United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Intangible
Cultural
Heritage

13 COM

ITH/18/13.COM/4
Paris, 4 May 2018
Original: English

CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE

Thirteenth session
Port Louis, Republic of Mauritius
26 November to 1 December 2018

Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda:
Adoption of the summary records of the twelfth session of the Committee

Decision required: paragraph 7

1. This document contains the summary records of the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Jeju Island, Republic of Korea, from 4 December to 9 December 2017.

2. Some 738 participants attended the session, among which delegations from twenty-four States Members of the Committee, eighty-seven States Parties not Members of the Committee, three States not party to the Convention, two intergovernmental organizations, six category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, fifty-seven accredited non-governmental organizations to the Committee and nine press/media entities.

3. The full list of participants is available online.

4. The session was conducted in five languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee), Arabic, Spanish and Korean.

5. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.

6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the twelfth session of the Committee were:

Chairperson:	Mr Byong-hyun Lee (Republic of Korea)
Vice-Chairpersons:	Bulgaria, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Palestine and Turkey
Rapporteur:	Mr Gábor Soós (Hungary)

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

DRAFT DECISION 13.COM 4

The Committee,

1. Having examined document ITH/18/13.COM/4,

2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee's twelfth session contained in this document.

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE TWELFTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

[Monday, 4 December 2017, morning session]

ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA: OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/INF.1 Rev.2*

8. The **Chairperson** of the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, **Mr Byong-hyun Lee**, officially opened the meeting, noting that there were more than 730 registered participants. He began by announcing that the debates would be interpreted in five languages: English; French; Arabic, thanks to the generous support of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; Spanish, thanks to the generous support of the Government of Spain; and Korean thanks to the generous support of the Government of the Republic of Korea. The Chairperson extended a warm welcome to all the distinguished delegates, speaking of his honour in welcoming everyone to the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. He also recognized the presence of many Ministers and dignitaries of the States Parties as well as non-States Parties to the Convention, experts and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society. The Chairperson was looking forward to working with the delegates over the forthcoming week. Over the next six days, the Intergovernmental Committee would deliberate on important issues and make decisions for the effective safeguarding of living heritage. As the agenda was very heavy, the Chairperson counted on everybody's cooperation in making their interventions short and succinct. He also introduced the Vice-Chairpersons, who would be called upon from time to time to ensure the smooth progress of the session. They were Bulgaria, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Palestine and Turkey. The Rapporteur was Mr Gábor Soós from Hungary. He then invited Mr Kim Jong-Jin to say a few words on behalf of the Cultural Heritage Administration (CHA) of the Republic of Korea.

9. **Mr Kim Jong-Jin, Administrator of CHA of the Republic of Korea**, greeted the delegates to the six-day session of the twelfth Intergovernmental Committee. For the past year, the UNESCO Secretariat, the Committee's Bureau, the Administration of Cultural Heritage of Korea, and Jeju Province had worked together to prepare for this meeting, which was now in good hands with the Chairperson, the Bureau Members and the Committee Members. Mr Jong-Jin hoped that fruitful results would emerge as a result of the inscription, safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage. Throughout the week, his administration would spare no efforts in supporting the Secretariat. He concluded by thanking the Chairperson, the Assistant Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar and the Secretary, Mr Timothy Curtis, for their hard work, wishing the delegates a successful session.

10. The **Assistant Director-General, Mr Francesco Bandarin**, returned to his earlier keynote address during the official opening ceremony of the previous day and expressed thanks once again to the Government of the Republic of Korea for hosting this Committee session and for the extremely well-organized arrangements. He also expressed gratitude to the Jeju Self-Governing Special Province for its support in the beautiful island of Jeju. Although the key tasks had already been presented, Mr Bandarin wished to bring up the important issue that would be central to the Committee's discussions, which was related to financing. As was well-known, UNESCO was currently facing a difficult situation – the dedicated resources approved in the new C/5 dedicated to the culture Conventions were gradually diminishing. However, this situation was not new in that this had occurred for at least six years. In this regard, UNESCO had made a considerable effort to keep its promise to provide Member States with the services required by the Secretariat of the Convention despite the budget having been cut by a quarter. This was due to the fact that the resources had been concentrated in investing in the functioning of the Conventions, which also generated a lot of success. This

Convention was indeed proof of the success and growth of the UNESCO Conventions, as its global relevance and the number of elements continue to increase. However, success also comes with increasing demands, exacerbating the already difficult situation, with diminished resources and increased demands from States Parties. Thus, the solution had to be sought elsewhere to support the Secretariat, especially in the coming biennium or two biennia, in the form of financing and resources. This could be achieved through the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, which belonged to States Parties and was specifically dedicated to this very important task – or States Parties could provide support bilaterally. This issue was thus critical and Mr Bandarin was certain that UNESCO's new Director-General would also devote a lot of energy to and place the emphasis on trying to increase the resources available for UNESCO and the Conventions.

11. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Bandarin for his words of appreciation addressed to the Government of the Republic of Korea, in particular the CHA and the Jeju Self-Special Governance Office, adding that the financial situation would be addressed later in the agenda. The Chairperson then proceeded to declare the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee open.

12. The **Secretary of the Convention, Mr Tim Curtis**, welcomed all the participants on behalf of the Secretariat and thanked Saudi Arabia and the Republic of Korea for generously financing Arabic and Korean interpretation. It was noted that live video transmission was available online. The Secretary welcomed the press for whom a dedicated press/media room had been set up. As in past years, the session would be paperless with printed documents only available to Members of the Committee upon request. All other participants were invited to download the documents from the dedicated website of the twelfth session. USB keys had also been distributed upon registration, which were generously provided by the host country. A copy of the 2016 edition of the Basic Texts had also been distributed in English or French. These reflect the latest resolutions of the most recent General Assembly and Committee meetings. Copies of the Basic Texts in Arabic, Chinese, Spanish or Russian were also available on request. Electronic copies are available from the Convention website. The list of participants is also available online. It was noted that more than 730 people had registered to attend this session from more than 110 different countries. The Secretary then provided some information regarding those who had received financial assistance to attend the session for which a signature was required, as well as lunch and transport options. Free shuttle buses were provided by the host country, and ushers were available to offer assistance and guide participants.

13. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** moved to the next agenda item.

ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents: *ITH/17/12.COM/2*
ITH/17/12.COM/INF.2.1 Rev.6
ITH/17/12.COM/INF.2.2 Rev.9

Decision: *12.COM 2*

14. The **Secretary** introduced the item and the provisional agenda that included 23 items, some of which contained sub-items. It was noted that this was a full agenda. Items 2 to 4 and items 19, 20 and 22 were customary items of every Committee session, as determined by the Rules of Procedure. Other items were included on the agenda on the basis of specific decisions made in previous sessions of the Committee or the General Assembly. All the remaining items, such as the examination of nominations and periodic reports, were related to Articles of the Convention or to provisions of the Operational Directives. All the documents had been published online by the statutory deadline of 6 November, four weeks before the opening of this session, in accordance with Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, with the exception of document 13 (Report of the informal ad hoc working group), as the working

group's meeting had only taken place on 23 October. This document had been published online on 17 November. The list of documents could be found in document INF.2.2 Rev.9. All the documents had the code ITH/17/12.COM/ followed by the item number. Information documents were preceded by 'INF'. Revised published documents would be suffixed by 'REV'. The agenda of this session could be found in working document 2. It was noted that the twelfth session of the Committee would be a six-day session. The timetable adopted by the Bureau at its meeting on 3 October in Paris could be found in document INF.2.1. In accordance with the timetable approved by the Bureau, items would be examined in the sequence of their agenda numbers, with the exception of agenda item 5.a [Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities (January 2016 to December 2017)], which would be considered after all the items requiring a decision by the Committee, i.e. after agenda item 21. In this way, the report to the General Assembly would reflect the decisions taken during the current session of the Committee. The Committee would then continue with the adoption of its report under agenda item 22. The working hours of the Committee were noted, with the Bureau deciding to extend the duration of the session from five to six days on the condition that the Committee would not hold any night sessions. The Bureau would meet every morning to adjust the provisional timetable as required. Observers were welcome to attend. The Committee was thus asked to adopt the agenda and not the timetable. The Secretary took the opportunity to present some of the side events that would take place during the session. The NGO Forum would have their annual plenary meeting later in the evening. A roundtable on intangible cultural heritage and tertiary education was convened by the International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (ICHCAP) in collaboration with the UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage Section during the lunch break the following day. Finally, a press conference would be held immediately after this morning session.

15. The **Chairperson** remarked on the important issues for discussion during the next six days as well as the very tight schedule, and he thus counted on the Committee's cooperation to keep interventions brief. He invited Members to limit their remarks to the minimum time, and to abstain from taking the floor more than twice in a single item. A timer would indicate the length of each intervention. Members wishing to introduce amendments to the draft decisions could do so by completing the relevant form available both from the Secretariat and on the Convention website, or by submitting written amendments to ich-amendments@unesco.org. Following the debate on each item, the Chairperson would give the floor to Observers, time permitting, and only during a general debate or after a decision had been taken, and not during discussions on draft decisions. Concerning the Report of the Evaluation Body to the Committee, and in particular items 11.a, 11.b and 11.c, 11.d and 11.e, it was noted that the Committee had forty-five files to examine. Fifteen hours would be dedicated to this purpose, which translated into about eigteen minutes per file. Due to this tight schedule, and in order to allow sufficient time to discuss each agenda item, the Bureau meeting on 3 October discussed the need to continue to ensure that debates on nominations proceeded efficiently. Therefore, the Bureau proposed continuing with the working method adopted two years ago. As a general principle, the individual decisions concerning nominations to the Lists, requests for International Assistance and proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices should be adopted without debate, unless a Committee Member wished to raise specific issues. In this case, the Committee Member would be invited to make this known in advance, prior to the Bureau meeting, which would allow the Bureau to better organize the time available for debating these items. Proposed amendments to the draft decisions or requests for debate should be sent by email, or by completing the relevant form available from the Secretariat. As a consequence, the Committee would take it for granted that draft decisions on nominations for which no request for amendment or debate had been put forward could be proposed for adoption as a whole, instead of discussing them on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. This would save time, allowing for more time to debate other nominations that deserved greater attention. Of course, Members of the Committee would be entitled to ask for the floor at any time; this was simply a way to better organize the adoption of draft decisions.

16. The **Chairperson** also presented the procedure with regard to the nine files for which the Evaluation Body proposed draft decisions with two options: 1) to refer the file to the submitting State due to missing information, as per the existing procedure; and 2) to allow the submitting State Party to provide evidence of the missing information at the present session so that it would not have to wait another two years to resubmit the nomination file. As mentioned in its report, the Evaluation Body proposed this system exclusively in the case of files recommended for referral based on the lack of factual information related to criterion R.5/U.5 because the revised format for Section 5 would only be made available for the 2018 cycle. Following the publication of the Evaluation Body's report, the Bureau discussed electronically the best way to proceed with the examination of those nine files. According to Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, the Bureau wished to open the debate on these nine files and invited the submitting States Parties to provide the information related to the questions raised by the Evaluation Body. Therefore, States could send the Secretariat this additional information, which would in turn be forwarded to all the Committee Members. Submitting States were encouraged to send information in writing in both English and French. This was considered important as the documents sent to the Secretariat and examined by the Committee during this session would be attached for the record to the nomination file concerned. During the examination by the Committee of each of the nine files, the Chairperson would invite the representative of the State concerned to answer the questions raised by the Evaluation Body. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.

17. The **delegation of Cuba** congratulated the Chairperson on his election to the Executive Board and for his chairmanship of this Committee. It fully agreed with the hope of moving forward with the rich agenda as much as possible, unlike the situation that had occurred in [Addis Ababa] Ethiopia. However, the most important point was to be able to conduct the debates on all the points in a correct manner. With regard to the sensitive issue of nominations, the delegation believed that it would be judicious to determine a methodology for presenting amendments in advance. In this vein, Members of the Committee had the right to speak, pending the decision on the draft decisions, as not all aspects could be covered prior to the debate on the element or inscription in question. The delegation thus requested the Chairperson's indulgence to allow Members to speak so as to advance as much as possible.

18. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Republic of Korea for its excellent organization and management, and for the opening ceremony. The delegation would try, as far as possible, to respect the recommendations in the conduct of the session in terms of speaking time and working standards. Nevertheless, the Committee Members shared the concern to reach consensual decisions, for which the delegation agreed that Members should only speak once. However, for the sake of seeking a consensus, and if required, Members should be allowed exceptionally to speak again for this sole purpose.

19. The **delegation of Turkey** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and for his hard work during 2017, noting its full confidence that he would bring about successful discussions and outcomes from this meeting. It also extended its deep appreciation and friendship to the people and the Government of Korea, and also to the Jeju Special Governance Office for its warm and generous hospitality, as well as the excellent conference facilities and opening ceremony. Finally, the delegation thanked the Secretariat for its successful organization of this Committee, and it welcomed the dual option put forward [for the Representative List], which it believed would be implemented effectively by this Committee. In this regard, it thanked the Evaluation Body for proposing this working method for files lacking factual information, as this increased dialogue between the Parties concerned, the Evaluation Body and the Committee, and was thus very productive. Regarding the agenda, the delegation proposed merging agenda item 12 [Procedures to facilitate dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State(s)] and item 13 [Report of the ad hoc working group], as they were linked, preferring to address agenda item 13 ahead of item 12.

20. Before turning to the decision, the **Chairperson** invited UNESCO's Deputy Chief of Security for UN coordination, Ms Mary Moné, to say a few words regarding security.

21. **Ms Mary Moné**, **UNESCO Deputy Chief of Security for United Nations Coordination,** spoke as the security advisor for the duration of the meeting session. The current security level in the entire Korean Peninsula was low, and she reassured the delegates that a lot of hard work and effort had gone into ensuring that the necessary security measures were in place. In this regard, Ms Moné thanked the Republic of Korea and the Government of Jeju. Delegates requiring assistance were asked to contact her directly. Other security measures covering first aid, personal security and personal behaviour were outlined. She bid all the delegates a successful Committee session.

22. The **Chairperson** then turned to the draft decision, which was projected onto the screen. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 2 adopted**.

ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:
OBSERVERS

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/3*
Decision: *12.COM 3*

23. The **Secretary** introduced the agenda item, explaining that this item was required by the Committee's Rules of Procedure, according to Articles 8.1 to 8.3. Articles 8.1 and 8.2 stipulate that States Parties that are not Members of the Committee, States which are not Parties to the Convention but which are members of UNESCO, Associate Members of UNESCO, permanent missions Observers to UNESCO, as well as representatives of the United Nations and the United Nations system may participate in the sessions of the Committee as Observers. According to Article 8.3, intergovernmental organizations other than those referred to in Article 8.2 and other public or private bodies, as well as individuals, may also participate in future sessions of the Committee as Observers upon written request. By its Decision 10.COM 3, the Committee authorized the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) to participate in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions of the Committee as an Observer, and the International Centre for Research and Documentation on African Traditions and Languages (CERDOTOLA) to participate in the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Committee as an Observer. By its Decision 11.COM 3, the Committee authorized the participation of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) as an Observer at its twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions. To date, one organization had asked in writing to attend future sessions as an Observer: the African Trade Centre. It was noted that the working document did not mention the participation of accredited NGOs because they are automatically admitted as Observers to Committee sessions in accordance with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure.

24. The **Chairperson** reminded delegates that Observers would only be recognized to speak during a general debate or after a decision had been taken, but not during discussions on draft decisions. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 3 adopted**.

ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA
ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/4*
Decision: *12.COM 4*

25. The **Secretary** presented the report of the eleventh session of the Committee. Although it was a very lengthy document, the report would remain a record of the debates that the Committee might wish to return to during this session or in the future. It was hoped that the report faithfully summarized the interventions of all Members of the Committee and Observers who spoke at the eleventh session of the Committee. The Secretary reminded the delegates that recordings of the debates were available online.

26. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 4 adopted**.

27. Before moving to the next agenda item 5, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there were two reports to be presented: the report of the Chairperson of the Committee on the Bureau activities, and the report of the Non-Governmental Organizations Forum. Presenting the report on the Bureau's activities, the Chairperson noted that the Committee entrusted significant tasks and responsibilities to its Bureau, which enjoyed flexibility in meeting throughout the year, either face-to-face or electronically. Such flexibility allowed important decisions to be adopted for the implementation of the Convention between the two Committee sessions. Outlining the tasks of the Bureau, the Chairperson explained that the Bureau coordinated the work, fixed dates and times, and the order of business of Committee meetings. In addition, the Bureau is also responsible for examining and approving International Assistance requests up to US$100,000. The Bureau also exercises other tasks the Committee might assign to it. The Chairperson spoke of his pleasure in chairing the Bureau, and thanked its Members for their participation, hard work and spirit of cooperation. Since its election, the Bureau had examined and decided on a variety of important issues. So far, there had been two face-to-face meetings and two electronic consultations. The fifth and last meeting was scheduled for the following day. The main decisions taken by the Bureau in the course of the year included its decision to accept the request from the Republic of Korea to change the host city of this session from Seoul to Jeju Island. Secondly, based on previous years' experience, it was decided to extend the duration of the session from five to six days on the condition that there would be no night sessions. Night sessions not only disrupted the evening activities planned by delegations, but more importantly they also disrupted the deliberations and decisions on the important issues affecting the implementation of the Convention. The Bureau was also asked to study important budgetary questions. The Committee, by its Decision 10.COM 9, delegated to the Bureau the authority to decide upon the utilization of the funds allocated under 'Other functions of the Committee' in the plan for the use of the resources of the Fund. In 2016, the Bureau approved the utilization of those funds in the 2016–2017 biennium. In 2017, the Bureau approved the proposal of the utilization of the Fund presented by the Secretariat for the first six months of 2018. However, most of its work in 2017 was dedicated to the examination of International Assistance requests. So far, the Bureau had examined eleven financial assistance requests: nine International Assistance requests up to US$100,000; one preparatory assistance request; and one Emergency Assistance request. At its meeting scheduled for the following day, the Bureau would discuss and decide on four more requests up to US$100,000. In other words, by the end of its mandate, the current Bureau would have examined fifteen financial assistance requests in one year. This high number was a record for the Bureau and testified to the effectiveness of the measures taken at the sixth session of the General Assembly in 2016 to increase the amount of International Assistance requests that the Bureau could examine from US$25,000 to US$100,000. Of the eleven requests examined so far, the Bureau had approved four International Assistance requests from Colombia, Cuba, Morocco and Uganda, one preparatory assistance request from Namibia, and the Emergency Assistance request from Niger.

28. The **Chairperson** presented a summary of the projects. The four International Assistance requests up to US$100,000 included: i) a project in Morocco aiming to safeguard the female chants of Taroudant in the south-west of the High Atlas Mountains in Morocco; ii) a project in Colombia aiming to safeguarding knowledge associated with the stewardship of sacred sites of the jaguar shamans of Yuruparí settled along the Pirá Paraná River of the Colombian Amazon; iii) a project in Cuba aiming to identify, define and inventory intangible cultural heritage present in Guantanamo, the easternmost province of the country; and iv) a project in Uganda aiming to raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage among management and academic staff at four universities in Gulu, Kampala, Nkozi and Fort Portal. Namibia's preparatory assistance request concerned the nomination of Aixan (gâna/ōb ǂans tsî//khasigu), ancestral musical sound knowledge and skills, to the Urgent Safeguarding List. The emergency request from Niger had been prepared in the context of a rise in religious fundamentalism in the region. Mobilizing living heritage as an instrument for unity, integration and peace, the project incorporated a community-based needs identification, capacity-building training workshops, an awareness-raising campaign and activities directed at

supporting dialogue among communities, together with the identification of living heritage practices affected by the crisis in the two pilot regions, the provinces of Diffa and Tillabéry. This emergency request from Niger demonstrated that States recognize the role of intangible cultural heritage as a source of resilience, dialogue and social cohesion between displaced populations and host communities. The variety of these six approved projects testified to the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and to the multiple forms that safeguarding can take.

29. The **Chairperson** also remarked that during the course of the year, the Bureau had been confronted with the fact that many States still encountered difficulties in preparing International Assistance requests that met the criteria laid out in Chapter 1.4 of the Operational Directives. Regrettably, the Bureau had decided to refer three requests back to the submitting States, and not to approve two other requests. He would of course report back to the Committee following the Bureau's scheduled meeting that coming Wednesday to examine four more International Assistance requests. The Chairperson also informed the Committee that as a result of the meetings of the Ad Hoc Working Group (sub-group 2) on governance established by the 38th session of the General Conference of UNESCO, which called for greater transparency with regard to the Bureau meetings of all Conventions, the agenda, documents and decisions of each Bureau meeting of the Committee would be published online and available for consultation. The Chairperson then opened the floor for comments and questions. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson invited the representative of the NGO Forum to briefly present the report on their activities. It was recalled that in Baku, in 2013, the Committee had decided to systematically include the outcomes of the Forum in its sessions.

30. A **Representative of the ICHNGO Forum** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to address the Committee. Since the last Committee session, the NGO Forum had strengthened its governance, notably by formalizing the structure of its steering committee. Its first elections would take place that week for representatives from each of the six regional groups to take part in the Forum's collective decision-making process. From 1 to 3 December 2017 in Jeju, the NGO Forum had organized and delivered its first international capacity-building workshop for accredited NGOs. The objective was to train a series of accredited NGOs in every region over the coming years that could move forward in building on outreach and regional networks for a larger audience of NGOs and civil society in their respective regions. The exchange of experiences and discussions was thus an important achievement for the hundred or so persons who attended this event. The NGO Forum expressed special thanks to Indonesia and the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation for their valuable support. Thus, through a global strategy for increasing the involvement of accredited NGOs in the implementation of the 2003 Convention at the national and (sub)regional levels, strong efforts were being made to develop regional NGO networks in the coming years. The NGO Forum would be launching these regional networking groups during the present Committee session. Despite experiencing some challenges in its financing, the NGO Forum had so far worked on a voluntary basis, engaging in the work of the Convention by organizing symposia, capacity-building activities, international cooperation projects, information-sharing and newsletters. It had also participated in the open-ended working group in China in June 2016 on the global framework for assessing the success of the Convention.

31. A second **Representative of the ICHNGO Forum** [presenting in French] spoke of the vast diversity of accredited NGOs, which offered the Convention an opportunity to draw upon their capacities in the many fields of expertise that contribute to the implementation of the Convention, including community engagement, cultural action, safeguarding methodologies, result monitoring and reporting, awareness raising, mediation and translation between policies and practitioners, and international cooperation and networking. As noted in agenda item 17 [Accreditation of new NGOs and review of accredited NGOs], the Forum shared the view that accredited NGOs currently played a formal and limited role in the structure of the Convention, and it looked forward to collaborating towards a more active and efficient role in order to enhance the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at local, national and international levels. This is why the Forum considered it important to review the criteria for

accreditation. In this regard, it enthusiastically welcomed the creation of an informal working group with States Parties, the Secretariat and NGOs (including the NGO Forum) to enhance the formal contribution of NGOs to the implementation of the Convention. Throughout this week, the Forum had planned a programme of events open to all delegates, which included the NGO open market installed in the entrance hall, the #Heritage Alive book launch, and the different working group sessions on research, ethics and the African continent. He urged the delegates to work together towards the common goal of safeguarding the wealth of multiple and diverse traditions throughout the world, and concluded by extending warm appreciation to the Government of Korea for organizing this event.

32. The **Chairperson** took the opportunity to thank the Forum for its continuous efforts, and to acknowledge the vital role of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention at the national and international levels, and in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The role of the NGOs would be further discussed under agenda item 17.

ITEM 5.b OF THE AGENDA

REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/5.b*

Decision: *12.COM 5.b*

33. The **Secretary** began by remarking on the busy year of activities from January 2016 to June 2017, which was cumulative with the report presented at the Committee's eleventh session in 2016. However, the report did not cover the activities undertaken since June 2017. Moreover, the report should be read in tandem with the financial statement regarding the Convention's Fund for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (Document 7). The report also reflected the extent of the Secretariat's work based on the 38 C/5 results framework and, more specifically, the performance indicators of Expected Result 5. It also covered the Secretariat's utilization of the funds made available from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund under the budget line 'Other Functions of the Committee', as approved by the Bureau. In this context, the document was structured around three parts: i) key achievements; ii) key challenges and ways forward; and iii) the Annex, which presented a detailed table of progress against targets for the five performance indicators of the 38C/5. The Secretary turned to the **key achievements**, the details of which could be found in paragraphs 5 to 23, and he began with the statutory support that was centred on three lines of action: i) the organization of meetings with fifteen statutory meetings organized between January 2016 and June 2017, leading to the adoption of key decisions for the Convention; ii) the treatment of eighty-seven nominations to the Lists, eleven proposals for the Register and twenty-two requests for International Assistance (the Secretariat had succeeded in remaining on schedule for the 2017 and 2018 cycles despite the workload); and iii) the examination of fifty-five new requests for NGO accreditation and the treatment of forty-four reports in view of renewal by the Secretariat. For information, the Convention had seen the ratification of eleven new States Parties and one extension of territorial application such that there were now 175 States Parties to the Convention, which was close to universality. In the field of intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development, a new chapter in the Operational Directives had been adopted in 2016, which was aligned with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), as well as the operationalization of the linkages between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development with the development of policy guidance notes and capacity-building activities. With regard to International Assistance, the Secretary recalled that in 2016 the General Assembly had decided to increase the ceiling of International Assistance requests examined by the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000, which had already attracted States Parties. Before this decision, only 19 per cent of requests had been directed to the Bureau (the rest being directed to the Committee), whereas since the decision 73 per cent of International Assistance requests had gone to the Bureau. This meant that States Parties did not need to choose between International Assistance requests and nominating files to the Lists or Register [as had previously been the case]. Technical

assistance had also proven to be a highly useful mechanism in supporting submitting States in the finalization of their requests. However, much remained to be done in terms of monitoring the results of the implementation of these projects, which had the potential to become a major operational and learning tool for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. This would be discussed in more detail under item 8.a [Reports of States Parties on the use of International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund].

34. The **Secretary** then spoke of the work on the development of the overall results framework, which had taken up a lot of the Secretariat's time during the reporting period and was the subject of agenda item 9 that would be discussed later. With regard to the Secretariat's collaboration with the category 2 centres, the Secretary highlighted a few important points. Firstly, two annual meetings had taken place between the centres and the Secretariat, which provided an opportunity to exchange information on recent developments in the life of the Convention, and to discuss new perspectives for fields of cooperation and future synergies between the centres, as well as between UNESCO and the centres. Secondly, the Centre in Algeria would soon become operational and would thus become an important partner for the effective implementation of the Convention in Africa. The renewal of the agreement between UNESCO and four States Parties for the continuation of the activities of four category 2 centres had recently been approved by the Executive Board of UNESCO. This concerned Bulgaria for the centre in Sofia, China for CRIHAP, Japan for IRCI, and the Republic of Korea for ICHCAP. Thirdly, the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) of UNESCO had recently completed an 'Audit of the UNESCO's Management Framework for Category 2 Centres' in which it underlined the heavy workload of the Secretariat in ensuring the cooperation with and evaluation of category 2 centres, as well as the mismatched expectations between UNESCO and category 2 centres. In this regard, it was of the outmost importance for category 2 centres to be aligned with the approved Programme and Budget for the Organization (39 C/5), and to adhere to its strategic vision and guiding principles. In the near future, the governing bodies of UNESCO might make some decisions in this regard. Nevertheless, the Secretary was happy to note that as far as the centres working on intangible cultural heritage were concerned, visible progress and improvements had been observed with regard to the alignment of their work plans with the C/5 and the overall programmes and priorities of UNESCO.

35. The **Secretary** then turned to the subject of capacity building, which is at the core of the Secretariat's operational support for States Parties for the implementation of the Convention and thus a high priority for States Parties. The Secretary briefly mentioned that activities had been initiated or implemented through UNESCO Field Offices with backstopping from Headquarters in more than seventy countries over the last three years. It was noted that multi-year projects based on the global UNESCO capacity-building programme for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage were mainly funded through voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund or extrabudgetary resources channelled through Funds-in-Trust Agreements. In addition, external evaluations had been conducted on some of the large multi-country projects, notably the JFIT project for the ASPAC region, and the Flanders project for PALOP countries in Africa[1], which highlighted the significant progress made in the areas of mobilizing stakeholders, strengthening the institutional infrastructure required for safeguarding, and developing community-based inventorying frameworks and collaboration among the project countries. However, there were challenges. More support was required to strengthen capacities in the areas of preparing safeguarding plans and developing policies and legislation across multiple sectors in the context of national development strategies, and for engaging with Agenda 2030, for example. In this regard, the Secretary invited the delegates to watch a training video on policy development in the field of intangible cultural heritage and to get an update on new materials during the information sessions on the capacity-building programme that would take place [during the session]. The Secretariat had also developed a fully-fledged needs assessment. This new approach had been used in fifteen countries and had proved very efficient in designing capacity-building

1 Japanese Funds-in-Trust (JFIT); Portuguese-speaking African countries (PALOP).

projects that responded specifically to a country's needs. This activity started from the premise that the involvement of national authorities from the outset of a project cycle, namely the needs assessment planning phase, was a prerequisite in the preparation of credible proposals, and particularly their effective implementation. In this regard, UNESCO provided specialized expertise to carry out on-site consultations in the potential beneficiary country so as to identify the needs as well as the objectives and key activities of a future capacity-building project in close collaboration with national institutions in charge of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO would then develop a multi-year project based on the needs identified, which could be addressed by the capacity-building programme. By identifying needs with the participation of beneficiaries, including government agencies, communities, experts and stakeholders, this approach lays the foundation for enhanced ownership of the capacity-building project.

