposed insertion of ‘in some cases’, Algeria had wanted to find a position halfway between two extremes when the text was dealing with equality between ethnicities, and that if equality was removed, it would no longer need ‘in some cases’ because respect is always a requirement. However, Algeria would rather keep the wording ‘equality’ when talking about ethnicities and therefore would prefer keeping the terms ‘in some cases’. It concluded by saying that the use of ‘in some cases’ would allow those that do not wish to talk about ethnicity to not talk about it, and that this would be the best solution to reach consensus.
159. The delegation of **Nigeria** confirmed that it preferred to speak of ‘ethnic identities’, because there is a qualifier to it - ‘respect for ethnic identities’. If one looked at specific attention to gender equality and youth involvement, there was a qualifier; so this is why Nigeria preferred the term ‘ethnic identities’.
160. The **Chairperson** moved to adopt the paragraph, confirming removal of the **Belgian** amendment on ‘ethnicity’ and retaining the Nigerian amendment, if that met with general approval.
161. The delegation of **Algeria** suggested that the Chairperson was leading the discussion too fast.
162. The **Secretary** read the paragraph in French and in English:
163. French: ‘Cultural diversity and identity of communities, groups and individuals should be fully respected. In the respect of values recognized by communities, groups and individuals, and sensitivity to cultural norms, the design and implementation of safeguarding measures should pay specific attention to gender equality, youth involvement and, where appropriate, respect for ethnic identities.’
164. Second sentence in English: ‘In the respect of values recognized by communities, groups and individuals, and sensitivity to cultural norms, specific attention to gender equality, youth involvement and as appropriate respect for ethnic identities, should be included in the design and implementation of safeguarding measures’.
165. The **Chairperson** asked if the Committee was now happy with the formulation.
166. The delegation of **Hungary** drew attention to the fact that if ‘as appropriate’ was used, it suggested that there would be some cases when respect of ethnic identities would not be needed, and wondered why ‘as appropriate’ should be in the text.
167. The delegation of **Algeria** said it made the proposal in order to find a consensus, and wondered if the discussion needed to continue to find a consensus.
168. The **Chairperson** asked whether ‘as appropriate’ should be retained or not.
169. The delegation of **Peru** wanted to support what had been said by Hungary, in that it was not necessary to mention ‘as appropriate’, because it was not used in the two previous cases relating to youth and gender.
170. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed support for the points of view of Hungary and Peru.
171. The delegation of **Algeria** said that the concept of equality was replaced by respect, and that Algeria was thus ready to give up its proposal to add ‘as appropriate’.
172. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Algerian proposal had been removed, and asked if paragraph 11 could be adopted as amended. There were no objections and paragraph 11 was adopted.
173. In paragraph 12, the **Chairperson** noted that Turkey had proposed an amendment inserting ‘and in some cases’ after ‘communities and groups’, and deletion of ‘or’ before ‘individuals’. There were no objections, and paragraph 12 was adopted.
174. The **Chairperson** announced a new paragraph proposed by Kyrgyzstan and gave the floor to Kyrgyzstan.
175. The delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said that at the beginning of this session it had said that the proposed paragraph had been suggested by the ICH NGO Forum and Kyrgyzstan fully supported this as Kyrgyzstan shared the concerns of no proper connection existing between policies and actions, and hoped that the new paragraph 13 could improve this.
176. The **Chairperson** read the paragraph in English from the screen: ‘The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage within the spectrum for sustainable development should be able to rely on public policies which value cultural action and which aim for respect of the environment and take into account equity in the allocation of resources when applicable such as for example the exchange of information, subsidies, individual grants, technical assistance, educational initiatives, publication of statistics and support to creation, promotion and diffusion, all of the above in a manner appropriate to the specificity of the various related elements’. The Chairperson turned to the Committee for comments.
177. The delegation of **Brazil** thanked Kyrgyzstan for proposing the amendment, saying that since the Committee was discussing about sustainable development rather than allocation of resources, the amendment might not be suitable for inclusion here. Brazil also suggested that the amendment should end with ‘and should be able to rely on public policies which value cultural action’.
178. The **Chairperson** clarified that Brazil was proposing to keep the paragraph as short as possible, stopping at ‘cultural action’ and deleting the rest of the amendment.
179. The delegation of **Bulgaria** expressed support for the amendment, mainly because it raised an important issue about policies and actions, and echoed the relationship between codes and tools which were mentioned in the beginning of the document. Bulgaria said that it was still not sure how appropriate the extensive wording was after the end-point that was suggested by Brazil, but in general Bulgaria found a need to keep at least part of the main message of the amendment.
180. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked the NGO Forum for its willingness to contribute to the debate on ethical principles, believing that there were probably many ideas in the proposed paragraph that were being treated as equally important but that Latvia felt it was difficult to find the major focus of the paragraph. The proposed paragraph largely related to issues of policy-making and sustainable development, so Latvia felt that it was similar to the recent debate about the States Parties and their responsibilities regarding national policy making and legislation, and Latvia was not convinced that the issues raised here would be relevant as they stood within the context of principles of ethics.
181. The delegation of **Nigeria** shared the sentiments of the NGO Forum as presented by Kyrgyzstan, but felt that the sentence was too long-winded and, as Brazil had said, the first sentence captured everything well.
182. The delegation of **Belgium** said that it was an interesting text, but that it did not belong in the twelve principles and that if the Committee wished to say something about it, it should be moved to a Committee decision or somewhere away from the annex.
183. The delegation of **Algeria** thought that in the framework of this discussion, it thought that the proposed text that was to be adopted was a principle-based text, and that the amendment that was just suggested by Kyrgyzstan was a programme-based text that should be moved in a different part of the document but, as the delegation of Brazil said, up until ‘cultural action’ there is a set of principles that can be kept. Algeria would end the paragraph after ‘cultural action’.
184. The delegation of **Hungary** favoured the amendment made by Belgium, because the proposed statement was about what the States Parties should do with these principles and with the annex, and it was better to put this statement in the draft decision. If the proposed paragraph was put in the draft decision, it would be stronger than in the annex, especially considering that the draft decision only spoke about making such kind of code of ethics and such statement would make actions alive.
185. The delegation of **Belgium** said that it wished to make a concrete proposition in line with what had been said and, with the indulgence of Kyrgyzstan, proposed to keep the first sentence as far as ‘cultural action’ and maybe put it in the draft decision on sustainable development. Belgium understood that the decision on sustainable development had already been adopted, but as the Committee would be adopting everything in the afternoon session, perhaps the Committee could agree on a draft text that could be inserted in the decision on sustainable development to be adopted during the afternoon session.
186. The **Secretary** regretted that it was a complicated option, because the Committee had already adopted the decision on sustainable development and the item could not be reopened. She suggested two options - whether to move some of the language into the draft decision as proposed by Hungary, or to consider that the idea was largely expressed in the draft Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. She concluded by saying that if the Committee wanted to express again this idea, the best option would be that of Hungary, namely to put it into the draft decision.
187. The **Chairperson** asked in anyone was in favour of keeping the entire paragraph 13 in the annex and noted that only Kyrgyzstan was in favour. The Chairperson then asked if anyone favoured keeping the first two lines of the paragraph as proposed by Brazil and supported by Algeria: there was no broad support, the Chairperson saying that the paragraph did not belong in the annex, which meant that the annex would end with paragraph 12. The Chairperson asked for the twelve paragraphs of the annex to be adopted as a whole; there were no objections and **the annex was adopted**.
188. The **Chairperson** moved the discussion to draft Decision 10.COM15.a. There were no objections to paragraphs one to seven, all of which were adopted paragraph by paragraph. She noted that there was an amendment proposed by Belgium in paragraph 8, inserting ‘and update’ before ‘their own’, and ‘groups’ inserted after ‘involving communities’. The Chairperson said that there was an objection from Hungary.
189. The delegation of **Hungary** had no objection to the Belgian amendment, but felt that this was the point where the Committee could encourage States Parties to take concrete actions, as it was the proposal of Belgium to insert the amendment suggested by the NGOs into the draft decision. The delegation of Hungary said that it would be grateful for assistance in formulating their suggestion.
190. The **Chairperson** said that would be difficult and asked the room for volunteers to assist Hungary with formulating its proposal. While waiting for Hungary’s text, the Chairperson suggested temporarily leaving the current paragraph as [Not Adopted] and moving to paragraph 9 where there was an amendment by Belgium to insert ‘platform with a’ before ‘toolkit’; there were no objections, and paragraph 9 was adopted.
191. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee to look at the new paragraph 10 proposed by Belgium: ‘Invites accredited non-governmental organizations to participate in enriching, sharing information, following-up, and helping to update the online platform with tools of ethics for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage’ and asked for comments.
192. The delegation of **Turkey** thanked Belgium for the proposal, which it supported.
193. The delegation of **Latvia** thanked Belgium and supported the new paragraph, but wished to replace ‘helping to update’ by ‘contributing to update’. The Chairperson confirmed that Belgium accepted Latvia’s amendment and in the absence of any further comments the new paragraph 10 was adopted.
194. In paragraph 11, the **Chairperson** noted that Belgium had suggested inserting ‘groups and other relevant stakeholders and intermediaries’ after ‘communities, and again after ‘governments’, and to add ‘and tools’ after ‘specific codes’. The **Chairperson** asked if the Committee could adopt paragraph 11 with the amendments; there were no objections, and paragraph 11 was adopted.
195. Returning to paragraph 8, the **Chairperson** hoped that the Secretary could propose appropriate text and asked her to elaborate.
196. The **Secretary** advised that the Secretariat had looked at the possibility of integrating the idea of the paragraph withdrawn from the annex here in the paragraph 8, but did not think that this was the right idea because although paragraph 8 dealt with States, it focused on the invitation to States and other local and national organizations to update codes of ethics. She thus proposes that a new paragraph be added at the end of the decision based on the three lines proposed by Brazil as follows: ‘Recalls that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, within the spectrum for sustainable development, should be able to rely on public policies which value cultural action’. She thought that this contained the initial idea of the paragraph that the Committee could add to if it wished, but she felt that this could suffice at the very end of the decision.
197. The **Chairperson** recalled that paragraph 8 had not yet been adopted; there were no objections to the two amendments by Belgium, and **it was adopted as amended**.
198. The **Chairperson** moved discussion to the new paragraph 12 suggested by the Secretariat based on the amendment from Kyrgyzstan: ‘Recalls that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, within the spectrum for sustainable development, should be able to rely on public policies which value cultural action’. There were no objections, and it was adopted.
199. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee to adopt the entire paragraph as a whole; there were no objections, and **Decision 10.COM 15 was adopted as amended**.