36. The **Secretary** further explained that the implementation of the capacity-building strategy was supported by the global network of facilitators. Regular regional meetings were thus organized to share experience and lessons learned, and to maintain a level of competence and knowledge that was up-to-date with the developments of the Convention. Facilitators are thus key partners for the Secretariat with regard to achieving greater outreach. However, as the Convention is expanding, it also needs to expand its network of partners. In the same vein, tertiary education also has a key role to play in supporting the capacity-building strategy in implementing the Convention as universities train future administrators, decision-makers and managers for intangible cultural heritage. In this regard, the Secretariat had conducted two regional surveys and held symposia (in Asia and the Pacific, and in Latin America and the Caribbean) on how universities integrate intangible cultural heritage into their postgraduate programmes, and it provided support to the European network on cultural management and policy (ENCATC) to do the same in Europe. It was noted that category 2 centres are strong partners in this work, and the Secretary informed the Committee that ICHCAP was organizing a side event in collaboration with the Secretariat on this topic the following day [on Tuesday]. The Secretary also recalled that the capacity-building programme had started six years ago, and it was thus timely to assess and envision its future. In particular, a strategy workshop with facilitators from every region had been held in Bangkok (Thailand) in March 2017 to take stock and reflect on the experiences and lessons learned. The meeting had highlighted several new strategic directions for the network and for the delivery of the programme at the country level, such as the continued need and challenge of building institutional structures, legal and political frameworks, and human resources, among other things. Furthermore, there was a continuing demand for capacity-building services expressed individually by Member States, but the services themselves also needed to be adapted to the evolving capacity of the Members States, as expressed collectively through the decisions of the General Assembly and the Committee. On this basis, an updated strategy would be submitted to the Committee for approval at the present session under agenda item 6.

37. The **Secretary** also underlined the new guidance note for inventorying intangible cultural heritage requested by the Committee at its tenth session in 2015. Its purpose was to provide guidance to States Parties, NGOs and communities on the process of inventorying intangible cultural heritage and the preparation of inventories of elements of intangible cultural heritage, and it was now available on the Convention website in English and French. During the course of the reporting period, the Secretariat had started working more vigorously on a key but relatively neglected safeguarding measure of the Convention pertaining to its Articles 2.3 and 14, namely the transmission of intangible cultural heritage through formal and non-formal education. In order to kick-start this process, the Secretariat had held a strategic inter-sectoral consultation meeting in May 2017 with colleagues from the Education Sector of UNESCO, and particularly the Regional Offices for Education and the Education institutes and programmes. The Secretary was happy to report that the meeting had been extremely positive. Education colleagues had acknowledged that intangible cultural heritage could provide context-specific content and pedagogy for all levels of education, across all subjects and topics, for example education for the prevention of violent extremism, global citizenship,

and technical and vocational training (TVET), which feature prominently in SDG4 on quality education and lifelong learning for all. It was thus clear during that meeting [read the report here] that there was a shared interest between colleagues from the two sectors, as integrating intangible cultural heritage into formal and non-formal education would prove beneficial both in terms of enhancing the transmission and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, as well as in addressing key issues in improving the quality of education. The intention was that this would primarily be implemented by Field Offices, making close collaboration with the Education Sector indispensable. To this end, the Secretariat submitted a new funding priority to the Committee, as well as an extension to the capacity-building programme, as referenced under agenda item 6 and document 6. Additionally, an information session dedicated to this topic would be held at lunchtime on Wednesday.

38. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that following a request by the Committee in 2016, with regard to intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, the Secretariat had piloted activities on the role communities play in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage at risk in situations of emergency, and how it could be mobilized as a tool for preparedness, resilience and reconciliation. Support was also provided for the preparation and implementation of the emergency International Assistance requests from Côte d'Ivoire, Mali, Niger and Vanuatu, as referenced under agenda item 15 and document 15. Finally, in relation to outreach and communications, the Secretary reported that important steps had been taken to design a robust framework to promote the objectives of the Convention, and a short presentation on the achievements made on this subject would be presented later. The **Secretary** then wished to present the key challenges and ways forward, as detailed in paragraphs 24 to 28 of the Secretariat's report. The document identifies three main challenges in going forward: i) the continued low implementation of the International Assistance mechanism, which would be discussed further under agenda item 7; ii) the implementation of the capacity-building strategy as it continually adapts to the evolving needs of States Parties, and for which the demands still exceed the capacity to deliver; and iii) the need to develop more robust outreach and communication for the Convention. It was thus apparent that after ten years dedicated to obtaining ratifications, setting up the procedures and mechanisms of the Convention, and supporting implementation through capacity building, the Convention was entering the next stage in which a number of new and emerging issues would come to the fore, while the need to assess and broaden its impact at various levels would become increasingly evident. This new phase thus called for a systematic and broad stocktaking of the impact of the Convention, as well as a broader implementation of activities. A number of items for discussion during this Committee pointed to this, such as the discussion on the overall results framework, the relation of intangible cultural heritage to the SDGs, and the reflection on the transfer of elements, which ultimately drew attention to the meaning and purpose of the Lists, and the role of accredited NGOs, among other considerations. Of course, capacity building would remain a fundamental priority, but new areas of work on the ground needed to be initiated. In this regard, the Secretariat had started investing time and resources into two themes: intangible cultural heritage and education; and intangible cultural heritage and emergency situations, as previously mentioned. The possibilities and potential for this Convention were thus vast and it had a bright future, but the human and financial resources that were required for its sustained growth continued to be extremely worrying. Indeed, the demands on the Secretariat increased as the number of States Parties expanded, and yet the resources to meet those demands were diminishing.

39. The **delegation of the Philippines** warmly thanked the Government and people of the Republic of Korea for their gracious hosting and congratulated the Chairperson on his election as Chair of the Committee and also the Executive Board. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat, led by Mr Tim Curtis, for its report. Despite the serious human and financial resource constraints, it recognized the dedicated work of the Secretariat and the crucial role it plays in the overall safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage worldwide. For this reason, the delegation endorsed the calls to strengthen the capacities of the Secretariat, and welcomed the new States Parties to the Convention, which showed the great interest in intangible cultural heritage across all regions of the world. In this regard, the delegation

believed that more work needed to be carried out in promoting the use of International Assistance in other regions, especially with a view to community-centred programmes in Asia and the Pacific Island States. It supported the focus on integrating living heritage into education systems, for example the Philippine National Cultural Heritage Act included provisions for incorporating intangible cultural heritage into basic education, which would be discussed later [under agenda item 15 on 'emergencies']. The delegation noted, in paragraph 23, the development of an outreach and communication strategy, and thus requested more information on the partner company undertaking the strategy, its associated costs and timelines, and which of the fifty stakeholders had been consulted, its basic parameters, and so on, adding that this would be useful ahead of the Committee's endorsement. The delegation appreciated the section on key challenges, particularly the point that the Convention is constantly evolving and that the intangible cultural heritage system needed to adapt to the changing needs and interests. A stocktaking of the impact on the Convention in this field would be a necessary exercise to determine its gaps and future directions. It believed that the Committee and the General Assembly should engage in more strategic and forward-looking discussions, and the informal ad hoc working group could be one platform to encourage such in-depth reflections. In conclusion, the delegation had submitted an amendment to the draft decision that was co-sponsored by other delegations.

40. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Republic of Korea for it generous hosting and for the impressive opening ceremony. It also congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent report, and appreciated all its achievements and commitment considering the high workload. It was pleased to note that 175 States Parties had already committed to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage on their territories, which represented near universal ratification. A major topic had become the implementation of the new chapter in the Operational Directives on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. On the one hand, issues like climate change, urban development and health certainly have an impact on intangible cultural heritage; on the other hand, living heritage could certainly contribute to the implementation of the SDGs, particularly SDG4[2]. The delegation thus welcomed the new programmatic focus on intangible cultural heritage and education. Likewise, it continued to support the focus on capacity building, adding that it was satisfying to hear the number of activities that had taken place thanks to the Secretariat, but also to the global network of facilitators and the new training materials provided online, for which it looked forward to working on these topics and sharing its experience. In addition, the increase in International Assistance requests was seen as very promising, as the first fruits of increasing the ceiling for submissions through the Bureau. A recurrent topic during the recent General Conference was the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in emergency situations, e.g. armed conflicts and natural or human-induced hazards, and it welcomed the contributions of the Convention to this important topic in terms of preparedness, resilience and reconciliation. Regarding the monitoring of the Convention and the high number of overdue reports, the delegation congratulated the Secretariat on increasing the reports submitted compared to the previous year thanks to the updated aide-memoire, the dedicated websites, e-letters and online forms. Nevertheless, the high number of overdue reports was still a cause for concern. The delegation welcomed the proposed new reporting system based on regions, aligned with the overall results framework and facilitated by regional workshops, capacity building and peer learning. It also took note with great interest of the outreach and communication strategy of the project carried out with a partner company, and it appreciated more information in this regard as mentioned by the Philippines.

41. The **delegation of Mongolia** expressed deep appreciation to the host country, the Republic of Korea, for organizing the twelfth session of the Committee, noting the important role it played in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the Asia-Pacific region, and for the fruitful cooperation between the Republic of Korea and Mongolia in this field. It thanked the Secretariat for the excellent report and for its continued support shown to Mongolia, for example in the organization of the capacity-building workshop on inventorying in Mongolia.

2 Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

The delegation believed that the involvement of NGOs and civil society organizations is crucial in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Mongolia was honoured to serve as a Committee Member for a third year, adding that its productive collaboration with the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section of UNESCO would continue in the future. It took the opportunity to invite the delegates to a Mongolian folk art performance to be held during a side event the following day. The delegation concluded by wishing the Chairperson and the delegates a successful and efficient session.

42. The **delegation of Turkey** congratulated the Secretary and his staff for their efforts and dedication despite the limited budget and resources, as well as the high workload. The delegation also welcomed the new States Parties that had recently ratified the Convention, which was about to reach complete universality, encouraging the Secretariat to continue its efforts in this regard. As a Bureau Member, Turkey had noted that the rise in the financial limit for approving International Assistance requests by the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000 had helped to increase the utilization of the Fund. As the report revealed, requests submitted in the periods rose to 73 per cent compared to the previous biennium. Nevertheless, the Committee should look into ways to develop a more targeted strategic and long-term approach to this issue, together with the problem of diminishing extrabudgetary funding. It commended the Secretariat for the initiatives taken to address the issue of overdue reports, noting that the generous contribution of the Republic of Korea would be instrumental in improving the situation. However, despite all the efforts, this continued to be a problem. For this reason, the delegation believed that this issue should be examined in depth under agenda item 10 [draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting] and it welcomed the efforts for the development of the overall results framework by the working group, thanks to China's generous support. Once adopted, it would be an important milestone in increasing the impact of the Convention. The delegation also believed that UNESCO Chairs were important actors within the framework of this Convention, and it wondered whether these centres could also be invited to annual coordination meetings. It also sought to know how the Secretariat had been coordinating its work with the Chairs. On this occasion, Turkey was happy to announce that in 2017 an Intangible Cultural Heritage Chair had been established in Gazi University in Ankara in Turkey, the Chair of which is the President of the National Commission. It was noted that one important aspect of the Committee's work in this biennium had been the introduction of emergencies into the intangible cultural heritage agenda, with a comprehensive perspective that included not only armed conflict situations, but also natural disasters and displacements, which it commended. The delegation also took note of the developments regarding the development of the outreach and communication strategy, and it sought more information on when the strategy would be finalized, how the Secretariat was planning to implement it, and whether the Secretariat foresaw any financial difficulty in its implementation. There was no doubt that the capacity-building programme was critical to States Parties in their implementation of the Convention, and it noted from the report that a number of activities had been carried out under the programme. Finally, one of the major challenges of this Convention continued to be the lack of financial and human resources of the Secretariat. The delegation remarked that the Secretariat continued to serve Member States despite the increasing number of States Parties, and thus States should look into ways to address this challenge during the present Committee meeting.

43. The **delegation of Senegal** warmly congratulated the Secretariat for the working document and for its exceptional work considering the budgetary constraints. Senegal understood these current issues and offered its strong support, adding that Senegal's culture policy placed culture at the heart of public policies. With regard to the report on capacity building, since 2016 Senegal had initiated a national programme for intangible cultural heritage through training workshops, as well as work on an inventory in close collaboration with the UNESCO Regional Office in Dakar, which had provided an expert. Regarding education, Senegal had been working with Cheikh Anta Diop, Gaston-Berger of Saint-Louis and Dakar universities for two years, as well as with NGOs that had allowed it to reach its objectives in establishing tools for the promotion and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation reported that this training programme had been completed in October 2017 with a national

seminar on inventory techniques, as well as the development of strategic tools. This work would continue into 2018 in collaboration with UNESCO for the inventory and the production of a national strategy with plans for cultural development across all regions. In this vein, Senegal had submitted a request to UNESCO for assistance.

44. The **delegation of Hungary** joined the delegations in thanking and congratulating the Government of Korea and the Jeju Special Self-Governing Provincial Government for their hospitality and warm welcome, and for the dynamism of the opening ceremony. It congratulated the Chairperson on his election and his chairmanship of the Executive Board. The delegation also spoke of its appreciation of the work carried out by the Secretary and his dedicated staff for the report and for their many achievements in the past year. In terms of ratification, the delegation noted that the Convention was nearing universality, and it welcomed the ten new States Parties. In terms of inventorying at the national level, it noted that the Secretariat had rightly pointed out its importance in the Convention and had prepared guidelines on inventories for States Parties in this regard. These guidelines were indeed a very good way forward and further reflection on this theme was needed, which could also perhaps be part of the Operational Directives. The delegation highlighted the important link between safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development at the national level in particular, remarking that the SDGs referred to in the report, in particular SDG4, could also be supplemented by referring to SDG11 and SDG12. In terms of International Assistance, the delegation highlighted the importance of this point, which also came across in the Chairperson's report, as this was a means of gathering momentum in the implementation of the Convention. It was of the view that substantial monitoring and an analytical review of the impact of International Assistance were indeed important and should be followed up. In terms of periodic reporting, it was noted that the monitoring interface had been made available online, and as capacity building was indeed one of the backbones of the Convention, it greatly appreciated the work in this regard and warmly thanked the countries that had provided financial support. Regarding intangible heritage and education, the delegation highlighted the relevance of tertiary education, as mentioned in the report. From experience in Hungary, this was indeed a key field of study for developing administrators for safeguarding living heritage. It also believed in the importance of the communication strategy, and thus sought more information in this regard, i.e. on the timeline of its implementation. Given the confusion, as pointed out by the Evaluation Body, between the 1972 Convention and the 2003 Convention, the communication strategy was understandably very important for the sake of clarity. Finally, the delegation agreed with the presentation given concerning the challenges faced in the implementation of this Convention, and it shared the view of the need to place the focus on making a meaningful contribution to the SDGs. In addition, education and intangible cultural heritage in emergencies should be at the forefront and underpinned by a robust capacity-building programme.

45. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** thanked the delegations for their compliments on the hosting of the session and on the opening ceremony; the event had been organized with the utmost care by the host country and Jeju Province. The Republic of Korea congratulated the Chairperson on his election and extended deep gratitude to the Secretariat for its invaluable efforts in preparing this Committee. The delegation believed the increasing number of States Parties indicated the growing visibility of the Convention at the international level, and it warmly welcomed the ten new States Parties. It noted in particular the countries joining from the Asia-Pacific region: East Timor, Thailand and Tuvalu. It was also happy to note the extended application of the Convention to the Netherlands for Curaçao. The delegation recognized the Secretariat's effort in implementing the Convention in the face of its limited human and financial resources over the past years, and hoped the Secretariat would continue its good work in International Assistance, establishing a framework for the Convention and further strengthening the capacity-building programme in intangible cultural heritage and education.

46. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked the Republic of Korea for its generous commitment to the Convention, as well as the authorities of Jeju Island for their welcome. It thanked and congratulated the Secretariat for the breadth and quality of its work, adding that the 175

States that had ratified the Convention were proof of the quality of the Secretariat's work. The delegation also wished to emphasize that the future of the Convention lay in the development of capacity building, as had been demonstrated in the meeting organized in Constantine in Algeria in 2015 for the facilitators of the African continent. It thanked the Secretariat for noting the progress of the category 2 centre for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage for the African continent, which had been granted to Algeria. Indeed, the Centre was progressing well and the first board of directors would take place in the coming months.

47. The **delegation of Ethiopia** congratulated the Chairperson, confident of successful deliberations under his able guidance and leadership. It also congratulated the Korean Government and the people who had worked hard to host the Committee. As the previous host, Ethiopia understood all the challenges and beauty of being a host country, and it had been enjoying both the tangible and intangible heritage since its arrival in Jeju. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat for its hard work and for the excellent report, despite its lack of resources. It noted the promising increase in the number of States Parties ratifying the Convention. Requests for International Assistance and capacity building had also been increasing over the years, as the Convention attracted more interest and success. However, this meant that serious consideration was needed to better manage the expectations of States Parties with the lack of human resources of the Secretariat; an important issue that clearly required an effective solution. The delegation also appreciated the focus on educational institutions to support the implementation of safeguarding measures, as well as a tool to reinforce UNESCO's action for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in the event of armed conflict. Ethiopia had ratified the Convention in 2006 and immediately started its inventory thanks to the International Assistance received from the Secretariat. Today, almost 90 per cent of the intangible culture of the different communities was nationally inventoried and had been published in ten volumes so far. Ethiopia had also been working hard to raise awareness about this Convention, and the three nominations previously inscribed on the Representative List served as great tools to increase its visibility across communities in Ethiopia. Regarding periodic reporting per Electoral Group, the delegation believed that this would indeed enhance international cooperation mechanisms established under the Convention, such as inscriptions on the Lists and requests for International Assistance, as well as the examination of national reports and the accreditation of NGOs. Ethiopia also believed that this would will help other African nations to create synergies in both addressing the challenges encountered by the Group as a whole, as well as increasing the visibility of the Convention. It could also help enhance the impact of the Convention through the crucial role of intangible cultural heritage as an enabler of sustainable development and mutual understanding.

48. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the information presented in the report, and acknowledged the Secretariat's work throughout the year on the Committee and the General Assembly, particularly at this difficult time with the current budgetary and financial situation affecting the Secretariat and the staff of UNESCO. On behalf of the Government of Cuba, the delegation was thankful for the financial assistance provided for the important Guantanamo project, a region greatly affected by natural phenomena, which would allow Cuba to take a step forward regarding intangible heritage inventories in the region. The delegation raised two points regarding UNESCO's strategy for the protection of heritage in the event of armed conflict in emergency situations, adding that this was indeed a very important issue and was likely to be an important subject of debate over the next two years. It could also provide guidance to the Executive Board regarding how the Committee and the Convention could contribute to this strategy. Another point of emphasis was while the culture Conventions are of fundamental importance on the field, eighty per cent of the Culture Sector's budget remains at Headquarters. Therefore, it was very important that the work undertaken during International Assistance projects be felt on the ground. Cuba had expressed this concern during the 39th General Conference, adding that States Parties should work together to think about how this could best be achieved as Convention instruments were the most important tools for linking work on culture with Headquarters and the field. The delegation also stressed the importance of Small Island Developing States,

which was covered by the Cuban project in terms of developing intangible cultural heritage, and it renewed its thanks for the financial assistance received in this regard.

49. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** thanked the Republic of Korea for the warm welcome, offering congratulations for the organization of this session. It also congratulated the Secretariat for the new ratifications, especially from Africa, which proved the importance of the Convention to Africa, as well as the awareness generated by the Executive Board and the Secretariat in favour of these countries. The delegation welcomed the increase in International Assistance from US$25,000 to US$100,000, recalling the tenth session in Namibia [in 2014] when there were very few requests. In this regard, the Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Secretariat for the assistance granted to it, which helped refine its national inventory. Nevertheless, the Secretariat's lack of financial and human resources continued to be a worrying problem, and it hoped that a solution could be found during the present session.

50. **The delegation of Palestine** congratulated the Chairperson on his double election, and warmly thanked the Republic of Korea for its outstanding organization and hosting, and for the wonderful opening session. It thanked the Secretariat for its work and for the quality of its report, adding that it joined the other Members in their remarks regarding the protection of intangible cultural heritage in cases of emergency and armed conflict. The delegation agreed to support the new approach for the periodic reporting by region, which would surely be very efficient. Finally, it sought further clarifications from the Secretariat regarding the outreach and communication strategy mentioned in the report with regard to the partner company identified, as it was unaware of the selection process.

51. **The delegation of Saint Lucia** congratulated the Chairperson, wishing him success, and also the Republic of Korea and beautiful Jeju Island for the excellent welcome and organization. It spoke of its appreciation to Mr Tim Curtis and the Secretariat for their high level of work and achievement, and for the excellent report. It particularly appreciated the priority granted to capacity building, and intangible cultural heritage and education. The delegation also supported the priority of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, particularly during the hurricane season witnessed in the Caribbean in 2017 that had led to the decimation of islands, calling for a robust focus on capacity building in this regard.

52. The **delegation of Afghanistan** joined in the praise expressed by the Committee to the organizers, congratulating them for their excellent organization and hospitality. It congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work, which reflected the achievements of UNESCO as a whole regarding its working methods and normative instruments. In this regard, the Secretariat is a good model and reference, working in a transparent manner, though it wished to see more pedagogical work, and more helpful publication of the method of the Secretariat's work.

53. **The delegation of Colombia** thanked the Korean Government for hosting this important meeting, as well as the Secretariat for its great efforts. It expressed gratitude for the International Assistance granted for its project developed in the Colombian Amazon. Colombia had worked for many years with indigenous communities with regard to their sacred sites of memory, which was very important for all Colombians. The delegation also congratulated the Secretariat for the report presented, expressing its support and interest in work in the field of education and intangible heritage.

54. The **Secretary** began by thanking the Committee Members for their comments on the report, noting the many questions about the communication strategy, which had yet to be presented and would in fact be presented in a full briefing scheduled after decision 5.b, though he conceded that it would perhaps be better to present it prior to its adoption. Nevertheless, he added that the funding and work for the strategy had been processed through the Bureau in a fully transparent manner under 'Other functions of the Committee'. Regarding funding, the intent was not to use it in the same way as for capacity building, i.e. not to use 'Other functions of the Committee' to implement a communication model or framework, but rather to use the Committee's budget line to carry out the upstream conceptual work, with any implementation

being subject to extrabudgetary funding, as was the case for capacity-building work. Regarding the questions from Hungary on the work on the SDGs and Agenda 2030, the Secretary concurred that intangible cultural heritage could touch upon almost every SDG. However, at this stage the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section had decided to focus in particular on SDG4, whereas the Culture Sector has an MLA specifically devoted to all the culture Conventions working on the basis of an integrated approach to the SDGs. However, in the framework of this Convention, the decision to prioritize SDG4 had been made for a number of reasons. Firstly, intangible heritage in education is also in the core text of the Convention under Article 2. Secondly, the work needed to focus on an area that would have a greater impact. Trying to cover every SDG would simply not be possible from an operational point of view, even if it might be conceptually possible. Nevertheless, the Director of the Division of Creativity [present at the session] could also attest to the fact that there was a specific MLA in the C/5 dealing with the integration of Agenda 2030 with the Culture Sector programmes, which the 2003 Convention, as well as other Conventions, would roll out more broadly on the work of the SDGs. Concerning the question by Turkey regarding Chairs in the field of intangible cultural heritage and category 2 centres, the Secretary concurred that the Sector had in fact held a meeting recently with the Chairs in the field of culture and with all the category 2 centres. Meetings had initially been held mainly with the category 2 centres because there were more such centres focusing on this area of work. However, there was no impediment from including Chairs in the future in that regard. The Secretary turned to the question from Afghanistan on publications and pedagogical materials, conceding that the Section had not focused on publishing, but had instead placed all the capacity-building materials online, which was mainly due to time constraints, prioritization, and the house-wide review to reduce the number of hard-copy publications.

55. The **Secretary** appreciated the many comments and took the opportunity to present the communication strategy, which would perhaps answer some of the concerns raised, particularly with regard to the selected company. He explained that the process followed UNESCO rules, and submissions had been received from about fifty-five companies, i.e. there was no tie to a specific company and stage-by-stage contracts had been granted. The company in question was called Giro, with offices in Hong Kong, Paris, Manchester and Dubai, and thus has a broad international scope. The Secretary read out the briefing point on the communication strategy prepared under agenda item 5.b, as it also concerned the language of the decision. Moreover, the document should be considered less as a 'strategy' per se and more as a framework in helping to enhance the visibility of the Convention. The Secretary noted the growing impact of – and interest in – the Convention, with 175 States Parties, and noted the important role played by the Lists in raising awareness and gaining increased attention in the local and international media during the time of inscription. Thus, during the weeks of inscription the Convention benefited from high visibility. However, the Lists only represented the tip of the iceberg within a broad spectrum of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and they did not convey the full breadth and importance of the Convention, as its real life actually took place on the ground, i.e. how intangible cultural heritage is being safeguarded by the different actors, and in particular by communities. These are the real-life stories that should resonate with the Convention and thus it was felt that a greater understanding and knowledge of the Convention was needed to further promote its objectives by supporting safeguarding activities through impactful and inspiring examples. Raising awareness could also be considered – as mentioned in Article 2.3 – as an act of safeguarding in itself, with communities safeguarding intangible heritage, i.e. it is a safeguarding activity and not just a promotional activity. It was felt that there was a strong common wish to make intangible heritage better known and better understood so that the importance of safeguarding would be more widely recognized. For this reason, it is essential to have a robust framework for communications and outreach. As the Convention grows, this will become ever more important. It is broadening the way we think about cultural heritage in general, which is evolving and dynamic. However, this message had not been suitably transmitted within the past communications strategy, for instance, there was continual confusion between World Heritage sites and intangible cultural heritage, whereby the idea of

safeguarding could be seen as a dynamic, evolving practice, whereas preservation was seen as fixing something that does not change.

56. The **Secretary** explained that a call for a proposal had been launched in September 2016 in order to identify a qualified communications agency competent in the field. Fifty-five agencies from twenty-eight countries had submitted proposals, which was then followed by a rigorous selection process and several rounds of interviews, resulting in the final selection of Giro as the partner to accompany the development of the strategy. Giro is a multinational communications agency with international experience in developing successful communication and outreach strategies in the field of culture. Since January 2017, the work with Giro – in collaboration with UNESCO's Division of Public Information – including its services for the web, public and media relations, had been intense. The main assignment was to build a strategy to enhance positive recognition of the importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, as well as to generate greater awareness, understanding and impact of intangible cultural heritage among a wide range of target audiences. Giro had been asked to conduct a thorough review of all the Convention's existing communication tools and material, and to undertake an in-depth analysis of the insights, requirements and expectations with regard to the outreach activities for the Convention; as a result, some first-hand insights from the analysis had been obtained. As part of a wide consultation process, around sixty relevant stakeholders, including UNESCO Field Offices, States Parties donors, accredited NGOs, national institutions, heritage professionals and community members had been interviewed so as to gain insights into what the 2003 Convention meant to them. The Secretary took the opportunity to sincerely thank those who had actively participated in this important interview process that took place between January and March 2017. Expectations were high for achieving a more inspiring, impactful and interactive communication flow. Giro had thoroughly analysed the textual and visual signs and messages that were communicated in the existing communication tools of the Convention. These included website, news and publications. These tools predominantly confirmed a top-down conventional speech tone, with a focus on the mutual delivery of information and documentation that primarily supported the statutory process. This was important in that it is not seen as attractive. In addition, the communication materials in general were determined to be far from contemporary, as well as ineffective in ensuring the interest and motivation of the various audiences. The communicated messages were neither engaging nor empowering, and failed to make any impact. Thus, an audit on all the Secretariat's communications came out rather negatively regarding the way in which the Convention had been communicated up until then. Different methodologies were applied to this review process, the results of which were cross-analysed, showing very clear and consistent orientations that were presented at a meeting in March 2017. The results showed that there is indeed a common desire to reset and create a communication platform for the Convention that echoes and values the very concept of intangible cultural heritage and the very purpose of the Convention. The next steps of the development process, emerging from that analysis and presented by Giro to the Secretariat, involved a strategic communications framework, and not a strategy in a programmatic sense, as a basis on which to work.

57. The **Secretary** further explained that the framework included strategic orientations and preliminary guidelines for priority actions and tools, as well as progressive deployment of the strategy. This framework was structured around three main elements. Firstly, the key positioning elements that would enable better communications in spirit and principle, i.e. the vision, mission and values. Secondly, the target groups matrix that outlines status, needs and expectations; the main target groups include the wider UNESCO organization, including Field Offices, States Parties, institutions and NGOs working in the field of intangible cultural heritage, as well as heritage professionals, and a deeper involvement of communities and practitioners, and hopefully, wider outreach to the as-yet uninvolved public, particularly youth. Thirdly, the list of priority tools needed for immediate development. The next step is to establish a narrative for the 2003 Convention by developing concrete templates; the Secretariat wished to develop templates for priority communication tools. These would include tools such as publications, newsletters, webpages, and a communication guide that

would present some basic graphic materials. It was important for the communication tools to emphasize the human relevance that was found lacking in most of the communications, which were extremely statutory and process-oriented and thus failed to bring out the human relevance of intangible cultural heritage that conveyed its dynamics. The Secretariat thus hoped to explore its full potential, to promote respect for differences, and to build cohesive links across generations, communities and cultures. The aim was to develop a real conversation through a set of relevant messages for the different target audiences by giving a direct voice to communities in their safeguarding efforts while further engaging youth so that they could play an active part in safeguarding living heritage. Concerted and joint efforts among the actors involved were planned once the basic creative tools had been developed. It was hoped that this would allow for consistent implementation by the Secretariat, as well as other actors, particularly Field Offices and States Parties, and local actors and communities. States would hopefully be supported in their national initiative of awareness raising and outreach, which was set out as one of the performance indicators in the C/5 that had just been adopted by the General Conference. With these summary points, the Secretary presented a short film that had been produced during the Youth Conference to give an idea of how communications around the Convention could be changed.

[Short clip of young people filmed at the UNESCO Youth Forum]

58. The Director of the Division for Creativity, **Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar**, responded to the point raised regarding SDGs by explaining that the Culture Sector evidently recognized and was committed to supporting Member States in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. Looking at the work plan for the biennium, the approved 39 C/5 for the next two years had already identified 23 targets out of 169 targets across nine of the 17 Goals for all the culture Conventions and programmes, as well as other instruments, such as Recommendations in the Culture Sector. Of course, the 2003 Convention plays a very important part in this, in looking at its relationship with the SDGs, and their implementation across several of the twenty-three targets.

59. The Assistant Director-General, **Mr Francesco Bandarin**, returned to the point made by Cuba and others on the importance of the work on emergencies. In fact, agenda item 15, devoted to the topic, would further explore this issue. Nevertheless, this would be a key dimension of UNESCO's work today and in years to come. It was noted that over the past two years the General Conference had approved a strategy that was initially focused on conflict situations, which was approved in 2015, but the General Conference [in October 2017] had also adopted an annex that included natural disasters. This was now a complete revision on 'emergencies', in which UNESCO could and should play an important role. The tools are of course the Conventions, and therefore the 2003 Convention could play a very important role in the different areas that concern emergency situations such as preparedness, prevention and response whenever there is a disaster or a conflict, as well as post-conflict or post-disaster reconstruction. The Convention instrument is very close to communities, which is very important as the communities themselves are the protagonists in these difficult situations. Moreover, agenda item 15 presents some testing through the use of the Emergency Heritage Fund on the role that the Convention and communities could play in these critical situations.

60. Noting the time, the **Chairperson** moved to adjourn the morning session.

[Monday, 4 December 2017, afternoon session]

61. The **Chairperson** spoke of the honour of the presence of the Minister for Arts and Culture of Cameroon, His Excellency Mr Narcisse Mouelle Kombi, inviting him to say a few words.

62. The **Minister of Culture of Cameroon** expressed sincere thanks to the Chairperson for the honour and privilege of addressing the delegates. Deepest gratitude was addressed to the Korean Government, the administrative authorities, and the Korean people for the quality of the welcome and for all the arrangements. Following Cameroon's ratification of the 2003

Convention on 9 October 2012, the Government has adopted and promulgated a law on cultural heritage that takes into account the provisions of the Convention, and gives pride of place to intangible cultural heritage, which is so cherished by Africans. Cameroon is a great nation of culture with an extraordinarily rich cultural diversity and, above all, a wealth of intangible cultural heritage. Regarding implementation, the decree on the orientation of the Ministry of Arts and Culture had created and organized an entire Directorate of Cultural Heritage consisting of a Sub-Directorate of Intangible Cultural Heritage. The safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, for which this orientation receives specific resources, is one of the Ministry's most important missions. Concerning management training, in the context of transmission, the anthropology department of the University of Yaoundé proposes a professional master's degree in cultural heritage that deals with intangible cultural heritage, including issues concerning the appropriate management of such heritage. CERDOTOLA, an international body based in Yaoundé, of which the Ministry of Culture is the institutional interface, plays a vital role in the creation of a database and a documentation centre of African languages. The inventory of intangible cultural heritage is an activity included in the cultural policy of the government. The national inventory process was launched in 2015 by the Ministry of Arts and Culture, with the support of UNESCO's Regional Office in Yaoundé, the National Council of Traditional Chiefs of Cameroon, and other bodies, which since 2016 had led to the organization by the local authorities of a series of workshops on the development of inventories, with the participation of communities, to train them on inventory methods. The participants, among the country's leaders, worked in four major groups based on the cultural areas of the country, bringing together more than 250 ethnic groups. The inventory itself had allowed local communities to identify more than 150 elements, building on the areas defined by the Convention. Documentation of this inventory, seen as a safeguarding measure, would not only provide access to this heritage but would also make it possible to define a systematic cultural policy for intangible cultural heritage, while respecting customary restrictions on access to cultural heritage and its living character. A workshop was scheduled for April–May 2018 to compile the nomination files [for the Representative List] of the Ngondo festivals (it was noted that the Ngondo had taken place less than 24 hours ago), and practices around the Ngog Lituba sanctuary, which is one of the most famous and oldest sanctuaries in Cameroon, and the traditional know-how of Mousgoum architecture in the far north of the country. With regard to bilateral, subregional, regional and international cooperation, Cameroon intended to submit a request for International Assistance so as to draw up an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage of the Bororo indigenous peoples, and especially the Pygmies, the first inhabitants of the African equatorial forest. To date, Cameroon had no elements yet inscribed on the Representative List, but with the support of the Committee it would submit nominations in 2018.

63. On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Korea, the **Chairperson** warmly thanked the Minister, and then asked the Secretariat whether any amendments had been proposed.

64. The **Secretary** noted that written amendments had been proposed for paragraphs 7 and 8.

65. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. The Chairperson asked Turkey to present its amendment to paragraph 7.

66. The **delegation of Turkey** explained that its amendment was in line with its earlier statement, as it believed that UNESCO Chairs UNITWIN are important actors within the framework of the Convention. It would thus be good to encourage the Secretariat to cooperate further with UNITWIN and UNESCO Chairs on this subject.

67. The **delegation of Algeria** had a question on paragraph 8.

68. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 7 adopted as amended. He then turned to paragraph 8, noting the amendment proposed by the Philippines, Hungary and Turkey.

69. The **delegation of Algeria** had no issue with the amendments and would in fact co-sponsor the paragraph amended. However, it also sought more information on the communication

and awareness strategy regarding how it had come about, how it was approved, and the consequences of the amendments tabled by the Philippines, Hungary and Turkey.

70. The **delegation of the Philippines**, as the delegation who had submitted this proposal, noted the following words missing, which should read, 'The Secretariat will submit the strategy to the thirteenth session of the Committee and the General Assembly *for its endorsement'*, which was correctly reflected in the French draft.

71. The **delegation of Hungary** had co-sponsored this amendment because, as had been expressed before, it believed that the Committee and the General Assembly should have a role and should endorse the strategy. It welcomed the presentation by the Secretariat and regretted that it was not included in the report.

72. The **delegation of Turkey** concurred with Hungary on the reason why it also co-sponsored this amendment given the important subject, and from the Secretariat's presentation a comprehensive study had been conducted on this. However, it also wished to see the Committee and the General Assembly engaged in this process for its endorsement, and it sought to hear more from the Secretariat on the timeline for this communication strategy.

73. The **delegation of India** thanked the Government of Korea and the Chairperson in particular for the invitation to the beautiful island of Jeju and for the excellent arrangements. It also thanked the Secretariat for the excellent work in this new strategy based on SDG4, and for the comprehensive presentation by the Secretary. At the same time, the delegation supported the amendment by the Philippines, Hungary and Turkey calling for more information before adopting the strategy.

74. Regarding terminology, the **delegation of Austria** wondered whether a 'roll-out plan' would be more active than a 'strategy', and could this have a bearing on the work planned?

75. The **delegation of Cuba** also supported the amendment, but wished to return to paragraph 7, adding that there were other resources in terms of cooperation with UNESCO, such as category 1 and 2 centres that could also work on this strategy, and that could be included in the decision.

76. The **Secretary** began by reassuring Cuba on paragraph 7, agreeing that 'UNESCO institutes' could be better explained, when indeed category 1 centres in education was implied, and possibly category 2 centres. The Secretary understood the confusion and concern regarding the communication strategy and that perhaps this could have been better explained. However, in the strict sense of the reporting period, which is up to June 2017, some of the work had been carried out *after* that date and hence it was not mentioned in the official report. The budget used for this work was approved under 'Other functions of the Committee' through the Bureau, as is always the case for upstream work. To clarify, the Secretariat was by no means intending to present a strategy to be adopted at this stage; rather, it was in the early stages of working on this framework, as endorsed by the budget of the Bureau. The Secretary regretted the use of 'strategy', because this did not concern a strategic document in the strict sense of a budgetary, programming or planning document. The Secretariat was in fact working on tools to improve and enhance communications following an audit of the current communication that looked at the media, for which the budget allocation was under 20 per cent. The original intention at this stage had been to present a more comprehensive report to this Committee, but the Secretariat had simply been overwhelmed with other work, meaning that it had been unable to finalize the presentation in time. Thus, the idea was to inform the Committee at this stage, and to make a more thorough presentation of the working tool at the General Assembly for possible consideration at the next Committee session. However, at the present time, the working tool had yet to be conceived and the plan was to get a communication agency to help develop the tools to improve communications and clarification on the Convention, but also regarding the 'roll-out', so that it could be shared with States Parties, National Commissions, category 2 centres, other stakeholders, and so on, to establish a language around the Convention, as there appeared to be a lot of confusion in press articles particularly when communicating about the Convention. As a result, the word 'strategy' – the word used with the communication agency – was not intended in the statutory

sense, and in hindsight was perhaps not the correct word. A better word would be 'framework', and of course it was always the Secretariat's intention to present it, but at the same time it was not considered as something that required endorsement, as it is not a directive or an Operational Directive; it is simply a way of enhancing communications and providing tools. The Secretary conceded that this issue had not been well-communicated regarding the documents, but also the work was not strictly covered in the reporting period. The Secretary was concerned about now being asked to submit a strategy, as it would not be ready, adding that he would feel more comfortable being invited to share progress on the work, as approved under the 'Other functions of the Committee', while sharing with the broader States Parties at the forthcoming General Assembly, which was the original intention.

77. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the amendment by Philippines, but following the Secretariat's explanation felt that there might be some confusion with the word 'strategy' and thus suggested instead using 'development of communication and outreach tools', which might be a little more comprehensive.

78. The **Secretary** agreed that 'tools' was more appropriate. However, the Secretariat would not be ready with all the finalized tools by the General Assembly; rather, this work should be seen under the approved two-year plan. For this reason, the Secretary would be more comfortable with the use of 'update' or 'inform' rather than 'adopt', which was more final.

79. Following the explanation, the **delegation of Algeria** understood this point to be an 'update' of a policy or strategy, which had already been approved, although this remained confusing.

80. The **Secretary** explained that the work on communication and outreach had been approved under the 20 per cent allocated to 'Other functions of the Committee', but that no strategy as such had been approved, as the Secretariat was not developing a strategy. The Secretary agreed that the word 'strategy' had been used to define the work of the agency, but that this was different from a statutory strategy. In fact, what was intended were tools, and thus the Secretariat had wished to inform the Committee of the progress in this regard, even though the tools had not yet been finalized. The Secretary thus proposed to 'ask the Committee to share the tools and inform', while deleting the word 'strategy', which was an unfortunate choice of word, as explained. In addition, in terms of roll-out and implementation, it was felt that the 'Other functions of the Committee' was meant for developing materials at the global level, for example work on capacity building appropriated these funds, with extrabudgetary funding used to actually implement it. Thus, to be clear, there was no funding for actually implementing a complete strategy; the funds were being used to develop the tools that would hopefully receive extrabudgetary money for their implementation or enable States Parties to undertake activities such as communication campaigns around intangible cultural heritage.

81. The **delegation of Algeria** found paragraph 8 very important and meriting clarification, particularly in light of the Secretariat's explanation. It thus proposed an amendment, which would read 'takes note of the development of tools or communication strategies' – it did not have an issue with the term 'communication strategy' – and 'awareness-raising aimed at improving the understanding and visibility of the Convention, and requests the Secretariat to regularly inform the Committee and the General Assembly of the development of this strategy'. The delegation explained that the information as presented and the approval of these tools had only been approved by the Bureau, despite efforts within UNESCO to standardize the roles of Bureaus across all the Committees and Conventions, in order to ensure equity and uniformity across the entire work plan throughout the Organization. For this reason, these types of decisions should be made by the Committee rather than by the Bureau. Returning to the amendment, the delegation suggested deleting 'to submit the strategy at the 13th session of the Committee'.

82. The **delegation of Turkey** amended the proposal to read, 'to inform regularly the Committee and the General Assembly' but wondered whether 'strategy' was appropriate, suggesting instead 'the development of the communication and outreach tools'.

83. The **Secretary** suggested 'a framework with tools' rather than a strict strategy.

84. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that it had also wished to submit an amendment along the same lines as Algeria and Turkey, agreeing that the development of the communication and outreach was better explained through the use of 'tools' instead of 'framework'. Additionally, the text 'for its endorsement' could also be deleted, as the paragraph referred to information and not an endorsement as such.

85. The **delegation of the Philippines** agreed with the amendments made, reiterating that the word 'strategy' had been taken from the Secretariat's report, but of course it understood the explanation. On another point, the delegation felt that 'tools towards the development of communication and outreach' was a better wording than 'development of communication and outreach tools'.

86. Having listened to the Secretariat, the **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** fully adhered to the term 'tools' as it seemed more appropriate than strategies. It thus proposed lightening paragraph 8, which would read, 'the development of communication and awareness-raising tools to improve the understanding and visibility of their co-functions and requests the Secretariat to regularly inform the Committee and the General Assembly'.

87. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the Secretary for the clarification on this point. Indeed, it also felt that the terminology 'tool' or 'framework' was more appropriate and thus supported the amendment. It also sought to include the roll-out plan that was originally in the decision, as in this sense of a tool or framework, it was important that the Secretariat continue with the work on the roll-out plan as outlined by the Secretary. The paragraph would thus read, 'inform regularly the Committee and the General Assembly as regards the tools for the development of the communication and outreach strategy as well as the roll-out plan for its implementation'. Or alternatively, the outreach tools could comprise the work on the roll-out plan. However, the important point was that the Secretariat continue with this work because communications should be more proactive and vibrant. It did not wish the process to be frozen because of these considerations, but at the same time it wished to be kept informed. Regarding the point made by Algeria, the delegation was of the understanding that the Bureau did not decide on any substantive issues and only had the authorization to approve budgetary issues. As an issue of governance, and as a Member of the Bureau, the delegation confirmed that the Bureau remained strictly within the statutory remit of what it could do and authorize.

88. The **delegation of Guatemala** expressed congratulations on his election, and gratitude to the people and the Government of Korea for their hospitality. Regarding this point, it wished to add the word 'impact', as the purpose of having these kinds of tools is to have an impact, as well as knowledge, so the proposal could read 'tools for the development and impact of the communication and outreach strategy'. The delegation explained that UNESCO was very results-oriented, such that actions should have an appreciable impact.

89. The **Secretary** reiterated his preference for deleting 'strategy' in place of 'tools'. In addition, as there was nothing to present at this stage, it was premature to speak of 'approval' or 'its impact'. The Secretary however understood from the remarks that there was a general sense of encouragement to keep working in this direction, but to keep the Committee and the General Assembly informed ahead of any decisions. In a sense, to 'ask the Secretariat' about the development of communication and outreach tools, followed by the roll-out plan for its implementation as part of those tools, as mentioned by Hungary. The Côte d'Ivoire also suggested that the Committee and the General Assembly be kept regularly informed, while the point was made regarding the specific reference to the thirteenth session. In summary, therefore, the paragraph would read, 'inform regularly the Committee and General Assembly as regards the development of communication and outreach tools'.

90. The **delegation of Palestine** felt that the suggestion from Côte d'Ivoire had been very clear, and that the suggestion by the Secretary was also reasonable and acceptable. The delegation proposed, 'notes the development of the communication and outreach tools with a view to enhancing the understanding and visibility of the Convention, and requests the Secretariat to inform regularly the Committee and the General Assembly'. In this way, this

would be understandable without mentioning the thirteenth session, as was implied with 'regularly'.

91. The **delegation of the Philippines** could agree with the recent formulation on the understanding that the General Assembly and the Committee be updated in the forthcoming sessions, as the Committee had a role to play in the development of these tools, in their preparation, implementation and eventual roll-out, as presented by the Secretary.

92. The **delegation of Cyprus** agreed with Palestine's proposal, and with Côte d'Ivoire to lighten the paragraph for the sake of clarity.

93. The delegation of **Hungary** noted a definite article missing to read, 'the General Assembly'.

94. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 8 adopted as amended. Paragraphs 9–11 were also duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 5.b adopted as amended**.

ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA

VOLUNTARY SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/6*

Decision: *12.COM 6*

95. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 6 concerning voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, reminding the Committee that it had two main tasks in this regard. Firstly, the Committee was to propose a biennial Plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for approval by the General Assembly under agenda item 7. It was noted that this Plan only applied to assessed contributions by States Parties under Article 26 of the Convention. Secondly, the Committee was to approval voluntary supplementary contributions by State Parties in addition to their assessed contributions for the implementation of activities that cannot be supported with the resources of UNESCO's regular budget. This was particularly important given UNESCO's difficult financial situation. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to present the item.

96. The **Secretary** remarked on the complex financial structure of the 2003 Convention, and reminded the Committee that the reporting period for this item on voluntary supplementary contributions dated from the eleventh session of the Committee in 2016 to October 2017. Presenting the background, the Secretary explained that at its ninth session, the Committee had approved, in its Decision 9.COM 7, the Concept Note for the 2014–2017 Complementary Additional Programme entitled 'Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development'. This related to the global capacity-building programme initiated and delivered by the Secretariat, as previously mentioned, though the Concept Note would expire at the end of 2017. Thus, by approving the Concept Note, the Committee would accept the voluntary supplementary contributions made to support capacity-building activities between the two Committee sessions, as well as authorize the Secretariat to make immediate use of such contributions. It was noted that during this reporting period, the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund had not benefited from any contribution to support the capacity-building programme. However, the Secretariat had received confirmation on 20 November 2017 of a contribution by the Netherlands to continue the capacity-building project in the Dutch Caribbean Islands and Surinam, for which the Secretariat was grateful. This contribution would be included in the report of the next session. Under the reporting period, there were two earmarked contributions that were not related to the capacity-building programme, and which were reflected in Annex I: firstly, a contribution of US$300,000 had been made by the CHA of the Republic of Korea to improve the periodic reporting mechanism under the Convention; and secondly, a contribution of US$100,000 had been made by the People's Republic of China to organize the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on developing an overall results framework for the Convention, held in Chengdu in June 2017.

97. The **Secretary** further explained that Annex I provided information responding to the Committee's request at its ninth session to be informed of all voluntary support given to the Convention during the reporting period, whether channelled or not through the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. For this reason, Annex I included information on voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to carry out specific earmarked activities, and contributions to the sub-fund of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for enhancing the human capacities of the Secretariat, as established by the General Assembly. In addition, the Annex included information on new projects approved under established Funds-in-Trust, as well as loans and secondments of personnel. In the recent past, the main funding requirements for implementing the Convention had concentrated on extending the reach and effectiveness of the global capacity-building programme and strengthening the human resources of the Secretariat. The Secretary took the opportunity to explain the evolution of the resources mobilized by referring to the two graphs included in the working document that collected data for the last two biennia and the current biennium. Projecting the capacity-building graph on the screen, the Secretary remarked on the decline of resources mobilized since 2012, which was at its lowest point in this current biennium. The mobilized resources reached only 56 per cent of the US$3M biennial objective set by the Committee at its ninth session. Nevertheless, support to the Convention through Fund-in-Trust arrangements had remained stable during the last three biennia thanks to the generous contributions aimed at strengthening national capacities in different regions of the world. These included: i) seven southern African countries having received support from the Government of Flanders in Belgium; ii) five countries in Asia and Pacific having received funds from Japan to undertake the second phase of capacity-building activities; and iii) four countries in the Arab States having received support from the Abu Dhabi Tourism & Culture Authority in the United Arab Emirates. While the Secretariat was very grateful for those generous contributions, it also took note of a decline in the amount contributed by some regular donors. However, the overall decline showed in the graph was explained by the critical decrease (90 per cent) in contributions made by States Parties through earmarked contributions to the Fund. During the reporting period, only US$110,000 had been received from the Netherlands in support of capacity building, which had been reported at the eleventh Committee session (but it did not include the most recent contribution received in November 2017). In a nutshell, the flow of contributions was unstable with a general trend towards declining contributions. The implication for the Convention meant that it would be difficult to guarantee a satisfactory level of support for national safeguarding efforts through the capacity-building programme. More concretely, the Secretariat identified (through needs assessment, external evaluation or direct requests from States) at least forty-one countries that could benefit from capacity-building support but could not be supported owing to a lack of contributions; of these forty-one States Parties, nineteen were from Africa.

98. Projecting the human resources graph on the screen, the **Secretary** further explained that the situation was not better concerning support to the human resources of the Secretariat, which in fact had never reached the annual target of US$1.1 million set by the General Assembly. Moreover, it had never been at such a low level since the establishment of the sub-fund in 2010. Since the eleventh Committee session, the sub-fund had only received voluntary contributions from Monaco totaling US$22,408, i.e. a decrease of 70 per cent compared to the previous two biennia. Consequently, there were no funds left in the sub-fund for human resources. This decrease was especially important given that mechanisms such as periodic reporting were increasing. In light of the 2014–2017 Complementary Additional Programme expiring, the Secretariat sought approval from the Committee (in Annex II) for two new funding priorities for the period 2018–2021. These new funding priorities were in line with UNESCO's new Integrated Budget Framework that set out the organization's overall funding requirements for the next exercise in the 39 C/5. The first funding priority sought to continue efforts to extend the reach and effectiveness of the global capacity-building strategy (target US$5 million), while the second aimed at initiating efforts to incorporate intangible cultural heritage into formal and non-formal education in cooperation with the Education Sector (target US$2 million). In line with Decision 9.COM 7, with regard to the Concept Note 2014–2017, if approved, any future voluntary supplementary contributions received between

two Committee sessions within the scope of these two funding priorities would be considered as accepted by the Committee.

99. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clear explanation, noting the extremely worrying situation that deserved the attention of both the Committee and all States Parties. In this regard, he expressed gratitude to those who had provided support to the Convention and its Secretariat since the last session, namely the Abu Dhabi Tourism & Culture Authority, and the States Parties of Japan, China, Monaco and the Republic of Korea. He was also happy to hear the excellent news concerning the additional contribution to the Fund by the Netherlands so that the capacity-building project in the Dutch Caribbean Islands and Surinam could continue. The Chairperson also took the opportunity to thank the Secretariat for all its work during this biennium, for complying with the increasing obligations, and maintaining a high-quality standard despite the drop of 70 per cent to the sub-fund. He then opened the floor for comments.

100. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its report, but regretted that the situation of voluntary supplementary contributions was not very promising. While global capacity building had been crucial for the implementation of the Convention, the extrabudgetary funding was unfortunately in constant decline, meaning the Secretariat could no longer deliver the capacity-building services. It believed that this issue should be addressed together with agenda item 7 [Draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2018–2019]. On the one hand, the International Assistance Fund was accumulating, while on the other hand, voluntary contributions were diminishing. Under these circumstances, donors would continue to question the need for further funds when there were unspent funds still available. The Committee should consider a long-term approach to address both issues. It should look into the broader resource mobilization strategy of the Convention in the context of the structured financing dialogue that would be launched in the margins of the 204th session of the Executive Board, together with the under-utilized fund of the Convention. It also needed to look at the funding situation of the Convention as a whole, to identify where the obstacles lay, and what was needed to address this paradox. The delegation believed that the Ad Hoc Working Group could be mandated to analyse this issue, to know more about the funding system of the Convention and thus identify any procedural or other forms of impediment, and then submit proposals to the Committee for its consideration. In this regard, the delegation would submit some amendments on this issue under agenda item 13. Regarding the two priorities in the report, the first one remained the continuation of the Complementary Additional Programme, with more emphasis on sustainable development, which it supported. Regarding the second priority, the delegation attached particular importance to formal and informal education for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and its transmission to future generations. Turkey's Ministry of National Education for instance had added a course in the curricula entitled 'Folk Culture', which embraced the principles set forth in the Convention for safeguarding and transmission. Its Ministry of Culture and Tourism had been registering the tradition bearers and providing for them so as to sustain their art through master-apprentice relations. Within this context, the 'One Master Thousand Masters' programme had raised substantive awareness on safeguarding. The UNESCO Chair, Intangible Cultural Heritage in Formal and Informal Education established at Gazi University in 2017, had begun working towards an enhanced and intangible cultural heritage-supported approach to formal and informal education subjects through undergraduate, graduate and doctoral education and museology studies. The Turkish National Commission for UNESCO, the Intangible Cultural Heritage Institute and Gazi University had organized winter schools on intangible cultural heritage. Thus, this priority was extremely important. In relation to its implementation, it was known that Field Offices were in charge of implementing the operational projects. In fact, the Field Offices had been empowered in many ways through the 'delegation of authority' decision of the Director-General. Although it welcomed simplifying processes to better deliver programmes, close cooperation and coordination between Headquarters and the Field Offices were deemed critical for achieving the expected results. Regular consultations were needed between Headquarters and the Field Offices from the first stages of planning to the

other stages of execution and monitoring, as well as reporting. With this understanding, the delegation sought to be further informed by the Secretariat about the working relations between the Field Offices and Headquarters. In addition, it was mentioned in Funding Priority 1 that training processes might also include relevant institutes, NGOs, universities, and community representatives, which it was assumed meant that these stakeholders were accredited to UNESCO. Finally, the delegation understood that this was the end of the Complementary Additional Programme for 2014–2017 and a new programme for 2018–2021 would be launched by this Committee. Thus, it sought to know whether CAP had been successfully implemented and whether its outcomes had been achieved.

101. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** thanked the Secretariat for its work and clear presentation, as well as the countries that had provided funds, namely China, Japan, Monaco, the Republic of Korea, the United Arab Emirates and the Netherlands. Without wishing to pre-empt the next agenda item, it nevertheless spoke of the discrepancy between the insufficient extrabudgetary funds and the underutilization of funds dedicated to International Assistance. The delegation wondered whether a compensation strategy could be envisaged to avoid this contradiction.

102. The **delegation of the Philippines** echoed the concerns regarding the declining voluntary supplementary contributions, which often provided a lifeline for carrying out activities required, and it thanked those States Parties that had contributed in this regard. The delegation supported the two funding priorities but, like others, would appreciate more information on how these were selected. It also wished to flag that the Committee, in accordance with its mandate in Article 7.d of the Convention, could play a more proactive role in increasing the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. Some inspiration could be drawn from recent efforts by the World Heritage Committee to enhance the sustainability of its Fund. The 1972 Committee had adopted a roadmap for sustaining the World Heritage Fund and indicative targets with short-, medium- and long-term measures. Ideas such as a core group and an intangible cultural heritage donor forum might be worth exploring. For instance, there could be opportunities for Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee Members, working with the Secretariat in the under-utilized extensive network of accredited NGOs, to consider creative means to mobilize additional resources, as such difficult situations required innovative approaches. Again, the informal Ad Hoc Working Group could be seen as a practical platform where such discussions could take place at a minimal cost.

103. The **delegation of Austria** noted the activities and importance of capacity-building activities in the implementation of the Convention, as discussed under agenda item 5, and thanked the Republic of Korea, China, Japan, the United Arab Emirates, the Netherlands and Monaco for giving intangible cultural heritage an additional boost. However, it also noted the decline in the resources mobilized for the capacity-building programme, and thus the Committee had to be realistic in terms of fundraising policies, and prioritize additional projects accordingly. In this regard, the delegation welcomed the two funding priorities proposed: capacity building and intangible cultural heritage and education. What was particularly interesting about the latter was its link with the 2030 Agenda. If already decided, the delegation sought to know how many countries were envisaged for participation in the second funding priority, and what the newly established clearing house for integrating intangible cultural heritage into education implied in terms of infrastructure, human resources and functions. The delegation hoped that the two funding priorities would inspire States Parties to contribute accordingly.

104. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** expressed gratitude to the States Parties for making generous voluntary contributions to the implementation of the 2003 Convention, especially the Netherlands for having recently decided to make a contribution. Together with Turkey and the Philippines, the delegation also welcomed the funding priority for the period of 2018–21 entitled 'Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage for sustainable development' and 'Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education'. The delegation firmly believed that intangible cultural heritage represented the values and practices that make us who we are and that it was of the utmost important for

future generations to learn its value. In this light, it welcomed the initiative to underline the importance of transmission by prioritizing education.

105. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the Secretariat for the very transparent reporting, as well as the sobering picture of the situation. Hungary also fully supported the funding priorities, mainly capacity building, and intangible cultural heritage and education. It was also grateful to the States that had provided financial support in this past year, but also sought to know whether any attempt had been made to mobilize resources from the private sector. Indeed, this Convention was receiving broad visibility, but only States appeared to be providing financial support. The delegation asked whether the private sector had been called upon, or whether there had been any successful fundraising activity in this regard.

106. The **delegation of Cuba** wondered why there was a slightly disconnect in this debate compared to the recent provisions adopted during the 39th General Conference in which an integrated budget had been adopted that specifically referred to the regular budget as well as extrabudgetary funds. The delegation asked the Secretariat to explain the projection concerning the application of these adopted integrated budgets across all the sectors and all the competences of UNESCO, and how this would be reflected in reality vis-à-vis these Conventions. The delegation concluded by agreeing with the priorities, and thanked all the donors for their financial contributions.

107. The **delegation of Senegal** joined the colleagues who had proposed innovative measures, such as looking to public/private partnerships for certain heritage sectors, which was already happening at the level of built heritage. Thus, were there opportunities to consider at the level of intangible heritage? In the same way, the suggestion by Côte d'Ivoire to reallocate resources to priorities was also worth considering. This would indeed resolve the issue of the underutilization of resources, while such a mechanism would allow for the reallocation of resources, as exceptional situations called for exceptional measures. The delegation also expressed gratitude to all the donors.

108. The **delegation of Japan** began by thanking the Republic of Korea for hosting this Committee session, and the Secretariat for the clarification on this agenda item. Regarding the two main funding priorities, it especially welcomed the proposal entitled 'Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education'. It believed that this was indeed very timely, as more importance was attached to policies in the various fields within the SDGs. Japan intended to continue its cooperation with UNESCO and Member States, and to contribute further to the implementation of the Convention.

109. The **delegation of Cuba** first wished to hear from the Secretariat on the projections of the integrated budget and the perspective within the Convention before adopting the decision.