**ITEM 15.b OF THE AGENDA:**

**GUIDELINES FOR THE TREATMENT OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH REGARD TO PERIODIC REPORTS**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/15.b*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-15.b_EN.docx)

Decision ***10.COM******15.b***

1. The **Chairperson** invited Brazil in their role as Vice-Chairperson to take the Chair. The **Vice-chairperson** introduced the Item, and asked the Secretary to present it.
2. The **Secretary** began by mentioning a first-time scenario from the previous year where the Secretariat received a letter from a State, raising concerns about the content of a report submitted by another State. At that time, the Committee decided to apply *mutatis mutandis* to periodic reports the guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from the public or other concerned parties with regard to nominations as found in Decision 7.COM 15. In that same decision the Committee requested the Secretariat to propose guidelines specifically applicable to periodic reports for examination at the current session; this is why a set of guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from States, the public or other concerned parties are included in the Annex of the document which, as could be noted, were similar to those for nominations.
3. The **Vice-chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened the floor for debate. There was none; moving to the adoption of draft decision 10.COM 15.b and seeing no objections, the Vice-chairperson **declared Decision 10.COM 15.b adopted**.

**ITEM 15.c OF THE AGENDA:**

**FOLLOW-UP ON AUDITS AND EVALUATIONS**

Document [*ITH/15/10.COM/15.c*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-15.c_EN.docx)

Decision ***10.COM 15.c***

1. The **Vice-chairperson** (Brazil) proceeded to the examination of Item 15.con the status of implementing the 24 recommendations made by UNESCO’s Internal Oversight Service (IOS), following an evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of the 2003 Convention, and on the status of four recommendations of the audit report on working methods of all six of the culture conventions.
2. The **Vice-chairperson** was pleased to see in the text that good progress had been achieved in response to the recommendations and handed the floor to the Secretary to present the item.
3. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that this was a recurrent item on the agenda of the Committee, through which the Secretariat planned to report on the follow-up and status of actions taken in response to any evaluations or audits that touched upon the Convention. The document was in table format in two parts; she explained that the first part covered the follow-up on IOS’s evaluation on the impact and effectiveness of the 2003 Convention, whilst the second part covered the follow-up on the audit by IOS of the working methods of all of the culture conventions.
4. The **Secretary** advised that the table summarised the planned actions in response to each recommendation of the evaluation and the audit with timelines and underlined that many of these recommendations were directed to States. She went on by saying that the table concentrated on actions taken by the Secretariat to support States, such as the creation or revision of new training material, publications, aide-memoires, guidance notes and forms, as well as the organisation of workshops and consultations.
5. While the Secretary pointed out that she would not go through each recommendation, she wished to bring to the Committee’s attention Recommendation 13: ‘Give priority to International Assistance requests within the ceiling of files to the Convention’s mechanisms’. The Secretary recalled that this idea was proposed to the Committee by the Secretariat at its eighth session (Document ITH/13/8.COM/5.c[[30]](#footnote-31)) but was not endorsed as it was considered as the sovereign right of States to decide on presenting nominations to the Lists over presenting international assistance requests. At the same time, she emphasized that more and more international assistance requests over US$25,000 go to the Bureau of the Committee for approval and she gave the example of the emergency assistances granted to Mali and Côte d’Ivoire; the case of Sudan where the Committee requested the State to submit a revised request to the Bureau in line with recommendations of the Consultative Body; and the case of the international assistance request from Kenya this year, where the Committee delegated its authority to the Bureau to decide.
6. Bearing this in mind and with an aim to reduce competition between international assistance requests and nominations to the Lists, the **Secretary** advised that in response to Recommendation 13 the Secretariat proposed amendments to the relevant paragraphs of the Operational Directives, to increase from US$25,000 to US$100,000 requests for international assistance that can be approved by the Bureau of the Committee and to present those amendments to the General Assembly during its sixth session in June 2016.
7. The **Secretary** explained that if the Committee endorses these amendments and the General Assembly approves them, States Parties will be able to present requests for international assistance for more important projects to the Bureau instead to the Committee; this means that these requests will not be part of their quota within the celling of files to the Convention’s mechanisms and they could be submitted any time.
8. The **Vice-chairperson** thanked the Secretary for her presentation and opened the floor.
9. The delegation of **Belgium** commended the Secretariat for progress made on this interesting evaluation, adding that Belgium wished to make a small intervention regarding the evaluation, reflecting on Belgium’s work in the Committee over the past four years. Belgium reminded participants that it would soon be leaving the Committee and would consequently like to share observations in regard to recommendations eight, nine, ten and 16 of the document being examined. It said that being member of the Committee had been a very enriching experience during which much progress had been made, such as establishing an evaluation body as recommended for by the evaluation and that it wanted to commend all members for their diligence and constructive spirit.
10. The delegation of **Belgium** continued by saying that, over the past four years it had tried making few small contributions and mentioned the Operational Directives for Sustainable Development, the code of ethics and its contribution to the capacity-building strategy. Given its imminent departure from the Committee, Belgium said it felt that it had more liberty to speak openly and to raise other points. During its four years it felt some discomfort, especially during discussions on the Representative List. Clarifying, the delegation of Belgium, said that it sometimes had the feeling that the Committee was discussing World Heritage listings instead of Intangible Cultural Heritage whereas Committee there were not examining whether one element was better than another and not making judgements on the elements themselves. Belgium said that elements were not examined during discussions, and that what was examined was the files. Belgium wished to clarify its position during the past four years and during discussions relating to Recommendation 9, to clarify stakeholders’ misconceptions regarding the Representative List. Belgium said that when talking to members of the Committee, it sometimes sensed that members thought that Belgium was too strict, focusing too much on rules and the files; and said it was doing this because of its wish be consistent in its approach to all files presented to the Committee.
11. **Belgium** also said that the Committee’s obligation and duty was to treat all applications in a similar and equal way, and it wondered whether this had been always the case. Belgium felt that this was maybe why the evaluation body had been created, to really ensure a consistent approach to all evaluations and assessments made in the Committee. Belgium agreed that it was not easy to say no to nominations and requets, as when looking at an element one is always aware that there are communities and people behind them, who of course don’t always understand why decisions might or might not be taken to inscribe or refer. Belgium said it understood why sometimes it might be difficult for members of the Committee to avoid judging the actual elements rather than the files but that the Committee should show consistency. Belgium said it would be in favour of a more open system, for example moving to something similar to a Wikipedia listing in which there would not be such strict, confining criteria, which would allow the listings to be updated regularly. Belgium said that they would support the draft decision, as it was important to activate the mechanism for international assistance and also supported increasing the ceiling.
12. **Belgium** reiterated the need to promote the Urgent Safeguarding List and to promote capacity-building and synergies between the different conventions mentioned in Recommendation 16. Returning the listing system, Belgium said it was not against listing, but looking forward felt that the Committee was slightly trapped between two systems: a closed system such as at present with criteria and rules; or the possibility of a very open system. Belgium asked the Committee to remind themselves what the Representative List actually represented, as mentioned in Recommendation 9, as it was mostly a mechanism to raise awareness and it reminded that earlier was mentioned that the singer Shakira had just tweeted about intangible cultural heritage to her millions of followers. Belgium concluded by reaffirming their full trust to the Committee and incoming members in the next General Assembly and their commitment to the work on intangible cultural heritage that it would be supporting as an observer from now on.
13. The **Vice-chairperson** thanked Belgium and gave the floor to the Philippines.
14. The delegation of the **Philippines** expressed their support to the decision and its satisfaction that international assistance can be made more accessible by increasing the ceiling and allowing more flexible deadlines. It also expressed its appreciation for the approval of the Philippines’ request for international assistance by the Bureau of the Committee. It supported Belgium and said that it found interesting Belgium’s reflection on future medium-term of deciding whether to move intangible cultural heritage towards a more open, inclusive system or a more stringent application of rules for all.
15. The **Vice-chairperson** thanked the Philippines, and moved to draft decision 10.COM 15.c. With no objections the Vice-Chairperson declared **Decision 10.COM 15.c adopted**.
16. The **Secretary** announced that the interpreters would allow the Committee to continue for a further half hour, and that if the Committee agreed then Item 19: *Other business* could be linked to the Viet Nam question, so that the very substantive work of this morning could be completed before returning later in the afternoon.
17. Before closing the discussion on the item, the delegation of **Hungary** wished to emphasise important role of Belgium in the Committee and its appreciation for their clear presentation. Hungary continued by saying that Belgium had played an important role in moving the discussion towards clarifying the Committee’s roles and that their colleagues from the Philippines had reminded them how important that was, and agreed that the Committee found itself vacillating between two systems from which it had to move forward.