110. The **delegation of Palestine** had an amendment in paragraph 6, and wished to advance on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.

111. The **Secretary** summarized that there was a question posed by the Philippines on how the two funding priorities had been chosen, while Austria had asked how many countries the second funding priority covered. Another country had asked for a review of the capacity-building programme in terms of results, while Cuba had put forward a question on the integrated strategy, and there were also several questions related to private sector funding. Regarding the two funding priorities, the Secretary explained that one was a continuation of the priority stated by Committee Members over the years, namely the capacity-building programme. Coming at the end of the period, the Secretariat thus proposed renewing the priority for another four years. The second funding priority, however, was a new one, and was now being proposed precisely because of the interest generated in this area that had emerged during both formal and non-formal discussions, with the references to intangible cultural heritage and education in Articles 2 and 14 of the Convention, and in the text of the Convention. The Secretary understood that Austria was asking about expectations regarding the US$2 million and how much work this would allow. The Secretariat had estimated that around ten States could benefit from funding, should the funding target be reached. As for the review of the capacity-building programme, the Secretariat had not yet been able to

conduct a formal review, but there had been several opportunities to form an idea. For example, the IOS audit in 2013 very clearly identified the capacity-building programme as a success, encouraging its continuation and expansion. In addition, two of the large extrabudgetary funded projects had their own project review mechanisms, which were available. Finally, regarding Cuba's question on the Integrated Budget Framework recently adopted by the General Conference, the Secretary invited the Administrative Officer of the Culture Sector to report on the technical issues, adding however that the Secretariat had tried to present proposals within this framework. The Director of the Division was also invited to respond to the question on private funding.

112. The **Administrative Officer of the Culture Sector, Mr Baakrim Abdelghani**, explained that the integrated budget issue had been referred to in paragraph 10 of the working document, and he assured the delegations that as States Parties as well as Member States during the preparation of the 39 C/5, and especially scenario 518 – the operational scenario for the 2003 Convention – the Expected Result 6 evidently took into account of all aspects. The operational budget of the Regular Programme is equal to US$2.7 million for the biennium, which includes the Headquarters and regional offices, plus voluntary contributions totaling US$14.9 million. He further explained that the amount of US$14.9 million also covered the entire budget, including the funds that could not be implemented for reasons that would be explained under agenda item 7. Thus, in short, the integrated budget had been applied, and both the Regular Programme budget and the voluntary contributions had been taken into account, as well as an estimate to arrive at a global amount – for Result 6 corresponding to the Convention – which together amounted to US$19.1 million. Mr Abdelghani was available for bilateral discussions with Cuba should more information on technical aspects be required.

113. The **Director of the Division for Creativity, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar,** wished to respond to the question on private sector funding, particularly given the current financial situation, in that the Division was looking seriously into a number of ways in which funds could be raised. This was also linked to the communication tools under development, so as to be able to reach private sector donors by making support for the Convention and for intangible heritage attractive to them. However, the issue that was often encountered with private sector funding, particularly when looking at a Convention with an emphasis on capacity building and specific communities, as well as multi-donor funds, was that private sector donors were very often reluctant to donate to multi-donor funds as they did not wish to have an association with a particular fund. They also sought to bring in other components, such as visibility for their own work, or to have an exhibition or demonstration in a way that took the intangible heritage out of context. Hence, it was not very easy to retain the integrity of the Convention's work while promoting it alongside private sector donors as partners. Nevertheless, this was an ongoing work stream, but it was certainly not as straightforward as one would expect because of the kinds of pressures that private sector donors require in such a partnership.

114. The **Assistant Director-General, Mr Francesco Bandarin**, also wished to provide some clarifications regarding the budget issues, which were quite complex. Mr Bandarin explained that over the past two years, UNESCO had decided to produce a new type of budget, an integrated budget, which essentially pulled together resources under the Regular Programme based on the contributions by Member States, as well as other funds raised through fundraising operations. The aim and principle was to provide transparency and coherence: transparency with regard to the Member States' set of priorities for the C/5, its Programme and Budget; and coherence in showing how the different funds contributed to the priorities that had been established. Thus, this was perhaps the first time that Committee Members had experienced the new budget. However, although this process had been carried out in terms of numbers, one could not say that it was a fully complete process. In fact, this process was now supported by another process called the 'structured financing dialogues', which was essentially a way to entertain relationships with donors so they could clearly see UNESCO's priorities and the way it operates. This structured financing dialogue, once it was fully achieved, would actually result in a very integrated budget. Mr Bandarin further explained that UNESCO was in a process of transition and had not yet achieved full coherence between the different mechanisms, though this was clearly the direction it was taking. It was also clear

that a market for donors existed, which was both public and private. Member States were, to a certain extent, offered a 'product' – in this case the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention – and were sufficiently convinced of supporting this product over another one also available on the same market, whether at UNESCO or in other organization. It was thus important to define the product that was being marketed. Although this perspective had been tried over the last few years, it was now more advanced in that the current extrabudgetary funds were greater than the Regular Programme funds, i.e. US$56 billion for the biennium of extrabudgetary funds and US$43 for the Regular Programme. However, it was clearly not easy to approach a private sector agency to push a particular project for financing, as it was important to convince both public and private operators that there was something in return to gain from the support. Clearly the return is different for States Parties of the Convention, as they share the objectives of the Convention, but it is different for private sector commercial operators who want to see something in return, as explained by Ms Hosagrahar. UNESCO could not sell the logo or the spirit of the Convention to a commercial operator simply because it needed the money, and thus a proper alignment had to be found, which is not always easy to establish. Nevertheless, some progress had been made in this regard, firstly by creating a specific culture and capacities to address this issue, and secondly by creating interest to help motivate the private sector. This current process would take time to fully complete, but it would greatly benefit from the goodwill and support of States Parties.

115. Having listened to Mr Bandarin, the **delegation of Cuba** remarked that a price could not be placed on culture, and that it could not be referred to in terms of a product or marketing. Cuba did not believe that this was the right direction as the Convention could not be privatized. It is a Convention of the States Parties and an Intergovernmental Committee. The delegation understood that resources had to be mobilized but stressed that work with the private sector should be based on the priorities of the Convention. It also understood that UNESCO saw the integrated budget, as presented to the Member States, as a solution to the situation at UNESCO. However, the delegation was unconvinced and called for vigilance vis-à-vis commercialization, the notion of products, and so on, as culture has no price.

116. The **delegation of Palestine** had a general comment regarding the structure of the decision and would come back to the decision at the appropriate paragraph.

117. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 6.

118. The **delegation of Palestine** had an issue with this paragraph, as it related to agenda item 11.c[3], and was thus unnecessary and out of context. The proposal was thus to delete paragraph 6 from this decision.

119. The **Secretary** explained that paragraph 6 was in the decision because it had been requested by the previous Committee, and although no supplementary voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund had been received, the Secretariat had to report it under this item, even though substantively this issue belonged to another agenda item. From a budgetary point of view, the Secretariat was reporting on the non-reception of the requested funds.

120. The **delegation of Palestine** understood the rationale in that the Secretariat had not received the necessary funds to cover the cost of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the issue of the removal and transfer of an element from one List to another, which had been requested since the tenth session in Windhoek. In that case, the delegation wondered whether the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund could be used for this purpose on an exceptional basis.

121. The **Secretary** explained that such a decision could only be made by the General Assembly, as the Committee did not have the authority to activate the Fund for such purposes. As such, a recommendation by the Committee to the General Assembly would be required. The

3 Removal of an element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and its transfer to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.

reason for the paragraph was that a date for reception had been provided in the original decision, which therefore had to be reported now that the date had passed.

122. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Republic of Korea for hosting the Committee session, and for the wonderful reception and arrangements. It also congratulated the Chairperson on his election, as well as Mr Tim Curtis and his team for the quality and volume of work covered during the reporting period. The delegation was particularly happy with the efforts towards developing partnerships with educational institutions to support the implementation of safeguarding measures, adding that this was a very good approach as it guaranteed a way of ensuring the sustainability of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding actions. It also thanked UNESCO for its continuous support, which enabled most of the developing countries to participate in these meetings. The delegation wished to return to paragraph 5, which had already been adopted, as it felt that the concern was not so much the small number of new voluntary supplementary contributions, but rather the dwindling amounts of contributions received, as the number of donors was less important than the amount itself.

123. The **delegation of Cuba** had the impression that paragraph 6 somewhat limited the right of the Committee to create mechanisms for intergovernmental negotiation, particularly as there was not enough time under a normal agenda for these negotiations (or a meeting) to take place. With regard to the paragraph, the delegation wished to know whether the Secretariat had consulted the General Assembly on this issue or not as the Committee could not limit the right of Member States to meet and work on this very important issue. Otherwise, a solution needed to be found ahead of the sessions of the Committee and the General Assembly, so that the organization of these meetings could take place to allow for debate and reflection.

124. From the explanation given by the Secretariat, the **delegation of Turkey** understood that this was more procedural in that at its tenth session the Committee had asked the Secretariat to report on this issue, which was the intention of the paragraph. It wondered whether reference to the Committee's decision at its tenth session in Namibia would help.

125. The **Secretary** concurred with Turkey's understanding that the paragraph responded to a specific request by the Committee, and it did not exclude the possibility of new funding becoming available at a later date.

126. The **delegation of Colombia** believed that before discussing the budget for the removal or transfer of an element from one List to another, the Committee first needed to debate the issue that was covered under agenda item 14. The delegation therefore suggested turning to item 14 before making a decision on the budget.

127. The **Secretary** reiterated that the item was a reporting issue in that the Secretariat was asked to raise funds during a specific period but those funds had not been raised. It did not preclude the possibility of forming an intergovernmental working group. The reference simply stated that at 10.COM, the Committee had been asked to organize an open-ended working group on the transfer of an element from one List to another, subject to the reception of extrabudgetary funding by January 2017. The Secretariat was thus reporting that no extrabudgetary funding had been received by 2017. Indeed, agenda item 14 had another request for extrabudgetary funding to continue with an open-ended working group, but this had no bearing on this issue, which was solely reporting on the past and did not preclude any other request for extrabudgetary funding for an open-ended working group.

128. Following the explanation, the **delegation of Palestine** withdrew its request to delete the paragraph, and instead suggested a small amendment in the case of no supplementary voluntary contributions being received prior to the next General Assembly, in which the Committee might recommend that the General Assembly authorize the use of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund on an exceptional basis for the purpose of organizing an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group to settle the issue of the transfer and removal of an element.

129. The **Secretary** responded that such funding would have to come at the expense of something else, such as International Assistance or the implementation of the Convention. He explained that the standard in this Convention had always been for open-ended working groups to be subject to extrabudgetary funding, and he cautioned against setting such a precedent in which funds designated for the operational side of the Convention were used to conduct more meetings, especially as the majority of the Regular Programme funds already went towards statutory meetings.

130. The **delegation of Palestine** partially agreed in that a precedent would indeed be set, but this did not detract from the fact that a debate on this issue was imperative, as there was currently no mechanism in place or texts in the Operational Directives concerning the removal or transfer of an element. In this case, instead of recommending that the General Assembly authorize funding on an exceptional basis, the General Assembly could be asked to reflect on this issue in order to find a solution.

131. The **Secretary** conceded that this paragraph, which was reporting on the past, did not in fact belong here, and would have been better placed under agenda item 14 where there was already a draft decision requesting extrabudgetary resources.

132. The **delegation of Zambia** agreed with the intent of the paragraph, adding that it appeared to focus more on the number of new voluntary supplementary contributions, and hence its proposal to place the focus on the money aspect rather than solely on the new number of voluntary supplementary contributions.

133. The **Chairperson** explained that paragraph 5 had been adopted, and that the Committee was now discussing paragraph 6.

134. The **Secretary** concurred that his response was in relation to paragraph 6, not paragraph 5.

135. The **delegation of Turkey** supported the remarks made by the Secretary in that the important issue of transfers, which it acknowledged required a debate, was best discussed under agenda item 14. Thus, in order to clear up the confusion, the delegation asked the Secretariat to read out the relevant Decision 10.COM 19 pertaining to paragraph 6.

136. The **Secretary** read out paragraph 10 of Decision 10.COM 19, which read, 'Decides to convene an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group, to be held before the twelfth session of the Committee, to discuss draft Operational Directives on the procedure for removal of an element from a List and the transfer from one list to the other; this meeting will be organized on condition that voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund are received […]'. In short, the Secretariat was reporting that it had not received any funds before the present twelfth session of the Committee. The question of whether the Committee wished to request more funds would appear under agenda item 14.

137. The **delegation of Senegal** suggested that the Committee not digress from the discussion on each point, if possible. In this case, it was a reporting issue for a planned activity that could not be held due to a lack of contributions. There were indeed some important issues on the transfer of an element, but this discussion was on another level and went beyond the scope of the reporting expressed in this paragraph. The delegation felt that this issue was simple in that the debate would continue under agenda item 14, and thus in the future the Committee should not deviate from the agenda items under discussion.

138. Noting the remarks and explanations, the **delegation of Algeria** suggested adopting the decision as a whole, as all the questions had been answered, and reference had been made to the tenth session of the Committee.

139. The **Secretary** remarked that the Committee also had to approve the two spending plans cited in the decision, i.e. the whole decision was not solely a reporting matter.

140. The **delegation of Ethiopia** echoed the remarks made by Senegal, recalling that Decision 10.COM 19 had come from Viet Nam, which suggested more expert meetings and deliberations on the issue of a transfer of an element, for which extrabudgetary funding was recommended. Thus, this paragraph was a follow-up to that discussion, as explained by the

Secretary. The delegation urged the Committee to proceed as recommended by the Secretariat, and leave the detailed discussions on the way forward under agenda item 14, as planned.

141. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported Algeria in the adoption of the paragraph as a whole, and the proposal to continue the debate on the working group under agenda item 14.

142. The **delegation of Afghanistan** agreed with the idea of retaining the paragraph, but suggested simplifying the text by deleting 'supplementary', with 'has not yet been received' (regarding the funds) appearing near the end of the sentence.

143. The **Secretary** clarified that 'supplementary voluntary contributions' was specific technical terminology that corresponded to the previous decision.

144. The **delegation of Afghanistan** noted the fixed terminology that should be retained.

145. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 6 adopted as amended. Paragraph 7 was also duly adopted. Paragraph 8 contained two related points: i) to approve the two funding priorities for the period 2018–2021 as presented by the Secretariat and further explained in Annex II; and ii) to accept any future voluntary supplementary contributions received within the scope of such funding priorities, and authorize the Secretariat to make immediate use of those funds. With no objections, it was adopted. Paragraphs 9 and 10 were also duly adopted.

146. The **delegation of Turkey** returned to an earlier statement in which it wished to see resource mobilization discussed within the Ad Hoc Working Group, and would therefore submit an amendment under agenda item 13 in this regard.

147. The **delegation of Zambia** noted that paragraph 10 was restricted to the thirteenth session, and instead suggested 'subsequent sessions'.

148. The **Secretary** explained that this was a standard paragraph in that each subsequent session was cited specifically, i.e. in this case the next session would be the 'thirteenth session'. This was a way of making sure that a session was not missed, as it was specifically cited.

149. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 6 adopted**.

ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA

DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2018–2019

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/7*

Decision: *12.COM 7*

150. **The Chairperson** then turned to the next agenda item on the draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2018–2019, adding that many of the achievements by the Committee and the Secretariat over the past two years had been made possible thanks to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to which States Parties contributed every year. It was noted that the functions of the Committee were laid down in Article 7 of the Convention, one of which was to propose a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund for the General Assembly's approval. As this session was taking place the year before the next General Assembly, the Committee was called upon to examine the spending plan for the next two years, as prepared by the Secretariat. The Chairperson gave the floor to the Secretary to present the document.

151. The **Secretary** explained that working document 7 was made up of two main sections. The first part concerned the *past* and included the report on the implementation of the Fund from 1 January 2016 until 30 June 2017 and the detailed analysis on past expenditure trends, explaining the current situation of the Fund. The second part was about the *future* and included the proposed draft plan for the use of resources of the Fund for the next biennium and the first six months of 2020, recalling that the General Assembly would meet in June.

The document also included two important annexes: Annex I and the draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund; and Annex II and the financial statement on the use of the Fund, issued by the Bureau of Financial Management for the period 1 January 2016 to 30 June 2017. The Secretary then presented the situation of the 'past' and how the Fund was used. The total income of the Fund was based on: assessed contributions; voluntary contributions; and interest generated. During the 38 C/5 biennium, the total income of the Fund amounted to US$4,660,232, i.e. 15 per cent lower compared to the previous biennium. This decline was the result of the drastic reduction in the voluntary supplementary contributions, as discussed under item 6. By its Resolution 6.GA 9, the General Assembly approved a budget of US$7,977,920 for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2017. From Annex II/Financial Statement I, it was noted that as of 30 June 2017 the total expenditure was US$2,769,000, i.e. 35 per cent of the total budget approved. A detailed analysis would be presented on this persistent low expenditure rate when outlining some of the past trends. With regard to Financial Statement I, according to the budget approved by the General Assembly in 2016, the majority of the resources of the Fund (59 per cent) was dedicated to budget line 1, International Assistance. As of 30 June 2017, the expenditure rate of budget line 1 was 19.7 per cent and was expected to rise to around 26 per cent by the end of 2017, as new contracts had materialized since the end of the reporting period (i.e. Cambodia, Morocco), and two projects were approved by the Bureau for Niger. Regarding budget line 2, four States had received technical assistance for the preparation of International Assistance requests during the reporting period, representing an expenditure rate of 6.9 per cent. Furthermore, the Bureau had approved a preparatory assistance request for a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List after the reporting period for Namibia, which would increase this budget line to 9 per cent. Nevertheless, there was a dramatic underutilization of this line. For budget line 3, 'Other functions of the Committee', the expenditure rate had reached over 60 per cent at 30 June 2017, and was currently at 89 per cent, though it was expected to reach above 95 per cent by the end of the year. More detailed information on the activities undertaken could be found in the Secretariat's report. Budget lines 4, 5 and 6 corresponded to financial assistance for the participation of experts and NGOs in the Evaluation Body and Committee sessions, while budget line 7 corresponded to the fees of the members of the Evaluation Body and the fees paid to the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for their additional tasks. The expenditure rate of this line could not be completed as a margin was necessary in order to establish the contracts of the members of the Evaluation Body at the beginning of the evaluation cycle for the period before the meeting of the General Assembly when the spending plan would be approved. Finally, budget line 8 corresponded to the Reserve Fund, which had reached US$1 million this biennium, and the Fund would thus cease to be replenished, as per the limit set in Decision 10.COM 8.

152. The **Secretary** further explained that this situation was not new but was rather a recurrent trend. From the graph displayed on the screen, it was noted that over the years the level of expenditure was constantly lower than the assessed contributions due for the biennium. Since unspent balances were added to the assessed contributions, the total budget grew from one biennium to the next. The insufficient use of International Assistance and Technical Assistance mechanisms by States Parties had been the main cause of this trend over the past several cycles (under budget lines 1 and 2). Indeed, efforts by the Secretariat to improve the use of these mechanisms had resulted in a recent increase in expenditure compared to previous biennia. However, the expenditure rate remained proportionally low; well below half of the assessed contributions. If States continued to under-utilize the resources of the Fund, this trend would continue, and the total approved budget would keep increasing in future cycles. Thus, a specific strategy was required to address this situation. At a time when the funds of UNESCO were severely dwindling, it seemed incomprehensible to have a fund that was not being fully utilized.

153. Presenting the future, the **Secretary** referred to Annex I and the Draft Budget for the period of 24 months (2018–2019) plus the first six months of 2020, as there were ongoing activities during this period that the General Assembly would consider approving at its seventh session in June 2018. The Budget for the first six months of 2020 was calculated based on a

percentage (1/4) of the total budget approved for the period 2018–2019. For the period 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019, the amount of the spending plan for submission to the next General Assembly was estimated at approximately US$8.3 million. This time, the Secretariat's proposal included a sub-line in the spending plan to enhance human resources so as to improve the implementation of the International Assistance mechanism, which was specifically proposed to address the problem of its under-utilization. The Secretary was pleased to report on several positive points in the administration of International Assistance. For example, since the establishment of this procedure, 39 States Parties had been granted financial assistance from the Fund for a total amount of US$3.7 million in support of 69 projects. It was also encouraging to note that 63 per cent of the requests approved were submitted by States Parties from Africa, Electoral Group V(a), representing US$2.23 million, which was in line with UNESCO's global priority for Africa. The significance of International Assistance as the operational window of the Convention had been stressed in many instances, as it allowed for a comprehensive and realistic picture of the safeguarding priorities and actions of States. The projects implemented through International Assistance also had the potential to be a major learning tool for the Committee on the implementation of the Convention, for example as a repository of good safeguarding practices from which others could learn. The Secretariat had reviewed its working methods and made efforts to optimize the handling of International Assistance. Consequently, during this biennium, it was able to increase the number of International Assistance files presented to the Bureau by 40 per cent compared to the previous biennia. However, while this increase was the result of intense work concerning the processing of requests for approval by the Bureau, other important tasks related to what happens after the approval, including the establishment of contracts, the monitoring of progress, the processing of payments and so on, were not apparent. So, while the number of approvals had increased, this created an additional unsustainable workload in terms of working with the States Parties and in the implementation of the approvals. The Secretary explained that the work carried out by the Secretariat at this stage mainly involved budgetary and administrative monitoring, which missed out on opportunities that this operational mechanism could offer in terms of learning. Substantive monitoring of the projects should be an important dimension in the implementation of International Assistance as it could help States Parties create favourable conditions for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the short and longer term. An in-depth analysis and comprehensive evaluation of the results and impact of the projects could be highly useful for understanding the effective implementation of the International Assistance mechanism, as well as a promising means of informing on the overall implementation of the Convention. However, this would require a substantial investment in terms of time and resources from the Secretariat.

154. The **Secretary** remarked that the involvement of the Bureau and the Secretariat in the implementation of the International Assistance mechanism was expected to continue growing, especially with the increased ceiling of assistance requests examined by the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000. Thus, by increasing the scope for demand it would also be necessary to increase the capacity to supply that demand. At this stage, it was clear that the Secretariat's capacity did not allow for more than the basic administrative follow-up, let alone the substantive monitoring and analytical review of International Assistance projects. Projecting the human resources situation on the screen, it was noted that the current Secretariat was composed of eight professional and four general fixed term staff, which was a 20 per cent decrease since 2010 at a time when core statutory processes were growing in demand (for example, in the preparation of statutory meetings, drafting documents, supporting the Evaluation Body in its work, treating nominations and NGO requests for accreditation, reviewing and following-up on periodic reporting, organizing open-ended working groups, among other functions, including the capacity-building programme). The Secretariat therefore currently had no other solution than to turn to temporary assistance to cover some of these functions. With regard to International Assistance, the roles and responsibilities were divided between several staff (fixed and temporary) over and above their primary responsibilities. Hence, the draft plan proposed included a new budget line (1.1) to cover the biannual costs of two new extra-budgetary fixed-term posts (one P3 and one G5) to form a team dedicated to fully activating the International Assistance mechanisms, as

well as much-needed monitoring and the evaluation of its implementation. This would ensure stability and continuity of the results, and thus budget line 1.1 should also form part of future plans. The funding of these posts would evidently continue to be subject to approval at each General Assembly. This new budget line would amount to only 5.4 per cent of the total estimated budget for the next biennium. To absorb this new percentage, slight decreases were proposed under certain budget lines, but without affecting their objectives. Additionally, the interest received on the balance of the Fund corresponded to 40 per cent of the costs of the two posts.

155. The **Secretary** then turned to the other parts of the proposed spending plan. Budget line 1 (International Assistance) would be assigned the majority of the allocation of the Fund (54.85 per cent). The slight decrease (4.15 per cent) compared to the current plan would be dedicated to covering most of the newly created budget line 1.1. Budget line 2 (Preparatory/Technical Assistance), which was also highly under-utilized at 9 per cent, would decrease by one percentage point (from 5.5 per cent to 4.5 per cent) with the difference used to cover the creation of the two new posts. Budget line 3 (Other functions of the Committee) would be maintained at 20 per cent of the total approved budget. As previously approved, funds allocated to this budget line would be specifically dedicated to: i) the capacity-building programme and the global upstream work; ii) the integration of intangible cultural heritage into development plans, policies and programmes, with a particular focus on education, which would allow the Secretariat to carry out the upstream work that would in turn generate projects; iii) the management of knowledge, information and monitoring of the Convention, which included key functions, such as supplying online information on statutory meetings, databases, and so on; and iv) promoting the objectives of the Convention though awareness raising and outreach. The Secretary reminded the Committee that this line was dedicated to upstream work at the global level, which would allow for the implementation of projects and programmes at the national and regional levels through extrabudgetary means. Budget lines 4, 5, 6 and 7 would be maintained at their respective percentages with slight changes so as to better align them with upcoming obligations. In this regard, the Secretariat would present a slight amendment based on its experience that year, which would allow for some flexibility in using funds across the budget lines. The Secretary explained that these budget lines were related to the cost of the participation of experts and Committee Members, States non-party to the Convention, and accredited NGOs to statutory meetings. However, as the Secretariat did not know when the Committees would be held, and thus their exact costs and demands, the budget lines could be better utilized by allowing for movement from one budget line to the next. For example, in 2017, one budget line had been fully utilized, which meant that some delegates were unable to receive financial assistance under this line, while another budget line had been under-utilized and could have been used to serve the purpose of the first budget line. In this way, the funds could be used much more effectively. What was the implication of the proposed plan for the use of the resources of the Fund? The Secretary explained that in this new scenario – if the draft plan was approved by the General Assembly – it would mean that the Fund would reach its optimum level when the total budget approved equalled the amount of assessed contributions and expenditure. It was thus necessary to have the Fund working as originally intended, rather than allowing it to grow over the years. In this way, the Fund would be replenished effectively, not least because there was a drop in extrabudgetary funds, as previously mentioned, which could be attributed to the fact that States Parties were reluctant to contribute additional funds when the Fund was growing but under-utilized. The graph showed that assessed contributions would increase by 3 per cent every biennium, and yet even if an increase by 40 per cent in both budget lines 1 and 2 during the 39 C/5 and 40 C/5 were sustained, it would still take 14 years until the 45 C/5 to get back to the ideal situation, i.e. where assessed contributions were being used to their maximum extent. It was thus important to address this situation, as it only risked getting worse.

156. With this in mind, the **Secretary** proposed amending the draft decision by adding two new paragraphs, which were not included in the document as they were based on the experience in 2017 and therefore post-publication. They concerned the process of granting financial assistance to experts from developing States Parties and representatives of NGOs to

participate in the sessions of the Committee. It was noted that in recent years, as the Convention was reaching near universal ratification, the Secretariat had witnessed an increasing number of financial assistance requests to cover the participation costs of States Parties' experts in the Committee (line 5). However, in 2017 the demands had exceeded the available resources allocated for this purpose for the second year in a row, and more so than in 2016, i.e. the first year the budget line was unable to meet all the requests, resulting in some refusals. At the same time, the budget allocation for the participation of Committee Members' experts (line 4) and representatives of NGOs (line 6) remained partially unused. In total, some 25 per cent of all the funds allocated to the three lines had remained unused during the last biennium. With 175 States Parties, 164 accredited NGOs and a Committee venue that was not known in advance, it was thus difficult to predict the amount needed under each budget line. The proposed paragraph 8 would therefore allow the Secretariat to make transfers up to an equivalent of 30 per cent of the initial total allocation between lines 4, 5 and 6 with a view to optimizing their use. In the case of the proposed paragraph 9, this sought to amend Rule 5.5 of its Rules of Procedure to revise the deadline by which requests for assistance from State Parties should reach the Secretariat, extending it from four to eight weeks ahead of the session concerned. The Secretary clarified that since 2014, the Secretariat had in fact applied an earlier deadline than the one specified in Rule 5.5, and States Parties were always informed in advance in their invitation letters. The reason behind this request for a different deadline was so that the Secretariat could abide by the administrative regulations of UNESCO, according to which tickets should be booked no later than three weeks prior to the departure date. In light of the large number of requests received by the Secretariat, not only did the deadline in Rule 5.5 not allow the Secretariat to abide by the internal administrative rules, but it did not even provide enough time to respond to all the requests received. Furthermore, an earlier deadline would also help cover the costs of more experts, as ticket prices tended to be lower when booked in advance. This proposed amendment thus sought to rectify the discrepancy between Rule 5.5 and the administrative regulations of UNESCO. The Secretary concluded by bringing to the Committee's attention some figures on the state of compulsory assessed contributions as of 24 November 2017. Citing Article 26 of the Convention, it was noted that 40 per cent of the contributions due for 2017 had remained unpaid. The total unpaid amount was $879,928, as of 24 November 2017, and 15 per cent of States Parties had not made any contribution during the current biennium.

157. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the detailed explanation of the use of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund since 1 January 2016, and for the presentation of the Plan for the next period 2018–2019, which included important changes to improve the implementation of the Fund in future cycles. The Chairperson recalled that the use of its resources was based on the guidelines laid down in Chapter II.1 of the Operational Directives, as approved by the General Assembly, in accordance with Article 5.1 of the Financial Regulations of the Fund. The Chairperson opened the floor to the Committee for comments and questions.

158. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the report and the extensive briefing, and welcomed the two items proposed, though some reflection was needed, which it wished to see displayed on the screen. As emphasized in the previous agenda item, although there was some improvement, it noted with concern that while the Fund continued to grow, while being under-utilized, extrabudgetary funds to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for capacity-building programmes, as well as to the sub-fund for the human resources of the Secretariat, continued to diminish. As a remedy to this problem in the short term, access to the Fund had been improved by granting authority to the Bureau to approve International Assistance requests from US$25,000 to US$100,000. However, this could not be considered as a permanent solution for the following reasons. First of all, it did not address the issue of monitoring the funds from the perspective of finances and intangible cultural heritage. Access to International Assistance had been eased both in terms of scope and rules, but provisions relating to supply or delivery still needed to be addressed. Secondly, access to funds by raising the financial limit of the Bureau for approving International Assistance requests overstepped the Bureau's role, particularly in line with the recommendations of the Ad Hoc

Working Group on governance regarding the role of the Bureaus. For these reasons, the Committee should exercise caution in giving such responsibilities to the Bureau. On the other hand, it welcomed and supported the proposal by the Secretariat to create a new budget line to cover the costs of two extrabudgetary fixed-term posts who would work on activating the International Assistance mechanisms, and monitoring and evaluating their implementation. In fact, it would be even more favourable if more than two fixed-term posts were allocated for this purpose. Nevertheless, in the meantime, the Committee should consider a comprehensive long-term approach, as this would soon become a chronic problem for the Convention. The Committee also had to look for solutions that would allow the Secretariat to effectively deliver International Assistance to requesting States Parties. This issue needed to be addressed together with the broader resource mobilization strategy of the Convention in the context of the structured financing dialogues. Accordingly, the delegation proposed that the ad hoc working group be mandated to analyse the funding issue as a whole, both for under-utilized funds as well as extrabudgetary funding. In this regard, it would introduce some amendments under agenda item 13.

159. The **delegation of Ethiopia** thanked the Secretariat for the extensive explanation and for sharing the issues that required serious attention. As mentioned earlier, this Convention had achieved a lot and become increasingly attractive, which should very much be encouraged. However, the growing workload owing to International Assistance requests and the resources of the Secretariat were not adequately balanced. International Assistance mechanisms are very important for the African continent; the assistance received by Ethiopia had helped develop inventory mechanisms, nomination files and national guidelines for capacity building to raise awareness about the Convention among practitioners. As mentioned in the Secretariat's report, a very small amount of the available Fund was utilized, and this was primarily due to the limited human resources. While there were under-utilized resources, it really made no sense not to place resources to their best effect for the sake of the Convention. The Committee should thus consider the everyday reality of the Secretariat's capabilities and decide to best cope with the ever-growing demands from States Parties. With a view to achieving more and effectively implementing the Convention, the delegation strongly supported the request to open up extrabudgetary [staffing] positions. This would allow for an appropriate follow-up and monitoring of the proposed measures so as to benefit from the resources available in the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to a greater extent. Moreover, this would only be a temporary solution, owing to its extrabudgetary nature. Although it would prefer a more sustainable solution, the delegation supported the decision, given the financial situation of the Organization.

160. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for its report on this item, noting with concern that the utilization of International Assistance remained low, despite some improvements observed in 2017. It believed that the targeted workshops and meetings would be needed to further improve the rate of submission of requests from other regional groups. In this regard, the UNESCO Field Offices with an on-the-ground presence could be better utilized. The delegation therefore supported the initiative to have dedicated staff for International Assistance, funded through extrabudgetary resources. However, it also wished to know more about the donors and whether these posts could not ultimately be sourced through the Regular Programme, as these posts would no doubt be required on a permanent basis when the provision of extrabudgetary support could not be guaranteed over time.

161. The **delegation of Austria** renewed its appreciation for the Secretariat's work, the efforts of which were clearly reflected in the figures. For instance, it was noted that the utilization of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund under budget lines 1 and 2 had considerably increased due to the raised ceiling for International Assistance requests presented to the Bureau, which implied an additional workload for the Secretariat and was very likely to continue in future cycles. However, the delegation agreed that there was still room for improvement with regard to International Assistance, which was the primary function of the Fund according to the Operational Directives. It understood that further activities to enable States Parties to request International Assistance required additional human resources within the Secretariat. It also understood that the costs for additional posts could not – in the short- and mid-term – be

covered by cost recovery as generally foreseen for activities related to the Fund. The delegation therefore supported the proposal by the Secretariat to establish a new budget line for two additional fixed-term posts in order to fully activate the International Assistance mechanism, and effectively monitor and evaluate its implementation. However, once the Fund had become more extensively utilized, staff costs should be covered to an increasing degree by resources stemming from cost recovery. The delegation thus sought to hear from the Secretariat about the length of time for which these two posts would be covered by the additional budget line from the Fund, and what would happen to the posts should the General Assembly decide in a future cycle not to prolong the budget line.

162. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Secretariat for the very clear report and detailed explanations. Despite the noted evolution in the situation, which the delegation welcomed, it remained fairly paradoxical, especially considering the enormous needs of States Parties, particularly from developing countries in Africa. On the one hand, there was a noted underutilization of the resources available to States because of the problem of human resources, as well as the problem of developing projects and programmes to obtain these resources. On the other hand, though, there was also a problem of human resources at the Secretariat in terms of the capacity to treat these files. These paradoxes lead the Committee to actually find solutions, i.e. through capacity building in these countries, but also by strengthening the human resources at the Secretariat. The Secretariat needed to be able to deal with all these issues and to have the adequate resources to deal with these requests, expressed by a larger number of States having ratified the Convention. Consequently, Senegal strongly supported the proposal to allow the Secretariat to allocate a budget for the creation of two posts.

163. Responding to the question from the Philippines, the **Secretary** clarified that these posts would not be funded by donors but by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund under the International Assistance mechanism. They would thus be considered as extrabudgetary posts in the UNESCO framework, even though they would be assigned under the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. With regard to Austria's question on what would happen should the General Assembly not approve this sub-line at some time in the future, the Secretary invited the Administrative Officer to respond.

164. The **Administrative Officer of the Culture Sector, Mr Baakrim Abdelghani**, wished to first clarify – in response to the issue of cost recovery, which had also been raised by Austria – that should the Committee decide to recommend to the General Assembly the creation of these two posts, they would be considered as extrabudgetary posts. The cost recovery policy did not apply to extrabudgetary items so, in a sense, there would be a decrease in the withdrawals under line 1. In fact, the reduction in cost recovery would be slightly offset by line 1.1. With regard to an eventual decision by the General Assembly not to renew the extension of these two posts, of course, with regard to the positions established, should the time come, the sector would try to find ways to accommodate the staff members under the Regular Programme. However, for the 39th and 40th [sessions of the General Conference] the situation was so critical that it would be difficult to envisage the creation of these posts, otherwise they would likely have already been created.

165. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** appreciated the Secretariat's presentation of the draft plan for the use of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for 2018 to 2019, adding that it found the Secretariat's proposal to create two fixed-term posts for International Assistance reasonable. Given the increasing workload of the Secretariat, combined with its limited human resources, it believed that the ever-increasing demand for International Assistance as well as the accumulation of under-allocated funds only demonstrated that a viable solution was needed. Nevertheless, the delegation asked that the Secretariat report back to the Committee in two years' time on how the strengthened resources had contributed to the revitalization of the International Assistance programme, so that the Committee and the General Assembly could be assured that they had made the right decision by approving this project.

166. The **delegation of Japan** acknowledged the efforts of the Secretariat, and hoped that the

resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for safeguarding living heritage would be used effectively. It added that in order to acknowledge the needs of submitting States and to respond [to their requests] in a timely manner, it was not enough only to bolster the budget, as reinforced human resources were also needed to improve the implementation of the International Assistance mechanisms. In this regard, Japan supported the draft plan that included the new budget item listed in Annex I, I.1. It also intended to continue working with UNESCO and Member States to contribute further to the implementation of the Convention.

167. The **Chairperson** declared the afternoon session adjourned.

[Tuesday, 5 December 2017, morning session]

ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2018–2019

168. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it had successfully concluded agenda items 1-6. However, it had not managed to finish examining agenda items 7 and 8.a, as foreseen in the provisional timetable. The Bureau, having met in the morning for the first time, had revised the timetable published under ICH 12.COM on the dedicated website. The day's session would begin with agenda item 7 before moving on to agenda items 8.a, 8.b and 8.c on the examination of the reports of the States Parties. The afternoon session would proceed with agenda items 9: Draft overall results framework for the Convention, item 10: Draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting, and item 11: Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2017. In addition, the Bureau proposed examining agenda item 13: Report of the informal ad hoc working group, followed by item 12: Procedures to facilitate dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State(s). Taking into consideration the heavy agenda, the Chairperson urged Members to be brief and to inform the Secretariat of any requests for debate or amendments to specific draft decisions concerning nominations. So far, the Bureau had received only two requests on a nomination to the Representative List. However, Members were free to take the floor on any decision if they so wished. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to make some announcements.

169. The **Secretary** reminded delegates who had received financial assistance to participate in the meeting to sign off with proof of travel to close the accounts. A roundtable on intangible cultural heritage and tertiary education organized by ICHCAP in collaboration with UNESCO would be held during lunch, which would be offered by ICHCAP prior to the event. The ICHNGO Forum would hold its regional working groups during the lunch break. There was also a Mongolian National Instrument performance in the foyer.

170. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted.

171. The **delegation of Mongolia** thanked the Secretariat for the detailed report on the use of resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the last biennium, and for the explanation of the budget proposal for 2018–2019. The Secretariat had done an excellent job until now. With regard to the underutilization of the International Assistance mechanisms and the growing imbalance of the Fund, Mongolia fully welcomed the Secretariat's proposal to create a dedicated team with two new fixed-term posts in order to fully activate the International Assistance mechanisms and effectively monitor and evaluate their implementation. The delegation believed that all the States Parties would agree that such an important subject as International Assistance required not only money but also the necessary human resources. Furthermore, concerning the two additional paragraphs proposed to the draft decision presented in document 7, it supported these additions as it understood the rise in requests for assistance to participate in Committee sessions, and it was aware that the Secretariat was working hard in preparation for those sessions.

172. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** remarked that it was perhaps desirable to specify the period of the two fixed-term posts. Under French legislation, the notion of *durée determinée* or 'fixed-

term' was well established, whereas this period covered 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019. Thus, the addition of 'for the period' or 'for two years' would clear up the timeframe issue.

173. The **Secretary** explained that the use of 'fixed-term post' employed UNESCO language, as these were UNESCO posts and were thus not subject to French legislation. All posts were to be reviewed every two years at the General Conference, so contracts were always for a period of two years. The posts would be financed from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and thus would be subject to the same language as the C/5, and consequently the same C/5 procedure. However, the posts would not take effect on 1 January 2018 because the General Assembly first had to approve this decision, which was therefore a recommendation to the General Assembly. After that, it would be necessary to establish the post and recruit the personnel. Nevertheless, it would be an ordinary UNESCO 'extrabudgetary fixed-term' post financed by the Fund. That being said, the Fund would be subject to review by the General Assembly every two years, as the Regular Programme is subject to review by Member States every two years.

174. The **delegation of Algeria** asked the Secretariat whether the two posts would be sufficient to carry out all the work planned by the Committee over the next two or four years. The delegation explained that it did not wish to have half-measures, and given the growing consensus in the room, wondered whether three positions would not be more appropriate.

175. The **Secretary** replied that in all honesty, the answer was *no* in that the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section mainly relied on personnel under temporary contracts and not fixed posts. In any case, the Secretariat was not sufficiently staffed, whether for statutory meetings or for the work currently undertaken, for which it depended increasingly on extrabudgetary resources, more so than on UNESCO posts. The Secretary further explained that these posts would help by focusing exclusively on the implementation of International Assistance. However, regional officers were in direct contact with States Parties. These two posts would thus reinforce the work of the regional officers. In addition, the regional officers undertaking work related to NGO assessments, for example, often had multiple tasks. Thus, a third post would effectively free up the work carried out by staff in other non-defined posts. The Secretariat had sought two extra personnel who would focus specifically on this aspect, but this small team would not be able to perform all the tasks required for the implementation of International Assistance.

176. The **delegation of Cyprus** proposed that posts be seconded by States Parties to assist the Secretariat. For example, this had been done by the Secretariat of the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention and had apparently worked very well, as they can be seconded for two or three years. Cyprus has already done so for this Convention.

177. The **Secretary** did not believe that this would work in this case. Although the Secretariat appreciated the secondments and the expertise with which they come, in this case the implementation of projects required knowledge of UNESCO's procedures and administration, which would take two or three years to acquire. The Secretary explained that secondments were indeed very welcome and encouraged, but that some positions were administratively too complex and required different skill sets.

178. Having listened to the explanations, the **delegation of Algeria** wished to propose the creation of three posts to the General Assembly. It explained that the Secretariat's presentation on the use of the Fund and its upward curve was worrying, while at the same time the Committee had heard many delegations speak about seeking extrabudgetary funds when the Convention's own funds were not being fully utilized. Given the exceptional circumstances, and the decision to ultilize these funds on an exceptional basis for the creation of posts, the Committee should not seek half-measures, i.e. to employ two persons only to realize two years later that this was inadequate. Thus, instead of two posts, the delegation wished to propose three extrabudgetary posts, to be determined by the General Assembly. Given all the explanations, it believed that three posts were not too many.

179. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that although it appreciated the work of the Secretariat, no numbers or figures had been presented in terms of costs, and thus this decision seemed rather spontaneous.

180. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** shared the same concerns in that it seemed premature to ask for three posts when the Committee could already begin with two posts and then see how this would evolve in the future.

181. The **delegation of Algeria** did not wish to argue against the general consensus, but on hearing the remark by the Côte d'Ivoire it felt that there was indeed some confusion. The delegation explained that these two or three posts would be established on an exceptional basis and would not necessarily be renewed; this decision dealt with a one-time problem with no expected future as such. This measure would not only reduce the pressure on the Fund by utilizing the funds, which would otherwise remain in the bank, but it would also provide additional resources to the Secretariat to allow it to do the job properly. Everyone agreed that a team of two was almost unmanageable, and thus it was a question of logic.

182. Thanking Algeria, the **Chairperson** found the consensus very encouraging in that everyone agreed that the Secretariat should be properly staffed in terms of International Assistance. As a compromise, the Chairperson proposed stipulating in the decision the creation of two or three new extrabudgetary fixed-term posts.

183. The **Secretary** explained that two proposed options would require two budgets for presentation to the General Assembly, as the Committee was expected to agree on the budget for presentation to the General Assembly. Thus, the budget table would have to be revised. Alternatively, the Secretariat could prepare two budget options, if requested to do so, otherwise the current decision would be incorrect with respect to the budget proposed. Thus, the option of two or three posts and their associated budgets was a technical issue.

184. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** noted that it would be burdensome to prepare two separate budget proposals, and it also concurred with the sensible remarks made by Côte d'Ivoire. Noting that the need for two or three posts would depend on the amount and intensity of the work required, the delegation believed that the Committee should stick to the original proposal of two posts and see with time how much the workload would increase, and then make a decision based on that.

185. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the proposal for the option of two or three posts for submission to the General Assembly, despite the fact that it understood the Secretary's concern regarding the preparation of two different budgets.

186. The **Secretary** could live with the two options, but the Secretariat would require the flexibility to prepare the two budgets in an Annex I and Annex I bis. With this in mind, paragraph 4 would have to be reopened, as it referred to Annex I.

187. The **delegation of Algeria** further explained that some delegations had wished to have two posts and see how this would affect the work in the future and perhaps adjust the situation accordingly. However, its understanding was that these two or three created positions would be on an exceptional basis, which would not be renewed, so a third post could not be added in the future. Thus, there was only one open opportunity to do it. Moreover, if the option of three new posts was retained, it did not preclude the decision taken by the General Assembly to which the proposal would be submitted. Thus, the General Assembly would decide whether to retain two posts. So for the moment the option remained just a proposal, as States Parties awaited more details at the General Assembly. This was why Algeria wished to have three posts to start with, until the General Assembly when new details would emerge.

188. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that it was known that the Secretariat lacked staff and that these two additional posts would be covered by the bank interest generated from the Fund, i.e. 40 per cent of the expenditures related to the post during this exercise would be covered by the interest of the Fund, as presented in the report. The delegation thus wondered why the Secretariat had come to request two posts and not three, and wished to hear the reasoning behind this decision.

189. The **Secretary** was explicit in that the Secretariat's needs would not be met as it was clearly understaffed. He explained that the Intangible Cultural Heritage Section currently had twelve fixed-term posts and around eighteen people working on non-fixed posts, when in reality the Secretariat would need as many fixed posts. However, the Secretariat's reasoning was to request a reasonable number of posts that was likely to be accepted. With regard to the Fund, it was indeed generating interest. So initially the cost would be borne by the interest generated, followed by the capital when the interest was exhausted. To answer Turkey's question, the real required number of staff would be around ten–fifteen posts. However, given the current financial situation in UNESCO this was not realistic. Thus, the Secretariat had decided to request a more reasonable number of posts with this innovative approach to budgeting for them.

190. After hearing the explanation from the Secretariat, the **Chairperson** withdrew his amendment on the understanding that Algeria would also withdraw.

191. The **delegation of Algeria** believed that it was mandatory to have the Secretariat working in a proper manner. However, it was clear that the Secretariat was understaffed and was asking to create more posts, as there was no possibility to do it without further help. Thus, for Algeria, three posts would be a minimum and not an unreasonable request. In any case, this proposal would be put to the General Assembly.

192. Having listened to the Secretary's explanation, the **delegation of Saint Lucia** noted that the Secretariat was being reasonable in requesting two posts when obviously there was a consensus that they needed the Committee's support for the additional personnel. The delegation felt that the Committee could agree to be even more reasonable and support the Secretary with three members of staff. It therefore supported Algeria's amendment.

193. The **delegation of Cyprus** also wished to support the proposal by Algeria for three posts, knowing that the General Assembly would have to decide on the number of posts created. In addition, the posts were for a fixed-term period, and therefore there would be no point in returning to the decision in the future.

194. The **delegation of Turkey** echoed the previous speakers in supporting Algeria's justified proposal. The Convention was almost universal with more States Parties coming on board, which meant a greater workload for the Secretariat. Meanwhile the Fund was under-utilized so there was already justification for the General Assembly to approve this proposal. It thus supported the option of three posts.

195. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Secretariat for the explanation, and of course it understood that staff were needed, particularly for statutory obligations. However, a budget line 1.1 would be created under International Assistance, where the posts would provide exclusive support for International Assistance, but the Committee did not have the relevant budget on which to make a decision. The delegation therefore suggested postponing this decision until the relevant budget had been prepared.

196. The **Secretary** fully appreciated the support and understanding. However, the Committee had already adopted paragraph 4 with the set amount under budget line 1.1 corresponding to the costs of two posts. The budget was now in place, but in the case of three posts, the Secretariat would require some flexibility on that budget to allow for three posts, otherwise it would be impossible to create three posts from the budget earmarked for two posts. This was therefore a technical issue and the Committee needed to find a wording that would provide the Secretariat with some flexibility within the two budget options of line 1.1. The Secretary suggested one option, which was to reopen paragraph 4 and present the Committee with the two options under budget line 1.1. The other option – because this would need to be submitted to the General Assembly – would perhaps be to delegate the two options to the Bureau in order to save time. After a long pause, the Secretary came up with another suggestion, which was to introduce a third column in Annex I that would indicate a percentage of the Fund corresponding to three posts (at the moment 1.1 represented 5.4 per cent of the Fund for two posts). The Secretariat would present the figure to the Committee so that it could then decide, for which paragraph 4 would need to be reopened.

197. **The delegation of Algeria** asked the Secretariat whether it could adopt a new paragraph that 'took note' of paragraph 4 as it stood, with the adoption of a new paragraph requesting the consideration of opening another post?

198. The **Secretary** suggested suspending the adoption of the decision to allow the Secretariat to prepare the documents that would enable the Committee to adopt the corresponding budget.

199. The **delegation of the Philippines** agreed with the Secretariat's proposal to allow for some time to make the necessary modifications, and to suspend the discussion for the moment.

200. The **delegation of Senegal** concurred with the Secretariat to return to the proposal.

201. The **delegation of Hungary** noted the withdrawn proposal by the Chairperson, as well as the growing consensus to request three posts, which was supported by Algeria, Saint Lucia, Turkey, Côte d'Ivoire and Cyprus, adding that it simplified the task to have only one option on the table. Hungary thus supported the option of three posts.

202. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary, adding that he had wished to suggest the same, noting that the majority view was for three posts. The Chairperson suspended the item.

203. The **delegation of Ethiopia** strongly concurred with Hungary's remarks, and with the Chairperson withdrawing his proposal; it would be easier to allow the Secretariat to prepare the draft decision based on three posts.

204. The **Chairperson** proposed suspending the debate on this item until the afternoon session with the understanding that three posts would be created. He then turned to the set of sub-items under agenda item 8 on the examination of reports submitted by States Parties, beginning with agenda item 8a: Reports of States Parties on the use of International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, which took stock of the implementation of the Convention on the ground.

[Suspension of agenda item 7]

ITEM 8.a OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/8.a*
Decision: *12.COM 8.a*

205. The **Chairperson** introduced a set of sub-items under agenda item 8 on the examination of reports submitted by States Parties, beginning with item 8.a: Reports of States Parties on the use of International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund. He invited the Secretary to present the item.

206. The **Secretary** referred to Article 24.3, which stipulates 'The beneficiary State Party shall submit to the Committee a report on the use made of the assistance provided for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage'. He noted that following Decision 11.COM 9.c, the Secretariat had made efforts to match reporting periods as closely as possible with the submission date of 30 June 2016, which meant that eleven reports would be presented at the present session, having been submitted between 1 July 2016 and 30 June 2017. The working document had hyperlinks to the final reports on completed projects and projects that were still being implemented. The document also provided direct access to these reports, which were available in both English and French. Summary data on all the reports were also attached. The Secretary reminded the Committee that these reports represented only part of the current projects. The working document also included a list of all the projects in progress, representing a total of twenty-four projects for a total amount of US$2.2 million. The Secretary recalled that under agenda item 7, he had presented in detail the issues and challenges related to the implementation of the International Assistance mechanism. In this respect, the Committee's potential decision to accept the proposal to create three fixed-term posts

financed with extrabudgetary funds would be highly appreciated and should allow for a better implementation of the International Assistance mechanism.

207. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–8 were duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.a adopted**.

208. The **Chairperson** noted that a number of countries having benefited from International Assistance and having completed their projects wished to share their experiences with the Committee. Côte d'Ivoire also wished to take the floor to share some initial achievements in the implementation of its ongoing emergency International Assistance project.

209. The **delegation of Burkina Faso** spoke of its honour in sharing its experience regarding the implementation of the project 'Inventory and Promotion of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Burkina Faso', for which it had benefited from financial assistance from UNESCO. The delegation expressed thanks to the authorities of Burkina Faso for their invaluable support, given their limited means. Burkina Faso had benefited from US$262,080, for which it was very grateful. One of the benefits gained from the implementation of this project was that it made it possible to better approach communities and to discover a number of concerns. It had also made it possible, with the active participation of communities, to collect 1,492 intangible cultural heritage elements during the twenty months of work required. The database would now allow for the activation of new actions thanks to the learnings on the state of viability of the inventoried elements; one of the major objectives from the outset. In addition, the capacities of the administrators, members of the communities and NGOs had been strengthened in terms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which was a very important outcome. Burkina Faso had learned that nothing could be achieved without the communities, but also that approaching the communities was a delicate matter. Future actions would now be better prepared with the lessons learned from the field. It had also learned that fieldwork was needed to anticipate a number of difficulties in accessing the elements, as evidently communities were understandably not always willing to open up or provide information. The delegation also stressed the importance of informing the communities, while taking into account a number of financial conditions. It had also learned that many actions, even governmental ones, could have negative repercussions for the cultural life of the communities, but if development policies took these cultural aspects into account, this offered a higher chance of success. The delegation explained that the project had not been easy, as a change of political regime in 2014 had complicated matters when more than three months passed without state authorities in place. During the preparation for the launch of the pilot phase, a military coup had occurred, which had complicated matters even further. The financial conditions had changed in the meantime and the project had been taken over by the State, which proved to be a difficult situation. Concluding, the delegation wished to show a short film that invited the communities to share their intangible cultural heritage, once again thanking all those that had made this project possible, particularly the staff at UNESCO for their work.

[A short film was projected]

210. The **delegation of Togo** congratulated Korea for hosting and organizing the Committee session. Togo had benefited from the Fund for a project to undertake an inventory and an evaluation of the know-how and practice of the traditional musical instruments of Togo. The pilot phase took place from December 2015 to January 2017 in the maritime region of southern Togo with financial support from UNESCO amounting to US$25,000. The project brought together three flagship activities, including an inventory, workshops related to making and practice of the instruments, and an exhibition-type presentation. There were three main lessons learned from the pilot phase. The first lesson is that the inventory revealed the importance of know-how, the bearer communities, and the involvement of young people in its promotion. The second lesson came about from the method of duplication or training workshops. Originally, the workshops were planned with one set up for the making and one for the practice of the instruments. However, together with the bearers, the project team

devised a common strategy whereby the workshops were duplicated: three sessions for the making and three sessions for practice in three different villages. This method resulted in strong involvement by the trainers from the communities, especially among the learners who attended the training sessions at the community level. This approach is therefore a model for a traditional school in Africa, which – beyond the knowledge acquired – is a space for the socialization of young people. The last lesson learned concerned sharing the results, which was organized with the communities based on a particular model. Exhibitions were linked with educational and cultural events organized by the trainers who came from the communities, the experts who participated and developed the inventory, and mostly young people from the school environment. More than 6,000 people participated in these exhibitions over two weeks. In the content of this exhibition, some rediscovered the dances and instrumental practices of their origins, as already at secondary school the pupil is removed from her/his environment, and at university, they no longer identify with these practices found at the village level. The project thus nurtured cooperation between the cultural administration (at central and local levels) and the school administration, leading up to a more promising phase. The delegation reiterated its thanks to UNESCO, which also strengthened the capacity of the project team for the implementation of this pilot phase. It hoped to continue to benefit from its support in financial as well as material resources for the full implementation of the project.

[A short film was projected]

211. The **delegation of Uganda** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and for his excellent leadership. It thanked the Republic of Korea and the self-governing region of Jeju for their hospitality and excellent organization, and congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent service in the implementation of the Convention. Bigwala, gourd trumpet music and dance of the Busoga people in Uganda, is an element of intangible cultural heritage that was inscribed in 2012 [on the Urgent Safeguarding List]. Uganda received assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund to revitalize its cultural practice, and the project was completed in April 2017. As a result of the revitalization project, Bigwala, which was on the verge of extinction, is played on Busoga's best radios, and fifty selected new players performed at the second coronation anniversary of the King on 13 October 2016. Bigwala was recently performed at ten community functions in the Busoga region. Seven new groups of Bigwala players, including forty-five instrumentalists and fifty dancers, have been created. These groups include men, women and the youth who play Bigwala, but trained was also provided in Bigwala-making skills. Before the intervention, gourds that were used to make Bigwala were not available in Busoga. Communities have now been provided with seeds and currently gourds are available in the communities. In conclusion, the International Assistance had contributed to the viability of the element immensely, and Uganda was now on the right path to achieving the complete revitalization of the element. The State Party, together with the communities concerned, would continue with its safeguarding efforts, including awareness creation, the implementation of all the processes involved, and transferring skills to the younger generation through continuous performances. The delegation would notify the Secretariat at the appropriate time of its readiness to apply for the transfer of the element to the Representative List. It sincerely thanked UNESCO for the International Assistance provided and for the technical support and guidance it had received throughout the implementation process.

[A short film was projected]

212. The **delegation of Zambia** presented a brief review of two projects that were funded for about US$25,000. A progress report had been submitted for one of the projects. During the reporting period (1 July 2016 to 3 June 2017), Zambia implemented two projects under the International Assistance mechanism. The projects were carried out in two out of ten provinces in the country: the Central Province and the Western Province. The project, the final report of which had been submitted, involved the inventorying of the music and dance of the Lozi

and Nkoya people of Kaoma District. This project period went from 12 August 2016 to 3 June 2017. It involved the inventorying of music and dance, and at the end of the project there were two main outcomes. An exhibition of the inventoried elements was held in the form of a video and photographs that were displayed at two different locations within the Western Province. The displays motivated a number of people to want to undertake intangible cultural heritage safeguarding activities. Even the traditional leadership mobilized themselves to spearhead the establishment of community committees aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in their chiefdom. The second project involved inventorying proverbs of the Lala community of the Luano District of Zambia, which ran from 20 September 2016 until 29 September 2017, for which the final report was pending. However, the project itself was successfully carried out and, as a result, a number of communities within Luano are now interested in undertaking activities aimed at safeguarding living heritage. For example, two communities have now begun to prepare proposals for International Assistance to carry out an inventory within their community. The projects ran smoothly. The only challenge experienced in both projects was the inability to get two international intangible cultural heritage experts to collaborate, as the two experts in the southern part of Africa were already conducting activities outside the continent. So, the two projects involved two national intangible cultural heritage experts instead, who did a good job. The delegation thanked UNESCO, which had enabled the two activities to take place under the International Assistance mechanism. The delegation wished to present a short film on the inventorying of the Lozi and Nkoya music and dance, which showed dances from the Lozi ethnic group and a funeral rite for the Nkoya people.