**ITEM 19 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

****Document**** [*ITH/15/10.COM/19*](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/Decisions/10.COM/19)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** (Brazil) moved to the examination of Item 19: *Other business*, reminding the meeting that, while examining Item 6.b on Monday, the Committee had decided to discuss under this item a specific procedure for the transfer of the element *Xoan* singing of *Phú Thọ* Province of Viet Nam, inscribed by Viet Nam in 2012 on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, to the Representative List. The Committee had agreed to discuss the issue and to take a decision on ways to move the proposal towards defining procedures for transferring an element from one list to another and also for removing an element from both lists.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** informed the Committee that the delegation of Belgium had proposed a draft decision that had already been shared with and favourably received by some members of the Committee, identifying a way forward towards identifying procedures to be adopted by the General Assembly in 2018 for the transfer of an element from one list to another and for the removal of an element. Meanwhile, in consideration of the probably lengthy process leading to the possible adoption of these procedures in the General Assembly, it was proposed that the Committee would, on an exceptional basis, examine at its twelfth session in 2017 the request for transfer of the element as requested by Viet Nam to the Representative List as well as a report on the current status of the element in question, if they were submitted by Viet Nam before 31 March 2016. If submitted, the new nomination and the report would be examined by the Evaluation Body for the 2017 cycle and the Committee would include this new responsibility in the terms of reference of the next Evaluation Body. The delegation of Belgium was invited to explain the proposed draft decision.
3. The delegation of **Belgium** said that the Vice-Chairperson had provided an excellent summary of the proposal, adding that Belgium commended Viet Nam for their request which, as this was the very first time that the Committee had been presented with such a request, forced them to think about the important considerations involved in updating the lists and keeping systems alive as well as being able to remove elements from the Urgent Safeguarding List. Belgium continued that the aim was to have the proposal examined by 2017 as it would have to go through the normal procedure of nomination to the Representative List concurrently with examination of the implementation of the safeguarding plan, meaning that 2017 was the soonest it could be done. Belgium said that they had received support for the draft decision from the Republic of Korea.
4. The delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed their appreciation of the Belgian proposal, emphasising their belief that Viet Nam was setting a good example, being a country that was effectively safeguarding an intangible cultural heritage and that Viet Nam’s request to transfer their item from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List was an exemplary example for States Parties to follow. In this regard the Republic of Korea fully supported the spirit of the Belgian proposal, although upon more careful reading had found a procedural problem regarding paragraph 8: ‘*Further decides that the possible examination of the nomination of the element to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in the 2017 cycle will only take place should the Committee first decide, after examination of the report, on the removal of the element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and that, should the Committee decide to refer or not to inscribe the element of the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, it will remain on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding*’. The Republic of Korea pointed out that if the Committee decided to refer or to not inscribe the element, with this wording the element would return to the Urgent Safeguarding List despite any decision to move it from there, so Korea felt it would be better to delete the latter part of paragraph 8, starting from ‘and that’.
5. The delegation of **Algeria** thanked Belgium for the proposed text, which Algeria supported and congratulated Viet Nam for their efforts in enabling their proposed transfer of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. Algeria felt that the proposed transfer sent a positive signal, highlighting Viet Nam’s effectiveness by providing the first tangible example of a proposed transfer away from the Urgent Safeguarding List and Algeria said they strongly supported the wording of the Belgian proposal.
6. The delegation of **Turkey** believed that this case of Viet Nam merited appreciation and support, saying that the case of the Viet Nam request and the way the issue was being addressed was conducive to evolving the Convention in a positive direction. Turkey said that they were supportive of the addition of the extra paragraph and that establishing the conditions, modalities and mechanisms would require more than one meeting. Turkey concluded saying that the president of the Turkish National Commission, Professor Dr. Öcal Oğuz had generously indicated he would be keen to assist with the work of such a group.
7. The delegation of **Belgium** acknowledged the kind words of the Honourable Turkish Ambassador and thanked the Turkish delegation for exploring the possibility of assistance. Belgium gladly acceded to the inclusion of the final paragraph proposed by the Republic of Korea, expressing their appreciation to the Korean delegation for their careful reading of paragraph 8 and agreeing that there might well be an issue with the wording as originally proposed.
8. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said they appreciated the spirit of Belgium’s proposal, believing the Committee needed to encourage the extraordinary and exceptional initiatives made by Viet Nam and that Ethiopia agreed with the proposed draft as amended by the Republic of Korea.
9. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** offered their congratulations to Belgium while appreciating their willingness and availability to support the Committee in its work. Côte d’Ivoire supported the text proposed by Belgium and congratulated Viet Nam.
10. The delegation of **Uganda** thanked Viet Nam for their good example, saying that Uganda had a number of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List and that they had been wondering how to move them to another list once they became viable again, so Uganda totally supported the draft decision.
11. The delegation of **Algeria** apologised for taking the floor again, this time in support of the amendment of the Republic of Korea to the Belgian text.
12. The delegation of **Tunisia** congratulated Viet Nam for their efforts, especially as their request gave the Committee an opportunity to develop an appropriate mechanism for transferring elements from one list to another, and expressed their support of the draft decision by Belgium.
13. The delegation of **Namibia** supported the draft resolution as proposed by Belgium and amended by the Republic of Korea, saying that the establishment of an open-ended working group to develop a mechanism of moving an element from one list to another would be a good idea.
14. The delegation of **Hungary** wished to express its appreciation to Viet Nam for their work concerning removing a viable element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. Hungary thanked Belgium for their draft proposal, while expressing their approval of it.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson** moved to adopt the decision paragraph by paragraph.
16. Paragraphs 1 to 3 were adopted without amendments.
17. The delegation of **Latvia** wished to comment on Paragraph 4, saying that they were in favour of the proposed decision, but wished to propose a minor amendment. The draft decision mentioned that the Committee would examine the nomination for the Representative List together with the report concerning the nomination for the Urgent Safeguarding List; however, Latvia believed that the nominations submitted for the Representative List would follow all processes of an evaluation, namely the work of the Evaluation Body and Latvia suggested that parts 17 and 18 of the Operational Directives could be mentioned here concerning submission of files and evaluation of files. There were no objections, and paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.
18. Paragraphs 5 to 10 were adopted, with only paragraph 8 being amended.
19. The **Vice-Chairperson** moved to adopt the decision as a whole and on request gave the floor to Côte d’Ivoire.
20. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** had an objection regarding standardising spelling, asking whether Viet Nam consisted of two words or a single word.
21. The **Vice-Chairperson** said the Secretariat would proceed with necessary corrections.
22. The delegation of **Hungary** suggested one more paragraph to be added to the draft decision: ‘The Committee acknowledge and appreciate the efforts of Viet Nam concerning the related element’ as despite the apparent complexities of Viet Nam’s request, it was very much a success story.
23. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if Hungary’s suggestion was an amendment to paragraph 3.
24. The delegation of **Hungary** had no opinion on the placement of the paragraph, suggesting it could be inserted towards the end of the proposal.
25. The delegation of **Belgium** thanked Hungary for their important point, clarifying that Belgium had attempted to reflect this aspect in paragraph 3, but wondered why Hungary felt that Viet Nam needed commending for their request as their report had not yet been examined and their level of success could not yet be pronounced on.
26. The **Vice-Chairperson** commented that the paragraph had already been adopted and asked whether the explanation by Belgium was satisfactory.
27. The delegation of **Hungary** said that if the Committee were in agreement with Belgium’s comment, they would retract their suggestion.
28. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked Hungary, saying that Viet Nam could be commended and congratulated the following year if their request was successful.
29. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if the decision could be adopted, apologising to Viet Nam for her pronunciation of the element. There were no objections, and **Decision 10.COM 19 was adopted as amended**.
30. The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Viet Nam to take the floor.
31. The delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked the Belgian delegation and the Secretariat for proposing a text that enjoyed broad support from the Committee, and the Committee for listening to Viet Nam’s concerns while trying to address Viet Nam’s request for the transfer of *Xoan* singing to the Representative List in the most practical and reasonable manner. The delegation understood the difficulties faced by the Secretariat and the necessity to observe the rules and procedures, but expressed some concerns. Viet Nam said that eight years ago the country had gone through the long process of nominating this element to be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and over the past four years, Viet Nam had invested heavily in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, the successful outcomes of which had been sent to the Secretariat; yet Viet Nam was now embarking on another journey to prepare a new nomination for the same element for the second time, but this time for the Representative List. Viet Nam said although the process was lengthy, Viet Nam was proud to be an example of successful safeguarding efforts and would do their best to implement the decision.
32. The delegation of **Viet Nam** wished to share an observation with the Committee, in that the 2003 Convention had brought about concrete results, revitalising threatened expressions and practices that might otherwise have been lost. However, Viet Nam felt that the Committee might wish to reflect on the sense of urgency attached to the safeguarding of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, as when an element is inscribed it requires focused protection to allow it to no longer require urgent protection in the future. Viet Nam’s question was about how long a sense of urgency could last, as they did not have a state of conservation mechanism as provided for in the 1972 Convention. The protection of intangible cultural heritage stretches human and financial resources, and it was not by any means the delegation’s intention to discredit the Urgent Safeguarding List but Viet Nam believed they were perhaps victims of their own success.
33. In concluding, Viet Nam felt that it was time for the Committee to reflect on mechanisms of ownership as the overall and ultimate objective of the Convention was to safeguard and promote intangible cultural heritage; honouring communities by inscribing their intangible cultural heritage on the list was very important, but that itself is not enough and best safegarudig practices were what should be privileged in order to encourage communities in their challenging endeavours to protect and safeguard their intangible cultural heritage for generations to come.
34. The **Vice-Chairperson** assured Viet Nam that the Committee would make a careful examination of their nomination the following year and thanked Viet Nam for their efforts.
35. The **Secretary** announced that the afternoon session would be postponed until 3 p.m. as the session had run over by half an hour; at 3 p.m., the Committee would find all the decisions adopted thus far, which they would have half an hour to read and check.

*[Friday, 4 December 2015, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA:**

**DATE AND VENUE OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/17](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-17_EN.doc)*

Decision*10.COM 17*

1. The **Chairperson** opened discussion of Item 17, to decide on the date and the venue of the eleventh session of the Committee in 2016 and directed the Committee to document 17 and its corresponding draft decision for their reference. The Chairperson advised that UNESCO had received a proposal from Ethiopia on 10 November 2015 to host the Committee’s eleventh session in 2016 and invited the Ethiopian delegation to extend that invitation directly to the Committee.
2. The delegate of **Ethiopia** thanked the Chairperson, all members of the Committee and members of the Secretariat. Ethiopia expressed their sincere hope that their proposed venue for the next Committee meeting would be a memorable experience for all present with regard to intangible cultural heritage, as in visiting Ethiopia one could experience where humanity had first walked, with scientific evidence dating back to 2.6 million years-old. The delegate said that Ethiopia was known for ancient civilisations, reflected by the obelisk inscribed on the World Heritage List. The delegate of Ethiopia continued that Ethiopia is a nation where people have struggled yet managed to never be colonised and continues to be an inspiration for the pan-African movement and a capital for all its African brothers and sisters.
3. The delegate of **Ethiopia** said she was certain that her country would meet the expectations of all participants of the proposed conference and that, as the State Minister of Culture and Tourism, she thanked everyone for giving Ethiopia the opportunity to host the next Intangible Cultural Heritage session in 2016. On behalf of the Ethiopian government, she assured the Committee that Ethiopia would do their best to make the meeting as memorable as possible and closed her intervention by once again extending an invitation to all to the next session of the meeting in Ethiopia.

[Audio-visual presentation on Ethiopia]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia for their words and audio-visual presentation, and confirmed Ethiopia’s offer to host the eleventh session of the Committee by suggesting that the meeting accept Ethiopia’s kind offer by acclamation.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia, expressing her pleasure over their offer and that she was proud that Ethiopia would welcome the Committee session once again to the African continent. Turning to the dates, the Chairperson invited the Secretary to provide some additional information.
2. The **Secretary** thanked the Chairperson, and advised the Committee that Rule 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure stipulated that the Committee shall determine at each session and in consultation with the Director-General of UNESCO, the date and place of the next session. She advised that she had managed to confirm with the Director-General and Ethiopian authorities that the eleventh session could be held from Monday 28 November to Friday 2 December 2016. The Secretariat had amended the draft decision accordingly, and her team was now displaying it on the screens.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and, seeing no objections, declared **Decision 10.COM 17 adopted as amended**.

**ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

Document *[ITH/15/10.COM/18](http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/ITH-15-10.COM-18_EN.doc)*

Decision*10.COM 18*

1. The **Chairperson** addressed Item 18, saying that now that the date and venue of the Eleventh Session of the Committee had been decided upon it was time to elect the next Bureau and directed the Committee’s attention to document 18 while recalling that, in accordance with Rules 12 and 13 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee was obliged to elect a Bureau consisting of a Chairperson, one or more Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur who would remain in office until the end of the next ordinary session.
2. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that in accordance with Rule 13.4 of the Rules of Procedure, in electing the Bureau the Committee should have due regard for the need to ensure equitable geographical representation and, as much as possible, a balance among the various fields of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The members of the Bureau also needed to be members of the Committee, so the choice was among those Members who would remain in office until the next ordinary session of the Committee. The Chairperson invited the Committee to suggest suitable persons to serve as the next Chairperson.
3. The delegation of **Turkey** proposed *Mr Yonas Desta Tsegaye* (Director-General, of the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage - ARCCH) from Ethiopia as the Chairperson of the eleventh session of the Committee, saying that Mr Tsegaye is a prominent intellectual, an experienced technocrat and a committed community leader, who would serve the Committee well. He has been the Director-General in the Ministry of Culture and Tourism since July 2011, and previously served as a Director in the Ministry of Industry, and before that he was the supervising plant engineer in Midrock Group, Ethiopia. Dr Tsegaye had studied chemical engineering and graduated from Addis Ababa University in 2005, was also awarded an MSc in environmental engineering in 2010 and business administration at ABH Jimma University in Addis Ababa in 2015. The delegate of **Turkey** submitted this proposal for the scrutiny of the members of the Committee.
4. The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee if Mr Yonas Desta Tsegaye from Ethiopia could be elected as Chairperson of the eleventh session by acclamation.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee and offered congratulations to the new Chairperson of the eleventh session of the Committee, reminding him that he would represent the Electoral Group V(a) Africa. The Chairperson said that this year three electoral groups will face a clean-slate situation where only one member is eligible for election to the Bureau. These are:

* Electoral Group I: Only Turkey, whose mandate terminates in 2018, is eligible for this position because Belgium and Greece’s terms come to an end in June 2016.
* Electoral Group III: Saint Lucia, whose mandate terminates in 2018, is eligible as the mandates of Brazil, Peru and Uruguay terminate in June 2016.
* Electoral Group V(b): Algeria, whose mandate terminates in 2018, is eligible while as the mandates of Egypt and Tunisia terminate in June 2016.