[A short film was projected]

213. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** reported that International Assistance had made it possible to start the process of inventorying the intangible cultural heritage present in the country since December 2015, with a view to its urgent safeguarding. The inventorying process had given rise to two phases: the first phase had been completed, while the second one was ongoing. Phase 1 covered six regions. The activities in this phase included: i) national coordination training on the 2003 Convention and participatory inventory work; ii) the methodological framework of phase 1; iii) an awareness-raising mission among the national coordinators in the chief towns of the six regions; iv) the training of six regional coordinators; v) the awareness-raising missions of the regional coordinators in other localities of their respective regions; vi) the training of twelve inventory teams from phase 1; vii) the collection of data by these teams; viii) regional workshops; ix) the training of officers of the Directorate of Cultural Heritage in the management of the database; x) a national workshop for reporting and the validation of results; and xi) the external evaluation of phase 1 by an expert member of the UNESCO network. The delegation further reported that the operation had also resulted in three related activities: i) a reflection workshop on strategies for integrating intangible cultural heritage into educational programmes; ii) a workshop to validate the draft of the new law for the creation of national cultural heritage with a view to incorporating the notion of intangible cultural heritage; and iii) a validation workshop on the preliminary draft decree establishing the National Commission for the Selection of Living Human Treasures. Phase 2 would cover the remaining twenty-six regions, in agreement with the Convention's Secretariat. This phase was split into two parts. The first part, which had been ongoing since the beginning of the second half of 2017, was defined by the framework of Phase 2, which consists of awareness-raising missions by national coordination in the chief towns of the first thirteen regions, the creation and coordination of information for the thirteen regions, as well as the set-up and training of the corresponding inventorying teams, who were already on the ground; the completion of this part was scheduled for February 2018. The achievements of Phase 1 included the training of more than 100 people, including cultural professionals, local government officials, community members and NGOs on intangible cultural heritage, the 2003 Convention, and participatory inventory work. In terms of achievements, they include data collection for more than 200 elements, of which 150 had been validated and 50 remained to be consolidated.

214. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** noted, however, that some financial and operational difficulties had emerged in the implementation of the project. Protocol costs that were not included in the initial budget had proved to be essential for awareness-raising and information-gathering missions. The transport and subsistence costs of the inventory teams had proved insufficient in the face of realities on the ground, as well as the difficulties encountered in the coordination between the Ministries of Culture and Finance. Finally, the outcome of the training by the regional coordinators in the regions to the benefit of the inventory teams had revealed shortcomings in the application of the principles of participatory inventory work. To counter these difficulties, some solutions had been proposed, notably the organization of several working sessions between the Directorate of Cultural Heritage and officials of the Ministry of Economy and Finance involved in the management of the operation. In addition, Phase 2 was divided into two parts. Thirteen regions were covered in 2017, ensuring that the budget allocated by the State in 2017 not only covered the expenses initially planned for the thirteen regions but also took into account the expenses revealed to be indispensable. In agreement with the Secretariat, the training of the inventory teams was supervised to ensure its high quality, as provided by the national coordination. These actions would ensure better results under Phase 2. The delegation would therefore have the opportunity to present the results of Phase 2 at the end of the project's implementation. Concluding, the delegation thanked UNESCO for its assistance, and the Secretariat for its ongoing monitoring of the implementation of this inventory, which meant that Côte d'Ivoire would now have a searchable database.

[A short film was projected]

215. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegations for kindly sharing their experiences. He then turned to the next agenda item 8.b: 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.

ITEM 8.b OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/8.b Rev.*
Reports: *11 reports*
Decision: *12.COM 8.b*

216. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

217. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee of its task to examine the eleven periodic reports submitted by States Parties in the current cycle, and to provide its own report to the General Assembly. It was noted that the Annex consisted of four parts. Part I of the Annex provided a general overview of the 2017 periodic reports and the status of the fifty-two States that were expected to report in 2017. A total of forty-one States were currently overdue with their reports, i.e. 79 per cent of the reports, which represented a slight improvement compared to 2016 (84 per cent). Nevertheless, the situation remained worrying as twenty-five States were more than a year overdue. However, following a reminder letter, four additional reports had been received from Jamaica, Mauritania, Serbia and Uganda after the deadline of 15 December 2016 and would thus be examined in 2018. The Secretary spoke of the persistent problem of the low rate of submission, recalling that the Committee, in its Decision 10.COM 6.a/6.b in 2015, had decided for the first time to encourage States Parties to fulfil their reporting requirements before submitting new nominations, reiterating its encouragement in 2016 (Decision 11.COM 9.a). Part II of the Annex gave an overview of the main topics covered by the eleven reports submitted for this cycle, which included institutional frameworks, inventory making, safeguarding measures undertaken at the national level, and cooperation at the bilateral, subregional, regional and international levels. It was also noted

that the revised version of the working document reflected the official name of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. In Part III of the Annex, the Secretariat provided an in-depth and cumulative analysis. For this cycle, the focus was on measures taken by States Parties to build and strengthen capacities in their territories for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. This analysis covered all the reports submitted from 2011 onwards. Several aspects were highlighted, such as the lack of human resources in some States Parties for implementing safeguarding measures, and the training provided in intangible cultural heritage management at the institutional and community levels. The cumulative focus proposed for the 2018 cycle was based on measures taken by States Parties to raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage. Part IV of the Annex presented abstracts for each of the eleven reports received, which would be available on the Convention website, as well as the reports examined by the Committee between 2011 and 2016. The Secretary concluded by recalling that the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group meeting held in Chengdu in June 2016 had discussed the role of the periodic reports in the overall results framework for the Convention, and how the existing reporting system could be improved. These issues would be further discussed under items 9 and 10. The draft decision proposed thus emphasized some general trends, while addressing several topics raised in the Annex.

218. The **Chairperson** noted that some of the States that had submitted a report in this cycle wished to share with the Committee their experiences in preparing the reports and the challenges and opportunities encountered while implementing the 2003 Convention at the national level.

219. The **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** explained that policy related to intangible cultural heritage had developed rapidly following the ratification of the Convention in 2006 and the ratification of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. With these ratifications, Macedonian legislation had been enriched with two important legal instruments that not only raised awareness of this type of cultural heritage, which up until 2007 had been overshadowed by immovable and movable cultural heritage, but also accelerated the whole process and development of the system of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The policy-makers in the Republic of Macedonia had worked intensively between 2004–2011 and up to the present day to harmonize the legal acts that directly or indirectly affect intangible cultural heritage. They had worked on more than four strategies that originated from the country, eleven laws and several dozen by-laws. Macedonia has inscribed two elements on the Representative List: The Feast of the Holy Forty Martyrs in Štip in 2013 and Kopachkata, a social dance from the village of Dramche, Pijanec in 2014. They had also inscribed one on the Urgent Safeguarding List: Glasoechko, male two-part singing in Dolni Polog in 2015. The country had participated in the preparation and submission of the multinational nomination file ‘Cultural practices associated to the 1st of March’ with Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova, as well as in the preparation and submission of the joint nomination, ‘Spring celebration, Hidrellez’, with Turkey. The National Register of Cultural Heritage has so far registered eighty-eight intangible properties. The institutional framework in the system of protection is arranged according to a hierarchy wherein the Cultural Heritage Protection Office is the lead administrative organization responsible for adopting and implementing policies to protect cultural heritage, including intangible elements. With regard to scientific institutions, the Ministry of Culture has authorized four scholarly institutes and one national museum as entities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. In addition to the State institutions, there are six NGOs that are actively involved, which includes the International Council for Tradition Music (ICTM), an internationally-known expert organization that has formal consultative relations with UNESCO. The Ministry of Culture supports multiple programmes for the popularization and informal transmission of knowledge on intangible cultural heritage through forums supporting NGOs and civil associations, as well as through the financing of workshops, seminars and summer schools. The State recognizes the fact that the fostering of intangible cultural heritage is part of the wider social and political contexts. The delegation was satisfied that significant progress had been made over a period of ten years since the

country's ratification in terms of the creation, development and promotion of the system of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.

220. The **delegation of Mauritius**, speaking on behalf of the Minister of Arts and Culture, expressed gratitude to the people and Government of South Korea for their excellent and warm welcome. It commended the Chairperson, assuring him of its full support. It also congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of its work despite the difficult financial situation, and shared the Secretariat's concerns in searching for creative and lasting solutions to increase the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, while welcoming the ratification of the Convention by new Member States. The Republic of Mauritius had been a signatory to the 2003 Convention since 2004. In 2015, it had become a Member of the Committee and had had the honour of serving the Member States in this capacity. In order to fulfil its mandate as a State Party to the Convention, the government had set up the National Heritage Fund, the national repository of intangible cultural heritage. Since then, it had carried out the documentation of living heritage as part of its obligations in Mauritius, resulting in a national inventory that is continually updated. All of the activities carried out under this Convention, such as workshops and community consultations, are organized in close consultation and partnership with civil society and are geared towards the safeguarding and promotion of its intangible cultural heritage. Over the past two years, the Republic of Mauritius had succeeded in inscribing two elements on the Representative List, namely, 'Traditional Mauritian Sega' and 'Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius, Geet-Gawai'. The National Heritage Fund under the purview of the Minister of Arts and Culture led that nomination dossier. Furthermore, in March 2016, Mauritius submitted the nomination file 'Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island', which would be examined in the present session. The delegation was happy to state that Mauritius had submitted a periodic report of intangible heritage in its territory every six years, and would submit its second periodic report for the period 2010–2016, as per its obligations. The preparation of the report had been a fruitful experience that had allowed for better connections between the various stakeholders involved in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. As a diverse country in terms of its social and cultural history and traditions, Mauritius has real treasures that require regular documentation, updating and safeguarding. The preparation of the report allowed it to identify challenges in the national inventory, and to reflect on its improvements to better safeguard its heritage. The National Heritage Fund is currently updating the national inventory with the full participation of the communities and individuals concerned. Further safeguarding of its heritage was being ensured through close and efficient partnerships between cultural centres, universities and schools, local communities and professional associations. From its own experience, the delegation encouraged all States Parties to submit their periodic reports on time. It further strongly suggested that the global capacity-building programme should emphasize this issue, taking into account the respective needs of the States Parties concerned. It was ready to share its experience in the preparation of the periodic report with States Parties, adding that this was not a difficult task. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its support, assistance and guidance in the preparation of the report, and the State Party of South Korea for its efficient preparation of this meeting.

221. The **delegation of Panama** spoke of its honour in sharing its experience regarding the periodic report, as well as the challenges and opportunities in the implementation of the Convention. It was very satisfied with the enthusiasm expressed by its communities, institutions, the UNESCO Regional Office and the experts who had accompanied the journey, which had been complicated at times owing to the challenges in obtaining the free, prior and informed consent of the bearers, as well as the costs and duration of the training. Despite this, the journey had been incredibly rich in value, increasing appreciation for its cultural diversity both locally and internationally. Preparing this report had helped to appreciate the value of the contributions made by several of the institutions regarding the capacity building of the communities who had worked on the inventory. For instance, visiting remote villages under difficult transport and working conditions was only rewarded upon the completion of the inventory. The pride of the local team and those involved was unmatched. Currently, the database had registered over 5,000 knowledge-holders, not including the latest updates.

Furthermore, the exercise of preparing and submitting a nomination to the Convention for the first time, for the 'Traditional Techniques of the Sombrero Pinta'o', along with the second nomination, 'Ritual and festive expressions of the Congo culture', in 2018 had awakened the interests of the Panamanian people in all the intangible heritage fields in the country and globally, as the reading and evaluation of the Committee is a way of learning and also of providing training. Updating the inventory had also raised awareness among the wider public, as they had become more aware of the wealth of the national cultural diversity. For instance, a successful update of the inventory of the indigenous cultures of Panama named Kunas and the Emberas had already been carried out. An inventory had already begun in two other indigenous communities in the Ngäbe-Buglé regions. The delegation congratulated the States Parties for submitting their nominations to the List, as well as on their national and international commitment to their culture. It also congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work despite the budgetary constraints.

222. The **delegation of Japan** remarked that it had submitted its second periodic report following the first periodic report on the state of implementation of the Convention in 2010. It believed that sharing methods of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage with various countries through these reports was vital for the development of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in each country. This year marked the 67th year since Japan's legal system had been introduced in 1950 to protect cultural properties, both tangible and intangible. In the first and second periodic reports, Japan had provided information on the improvements to its legal system, as well as concrete activities aimed at the respective elements of intangible cultural heritage at every level in Japan. It was delighted to share its experiences with the Committee. Intangible cultural heritage plays a significant role in forming the core of regional identity, and contributes greatly to strengthening ties among individuals within the community. For instance, Japan had witnessed the power of intangible cultural heritage particularly through the great East Japan earthquake of March 2011 and during the recovery process. The delegation concluded by expressing its deep respect and appreciation for the efforts of the Secretariat and the States that had submitted reports, emphasizing that the periodic reports were not only mandatory but also extremely helpful.

223. The **delegation of Denmark** had been invited to share its experience, and was happy to respond to this invitation. The reporting process had been an interesting and constructive learning process for the Danish authorities. At least two specific issues had become clear during the exercise. Firstly, the present reporting framework did not fully reflect the situation in countries like Denmark. Secondly, the Danish National Commission to UNESCO played an important role in the consultation process. In more general terms, Denmark had taken new important steps to implement the Convention at the national level. These included public social media consultations to identify intangible cultural heritage of importance to the population. Joint collaboration by the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Culture had led to the development of educational materials based on the findings of the public consultation. Finally, the implementation of an inventorying process, inspired by the experiences of neighbouring countries, Norway, Sweden and Finland, consisted of a Wiki to which all interested practitioners in Denmark could submit contributions where they thoroughly described the intangible cultural heritage they perform.

224. The **delegation of Botswana** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to present an overview of its report since its ratification in 2010. It wished to congratulate the Republic of Korea for hosting this event and for its warm welcome, and commended the Chairperson for the excellent preparations. Botswana had submitted two periodic reports: a report on the current state of the element listed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and a report on the implementation of the Convention, both of which had been compiled at the same time, which was a mammoth task. However, this presented an opportunity to reflect on aspects relating to the implementation of the Convention since its ratification. Such issues as inventory making – to date, 461 elements had been documented – safeguarding measures, and the importance of working together in terms of the implementation of the Convention were all looked at. It was noted that the process of compiling the reports made Botswana realize the amount of resources that were needed to implement the Convention. In that regard,

Botswana had submitted a request for International Assistance in 2016, which was approved in that same year. Botswana was one of the first States Parties to benefit from the Fund after the increase from US$25,000 to US$100,000. The grant raised more awareness about the benefits derived from the Convention throughout the country, and it was hoped that the next report would reflect greater safeguarding efforts carried out by more communities. Finally, Botswana extended profound gratitude to UNESCO and the Government of Flanders for the tremendous financial and technical support towards ratification, as well as the implementation of the Convention.

225. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** appreciated the Secretariat's report on the examination of periodic reports submitted by States Parties, and for sharing the summaries of each report. It also welcomed States Parties who submitted their reports in a timely manner. Submitting the periodic report is an obligation of the Convention, as well as being an effective tool for sharing best practices in terms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. A slight improvement in the submission of periodic reports had been shown this year. However, the delegation was concerned that some reports were still overdue. To encourage the submission of periodic reports, the Secretariat had provided documents and additional guidance for completing the form to enable States Parties to submit their periodic report. It was hoped that the Republic of Korea's voluntary supplementary contribution to improve the periodic reporting mechanism would encourage States Parties to respect their reporting duty. The delegation also wished to inform the Committee that the CHA, responsible for safeguarding and transmitting Korean intangible cultural heritage, would distribute English language booklets on the activities of safeguarding and promoting intangible cultural heritage and the institutional management and inventorying system of Korean intangible heritage. The delegation invited delegates to the exhibition of Korean handicrafts organized by the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Centre.

226. The **delegation of Turkey** commended the Secretariat for all its efforts in encouraging, supporting and inviting States Parties to submit their periodic reports through the dedicated webpage, reminder letters and the guidance documents. It also welcomed those States Parties that had shared their reports on time, with special thanks to those that had shared their experiences at the present session. Turkey was also among those States Parties that had submitted their periodic reports on time. The reporting process in Turkey involved all relevant stakeholders, including institutions, communities and NGOs. As had been the case last year, the Secretariat's report revealed that unfortunately the periodic reporting mechanism was not functioning properly. Despite all these efforts, 79 per cent of the reports expected in this cycle were late. There seemed to be a slight improvement compared to last year, however this was about to become a chronic problem of the Convention. This challenge limited the Committee's ability to monitor the implementation of the Convention and to assess its impact. The Committee had been raising its concerns on this matter for some time, and had continuously encouraged States Parties to fulfil their basic obligations. However, this did not seem to have affected the situation in a positive way. The delegation believed that States Parties should voluntarily refrain from applying to the Lists before fulfilling their basic reporting obligations. The reporting mechanisms should be seen not just as an obligation, but also as an opportunity to better understand the status of intangible cultural heritage within the country. That being said, it was also the responsibility of the Committee to address this issue. It was thus time to identify the major causes of the delays so as to develop appropriate measures to remedy the situation. The delegation asked the Secretariat: Do we know why States Parties are unable to send their reports in on time? Is it due to a lack of capacities in terms of their preparation? Or to the lack of clarity in the format of the report? Or is it about the complexity of the report? The delegation sought the Secretariat's observations and reflections on this matter, which would further the discussions under agenda items 9 and 10[4].

227. The **delegation of Ethiopia** expressed its sincere appreciation to those States Parties that had submitted their periodic reports on time, noting that there had been a general mobilization

4 Agenda item 9: Draft overall results framework for the Convention.
Agenda item 10: Draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting.

to exploit all the opportunities provided by the Convention. The reports also provided lessons regarding the implementation of the Convention, such as financial constraints or the lack of human resources, and so on. Furthermore, the periodic reports presented an opportunity to learn from the experiences of Member States that had dealt with these challenges successfully, which also helped in taking the necessary measures to ensure the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at the national and international levels.

228. The **delegation of Sudan** thanked the Republic of Korea for hosting the Committee meeting. On behalf of Sudan, the delegation extended its thanks to the Secretariat for its distinguished work for the benefit of Member States. Moreover, assistance had been granted to Sudan in preparing its provisional list of intangible heritage in the South Kordofan and Blue Nile region. Due to impediments, among other logistics, Sudan had been unable to submit its periodic report to the Secretariat. However, with a follow-up by the National Commission, Sudan expected to submit it soon.

229. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that two new reports had recently been submitted for the 2018 cycle, from Bangladesh, which had been overdue, and from Turkmenistan, which was on time. Regarding Turkey's invitation to reflect on why States were not submitting their periodic reports, the Secretary believed that there were many different contexts and reasons that could be explored. Clearly there was an issue of capacity among States. In others, States were fully able to submit files for nominations but not for reporting, so clearly it was not a capacity issue in these cases. The Secretary believed that these issues would be best addressed under the relevant agenda items.

230. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision.

231. The **delegation of Turkey** had a minor amendment to paragraph 2, which was to add 'Decisions 9.COM.6.a' before Decision 11.COM.9.a, as this would highlight the recurrence of this issue, while emphasizing the importance of periodic reporting.

232. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, with the amended paragraph 2 as proposed by Turkey. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM.8.b adopted**.

233. The **delegation of Hungary** remarked that having heard the interventions of fellow Members as well as the Secretary's reply, it was clear that this was indeed a grave problem that deserved further reflection. It was noted that the Operational Directives contained a priority list for the examination of nominations. The delegation proposed that the submission of periodic reports should come as the fourth point in this priority list, proposing that this be an option for discussion at the next Committee, if the situation did not improve by the following year.

234. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary for its constructive intervention, adding that this matter would be taken up under agenda item 10. He then turned to the next agenda item 8.c.

ITEM 8.c OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/8.c*
Reports: *12 reports*
Decision: *12.COM 8.c*

235. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

236. The **Secretary** explained that the Committee was tasked with examining the twelve reports submitted by States Parties on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, as outlined in paragraph 6 of the working document. The table in paragraph 5 showed the three reports expected in 2015 and 2016 but not yet submitted to the Committee. However,

Mauritania had submitted its overdue report in August 2017, which the Committee would examine in 2018, with perhaps Brazil's report that was two years overdue and Kyrgyzstan's report that was one year overdue. It was noted that the draft decision once again proposed to encourage States to prioritize the submission of reports over new nominations, as just mentioned by Hungary, to acknowledge the progress made so far, and to submit the reports to the General Assembly. The document also included assessments of the twelve reports. As was customary, the Secretariat had summarized the reports based on the effectiveness of safeguarding activities, the participation of communities in implementing the safeguarding plan and the reporting process, and the viability of and current risks for the inscribed element. In this regard, a draft decision for each of the twelve reports was proposed.

237. The **Secretary** also took the opportunity to thank the Republic of Korea for its generous voluntary contribution approved by the Committee in 2016 in its Decision 11.COM 6, which made it possible to submit periodic reports on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List online from 2018 onwards. The online form was in fact already available on the Convention's website on an experimental and voluntary basis for those States submitting their Urgent Safeguarding List report by 15 December 2017. To date, only China and Viet Nam had volunteered to use this online tool. Projecting the tool on the screen, the Secretary then proceeded to explain what the tool looked like, based on the case of Viet Nam with 'Ca trù singing'. Looking at the screen, the heading referred to the contact, as designated by the reporting State, the deadline, the progress status, and links to download the current and previous reports. The system offered a useful feature when completing the report in that past information could be checked field by field. For instance, in B.1 'Social and cultural functions', it is possible to consult the report submitted in 2014 by clicking on the database icon, which would help link the two reports. It was also reported that the Secretariat had live access to ongoing reporting and could therefore provide States with technical assistance, if required, during the reporting exercise before the final deadline.

238. The **Chairperson** turned to the examination of the twelve reports, beginning with the report submitted by Botswana.

239. The **Secretary** first explained that all the draft decisions for the twelve reports would follow a similar structure, namely a few standard paragraphs as well as specific ones to address the needs, welcome the achievements, and underline the challenges for each inscribed element. The last paragraph concluded with the next submission deadline. The report submitted by Botswana concerned an element inscribed in 2012 on **Earthenware pottery-making skills in Botswana's Kgatleng District** in south-eastern Botswana. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed taking note of its continued efforts in safeguarding this element inscribed in 2012, in particular through its support with the formation of a Visual Arts Association, research and documentation on knowledge bearers, and funding opportunities for apprentices. Paragraph 5 encouraged the State to address the current threats by encouraging master potters to participate in competitions, enhancing their presence in formal education, training younger women, and establishing a District Pottery Making Academy for research, documentation and transmission.

240. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.1 adopted**.

241. The **delegation of Botswana** thanked the Chairperson for the decision taken on the report submitted on the current status of the element. Botswana thanked the Committee for its positive feedback on its first ever report on the listed element, as well as the Secretariat for providing guidance and support during the preparation of the report. The process enhanced the commitment of stakeholders in the implementation of the inscribed element, as well as providing an opportunity to come up with more meaningful ways of safeguarding the element. The inscription also helped in the visibility and promotion of the element, and this created economic opportunities for the practitioners in different arts and cultural activities. Two apprentices had now graduated to a status of master potters. The master potters had been involved in different transmission efforts for both students and out-of-school trainees. Recently, seventeen young people had been trained on the element by former potters as part

of the transmission through a project funded by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2016. The implementation of the safeguarding plan resulted in one of the master potters obtaining a mentorship award in the visual arts category of the 2017 annual President's Day National Competition. This was followed by the two master potters receiving presidential awards for services benefiting Botswana during the Botswana Independence Day on 30 September 2017. This enhanced the visibility of the Convention in UNESCO and Botswana.

242. The **Chairperson** thanked Botswana and invited the Secretary to present the next report.

243. The **Secretary** presented the element **Qiang New Year festival**, which is a traditional gathering of the Qiang people who live in four counties of Sichuan Province of China, providing them with an opportunity to offer thanks and worship to the gods of heaven for their blessings and prosperity. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision acknowledged the safeguarding efforts undertaken by China, in particular in its support of the representative bearers of the festival in all areas, as well as by rebuilding the training centre for this element to improve the mechanism for its transmission. Paragraph 5 invited the State to continue its support for bearers, introduce teaching of the element's components into schools and textbooks, and foster the safeguarding network that had been built among multiple participants. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to strengthen intergenerational transmission, which was affected by the advanced age of most bearers, as proposed in paragraph 6.

244. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.2 adopted**.

245. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's second report.

246. The **Secretary** presented the element **Traditional design and practices for building Chinese wooden arch bridges** inscribed in 2009. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed that the Committee acknowledge the continued efforts of China to safeguard this element, especially though establishing training and practice centres for woodworkers, documenting the element, and undertaking the maintenance and restoration of wooden bridges. In paragraph 5, the Committee might wish to invite the reporting State to encourage bearers to participate in exhibition and exchange activities, support the transmission of related knowledge, and promote the element through documentary films. Finally, the State might be encouraged to pay particular attention to the remaining challenges that still undermined transmission, as proposed in paragraph 6.

247. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.3 adopted**.

248. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's third report.

249. The **Secretary** presented the element **Traditional Li textile techniques: spinning, dyeing, weaving and embroidering**. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed taking note of the efforts of China in safeguarding this element inscribed in 2009, in particular by ensuring that the specific techniques of the element are effectively transmitted and seeking solutions to the difficulties faced by bearers. In paragraph 5, the State was invited to continue supporting bearers who transmit the techniques of the element, as well as with the provision of regular courses for Li women on all the textile techniques in training centres, and the integration of the element into the school education system. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to continue striving towards the safeguarding of this element and to explore the possibilities offered by other funding sources, such as local associations and NGOs, in order to further implement safeguarding measures and strengthen the element's viability, as suggested in paragraph 6.

250. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.4 adopted**.

251. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's fourth report.

252. The **Secretary** presented the element **Meshrep** inscribed in 2010. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed that the Committee take note of the safeguarding activities implemented

by China, which include, among others, the training of young people by experienced bearers. Paragraph 5 invited the State to further develop the regulatory and policy frameworks for inventorying the element and to create favourable conditions for bearers to take on apprentices and participate in demonstration and exchange activities. Finally, paragraph 6 proposed that the Committee encourage the State to effectively address the problems resulting from the fast transformation of Uygur communities of Xinjiang Autonomous Region from a traditional agricultural society into a modern industrial one, taking into account that there was also an urgent need to maintain and preserve a social environment favourable to the element.

253. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.5 adopted**.

254. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's fifth report.

255. The **Secretary** presented the element **Watertight-bulkhead technology of Chinese junks.** Paragraph 4 of the draft decision once again acknowledged the efforts undertaken so far by the reporting State to achieve three broad objectives: i) safeguarding the bearers and the modes of transmission; ii) improving the visibility and awareness of the element; and iii) addressing a number of challenges faced by the element and its bearers. Paragraph 5 proposed that the Committee encourage the State to continue safeguarding modes of transmission, including in vocational schools, and to provide bearers with financial and social support. Finally, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to carry on its awareness-raising activities and to further develop formal, vocational and extra-curricular education on the element and its traditional knowledge.

256. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.6 adopted**.

257. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's sixth report.

258. The **Secretary** presented the element **Wooden movable-type printing of China**. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed taking note of China's continued efforts to safeguard this element inscribed in 2010, in particular through the establishment of an archive for audiovisual material and the adoption of institutional support and funds for the bearers and practitioners. Paragraph 5 invited the State to further recognize the essential role of the bearers in transmission, and to facilitate the transmission by apprenticeship and by incorporating teaching bases for the element into school programmes. Finally, in paragraph 6 the Committee might wish to encourage the State to seek new patterns to diversify the fundraising channels in order to implement additional safeguarding measures and to explore new methods for the promotion of the element.

259. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.7 adopted**.

260. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present China's seventh and last report.

261. The **Secretary** presented the element **Hezhen Yimakan storytelling**. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision acknowledged China's safeguarding efforts aimed at ensuring community-based capacity building and promoting the Hezhen language and culture. Paragraph 5 invited the State to continue recognizing and training practitioners, and providing financial aid to them, and to strengthen the network of practice centres established in the Hezhen communities. Finally, in paragraph 6, the Committee might wish to encourage the State to continue its systematic digital documentation of the element and to include the element in formal and non-formal education.

262. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.8 adopted**.

263. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the next report submitted by Indonesia.

264. The **Secretary** presented the element **Saman dance**, which is a form of entertainment with aesthetic value, but which also has an important meaning for the people of Gayo Lues, serving as a tool of communication, friendship-building between villages and a means of strengthening their cultural identity. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed that the Committee acknowledge the efforts undertaken by Indonesia to safeguard this element, especially by strengthening modes of transmission both in the family, through the training of trainers and by facilitating Saman performance by opening a cultural space. Furthermore, the Committee might wish to invite the reporting State to continue officially certifying *sanggar* (traditional arts training centres) in Saman areas, including privately managed ones, among other activities included in paragraph 5. Finally, paragraph 6 proposed that the State might be encouraged to continue supporting the transmission of Saman-related knowledge, strengthen customary institutions related to the element, and complete the construction of a Gayo Art and Culture Centre.

265. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.9 adopted**.

266. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present Indonesia's second and final report.

267. The **Secretary** presented the element **Noken multifunctional knotted or woven bag, handcraft of the people of Papua**. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed taking note of the efforts of Indonesia to safeguard this element inscribed in 2012, in particular in providing guidance and assistance to craftspeople, including Noken, in educational programmes and ensuring that natural raw materials are available. In paragraph 5, the State was invited to continue inventorying the element and to roll this out to a wider geographical area, train Noken communities in data collection methods, and further build the capacities of Papuan craftspeople. Finally, paragraph 6 proposed that the Committee encourage the State to promote Noken through exhibitions and festivals, and to support craftspeople to showcase their Noken crafts, bearing in mind the possible negative impacts that over-commercialization could have on the element's social and cultural functions and meanings.

268. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.10 adopted**.

269. The **delegation of Indonesia** had read the report and the draft decision on Saman, as well as for Noken Papua, and wished to thank the Chairperson for his acknowledgement of the continued efforts undertaken by Indonesia to safeguard its elements. It also took note of the suggestion to continue officially certifying 'saangar', the traditional arts training centres in Saman areas, and would continue to further the safeguarding of the element by supporting the transmission and promotion of Saman-related knowledge.