1. The **Chairperson** pointed out that there were only needs for proposals for Electoral Group II and Electoral Group IV and invited the members of the Committee to make proposals concerning the appointment of the Rapporteur.
2. The delegation of **Belgium** nominated Mr Murat Soğangöz of Turkey as Rapporteur of the Committee. There were no objections and **he was elected**.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Mr Murat Soğangöz on his appointment and proceeded to the election of the two Vice-Chairs.
2. The delegation of **Hungary** recommended Bulgaria as a Vice-Chair for Electoral Group II. There were no objections, and **Bulgaria** was appointed to represent Electoral Group II.
3. The delegation of **India** proposed the Republic of Korea as a Vice-Chair for Electoral Group IV. There were no objections, and the **Republic of Korea** was appointed to represent Electoral Group IV.
4. The Chairperson thanked the members of the Committee for their assistance, and moved to adopt Decision 10.COM 18; there were no objections and **Decision 10.COM 18 was adopted**.

**ITEM 20 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS**

1. The **Chairperson** advised the Committee that the time had come to adopt the decisions of the tenth session, expressing her hope that delegates had had sufficient time to review the documentation. There were no comments on the decisions presented by the Secretariat, **which were approved** subject to a linguistic review by the Secretariat. The final version would be published online by the end of the year.

[General applause]

1. The **Secretary** of the Commission told the Committee that to facilitate their work, the Secretariat had already put a list of the decisions online in English and French online, but watermarked subject to linguistic revisions until the end of the month when the final version would be published.

**ITEM 21 OF THE AGENDA:**

**CLOSURE**

1. The **Chairperson** advised the Committee that the meeting was now at the stage where the decision of the sessions would be adopted, hoping that members had had a chance to look at them. There were no comments on the decisions as presented by the Secretariat, and the decisions were approved, subject to their linguistic review by the Secretariat, the final version to be published online by the Secretariat by the end of the year.
2. The **Secretary** advised that to facilitate the work of the Committee, the list of decisions as distributed in English and French had already been made available online, watermarked subject to linguistic revisions up until the end of the month of December when the final version would be published.
3. The **Chairperson** informed the meeting that the formal work had come to a close. She had an announcement from the Namibian delegation, reminding all of the closing ceremony to take place that night between 6.p.m. to 9 p.m. at the Independence Memorial Museum in the Central Business District of Windhoek; the building has a place in the history of Namibia, being a former concentration camp during the genocide of 1904.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked all present for their contributions to the success of the week-long deliberations, which was a tremendous task achieved thanks to the enthusiasm and willingness of all concerned to work in a spirit of consensus and cooperation that had been the tradition of the Convention since its earliest days. The Chairperson said that her work as chairperson of the session was rewarding and not difficult, thanks to commitment shown by the States Members of the Committee, Observer States Parties, the participating NGOs and other participants.
5. The **Chairperson** presented a summary of the achievements over the past five days.
6. There were 510 registered participants from 110 different countries. A total of 43 files were assessed for inscription; through rich and fruitful discussions a total of 5 elements were inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and 23 on the Representative List. One international assistant request was approved, and the **Chairperson** had pleasure noting that it belonged to an African country.
7. With regard to NGOs, their invaluable advice on diverse issues had been clearly recognised. Out of 54 new requests, accreditations of 24 non-governmental organisations had been recommended, and the accreditation status of 59 NGOs was maintained. The Committee examined 28 periodic reports which clearly demonstrated a continuous increase in commitment to implement the Convention, from many State Parties. It was proposed to the General Assembly that substantive amendments of the Operational Directives be approved, one of the most important issues being the Committee’s recognition of the relevance of intangible cultural heritage in relation to the Sustainable Development Agenda 2030, which clearly demonstrated the long-term vision of the Committee.
8. The **Chairperson** reiterated that by extension such an approach provided a clear base for linking the work of the Committe with aspirations of the AU agenda 2063 which had created a particularly important framework for the African States Parties. There had also been agreement on improvement of utilisation of resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, paving the way for the States Parties to be better able to benefit from available resources. Principles of ethics for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage had been endorsed, thus better framing how to achieve the spirit of the Convention and focusing on the role of communities as bearers of intangible cultural heritage. These were some of the achievements of the session, and the Chairperson strongly believed that they would have an important long-term impact long after conclusion of the tenth session of the Committee.
9. The **Chairperson** wished also to pay tribute to the Members of the Bureau, in whose midst she had felt privileged and humbled by the confidence that they had bestowed and for their support throughout this session. She particularly thanked her co-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur for extraordinary support throughout the session, as well as the interpreters, translators and technicians, all of whom contributed to the smooth functioning of the session.
10. The **Chairperson** finally offered thanks to the Namibian volunteers who were present throughout all the social and residential venues, being the ones who showed the smiling faces of the Namibia at any time of day or night, and asked the floor to show give a round of applause.

[Applause]

1. The Chairperson also thanked the Secretary of the Convention, Ms Cécile Duvelle and her able team for all the precious assistance they had provided and to whom a debt was owed for the late nights and rushed meals and on whom many demands had been placed throughout the session yet they maintained the efficiency.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** wished to pay a personal tribute to the Secretary, Ms Cécile Duvelle, advising the room that this was her last Committee as the Secretary of the Convention, before leaving UNESCO at the end of the year. She had invested much energy and emotion in supporting the work of the Committee, the States Parties, experts, NGOs and communities around the world and the Chairperson was sure that all would join her in their many languages of the world in thanking her and congratulating her for the tremendous work that she had accomplished.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the meeting for their applause before recognising the presence of the Speaker of the National Assembly of Namibia, the Honourable Peter Katjavivi, in the room saying she had invited him as he had been the first member of Namibia on the Executive Board of UNESCO between 1993 and 1997 and was therefore Namibia’s first contact with UNESCO, and she invited him to say a few words.
2. **Professor Katjavivi** thanked the Chairperson, saying he was delighted to join the important Conference under her guidance as Chairperson. Professor Katjavivi acknowledged the presence of the other distinguished participants, informing them that it was his great pleasure and honour to deliver brief closing remarks at the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and that it was his sincere hope that the Namibian people and organisers of the important event had been accorded the expected Namibian hospitality. It was also his hope that they had found time during their busy stay to experience a little bit of the cultural diversity of Namibia.
3. He said that culture, including intangible cultural heritage, is a powerful tool in the implementation of sustainable development goals and the 2030 development agenda. The Hanzou Declaration placed culture at the heart of sustainable development policies that were adopted in 2013 in China, recognising culture as a critical asset for the well-being of current and future generations. The declaration also called for full implementation of culture in development as well as the promotion of culture through education, communication and artistic and cultural programmes. The extraordinary power of culture and local content in shaping development was not always acknowledged or recognised in many countries and many citizens, including policy-makers, continued to see culture as a leisure activity rather than as a contributor to assist with poverty reduction, recovery of dignity and belonging, being inclusive in terms of stability and resilient of societies and conflict-resolution and peace-building processes.
4. As speaker of the National Assembly in the Parliament of the Republic of Namibia, **Professor Katjavivi** wished to use this platform to underscore the role of parliaments in emphasising the significance of intangible cultural heritage. Parliaments should facilitate a favourable environment for the promotion of intangible cultural heritage in their respective countries, as besides providing leisure, intangible cultural heritage often played a key role in creating harmony through conflict-resolution during times of conflicts, as well as facilitating peace-building. A people who shared customs, symbols, worship and other cultural aspects had often used these aspects to identify with each other irrespective of political boundaries which often facilitated, identified and provided solidarity as an important aspect of cooperation and refuge, especially during times of conflict due to environmental resource scarcity, civil strife and armed-conflict situations.
5. For those who had participated in the struggle for the liberation of their countries’, their survival today was partly due to the fact that they had been accommodated within neighbouring countries whose citizens shared and identified themselves with the various aspects of cultural and other senses of belonging, and even sharing their pain during the liberation struggle within the Southern African region. Those people had contributed tremendously and added value to the struggle for freedom and independence of Namibia, not to mention the rest of Southern Africa.
6. **Professor Katjavivi** said it was against this background that the UNESCO Secretariat and Member States should redouble their efforts to raise awareness of the objectives of UNESCO’s cultural conventions including the 2003 Convention, while monitoring their implementation. This was especially important as many areas of the world were facing armed conflicts and religious extremism, with an ever-increasing global migration crisis. These issues were easier to deal with when undertaken collectively as part of the international community.
7. **Professor Katjavivi** said that UNESCO Member States should establish effective institutions and institutional coordination mechanisms, and build capacities in the cultural sector. These institutions, among others, would develop evidence-based frameworks to inform public policy regarding the contribution of culture to sustainable human development, carrying out research and analysis in the areas of education, awareness-raising and capacity-building initiatives. It was important that awareness-raising and capacity-building programmes included all segments of societies, including parliamentarians and the general public and people at grass-roots level of our various countries.
8. **Professor Katjavivi** concluded by congratulating the States Parties to the Convention and the rest of the participants who had inscribed their elements during the tenth session on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, and on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in need of Urgent Safeguarding. He also congratulated the States Parties, whose requests for international assistance were approved during this session. It had been a week-long session and Professor Katjavivi congratulated everyone individually and collectively, for having endured the long event while deliberating and contributing to its successful outcome. He said he looked forward to welcoming everyone back in Namibia and wished everyone safe travel as they returned to their respective destinations. It had been Namibia’s great pleasure to host everyone, and he looked forward to meeting again either in Namibia or elsewhere and continuing to network. Professor Katjavivi said he had the pleasure to declare the conference officially closed.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Professor Katjavivi, saying that there were still a few things to do before the official closing of the session.
2. **Professor Katjavivi** interjected that speakers were allowed to jump the gun, but that for his part he had concluded his part of the deliberations.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Professor Katjavivi once again, turning to States or Members of the Committee, and gave the floor to Turkey.
4. The delegation of **Turkey** said this may be the last, but the most pleasant chapter of the conferences. On behalf of the Turkish delegation, the Turkish Government and the Turkish people, the Ambassador expressed his deep satisfaction for the high quality of the leadership and conduct of the tenth session of the Committee. He wished to convey their profound appreciation to all members of the Government of Namibia, the institutions, the ministries and the individual contributors, the civil society and the volunteers and everybody who had become helped to achieve the great success that was the tenth session. He said he wished also to highlight the high level of professionalism of the Secretariat led by Cécile Duvelle and commended the members of the Secretariat and international staff for their excellent contributions. The delegation of Turkey joined the Chairperson in expressing their joy, affection, respect and personal appreciation as a friend, as a professional leader, as an executive, and as an international staff member to Ms Cécile Duvelle, extending best wishes for the next chapter of her life. Her footprints, fingerprints, her smile would always be remembered and could not be endangered as they were now part of UNESCO’s intangible culture. Turkey welcomed Mr Tim Curtis who would succeed Ms Duvelle, believing he would build on the achievements of his predecessor and with whom they would be happy to work.
5. The delegation of **Turkey** welcomed all new Members of the Bureau, commending all the States Parties for their new inscribed elements of intangible cultural heritage which were now part of the world’s assets for humanity to learn from and to promote as part of our common heritage. This would lead to other States Parties to not only share the new additions to our common heritage, but should also set a model for those States Parties with fewer or no elements inscribed on the Representative List to make their best efforts through their nominations to join either the Urgent Safeguarding List or the Representative List.
6. The delegation of **Turkey** also wished to highlight the warmth and generosity of the host government, not only the Conference services, but outside the conference as well. Namibia as a young State had once again demonstrated how committed they were to the common values of the United Nations system and UNESCO, and how appreciative they were of the cultural diversity and richness of Membership of the United Nations. Turkey looked forward to multiplying UNESCO in all its chapters, including that of intangible cultural heritage. In closing, **Turkey** also thanked all those in the logistics and translation services.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Uganda** wished to join Turkey in offering congratulations to the Chairperson for ably chairing the whole session of the tenth session for the last five days. Uganda also wished to send its appreciation to the Government of Namibia for all the support, teamwork and coordination they had given, extending Uganda’s thanks to the Honourable Ministers and the Mayor who was with the delegates on Sunday. Uganda thanked the Secretariat, most especially Ms Cécile Duvelle for her good leadership, having worked with enthusiasm and passion to strengthen the safeguarding and awareness-raising of intangible cultural heritage. Uganda said they were sad that she was leaving, but would be with her in spirit. Uganda welcomed the incoming Secretary to the Convention, saying they were sure he would fit in the shoes of Ms Cécile Duvelle and would work with him to ensure a smooth transition. Uganda also thanked the Members of the Committee for their diligence. Uganda congratulated Ethiopia, first of all for offering to host the eleventh session and for making Africa proud by hosting the second session in a row in an African country, after Namibia. Uganda congratulated the States Parties whose elements were inscribed either on the Lists, programmes registered as Best Safeguarding Practices or those States Parties for receiving international assistance. Uganda also thanked observers, media and general public for supporting the tenth session.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Latvia** expressed its appreciation to the State of Namibia for its warm welcome during the week of the session. Latvia personally thanked her Excellency Ms Trudie Amalungu for leading the debates in her gentle and friendly manner. Latvia also thanked the Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur who contributed to the work of the Committee, and Ms Cécile Duvelle for her constructive work during all her years as Secretary of the Convention. Latvia wished to thank everyone within the Secretariat for their continuous commitment to the implementation of the 2003 Convention, ensuring that international cooperation was carried out in a respectful and effective manner. Latvia expressed their best wishes and encouragement to Mr Tim Curtis for diverse responsibilities he was about to take up, believing that it would become an enriching professional experience. As for the various aspects of implementing the Convention, Latvia looked forward to the broad outreach and capacity-building activities carried out and strengthening of the implementation of the Convention, which was the responsibility of every single State Party. Latvia looked forward to the diverse cooperation networks broadening and contributing to various aspects of reflecting upon and implementing the Convention. The Committee was bringing together representatives from various countries, from various cultures, and connecting to various values. Latvia was committed to Committee’s work, in order for debates to be carried out and the decisions taken as consistently as possible, and thinking of future implementation perspectives of the Convention. Finally, Latvia expressed its thanks to the States Parties to the Convention for entrusting Latvia to contribute to the work of the Committee for four years, that Latvia acknowledged as valuable experience that they would bring to other forms of international cooperation. Latvia thanked all the members of the Committee with whom they had worked, believing that they had continuously learned from each other during the common exercise.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Belgium** said they found this one of the most difficult points on the agenda, because how can they find the words to express their gratitude and thanks to Namibia and to everyone who contributed to the successful organisation of this Committee. First and foremost, in the name of the Federal Government of Belgium but also of regional governments present and the citizens of Belgium, the delegation wished to express thanks for the generosity, professionalism and hospitality that they had experienced. The delegation of Belgium thanked the Chairperson for the wisdom, calm and efficiency she displayed while conducting the meeting, thereby contributing to its success. Furthermore, Belgium expressed their appreciation to the organising committee and everyone not on the podium, the volunteers, those working in logistics at reception, everyone who had helped and contributed to the Committee session. Belgium highlighted the role of the Secretariat and the support from them through the many years Belgium had been a State Party to the Convention and their four years as a member of the Committee. The delegation of Belgium told Ms Duvelle that she had been the pillar of the Convention, the foundation upon which everyone built, their process, their working as a Committee during the General Assembly and thanked her personally. Belgium welcomed Mr Tim Curtis as her replacement, saying he had some very big footsteps to fill, but they were confident that he was up to the task. Belgium closed by thanking the States Parties to the Convention and their fellow members of the Committee, both outgoing ones and incoming; it had been an honour and a pleasure to have served with them, as well as an honour and a pleasure to be in Namibia.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Nigeria** began by congratulating the Chairperson for a job well done. Nigeria thanked the Chairperson for the excellent arrangements and warm hospitality extended to all delegates. The delegation of Nigeria said that, knowing that Ms Amalungu was to chair the meeting, they knew the standards would be very high having always sat next to one another at the Executive Board in UNESCO. Nigeria felt it was a pity that Ms Duvelle was leaving, saying that the little interaction he had had with her at the Secretariat showed that she was someone very thorough, with a wealth of experience and a lot of institutional memory, and was sure that under her mentoring and tutelage Mr Tim Curtis would be able to hit the ground running. The Nigerian delegation thanked all the members of the Committee where Nigeria had noted a strong spirit of consensus, as well as support to each and every Member State. Nigeria had also noted the excellent way the NGOs had participated in the work of the Committee and thanked all the volunteers and officials that had assisted the participation of Nigeria, especially the Namibian delegation at UNESCO and others behind the scenes such as the technicians and interpreters. Nigeria thanked the members that were leaving, including Nigeria, as by the middle of the following year Nigeria’s term would be over, when they looked forward to continuing to follow the work of the Committee and welcome new Members.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Algeria** congratulated and thanked the Chairperson for the able manner in which she had conducted the work of the Committee during the week. The leader of the delegation said for those who knew Namibia, where he had served as the Algerian Ambassador, there were no surprises and that the Chairperson had not only honoured Namibia but the entire African continent. Algeria thanked the Namibian government and the people of Namibia for the hospitality extended during their stay and for the well-organised meeting, the outputs of which were very fruitful. Algeria complimented the constructive attitude of the Committee and expressed their gratitude and thanks to the Secretariat for their excellent work and organisation of the meeting. Algeria also congratulated Ethiopia on its election as the next Chair of the Eleventh Session of the Committee, with Ethiopia being the fourth African country to chair the Committee after Algeria, Kenya and Namibia. Algeria congratulated Mr Tim Curtis on his appointment as the new Secretary of the Convention, wishing him all success in his mission. Last but not least, Algeria expressed their sincere gratitude and thanks to Ms Cécile Duvelle for her dedication and availability as the Secretary of the Convention, saying they would like to renew their unwavering friendship while wishing her all the best in her new life.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Ethiopia** said they had been humbled by the hospitality shown by the Namibian government, starting from the interactions with the Namibian Embassy in Addis Ababa, to the entire week of the meeting in Windhoek where volunteers were always on hand to meet people, escort them to conference rooms and assisting delegates wherever they could. Ethiopia said it had been a humbling experience and one that they would have to live up to, as Ethiopia was the host country for the next meeting.
2. The delegation spoke of how impressed they had been about the cleanliness and order of Windhoek, and that the beauty of having the committee meetings in different countries, gave delegates the opportunity to take home memories, images and observations about other countries. Ethiopia thanked the Secretariat, members of the Committee and many others who had shared the same opinions and observations about the beauty of Namibia.
3. Addressing the Secretary Ms Duvelle, **Ethiopia** recalled that they had met during meetings in Paris, when she had often told them how much Ethiopia had to offer, and that the meeting had been stimulating as Ethiopia had been very passive in this Committee over the past two years. Ethiopia said that their experiences of Ms Duvelle were exactly in line with explanations received from other distinguished members of the Committee earlier; Ethiopia hoped that her completing her term at UNESCO would not mean the end of her relationship with the Committee. Ethiopia said they looked forward to her consultations, experience and wisdom going forward working on intangible cultural heritage in the respective countries and looked forward to seeing her in Addis Ababa next year. Ethiopia expressed their hope that they would fill the big shoes created by the current session, and that hopefully the Chairperson and Ms Duvelle will be there to share their expertise and support in targeting 51 files for the following year.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia, saying they should feel free to take as many pieces of Namibia as they wished, before giving the floor to Hungary.
2. The delegation of **Hungary** thanked Namibia and the Namibian Government for hosting the meeting and wished to thank the volunteers for their unstinting assistance and the Chairperson for chairing the Committee so effectively with many smiles but appropriate strictness. Hungary thanked the Secretariat and particularly Ms Duvelle for assistance received during Hungary’s membership of the Convention, saying that Hungary could learn a lot from her personally, for which they warmly thanked her. Hungary thanked the Secretariat for their professionalism, and the Committee for open-minded and fruitful conversations concerning intangible cultural heritage. While appreciating that this was the time to say Thank You, Hungary felt it was nonetheless important to draw attention to what the Belgian delegation had raised, in that the Committee is in a middle ground concerning the Convention and nominations and how to deal with them, and Hungary felt it was important to continue the conversation as the Convention was not only about the lists, but about cultural heritage and dialogue pertaining thereto, calling for a more professional approach when dealing with cultural heritage.
3. **Hungary** thanked the States Parties who were not members of the Committee but who were here represented and congratulated the State Parties and Member States whose elements were inscribed. Last but not least, Hungary wished to thank the NGOs who participated in the network as without them, ‘governments were just giants without any arms’ and their importance to the work of the Convention could not be overemphasised.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Tunisia** congratulated Namibia for their impressive organisation of the session, commending the Secretariat for their efficiency and commitment to their work. Tunisia expressed their pride in working within the Committee during the term ending in 2016 saying that for Tunisia the journey was a rewarding experience.