270. The **Chairperson** thanked Indonesia and invited the Secretary to present the next report submitted by Peru.

271. The **Secretary** presented the element **Eshuva, Harákmbut sung prayers of Peru's Huachipaire [Watcheeparee] people**, which is a traditional expression native to the Paucartambo province in Cusco (Peru), whose main purpose is healing diseases by invoking the spirits of plants and animals. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision proposed that the Committee take note of the continued efforts of Peru to safeguard this element through the registration, inventorying and promotion of Eshuva songs, as well as the revitalization of the Huachipaire language. Paragraph 5 also proposed that the Committee welcome the involvement of the community concerned in the identification and implementation of the safeguarding measures. Paragraph 6 encouraged the State to continue to work with and support the Huachipaire communities and their representative associations by allocating appropriate financial resources to this end. Finally, paragraph 7 proposed that the Committee invite the State to strengthen its efforts to revitalize the Huachipaire language and its transmission to younger generations, in particular by providing intercultural exchange spaces for children so that it might contribute to combating ethnic tension that distances young people in the native communities from their mother tongue.

272. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.11 adopted**.

273. The **delegation of Peru** congratulated the Chairperson for the excellent job, and thanked the Republic of Korea for its hospitality. The experience of making this report was very important, not only at the local level but also at the national level because the process allowed Peru to reflect on the threats to the element that were as dynamic as the element itself. Thus, new measures would need to be created to contribute towards the safeguarding of the element and the entire Huachipaire culture. In the case of Eshuva, it was noted that the reinforcement of the mother tongue was mandatory to save the Eshuva and the Huachipaire people. Thus, for Peru it was necessary to make additional alliances to ensure the necessary resources for safeguarding. It thanked the Secretariat for the report, taking note of the recommendation.

274. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the final report submitted by Uganda.

275. The **Secretary** presented the element **Bigwala, gourd trumpet music and dance of the Busoga Kingdom in Uganda**, which was inscribed in 2012 and is performed at the Busoga King's coronation and its annual anniversaries. According to the report, the number of living practitioners is very low and young people rarely practise the element. However, its viability seems to now be more assured by the new generation of youth who have benefited from the implementation of the safeguarding plan. Paragraph 4 of the draft decision acknowledged the efforts undertaken by Uganda to raise awareness of this element, increase the number of proficient players through training and promotional actions, and develop better documentation of the element. Paragraph 5 proposed that the Committee invite the State to continue encouraging communities to grow gourds and ensure their supply, to teach young people to make Bigwala instruments, and to transmit knowledge about how to play and dance Bigwala. Finally, in paragraph 6 the Committee might wish to encourage the State to follow its proposed future safeguarding commitments to improve Bigwala proficiency among the youth, increase its repertoire, and prepare Bigwala educational resources for music teachers.

276. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c.12 adopted**.

277. The **delegation of Uganda** thanked the Secretariat for supporting the Bigwala element with International Assistance, which helped young people to learn about the Bigwala. Uganda would continue to work to ensure that school teachers and students promoted Bigwala.

278. The **Chairperson** turned to the 'chapeau decision' of this item and the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–8 were duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 8.c adopted**.

279. The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

[Tuesday, 5 December 2017, afternoon session]

ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2018–2019

280. The **Chairperson** returned to agenda item 7, recalling that the Committee had adopted paragraph 4 of the draft decision, and that over the lunch break, the Secretariat had worked to revise Annex I. This reflected the Committee's consensus to create three new extrabudgetary fixed-term posts.

281. The **Secretary** began by thanking the Committee for acknowledging the critical situation faced by the Secretariat in terms of human resources, and particularly in relation to the implementation of the International Assistance Fund. The Secretary remarked that the adopted paragraph 4 made reference to Annex I with the details of the budget, so the Secretariat was now proposing a new, revised Annex I. The Committee was therefore asked to adopt the revised Annex I, which now contained three posts. The Secretary reminded the

Committee that budget lines 1 and 2 were the under-utilized budget lines, with line 1 now representing 52.55 per cent of the overall Fund. Budget line 1.1 represented 8.2 per cent of the overall Fund and budget line 2 represented 4 per cent of the overall Fund, while all the other budget lines remained as initially proposed. The Annex now included three posts: a P-3, a P-2 and a G-5, as discussed.

282. The **delegation of Guatemala** asked the Secretariat why only budget lines 1, 1.1 and 2 had been modified, with no adjustments made to budget lines 3-8.

283. The **Secretary** explained that the budget lines selected corresponded to under-utilized funds. For example, in the last biennium, only 9 per cent of budget line 2 had been utilized. All the other budget lines had been fully utilized [and hence with no available funds].

284. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the Annex as amended, which was duly adopted. He then returned to paragraph 5 of the draft decision and the proposal for three fixed-term posts, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 6 and 7 were also adopted. A new paragraph 8 had been introduced by the Secretariat, as previously explained, which would authorize a margin of flexibility between budget lines 4, 5 and 6. It was duly adopted. Finally, the new paragraph 9 sought to modify Rule 5.5 of the Rules of Procedure to change the deadline for States Parties to send their requests for assistance to participate in the Bureau and Committee meeting from four to eight weeks.

285. The **delegation of Guatemala** had no objection but sought to know why the period of time needed to change.

286. The **Secretary** explained that under the current Operational Directives, States Parties had a deadline of four weeks to notify the Committee of their intention to participate. However, the administrative rules of UNESCO require that tickets be purchased at least three weeks prior to departure. However, with the increasing number of requests, the Secretariat simply could not process all the requests to meet its administrative rules within this timeframe. For this reason, the Secretariat wished to align with what had been established in 2014 so as to provide more time to process requests.

287. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 9, which was duly adopted. The **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 7 adopted**.

288. The **Secretary** informed the delegates that Arabic interpretation was now available, thanks to the generous contribution of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

289. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for its generous contribution that meant that everyone from the Arab-speaking world could now take the floor in their native language. Regarding the decision adopted on role of the Bureau, the delegation referred to the last General Conference in which a decision had been adopted on governance, and in particular on the role of the Bureau in UNESCO. The delegation asked that the Committee bear in mind and reflect on how it could adopt recommendations for that governance group to ensure the implementation of rules of transparency and the dissemination of minutes at the Bureau level. Moreover, it would later propose an amendment in this regard.

290. The **delegation of Turkey** supported the remarks by Algeria on this important issue, adding that as Vice-Chair of Group I, Turkey tried to be as transparent as possible, consulting widely among Group 1 members, so it was important to maintain this practice in the future within the Convention and Committee.

291. The **delegation of Cuba** also supported the comments made by Algeria, adding that the Convention had worked on all these issues for two years. The question of governance within the Bureau was indeed a sensitive issue and there was a need to harmonize working methods so that the Committee and the Convention could advance in the same direction as UNESCO with regard to governance issues.

ITEM 9 OF THE AGENDA

DRAFT OVERALL RESULTS FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONVENTION

Documents: *ITH/17/12.COM/9*
ITH/17/12.COM/INF.9
Decision: *12.COM 9*

292. The **Chairperson** recalled that this agenda item originated from the evaluation of the standard-setting work of UNESCO's Culture Sector conducted by UNESCO's IOS in 2013. According to the IOS, it would be difficult to understand the progress made regarding the implementation of the Convention if the objectives, indicators and benchmarks were not clearly defined. The Committee, at its eighth session, therefore decided to develop an overall results framework for the Convention. From the beginning, the Committee emphasized the necessity for an inclusive process of consultation and discussion in the development of such a framework, and thus asked for an open-ended working group. In 2016, the Committee had been able to acknowledge the outcomes of a preliminary meeting of experts generously hosted in Beijing by the National Commission of the People's Republic of China for UNESCO, taking note of the results map that the experts had produced. At this current session, the Committee would make another step forward as it discovered the results of the Working Group that had been held in June 2017, also in Chengdu, thanks to the generosity of the Ministry of Culture of China and the Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in Chengdu. This meeting represented a fundamental step in the process of consultation and dialogue between States Parties to achieve the ultimate goal of adopting the framework. The Chairperson introduced His Excellency Ambassador Xuexian Wang (China), Chairperson of the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group, recalling his key role as Chairperson of the First Extraordinary Session of the Intergovernmental Committee in Chengdu (China) in May 2007 and again as a key actor in 2013 during the International Conference on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of the 2003 Convention, also in Chengdu. He invited Ambassador Wang to present the main achievements of the Working Group.

293. The **Chairperson of the Working Group, Mr Xuexian Wang** thanked the Chairperson for the invitation to present a brief report on the result of the Working Group held in Chengdu. He recalled the first Chengdu meeting that had been held ten years ago, joking that he was noticeably older, but adding that time waited for nobody or no organization. Thus, the Committee should seize the day to ensure better safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, which is an integral part of life and of the soul of humanity. Returning to the report, it was noted that fifty-three Member States, three category 2 centres and eight accredited NGOs had been present in Chengdu for the Working Group meeting. These figures show that all intangible cultural heritage stakeholders are dedicated to working out a framework. Although the task assigned to the Group by the Committee was not an easy one and required a lot of joint effort and concentration due to the complexity of the results framework, the atmosphere in Chengdu had been very positive and harmonious and the participants had always intervened in a constructive way. The initiative – to work out a framework – was welcomed with enthusiasm, and the final consensus was reached quite easily, which had not been expected from the outset, thanks to the joint efforts of every participant, especially those from States Parties. The Group's discussions were built upon the results map proposed by the 2016 Expert Group, which was welcomed by the Committee in 2016. In Chengdu, the Working Group was able to examine and debate the draft set of core indicators one by one and the associated assessment factors prepared by the Secretariat, with the aim of permitting the effective measurement of the outputs, outcomes and impacts already identified in the results map. In most cases, Group members were able to agree on the wording of specific indicators or factors; in some other cases, they called for further revisions or a reordering of the components. A group of six Rapporteurs was elected, one for each UNESCO Electoral Group, to support the editing of the draft framework and review the debates of the Group. They worked very hard, even into the night together with the Secretariat. The Rapporteurs were: Ms Gabriele Detschmann (Austria); Ms Alla Stashkevich (Belarus); Mr Andrés Forero

(Colombia); Ms Sang Mee Bak (Republic of Korea); Mr Abdoul Aziz Guissé (Senegal) and Mr Hani Hayajneh (Jordan). The Chairperson was very grateful for their outstanding contribution to the final results of the text, which was well-prepared and unanimously adopted by the Group during its final session.

294. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** wished to underline that a number of core indicators remained unchanged at 26, and their order may have changed but not the content, while the number of assessment factors had increased slightly to eighty-six. The Secretary would provide additional details on the framework shortly. The Chairperson was pleased to highlight that the overall results framework had been adopted unanimously and enthusiastically by the Group and recommended to the Committee, and later on to the General Assembly for adoption. The Group was an important opportunity for the participants to discuss its possible impacts and linkages with the periodic reporting mechanisms under the 2003 Convention. A consensus was easily reached on the benefits that could be attained through moving to a regional cycle for national reporting, as this could provide opportunities for international cooperation, knowledge-sharing and technical assistance, including capacity building. Finally, the Group was able to deliberate on the potential of mobilizing complementary sources of information and how they might also be used for assessing the impact of the Convention. In this sense, it was suggested that the possibility of using other sources of information for assessing the impact of the Convention beyond periodic reporting continue to be explored, as well as potential synergies with reporting mechanisms outside of the 2003 Convention, in particular the SDGs of Agenda 2030. Mr Wang believed that the establishment of the overall results framework was an ambitious and visionary undertaking that was rare for intergovernmental normative instruments. He hoped that the work in Chengdu had provided a solid basis for the Committee's decisions, which was crucial for guaranteeing a successful future of the Convention. Finally, he expressed gratitude to the Secretary and his team for their professionalism, dedication and outstanding contributions to the work of the Group, and he also thanked the Chinese government and UNESCO for their trust in him as Chairperson.

295. The **Secretary** began by thanking Ambassador Wang for his hard work and skill in chairing the technically complex meeting in Chengdu. Regarding the meeting, the Secretary remarked on the new, innovative and ambitious work that this entailed. However, developing an overall results framework for an international normative instrument such as the Convention presented specific challenges, as it was atypical of the kind of programmes on which monitoring and evaluation work typically focuses. Like much of the United Nations' normative work, the Convention involves numerous actors, many potential causes and just as many possible effects, but the overall vision is already determined by its basic texts that should always be kept in mind when developing such a framework. It was noted that the graphic presentation of the framework in Annex 2 of document 9 was inspired by the indicator framework proposed for the 2005 Convention in its *2015 Global Report*. Referring to Table 1 in Annex 2 of the working document, the top four rows featured the impacts and outcomes proposed by the expert group in Beijing, and which were welcomed by the Committee at its eleventh session in 2016. The information had been reformatted with 'Impacts' appearing in the top row, followed successively by 'Long-term, Mid-term and Short-term Outcomes'. The fourth row identified eight thematic areas that grouped the core indicators in a logical way. The designation of a core indicator to a particular thematic area did not imply that it referred exclusively to that sole thematic area. Certain indicators may well be relevant in two different areas, but this facilitated the ordering of the core indicators. Table 1 also provided abbreviated statements of the twenty-six core indicators, which were provided in full in Table 2. With regard to Table 2, each core indicator is accompanied by two to five assessment factors against which the indicator would be assessed. Indicators were defined as a qualitative or quantitative means of measuring an output or outcome, with the intention of gauging the performance of a programme or investment. For indicators to function effectively, they must be measurable, and all actors involved in monitoring, reporting and evaluation should share a consensus about what to measure and how. The core indicators are generally formulated in terms of 'Extent to which [a given situation exists or change has been achieved]'

rather than 'Extent to which the State(s) Party(ies) have [completed X or implemented Y]', as often a large number of actors contribute to the results. It was therefore essential that the assessment factors include both *initiatives* that arise from within communities or groups, as well as *interventions* emanating from outside communities or groups (including those that originate with the State). For each core indicator, the draft framework presented two or more assessment factors against which that indicator would be assessed. Each State monitors and reports on the existence (or absence) of these factors within its territory. In most cases, these factors and their terminology were drawn directly from the various provisions of the Convention and its Operational Directives, in which States Parties are obliged or encouraged to ensure that specific conditions are met, either through their own actions or by facilitating the actions of others. Core indicators and assessment factors were closely focused on the kind of information that States Parties would regularly provide in their periodic reports; the principal source of information for the overall results framework that would provide sufficient information to determine whether each of the core indicators is achieved (with the exception of indicators 23 and 26, which are to be monitored at the global level, drawing upon information already being gathered by the Secretariat). Thus, the idea was not to create parallel reporting but to align periodic reporting with the overall results framework and thus help ascertain the impact of the Convention.

296. The **Secretary** explained that not every indicator would necessarily have the same relevance for each country. States would indeed monitor and report on the existence (or absence) of the corresponding assessment factors within their territory, and as each indicator had two or more associated factors, it would be possible to report that within a given State Party an indicator was fully or partially satisfied. The results framework would not impose new reporting obligations on States Parties, while synergies with other reporting mechanisms, such as the SDGs of Agenda 2030, would also be considered in assessing the impact of the Convention. With regard to the way forward, the Secretariat would develop *guidance notes* for all twenty-six core indicators similar to the sample guidance notes shown in the Annex, which would be a useful tool for effective implementation. As a result, all those involved in monitoring, reporting and evaluation would share a common understanding about the scope of each indicator and how to measure the degree to which it had been attained. Additional work remained to define baselines and targets for each core indicator at both the global level and the country level. The Working Group agreed that it would be prudent to approach the problem of baselines and targets at a later stage once States Parties had reached a general agreement on the draft framework. For the time being, it sufficed to clarify that both targets and baselines needed to be realistic to be effective, based upon actual experience and, in the case of targets, attainable. Targets should not be so easy that they would always be met, but neither should they be so ambitious that achievements would always fall short. Country-level baselines and target would be established by each State Party according to its own situation, capacities and priorities. The global ones would be established through an international consultative process. The adoption of the overall results framework would also have an impact on the periodic reporting system. Possible improvements would be discussed under agenda item 10 [Draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting], in particular with regard to the proposed shift to a regional cycle of national reporting. It was also noted that a revised results-oriented ICH-10 periodic reporting form was envisaged, as well as informational materials and capacity-building activities for rolling out the results framework and the new reporting system. The Secretary reminded the Committee that periodic reporting should not only concern compliance with reporting obligations; it also had to be meaningful and useful for States themselves and should instead be considered as a unique opportunity for States to take stock of the achievements and challenges that exist for effective implementation of the Convention.

297. The **delegation of Senegal** spoke of the privilege of taking part and being among the Rapporteurs of the Group. As such, a heartfelt tribute to Mr Wang was paid for his wisdom, sense of human relations and his pedagogy that had played an important role in his chairmanship. At times it had been difficult, but he knew how to bring the debates back into a spirit of harmony. The work was achieved in an inclusive, participatory way in which experts

from different horizons and NGOs could participate in the development of the work first carried out by the Working Group of 2016. The delegation hoped that the Committee would appreciate this work and move towards its adoption. Some extremely important items had been proposed, including on the cycle of periodic reports. Referring to a previous discussion concerning indicators and culture, the delegation felt it was not a question of selling or marketing culture, as mentioned by Cuba, however, the Committee still had to propose indicators within a framework of the economics of culture and Agenda 2030. In Africa, this might be considered within the notion of sacred aspects and secular aspects. For example, gastronomy is an essential element of our cultures, but gastronomy still had to sell, and to sell any product of culture, convincing indicators were needed. This was the premise of the Group's work. The delegation concluded by congratulating the Secretariat for its exceptional professionalism. The Group had sometimes worked impossible hours, but the Secretariat had always been there, and the delegation had returned happy with its experiences in China.

298. The **delegation of Colombia** commended the Secretariat and the participants of the Working Group for developing an extensive and comprehensive set of indicators and assessment factors with which to measure the overall results of the implementation of the Convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. It extended its gratitude towards China, whose generosity had allowed for the development of this Group, as well as those whose cooperative efforts had led to the construction of the overall results framework. The delegation also thanked Mr Wang for his wisdom in helping along the work on this subject, and it emphasized the importance of one of the recommendations of the Group, which was to work towards the exploration of synergies with other reporting mechanisms outside of the Convention. The delegation believed that the Committee needed to strive towards positioning intangible cultural heritage as a fundamental factor in generating new ways of understanding human wellbeing and providing a guide towards the protection of a diverse, creative and rich future at the global, national and local levels. In other words, it is important to continue work within the framework of the Convention, while understanding that safeguarding living heritage plays a larger role in communities and groups in re-training their capacities of resilience within the present context. Therefore, it wished to present an amendment in paragraph 7 of the draft decision, which would read, 'Further requests the Secretariat to elaborate provisional targets and to explore broadly potential synergies with reporting mechanisms outside the Convention, in particular, the Agenda 2030 SDGs, specifically Goal 11 in regard to sustainable cities and communities. Especially target 11.4 that calls for training the efforts to safeguard and protect the world heritage and cultural heritage'. This would place intangible cultural heritage within the important framework of sustainable development related to urban issues.

299. The **delegation of the Philippines** commended the Secretariat for its work on this initiative, which was based on an IOS recommendation and the Chengdu Working Group under the able leadership of Mr Wang. Having an overall results framework was indeed very useful to measure the implementation of the Convention. The delegation was of the view that the challenge would be in promoting the framework as a common point of reference for States Parties and communities. Considering the complexity of the framework, and the need for the Secretariat to prepare guidance notes, this would also be an additional burden on top of the daily administrative workload of the Secretariat. Questions about its implementation and measurement would also arise. Would this framework be embedded in the periodic reporting of States Parties? Conceptually, would numerical indicators be able to fully capture the diversity of local and national situations, institutions and capacities when it comes to intangible cultural heritage? There might also be pitfalls in prescribing a common template when comparisons are intrinsically very difficult to achieve. Also, the level and nature of communities' involvement in such assessments, measuring the extent to which certain policies or guidelines are being met, should be carefully considered before adopting the framework. Another concern was actually whether the overall results might resort to some contractual obligations based on the Convention. States Parties might need more time to fully understand the implications of the framework. In this regard, the delegation recommended that the Secretariat convene an information meeting for all States Parties prior to the General

Assembly, as not all States had been present or aware of the meeting held in Chengdu. In this regard, it had submitted an amendment to the draft decision, which was also co-sponsored by other delegations, which would read, 'Requests the Secretariat to convene an information meeting in the first quarter of 2018 on the overall results framework and its practical implications for States Parties'.

300. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Working Group on developing an overall results framework, as well as China for its the support, and particularly the Chairperson of the Group for his leadership. Turkey's experts had been there, but the wealth of the debate was clear from the summary records, and all the issues were explored. The delegation believed that the Committee was at a critical stage when it would be considering this framework. As a matter of fact, the work of the Convention had already been acknowledged as a best practice by the working group on governance. It would be replicated by other Conventions if this process was carried forward successfully. The application of the overall results framework was indeed an ambitious undertaking as this would be a new approach for States Parties, as well as the different actors involved in the process. Support and guidance would be needed for the implementation of this new approach and in the establishment of targets and baselines at the country level. As a result of the application of the results-based framework, the revision of the periodic reporting format was planned so as to align it with the overall results framework. At a time when the rate of reporting to the Secretariat was quite low under its current format, it would be even more challenging for States Parties to report with a new format, and thus they would need support to adapt. It thus wished to know how the Secretariat envisaged implementation, considering the financial constraints of the Convention.

301. The **delegation of Austria** welcomed the new overall results framework and joined the previous speakers in thanking China for hosting and co-funding the meeting, adding that it would help in monitoring the implementation of the Convention and the focus on outputs, outcomes and impacts. It was noted that the aim was to develop a clear and credible evidence-based vision for the future implementation of the Convention. The elements for this common vision included the concept of safeguarding, the involvement of communities, mutual appreciation and respect, as well as international cooperation. The delegation believed that this framework would serve as a road map to implement and realize the full potential of the Convention, and thus make it more effective. With the results framework, periodic reporting could indeed become a learning opportunity for States Parties at both the national and regional levels. It therefore drew the Committee's attention to the proposed improvements to the periodic reporting system as addressed under item 10, which would hopefully enhance the quality, usefulness, and, particularly, the number of periodic reports. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its helpful guidance notes and welcomed the preparation of similar notes for all twenty-six core indicators. The remaining challenge was the definition of baselines and targets for each core indicator considering that intangible cultural heritage involves a broad range of stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention. With the new framework and the new periodicity of the reporting system as proposed, however, the delegation was confident that the Committee would have a much better overview of how the Convention would develop in the future.

302. The **Secretary** wished to address the two questions from the Philippines and Turkey. Regarding the questions posed by the Philippines, the Secretary explained that these were exactly the complex questions discussed in Chengdu with fifty-three countries providing in-depth discussion over the three days, of which the results framework was the result. Letters had been sent to every single delegation to participate, and he regretted that the Philippines had been unable to attend. Moreover, the meeting required a three-day intergovernmental process in order to come to these kinds of agreements because of the complexity of those questions. The Secretary invited the Committee to consult the summary records, as many of those same points had already been debated. Of course, the framework would never be perfect, but it had achieved a consensus in Chengdu. The Secretariat was also happy to organize an information session before the General Assembly for those who had been unable to participate in Chengdu so that they could be informed of those decisions. Turkey's point was also very pertinent and was also addressed during the meeting, and had in fact led to

the proposal to reform periodic reporting. The next item would address this proposal, which was to suspend periodic reporting for a period while the Secretariat revised the forms and developed capacity-building materials. However, moving to this regional cycle would require extrabudgetary funds, but it was hoped that capacity-building would be conducted during the process.

303. The **delegation of Hungary** also wished to thank China for its generous hosting and co-funding of the Chengdu meeting. Unfortunately, the delegation had been unable to attend but it appreciated the richness of the debate from the summary records, and it thanked and commended the Chairperson for achieving this formidable result in such a short time. The delegation was aware of the complexity of the issue and also shared some of the concerns. Nevertheless, it appreciated the ambition of conceptual coherence present in the overall results framework in the way it would be rolled out with regard to the practical measures of periodic reporting that included capacity building accompanying the periodic reporting. This would result in a complex periodic reporting system but one that would also be meaningful. The conceptual clarity and coherence would make the reporting exercise meaningful and thus worth the effort of putting it in place. In this spirit, it also supported the proposal by the Philippines to convene the information meeting in the first quarter of 2018, and it looked forward to the implementation of the overall results framework that went to the very core of the Convention. Moreover, Article 1, defining the purposes of the Convention, notes the very same terms reflected in the overall results framework, i.e. safeguarding, mutual respect, raising awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of intangible cultural heritage, international cooperation and assistance, and of course, the active participation of the communities in the safeguarding measures and as active agents in the decision-making process. The delegation believed that the overall results framework reflected that attitude and the core principles of the Convention and thus it wholly supported it.

304. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary, then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted. The Chairperson noted an amendment in paragraph 5 proposed by the Philippines, Algeria and Hungary, inviting the Secretariat to say a few words.

305. The **Secretary** was happy to provide an information session, but had some concerns regarding the stated timeframe ‘the first quarter’ and being able to carry out the request in terms of logistics by the end of March. The Secretary reminded the Committee that UNESCO would have a new Director-General, which would be accompanied by a lot work, as well as the Evaluation Body. The Secretary therefore sought some flexibility in the timeline and suggested at least four weeks before the General Assembly.

306. The **delegation of the Philippines** found the Secretariat’s proposal acceptable.

307. The **delegation of Austria** aligned with the proposal by the Philippines, Algeria and Hungary, adding that it was an excellent idea to have an information meeting in order that delegations could familiarize themselves with the important draft framework ahead of the General Assembly.

308. The **Chairperson** noted that **Austria** and **Turkey** also supported the amendment.

309. The **delegation of Mongolia** also supported the information meeting before the General Assembly, as well as allowing the Secretariat some flexibility in the timeline.

310. The **Chairperson** noted the wide support from Committee Members, and paragraph 5 was duly adopted. Paragraph 6 was also adopted. Paragraph 7 requested that the Secretariat continue developing guidance notes and other informational materials.

311. The **delegation of Turkey** noted that the rest of the draft decision from paragraph 6 was inconsistent with paragraph 5 just adopted. Paragraph 5 recommended that the General Assembly approve the overall results framework, but the Committee would not have approved it, as it did not have the authority to do so, which lay with the General Assembly. Thus, could the Committee request the steps in paragraphs 6-10 before approving the overall

results framework? Or was it the purview of the General Assembly to request such steps? It suggested deleting those paragraphs, as otherwise the Committee was overstepping its mandate and prejudging the outcome of the General Assembly's recommendation.

312. The **Secretary** concurred with Turkey that as the work had already been through an intergovernmental process involving fifty-three countries by this Committee, sending it back to the General Assembly invoked a problem in procedure. Thus, the Secretariat endorsed Turkey's proposal. However, the Secretary conceded that it had made a mistake in omitting to include the written amendments to paragraph 7 that had previously been submitted by Colombia.

313. The **delegation of Colombia** recalled its earlier remark regarding SDG11 [on sustainable cities and communities], adding that although the Committee had been working on SDG4 and the overall agenda 2030, [UNESCO's] Division of Creativity was working on SDG11 under the different Conventions. The delegation therefore insisted on the importance of dealing with SDG 11 under intangible cultural heritage, and thus wished to include it in the amendment.

314. The **Secretary** noted that Turkey had suggested to remove the entire paragraphs 7 and 8 because they had not actually been included in Chengdu. However, the addition of the amendment was among a smaller group, while what was included was a reference to the reporting mechanisms outside the Conventions, in particular the SDGs of Agenda 2030 that had been agreed in Chengdu. However, SDG11 had not been agreed in Chengdu. Thus, there was a problem in procedure in that the Committee now wished to add to what had been agreed by a larger number of Member States, which would then be submitted to the General Assembly. Turkey was thus correct in that it was not the Committee's mandate to make these requests to the General Assembly for its approval, as it was for the General Assembly to request this work from the Secretariat. Moreover, an overall results framework was being addressed in the C/5 of UNESCO.

315. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the explanation and endorsement of its proposal, however it had actually proposed deleting the rest of the paragraphs, not only 7 and 8, as they were all interlinked. For example, [paragraph 8] requested that the Secretariat revise the periodic reporting Form ICH-10, which would be revised under the overall results framework, thus the paragraphs were all interlinked and related to the adopted version of the overall results framework, and why the General Assembly should request these steps.

316. The **delegation of Colombia** remarked that if it was an issue of procedure then it could agree to delete the paragraph, as what mattered was that the subject was worked on within the overall framework for the Convention.

317. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked Turkey for its suggestion and concurred that the remaining paragraphs would be superfluous at this stage since the General Assembly would need to make the final decision. However, it did take into account Colombia's useful suggestion, which should be noted in the summary records and for the future implementation of the topic. Moreover, the Committee also had a role in determining the overall results framework, and its discussions should feed into the discussions at the General Assembly. Thus, if amendments were required for the overall results framework then they should be considered because the Committee, based on its mandate, is a higher body than the Working Group that also had to report to the General Assembly. So, neither the Committee nor the General Assembly should have their hands tied to amend the proposal, if necessary.

318. The **Secretary** took note, adding that the report of the Committee would go to the General Assembly and all the discussions would be fully reflected in the report.

319. The **delegation of Algeria** had no comments to add; on the contrary, it supported the deletion of the paragraphs, adding that the report should mention the expectations of Colombia on this subject. Regarding paragraph 11, the delegation did not think that the deletion referred to paragraph 11, as it was simply inviting States Parties to make long-term

voluntary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, and it should therefore be retained.

320. The **Chairperson** noted a new paragraph 5, with original paragraph 5 becoming paragraph 6, and paragraphs 7-10 would be deleted. Following Algeria's proposal, paragraph 11 would become paragraph 7.

321. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that this was not a general capacity-building activity and was specifically related to the implementation of the overall results framework. So, in that regard, it should also be deleted.

322. The **Secretary** agreed that paragraph 11, as formulated, was directly related to paragraph 10 because it was asking States Parties to contribute for the purpose of paragraph 10.