[Applause]

1. The delegate of **Peru**, on behalf of their delegation, expressed their satisfaction with everything they had learned in Namibia with the Committee and wanted to personally thank the Chairperson for maintaining good conduct during the debates, a point already emphasised by all previous speakers. Peru thanked the Government of Namibia for their excellent and impressive organisation and to thank all States Parties present, both those who were part of the Committee and those present as observers, saying that the debates, inputs and judgments had much inspired them, taught them many things and they left to continue reflecting on the best ways to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. Peru said they had not forgotten the Secretariat, who always did a great job and thanked them for their dedicated and impeccable work. Peru wished Ms Duvelle a sad goodbye, thanking her for everything she had done for the Convention and the Committee. At the same time, she welcomed Mr Tim Curtis from whom they expected no less than had been expected from the former Secretary.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Côte d’Ivoire** shared the sentiments expressed by all the members who had already spoken and who made homage to the brilliance with which the Chairperson had led the session. Côte d’Ivoire thanked the Secretariat and wished, in addition to these acknowledgments, that Ms Duvelle and her elephant-like memory could continue to serve the Committee, so that the new Secretary could always be able to refer to the previous Secretary. On behalf of the Côte d’Ivoire delegation, the delegate thanked the Government and people of Namibia; she said that during the opening ceremony of the session, she read in the text of the national anthem to ‘be sure to make Africa a tree of life’ and she had seen by the way that guests were greeted, that this vow was translated into reality by the hospitality offered. The delegate closed by thanking Namibia again, as well as Ethiopia for hosting the next session.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Greece** joined the previous speakers from the Committee in their warm appreciation of the work of the Chairperson, the Secretariat, and the work of every other person of Namibia who contributed to the successful Committee meeting. Greece wished the best for Ms Duvelle who would be dearly missed, although Greece was sure that the new Secretary would maintain the high standards of Ms Duvelle. Since it was Greece’s last term on the Committee, the delegation offered a big thanks to all the members of the Committee and Member States with whom Greece had long discussions with through the years, coming out wiser, with a lot more experience. Greece particularly mentioned that the current Committee had resolved many issues that had been dragging on for some years, such as the amendments of the rules of procedure and he Operational Directives, as well as the Code of Ethics which had been a very big step forward. Greece offered that the Committee had done a good job and was sure that this spirit would continue with the next Committee and the General Assembly in June the next year. Greece gave thanks once again, wishing everyone all the best for the next session of the Committee in Ethiopia.

[Applause]

1. The delegation of **Palestine** wished to convey a small technical message regarding the attachment of Palestine to the Convention, informing the meeting that the departments dealing with the Convention in Palestine, in collaboration and close cooperation with the UNESCO Office in Ramallah, had finished working on *inter alia*, a bill to ensure compliance of national legislation in Palestine with the provisions of the 2003 Convention. Palestine offered their gratitude to the Namibian Government and the Namibian people for their warm hospitality and a special thanks to the young volunteers who were very efficient and a great help to everyone. As for Ms Duvelle, Palestine assured her she would be missed while wishing Mr Tim Curtis her successor, all the best. Palestine offered special personal thanks to the Chairperson, saying that her efforts in chairing had made the session a real success, concluding with thanks to the Secretariat and the members of the Committee.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine and recognised the United Arab Emirates, giving the floor to the President of the General Assembly.
2. The delegate of the **United Arab Emirates** said they had been honoured to participate at the opening ceremony as Chairperson of the General Assembly for Intangible Cultural Heritage States Parties; now at the end of the session the delegate wished to express thanks to the Government of Namibia. From high-level officials to the volunteers, everyone made the delegate welcome and Namibia would be well remembered. The speaker thanked the Chairperson, who raised the bar high and made sure that the meeting was successful, and the Secretariat and their large task that was successfully concluded as could be seen by all attending the tenth session as well as the extraordinary sessions since the ratification of the Convention. Their workload was high and more was done than could have been expected, but they had a leader with the leadership of Ms Duvelle with whom the speaker had worked closely, which was agreeable whether they were agreeing or disagreeing. Ms Duvelle raised the challenge for members of the Committee to do their homework in order to meet her suggestions and her relationship with her staff was exceptional. The speaker congratulated Mr Tim Curtis on his appointment to the post of Secretary and the United Arab Emirates would be happy to continue supporting and cooperating with him and the Secretariat towards the further successes of the Convention and the sake of safeguarding our human intangible cultural heritage.
3. The delegate of the **United Arab Emirates** also thanked the members of the Committee for their dedicated efforts to make the session successful, the observers of the States Parties and the NGOs who as some had expressed, are real partners; the speaker appreciated their work and assured them of cooperation. The speaker thanked thee Evaluation Body with whom one could agree or disagree, as that was human nature; they mostly got it right, but not getting it right is only human and that is why the Committee sometimes took the responsibility to participate and correct certain errors, but the Evaluation Body was a major force in the work of this Convention. The delegate assured the meeting that the United Arab Emirates would return home with many memories and with their three nominations having been inscribed in Windhoek, congratulating Ethiopia for taking the initiative to host the coming session when the speaker was sure they would again enjoy African hospitality and generosity.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked all the speakers for their kind words, responding that Namibia was also very humbled and very happy to host them, thanking them for their trust and faith in the young country and nation of Namibia. The Chairperson then gave the floor to Ms Duvelle to say a few words.
2. **Ms Duvelle, the outgoing Secretary of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention** thanked the Chairperson and all who spoken, saying it was her turn to thank their Namibian hosts. A successful committee is a group that combines style and substance and Ms Duvelle said that the organisation, logistics, intelligence and hospitality shown by the Namibian hosts were exceptional and she wished to congratulate and thank them. She thanked her colleagues from the tenth session who would long remain in her memory, in particular the Chairperson Ms Trudie Amalungu who greatly eased the Secretary’s work burden. Ms Duvelle thanked the members of the Committee, States Parties and observing States who were not yet parties, accredited NGOs, non-accredited NGOs and experts, for their collaboration. She recognised many faces of those who had participated in the Committee sessions for many years, but also saw new faces which was pleasing as it was important that the cultural treasures discussed during the sessions were shared, transmitted, and added to the overall direction and shape of intangible cultural heritage, ensuring that experience gained by the Committees was not jealously guarded. Ms Duvelle thanked the UNESCO team in Paris who had worked throughout the session through retransmission of proceedings. Referring to the field staff of UNESCO, she recalled that she had often said that none of the Committee’s achievements in the area of intangible heritage would have happened without them in the field, as it was they who implemented the capacity-building activities. She said it was because the intangible cultural heritage team was an exceptional one, that the results could be offered and appreciated, giving meaning to the mission of international public service. Ms Duvelle here related to the words of the Minister of Education, Arts and Culture of Namibia at the opening of the session: ‘If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together’, saying that the meeting would know which option she had chosen. Ms Duvelle said she was leaving the functions of the organisation but certainly not the intangible cultural heritage, recalling that her father had been an ethnomusicologist and that her earliest memories were of gifts from his travels, of statuettes of Yoruba twins, a bagpipe, a loincloth, a *senza*. She then had the chance to live in Africa for several years, where she came to appreciate the meaning of life, and the values of tolerance, respect and generosity. She then had the great opportunity to work with UNESCO, moreover in an area completely in line with her beliefs, of respect for the equal dignity of cultures and humility before the intelligence of human traditions, anxious to mobilise the values off cohesion and living together in harmony. Reading the morning news of massive corruption scandals in sport, lives lost due to attacks or isolated acts of violence, COP21, with difficult but encouraging negotiations towards a better future and a shared responsibility *vis-a-vis* the planet, which made her think that what had been accomplished during the week was somehow a mirror of that news. There had been a discussion that morning of ethical principles that should guide the actions of all those working with intangible cultural heritage and its safeguarding; proposals for directives had been adopted in order to place this backup in the heart of the effort we have to do to make it truly sustainable development and the service of all peoples. This was a fundamental task that the Committee had accomplished and if the new ethical guidelines and principles could be effectively implemented, they would without doubt change the daily reality of thousands of communities, groups and individuals, protecting and living their intangible heritage. The texts are essential, but actions are even more fundamental and Ms Duvelle said she would follow their work with great interest and attention in the evolution of the beautiful Convention and implementation of its principles. Ms Duvelle wished the Committee every success in their work and had a special thought for her successor, Mr Tim Curtis, who would now carry a heavy burden on his shoulders. She hoped that he would be given the same support and friendship that she had so kindly been offered.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** said that, before giving the floor to Mr Tim Curtis, she wished to hand over a gift to Ms Duvelle to remind her of the very first element of Namibia inscribed on the Representative List, that would also draw her back to Namibia in the near future; she also handed Ms Duvelle a book to guide her through the vast country called Namibia. The Chairperson also had a gift for UNESCO as an Organisation for having brought their Intergovernmental Committee to Namibia and called upon Mr Tim Curtis to say a few words.

[Applause]

1. **Mr Curtis, Incoming Secretary of the Convention**, greeted all present, saying it was a great honour to be present and thanking everyone and particularly the host government of Namibia for the wonderful hospitality that had been received all week. He said it had been a great honour to have been given the responsibility of becoming the next Secretary of the Convention by the Director-General. Having keenly followed the debates all week and looking forward to working with the Secretariat and Committee, following up on many points and suggestions that had been brought forward during the week and in the years to come for the future life of the Convention, which would be a great challenge. However, he said faced an even greater challenge as he would be following an outgoing Secretary who had put the bar at an extremely high level; he said he could not truthfully promise that he would achieve all she had achieved, but he did promise that to try and was extremely grateful to Ms Duvelle for having dedicated so much of her energy and time to helping the Convention move ahead and for resolving so many of the difficulties and challenges that the Convention had faced. Her dedication and devotion to intangible cultural heritage and to the Convention itself was a model to be followed and a source of inspiration and Mr Curtis also thanked Ms Duvelle for the amazing team she was leaving behind. Working from East Africa and South-East Asia, Mr Curtis said he had witnessed how passionate the Secretariat were about their work but that over the past week he have been truly impressed by the sheer volume of work, the teamwork and team spirit they had put into making the meeting a success. Mr Curtis concluded by inviting the team to the podium and inviting Ms Duvelle’s assistant, Ms Josiane Poivre, to say a few words.
2. **Ms Josiane Poivre** (Assistant to the Secretary of the Convention) expressed her wish to say a few personal words on Ms Duvelle’s departure. Citing the famous writer Gibran Khalil Gibran who said ‘Work is love made visible’, Ms Poivre went on to say love is the ups, downs, screaming, crying, gnashing of teeth, rants but at the same time, immense joy and laughter. She said love is pushing others so they give their best and that to give love is to be demanding, tough but fair. Love is also exchange and communication, as we say 'sorry, I was wrong’ or ‘please excuse me’. According to Ms Poivre, love is also sometimes the great moments of solitude, which lead to the questioning of what one does and how one should go forward – something that Ms Duvelle never stopped asking. While Ms Duvelle sometimes went ahead against all odds, taking risks which might have displeased others, Ms Poivre believed it is boldness that allows love to be true. Referring working with Ms Duvelle as an absolutely amazing and wonderful experience, Ms Poivre reminded Ms Duvelle of when she often introduced the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section as a dream team and asked the meeting whether a dream team could exist without a dream chief. Saying that Ms Duvelle is the perfect embodiment of the words of Gibran Khalil ‘work is love made visible’, Ms Poivre extended to Ms Duvelle her most heartfelt thanks on behalf of the entire team of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section.

[Applause]

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Poivre, making a final announcement about transport to the evening’s social function and that delegates should leave their headphones in the room. A Namibian cultural group would give the delegates a send-off performance, and at this stage it was her great pleasure to declare closed the tenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

[Applause]
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