323. The **delegation of Hungary** noted the fruitful debate and expressed support for the suggestion by Turkey, supported by a number of Committee Members, not to rush forward and pre-empt the General Assembly's decision. Although it might appear obvious, the delegation suggested a small phrase after paragraph 5 in which the Committee requested that the General Assembly expedite steps towards the implementation of the overall results framework. The suggestion would be that the General Assembly not only adopt the overall results framework but also make the necessary steps for its implementation in terms of developing guidance notes, and so on, as per paragraphs 6–10. In this way, the overall results framework could be put in place as soon as possible following its possible adoption by the General Assembly. Regarding the timeline, the delegation also sought to know whether there would be sufficient time to go into the first cycle of periodic reporting envisaged as regional, national reporting, i.e. whether there would be enough time after the General Assembly to instrumentalize the tools necessary to move along with the conceptual framework. The delegation also expressed support for the remarks by the Philippines concerning the role of this Committee, which was sovereign with regard to the Working Group in Chengdu. The fact that there had been fifty-three Member States present at the meeting and twenty-four Members States of the Committee did not determine authority. This Committee was elected by the General Assembly, and while the Committee appreciated the work of the Working Group, it was the Committee that had the mandate to approve the results achieved in Chengdu.

324. The **Secretary** noted two questions from Hungary. The first concerned the timeline in terms of periodic reporting, and he referred to working document 10 on the amendments to the Operational Directives on the reporting cycle, which explained why the Secretariat was proposing an 18-month suspension of periodic reporting. Mr Wang had suggested to the Secretariat that around 18 months were needed to work on the necessary changes following its approval. This would allow time to work on the forms and the capacity-building materials simultaneously. In this case, there would be at least two Committee sessions when no periodic reports would be examined because the Secretariat could simply not do both at the same time. Either the examination of new periodic reports is maintained or it is suspended for a while so as to carry out the necessary work to adjust to the new system. These were the draft amendments to the Operational Directives that would also need to be approved by the General Assembly. Regarding the mandate of the Committee, the Secretary concurred that the Committee was sovereign. However, the meeting in Chengdu was not an expert group, it was an intergovernmental Working Group whose governments sit on the General Assembly. So, while it was not a mandate issue, it did make sense to consider that they were also representatives of the General Assembly, which had higher authority than the Committee on this matter, and the reason why the Secretary spoke in those terms.

325. The **delegation of Algeria** was satisfied with the explanation given by the Secretariat.

326. The **Chairperson** noted Hungary's amendment to paragraph 6, which read 'Recommends to the General Assembly to approve the overall results framework as an Annex to this decision and to initiate steps for its implementation'. With no comments or objections, it was duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 9 adopted**.

ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE OPERATIONAL DIRECTIVES ON PERIODIC REPORTING

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/10*
Decision: *12.COM 10*

327. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

328. The **Secretary** recalled that the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group in Chengdu had highlighted the need to reform the periodic reporting process to make it more useful for States and for the Convention as a whole. The existing reporting system faced a number of challenges, as had been stressed by the Committee on repeated occasions. It had not demonstrated its full potential despite the wealth of information gathered since 2011. The main issues included: i) the low rate and tardiness of submitted reports; ii) the unpredictability of submissions meant that the Secretariat did not know in advance how many reports would need to be treated in a given cycle, as late reports became cumulative; and iii) from a substantive point of view, as outlined in the IOS evaluation, the reports themselves tended to focus solely on activities with little if any information on results and their impacts on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. As proposed under item 9, Form ICH-10 would be revised in light of the overall results framework, which would make it easier for States to report on the impact of the Convention against clear indicators and benchmarks. The Secretary underlined once again that the reporting exercise was not simply an obligation, but was also hopefully a useful tool to allow States Parties to self-assess their strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the Convention at the national level, and to share with others the experiences gained and lessons learned. The Working Group also recommended that 'the Secretariat propose to the Committee, for its consideration, possible changes to the periodic reporting mechanism to move towards a regional cycle of national reporting and prepare draft revisions of the Operational Directives necessary to that end'. The Secretariat's proposal could be found in the Annex of document 10.

329. The **Secretary** clarified that the procedure for Urgent Safeguarding List reporting would not change because of the broader reflections on the future of the Lists, and the transfer and removal of inscribed elements. Urgent Safeguarding List reports remained a separate reporting system based on a quadrennial schedule and the year of inscription. In addition, no revision was proposed for reporting by States non-party to the Convention on elements inscribed on the Representative List, which currently only concerned the Russian Federation, and would remain a sexennial reporting process based on the year of incorporation of Masterpieces on the Representative List. In order to help with the implementation of the new reporting system, specific training modules would be prepared that would be explained during capacity-building activities at the regional level. Operationally, the move towards the regional cycle of national reporting would require several steps before the new calendar would be fully in place. Outlining these steps, the Secretary explained that the Committee, at its thirteenth session in November 2018, would examine the reports submitted by the deadline of 15 December 2017; the last time under the existing procedure. The transition period would then last from 7.GA in June 2018 to 14.COM in November 2019.

330. The **Secretary** explained that following the adoption of the overall results framework, the Secretariat proposed to then revise the periodic reporting Form ICH-10 and prepare the capacity-building materials. The submission of periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention would therefore be suspended for the deadline of 15 December 2018 and 2019, including for overdue reports. The Secretariat would thus not process any reports during that period. The updated Form ICH-10 and the new capacity-building materials would then be presented to the Committee at its fourteenth session in November 2019. The preparation of reports in the first region would then start in early 2020 until the submission deadline of 15 December 2020. The Committee would then examine these reports at its sixteenth session in November 2021. At the same time, the second region would submit their reports by 15 December 2021, which would be examined by the Committee at its seventeenth session in November 2022, and so on until the other four regions had completed their

submissions leading up to 21.COM in 2026. All of this represented a long and major transition period in the life of the Convention. In this proposal, the regional cycle of national reporting would be six years with one year dedicated to each Electoral Group. The Committee would decide the order of examination by Electoral Groups for each six-year regional cycle at the beginning of the cycle; the decision for the first regional cycle would be taken in 2018 during the Committee's thirteenth session. The Secretary remarked that the move towards a regional cycle of national reporting represented the main change to the Operational Directives presented in the Annex of document 10. Other minor revisions proposed concerned: i) paragraphs 152, 161 and 169 to introduce the possibility of submitting reports online, which was already available from this year on an experimental basis for Urgent Safeguarding List reports; ii) paragraph 162, on Urgent Safeguarding List reports, to comply with the request of the Committee at its tenth session in 2015 to include the possibility for reporting States to update their safeguarding plans; and iii) paragraph 166 to conform to the existing practice for the publication of reports and its merging with paragraph 167 on the processing of reports.

331. **The delegation of Hungary** very much appreciated the document and the proposal put forward by the Secretariat, adding that periodic reporting was indeed a crucial element for the implementation of the Convention. It was important to know what happens on the ground at the national level, as well as the regional level, and it thus welcomed the suggestion for regional but also national periodic reporting on the understanding that the reports would continue to be national but the reporting exercise itself would be done with the cooperation of the regions, i.e. meetings would be convened where States Parties get together and learn from the experiences of other countries in their implementation of the Convention. This is the established practice in the 1972 Convention, and it very much welcomed the adoption of this practice in the context of the 2003 Convention. However, the delegation remarked that the document used the terms 'regional' and 'Electoral Group' interchangeably, though they did not have the same meaning. For example, Electoral Group 1 comprised countries from Canada to Turkey and Israel, which was not a region in the geographical sense. In the context of this Convention, as in the 1972 Convention, the delegation favoured regional reporting. In the context of the 1972 Convention, this was achieved by actually merging Electoral Groups 1 and 2, resulting in five regional groups, which still allowed for a six-year cycle on the understanding that there would usually be one two-year period of recess to assess the lessons learned from the previous cycles. In the case of the draft decision, the delegation was happy with the use of the term 'regional'. However, it wished to suggest following the same model as the 1972 Convention of merging Electoral Groups 1 and 2.

332. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its proposal, which it welcomed, adding that periodic reporting was a crucial instrument within the framework of the Convention. However, periodic reporting did not currently fulfil its purpose, not only because of the low rate of submission that hampered the overall monitoring of the Convention, but also because the reports were activity-oriented in their current form and did not enable the Committee to note their impact both at the national and global levels. It seemed that the overall results framework, once adopted, would better monitor the effectiveness of the Convention as a whole. It thus welcomed the proposal to revise the reporting process to align it with the results framework approach. However, the delegation also believed that this Committee was not the body to adopt the proposal before its adoption by the General Assembly. It would be the next Committee's responsibility to consider this issue based on the decision taken by the General Assembly. Having said this, capacity building would be required to adapt the results-based periodic reporting, which should be seen within the context of the preparation of existing reports having already been challenging and reports having been overdue for some time. The introduction of this new reporting format would definitely require additional capacity-building support for many States Parties. Indeed, the voluntary contribution of the Republic of Korea, which would address this issue, was very timely. The delegation sought to know whether the Secretariat had considered the diminishing extrabudgetary funding. Nevertheless, it welcomed the revision of the periodicity of the periodic reporting towards a regional perspective. Such a change would help obtain a

regional overview of the Convention. The advantage of regional periodic reporting would be to encourage cooperation at the regional level in terms of good practices, capacity-building activities, and so on. Accordingly, the Secretariat could develop capacity-building activities in line with the needs of the region.

333. The **delegation of Bulgaria** welcomed the efforts on behalf of the Secretariat to enhance and improve the procedure of the reporting, expressing its positive opinion on the proposed new system and cycle of reporting as it would make the reporting procedures and process more efficient. The delegation also believed that it would certainly enhance regional cooperation and dialogue, while strengthening the possibilities for joint efforts in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the implementation of the Convention. It specifically welcomed the attention accorded to the preparation of concrete training modules, as well as the focus on training and capacity-building activities. This would provide a broader reflection on the future of the safeguarding activities that would go beyond the national scope and address regional levels and joint cooperation.

334. The **delegation of Austria** welcomed the Secretariat's proposed new reporting mechanism, which was line with the overall results framework just approved. It believed that this new grouping together of reports invited the respective regional groups to build capacity programmes during meetings that might take place every six years to support and motivate one other in the preparation of the reports and thereby improve their overall quality and usefulness. Another challenge was related to the reporting of the Lists, which also required a revision in the long run as – in its present state – there was no clear mechanism foreseen for updating the elements inscribed either on the Representative List or included on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.

335. The **Secretary** noted three different points; the first was related to the regional and Electoral Group and the model currently being followed; the second related to the development of capacity building and its implementation; and the third concerned monitoring or reporting of the Lists. The Secretary remarked that the Secretariat had indeed looked closely at the World Heritage model and had proposed Operational Directives that allowed flexibility within that model should the Electoral Groups decide. In many ways, it would simplify the process, but the order of the cycle had yet to be established by future Committees. There would be six-year cycles, should two Electoral Groups wish to be grouped together, which would allow one year to prepare lessons learned for the next cycle; the World Heritage mechanism worked well in this regard. Concerning the development of capacity building, it was noted that 20 per cent of the funds were devoted to 'Other functions of the Committee', and as was usual with capacity building, the Secretariat developed the upstream material for the training sessions through those funding mechanisms because it concerned material developed at the global level, but also it was the kind of work that was difficult to attract donor interest. Furthermore, the actual holding of training sessions and meetings would depend on mobilizing resources, as is always the case with capacity building. The Secretariat thus intended to follow the normal process for capacity building, but there would be a lot of work involved in developing the materials, preparing the facilitators, and then raising the money for the actual implementation of the capacity building during that period. The question concerning the Lists, as raised by Austria, was indeed important and complex. The Secretariat was trying to manage one issue at a time. Nevertheless, agenda item 14 [Reflection on the removal of an element from a List and the transfer of an element from one List to the other] would begin to look into those issues, but would take some time as the timeframe proposed merely to change the periodic report was time-consuming.

336. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** sought clarification regarding the reports that were long overdue. Given that there would now be regional reports and a transition period, and that reports would only be submitted from 2020, what would happen during the transition period when those reports would not be examined.

337. The **Secretary** explained that there had to be a point at which the system would be reset; the Secretariat would examine those scheduled for this year, but the late reports would not be examined. However, there was the possibility of changing the system, as the Secretariat had

yet to examine the regions to begin with, and an inventory had to be taken of the countries concerned. For example, would the reports that were submitted late in the first year of the new cycle be re-examined? Evidently, some countries would submit their report on time, while others would be late. For late submissions, they might have to wait until the end of the suspended period to have their report examined. For this reason, the Secretariat was not proposing the order of the regions at this stage because a more detailed analysis was required. Also, there were countries that had submitted their reports and would therefore have to wait. The most likely scenario was that those that were on time would take priority in being examined, but it would be impossible to alter the system within the same cycle, i.e. the Secretariat could not continue examining the reports while establishing the new system at the same time. For this reason, there would be some discussion on certain countries and how to include them. It seemed logical that countries that were late would be treated late, and those that were on time would be included on time. All these aspects would have to be reviewed. For example, would countries that had submitted their report the previous year and were part of the first region have to resubmit their report a year later? Thus, a more complete analysis of the situation of the submitting States, their dates of submission, and so on was required. For the time being, the regulation stipulated that a report would be submitted every six years from the date of ratification, which made it impossible to organize capacity building, though it could be achieved at the regional level. The Secretary understood the concerns, but the Secretariat had not yet proposed a decision because a more in-depth analysis was required to better understand the situation.

338. The **delegation of Republic of Korea** believed that the new periodic reporting mechanism would serve as an efficient tool for monitoring the effectiveness of the Convention as a whole, as periodic reporting enabled States Parties to examine their achievements and challenges, and to define their priorities for safeguarding their heritage. However, the delegation wondered whether the new mechanism would in fact guarantee a higher rate of submissions. In order to encourage the implementation of the Convention, relevant reports and support at the national, regional and global levels was required, including cooperation with the regional partners, for example, category 2 centres, facilitators, accredited NGOs and intangible cultural heritage experts. The delegation requested that the Secretariat clarify whether there were other follow-up measures to promote the submission of reports when this new mechanism was taken up on a regional basis.

339. The **delegation of Burkina Faso** wondered, for example, whether it would be expected to submit its report in 2018 in view of the transition period.

340. The **Secretary** explained that the Secretariat would continue examining the reports in 2017 but would then stop processing them. However, this would have to be approved by the General Assembly. The Secretariat could still receive reports, but the Committee would only examine the reports in 2018 that were received in 2017 before the examination of reports was suspended for two Committees.

341. The **Secretary** recalled that the Republic of Korea had asked how the Secretariat would ensure the effectiveness of this mechanism, adding that there was no 100 per cent guarantee of how States Parties would fill in their reports. However, from the World Heritage model in particular, this way of working with Field Offices to organize meetings and to bring experts of different countries together did produce results. Of course, category 2 centres and other partners were welcome to help. In terms of other mechanisms, the Secretariat would continue working on the online reporting, and the new forms – once ready – would also be available online. The Secretariat would also continue working with the UNESCO Field Offices, though extrabudgetary funds would be needed. However, given the nature of the overall results framework, the Secretariat would like to maintain the focus on national reports. Intangible cultural heritage has its expression at the community level, which might not be expressed in regional reports. Thus, the idea was to have a regional cycle of national reports, which allowed regions to group together and to provide support for the process.

342. With no further comments or objections, or amendments, the Chairperson proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 10 adopted**.

ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2017

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11*
Decision: *12.COM 11*

343. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 11 and the Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2017, and the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco), and the Rapporteur, Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia), joined the podium. The Chairperson recalled that the Committee had established the Evaluation Body at its eleventh session to evaluate: i) nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List; ii) nominations to the Representative List; iii) the request for the transfer of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List; iv) requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000; and v) proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The item would begin with the overall Report of the Evaluation Body on its work presented by the Rapporteur, reporting on a number of cross-cutting and specific issues raised during the Body's work. Following the oral report, the floor would be opened for questions to the Evaluation Body concerning issues raised in its report. The general debate on this item would take place *after* all the individual files had been evaluated, followed by the adoption of the overall decision 12.COM 11. The order of examination of nominations would proceed as follows: i) the six nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List (item 11.a); the thirty-four nominations to the Representative List (item 11.b); the one request for the transfer of an element from one List to another (item 11.c); the two requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 (item 11.d); and the two proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (item 11.e). All nominations would be the subject of a brief presentation by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, justifying the draft decisions of the Body. Noting the heavy task ahead with forty-five files under examination, the Chairperson informed the Committee that the Bureau had agreed during its meeting on 3 October to adopt the same procedure as in the two previous years, i.e. to invite Members wishing to amend specific draft decisions to inform the Secretariat by 9 a.m., as a matter of organization. Members of the Committee were evidently not prevented from taking the floor on any decision if they so wished. The Bureau had also decided, through electronic consultation in November 2017, that the debate would be opened on all nine files for which the Evaluation Body had proposed two options. These were: i) the multinational nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List submitted by Colombia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela; ii) the nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List submitted by Mongolia; and iii) the seven nominations to the Representative List including the multinational file submitted by Bulgaria, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Romania; the nomination files respectively submitted by Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Indonesia, Ireland and Malawi; and a multinational file submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. In addition, the Secretariat had received requests for debate concerning two nominations to the Representative List. In principle, the draft decisions, for which amendments were submitted, would be adopted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. For other decisions, they were expected to be adopted as a whole. In either case, the submitting State would have two minutes for comments after adoption, as was customary.

344. The **Chairperson** further explained that for nominations recommended for referral, in conformity with Decision 9.COM 13.c in 2014, the Evaluation Body only recommended a referral in cases where information was lacking, whether of a technical or substantive nature. Depending on its own priorities, the submitting State might wish to resubmit the referred file during the subsequent cycle or another future cycle. In either case, files referred and later resubmitted would be considered as new nominations and would therefore be subject to the overall ceiling of files and the priority system, as per paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives. With regard to amendments to the draft decisions, in particular in light of Decision 11.COM 8, as well as the Committee's debates during the examination of nominations in 2016, the Chairperson recalled that the decision-making process had been the subject of numerous discussions throughout 2017 during the meetings of the informal Ad Hoc Working

Group, established during the Committee's eleventh session in 2016. It was noted that the work of the informal Ad Hoc Working Group was ongoing, but its report would in fact be discussed under agenda item 13. Indeed, since the eleventh session in 2016, considerable progress had been made: i) in its report (document 11), the Evaluation Body pointed out that three nominations that had been referred by the Committee in previous cycles had been significantly improved and were now recommended for inscription in the present cycle, which demonstrated the positive impact of the referral option; ii) the Secretariat had revised Section 5 of the nomination forms for the Urgent Safeguarding List (Form ICH-01) and the Representative List (Form ICH-02) to reduce the likelihood of nominations being referred due to the absence of technical information; and iii) the innovative proposal by the Evaluation Body to use dual-option draft decisions for referred nominations based solely on missing factual or technical information under criterion 5. It was hoped that this dual option proposed for nine nominations would facilitate the Committee's work in this session.

345. Taking into account all these considerations, the **Chairperson** wished to apply the following working method: i) in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, he would maintain the 'smooth conduct of the proceedings and the maintenance of order'; ii) as reflected in Decision 11.COM 8, the spirit of consensus would prevail in the debate; and iii) the Committee was reminded that the proposed draft decisions had been prepared by the Evaluation Body, a consultative body created to assist in the examination of nominations, comprising elected members. Therefore, debates and decision-making should demonstrate respect towards the expertise and diligent work of the Evaluation Body. In this regard, the Chairperson remarked that the decision-making process had an impact on the credibility not only of the Committee, but also of the Convention as a whole. With no comments or questions on the procedure proposed, the Chairperson recalled several other important points on the working methods adopted by the Committee: i) during the general debates, priority was given to Members of the Committee, but States Parties non-Members of the Committee and other Observers would also be given the floor, time permitting; ii) participation in the debates on draft decisions was limited to Committee Members; iii) Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure stated that submitting States, whether or not a Member of the Committee, should not speak to advocate for the inclusion of their file but only to provide information in reply to questions raised by Committee Members, if any. The Chairperson reminded Members and Observers of the large numbers of people following its work through audiocast and videocast or through the news media, and it was therefore important to keep to the schedule as closely as possible. With no forthcoming comments or questions, the Chairperson gave the floor to the Rapporteur to present the Report of the Evaluation Body.

346. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body**, Mr Saša Srećković, spoke of his honour in introducing the overall Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2017, which covered an overview of the files, the working methods, observations and recommendations concerning cross-cutting issues, as well as the draft decisions. Representing equitably all six regions, the Body was composed of twelve members, including six individual expert representatives of States Parties non-Members of the Committee: Ms Amélia Maria de Melo Frazão Moreira (Portugal); Ms Sonia Montecino Aguirre (Chile); Ms Hien Thi Nguyen (Viet Nam); Mr John Moogi Omare (Kenya); Mr Ahmed Skounti (Morocco); and Mr Saša Srećković (Serbia). In addition, there were another six persons representing six accredited NGOs: the Norwegian Crafts Institute; the Czech Ethnological Society; the Association of Friends of Brazilian Folk Art – Casa do Pontal Museum; the China Folklore Society (CFS); the Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda; and the Egyptian Society for Folk Traditions. The Evaluation Body met for the first time in March 2017 when Mr Ahmed Skounti was elected as Chairperson, Ms Amélia Maria de Melo Frazão Moreira as Vice-Chair, and Mr Saša Srećković as Rapporteur. The report thus presented the consensus on behalf of the twelve members of the Body. The Rapporteur noted that there was a total of forty-nine files evaluated, including the request from Viet Nam to transfer an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. There were six nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, thirty-five to the Representative List, four to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, three for International Assistance, and one transfer from one List to another.

347. The **Rapporteur** remarked that in addition to the principles and guidelines already established in previous cycles and reflected in the *aide-memoires* and other relevant documents, he wished to outline some recurrent issues and newly emerging issues. Regarding the working methods, the Body had again encountered a number of files lacking information or evidence related to criterion R.5/U.5. When all the other criteria were met, it regretted the recommended referral that was solely based on the absence of factual information related to the inclusion of the element in an inventory (R.5/U.5). Therefore, noting that nomination forms using a revised format for Section 5 would only be used from the 2018 cycle onward, the Evaluation Body had reached a consensus in these cases and proposed a form of dual system of draft decisions with two options: 1) to refer the file to the submitting State due to the missing information, as per the existing procedure; 2) to allow the State Party concerned to provide evidence of the missing information at the Committee meeting, so that it would not have to wait another two years to resubmit the nomination file. This process would only apply in the current cycle and would be limited to U.5/R.5. Nevertheless, the Body was pleased to note the high quality of the nominations, which appeared to grow constantly with each new cycle, and it commended States Parties for the work well done. Generally speaking, the Body appreciated the noteworthy diversity of the nominations, which included elements belonging to particular subdomains that had been under-represented in previous cycles, such as traditional games or know-how on managing natural resources. Likewise, some new perspectives had emerged, such as nominations in which children were the main practitioners, or practices such as rituals derived from memories associated with recent historic events that had previously been carried out by heritage mechanisms and institutions rather than communities. The files also included practices closely related to specific cultural and natural spaces, phenomena of urban heritage, elements integrating ritual journeys, an increasing number of culinary practices and other associated aspects. The Body was pleased to recommend some nominations to the Representative List as overall good examples. In addition, three files were also commended for specific aspects, such as community participation, the quality of safeguarding measures, and the monitoring of the possible effects of inscription. The Body was also pleased to note that three nominations that had been referred by the Committee in previous cycles, some based on several criteria, had been significantly improved and were thus recommended for inscription. While the referral option had only recently been introduced, the Body found that this positive outcome showed that this option was already reaping benefits. States Parties were reminded of the need to use language that adhered to the principles and spirit of the Convention when preparing nominations, and to be cautious when making statements about the origins of an element, especially with regard to certain titles of nomination files that might imply appropriation even though the element was shared by different communities and States. The role of videos as supporting documentation was found to be helpful thanks to the additional insight they provided, and which was able to allay certain doubts or dilemmas about the status of elements of intangible heritage when they arose.

348. Turning to thematic issues, the **Rapporteur** further reported that the Body had expressed concerns about files referring to ‘counterfeiting’, as such notions were not relevant to the Convention (indeed, they were even contrary to it) and this may instead refer to issues of intellectual property rights. States Parties were reminded that the inscription of an element did not imply exclusive rights over that element nor did it prevent other States Parties from doing the same. In this regard, States Parties were further reminded that the Convention did not seek to establish a system of protection based on geographic origin or geographic indication. In one case, the issue of licensing a practice of intangible cultural heritage had arisen, which might be interpreted differently according to specific contexts. Under the Convention, a license is acceptable only if it served as an acknowledgement for the bearers of the tradition, but not if it was used as a restrictive measure to prevent other practitioners from engaging in the practice of the element. Concerns were also raised regarding measures that might encourage over-commercialization, such as in some cases concerning culinary traditions. Elements of intangible cultural heritage were often practised in different ways, some of which brought commercial benefits, such as tourist programmes and performances during festivals. However, the element was more likely to be commercialized if the audiences

of the element were situated outside of the local communities. It was thus essential to indicate in the file whether or not the practitioners were salaried employees and in what way the element formed part of an economic process. Likewise, there were cases where specific companies were named, advertising specific products related to the element, which was not in line with the Convention. In addition, the Body drew attention to the distinction between traditional games as practices of intangible cultural heritage and professional sports. The Body had also encountered issues in cases where it was unclear whether women's participation in certain practices was voluntary. For example, when the purpose of young girls' participation involved finding a suitor for marriage, there was the issue of whether the girls had agreed of their own free will or whether coercion was involved. While some elements of intangible cultural heritage attribute gender-specific roles, without necessarily contributing to gender inequalities, other intangible cultural heritage practices might in fact be seen as reinforcing gender inequalities. Regarding the issue of economic revitalization, the efforts to restore certain traditions for the economic benefit of communities were not necessarily linked to promoting gender equality or empowering women. A project could be successful in economic terms but might still fail to achieve the empowerment or emancipation of women, who are the tradition bearers. It was therefore important to follow up on the real impact of such practices within the community in the long term.

349. The **Rapporteur** advised States Parties to take heed of the implications for a practice that acquired greater visibility if inscribed, particularly in cases of good practices in which economic interest constitutes an important objective, such as craft workshops. For example, if the labour regulations within the workshops do not grant due rights to workers and practitioners, the visibility of the heritage might convey negative messages. Some intangible cultural heritage practices also pose risks to environmental sustainability owing to different factors, such as pollution and the over-exploitation of the natural resources needed to sustain the element. However, there were cases in which practices promoted environmentally-friendly measures, such as those making use of natural energy sources and traditional technologies. The Body had also identified some cases in which States Parties had confused the 1972 Convention and the 2003 Convention, and therefore States Parties were advised to abstain from designating elements of intangible cultural heritage as 'world heritage'.

350. With regard to specific issues related to inscription criteria, the **Rapporteur** spoke of whether an element could actually be in need of urgent safeguarding when it has a relatively large number of identified practitioners. At times, the number of bearers was over-estimated owing to an inability to distinguish between people who are aware of an element, its audiences, and those who actively practise it. Compared to 2016, fewer files failed to meet criterion R.2, but the challenge remained. The Body was aware of the difficulties faced by people working in the communities and at the regional and local levels in understanding and expressing how the inscription of an element could increase the visibility of living heritage at the international level and raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general. The Body felt that the formulation of the questions in this section of the nomination form might not be fully adequate, and it had identified a few possible ways forward. One option would be to divide the questions on the form into sub-questions, while another option could be to provide separate boxes in which to place the answers. It was also proposed that States Parties be requested to provide information on concrete cases that could illustrate the statements provided on the form, which by themselves were mostly rhetorical and overly abstract. The Body discussed whether generic threats could be considered sufficient in identifying whether an element was in need of urgent safeguarding, and whether targeted safeguarding actions could feasibly be undertaken in response. Ideally, these threats should be as specific to the element as possible. It was also difficult to assess whether threats were generic or specific, as they were often interconnected within a given context. In addition, the Body mentioned the need to determine the severity of threats within specific contexts. If the threats identified were too generic, it was not possible to assess the appropriateness of the safeguarding plan. Even large-scale threats had targeted and concrete socioeconomic consequences, but the safeguarding plan could not be expected to address them in all their aspects; there needed to be a precise correspondence between the factors threatening the viability of the element

identified in U.2 and the safeguarding plan proposed in U.3. Occasionally, there was some confusion over the difference between safeguarding measures (required under R.3) and the safeguarding plan (required under U.3). The criterion U.3 should be precisely formulated and articulated as a whole, and should identify the objectives, activities, expected results, detailed budget and responsible bodies. A detailed budget and plan was not required for safeguarding measures, as required for criterion U.3. The Body further noted that some safeguarding measures were led entirely by governmental bodies. In some cases, such an approach was useful at particular stages of implementation. However, States should ensure that communities were involved to the largest extent possible so they could work proactively on and take a leading role in carrying out safeguarding measures. For some files, the Body had encountered difficulties in distinguishing between ongoing safeguarding measures with those completed in the past, those recently implemented, and those planned in the future. The Body therefore invited States Parties to ensure that the period of implementation of the proposed safeguarding measures be clarified in the nomination files. The Body also stressed the importance of the proposed actions being specific and connected with the groups and individuals concerned, rather than of a more general nature. The objectives and expected results needed to be clearly laid out so that the outcomes could be matched against the initial projections.

351. The **Rapporteur** remarked on the importance of the representativeness expressed through consent for a nomination, adding that it was one of the requirements set out in the form that the selection of community representatives be justified. This did not appear to have been given due attention in recent years, but future Bodies should enforce a systematic approach to selecting the representatives involved in the nomination process. States Parties should be encouraged not to send standardized consent letters, as it was important that the forms of consent be as varied as possible, including the various forms of media. Petition forms supporting the nomination were not acceptable. In some cases, there was a lack of clarity as to whether those who expressed their consent actually understood what safeguarding intangible cultural heritage involved, especially given the use of standardized letters of consent. Equally, communities did not seem to have been properly informed of the difference between a nomination to a List and a proposal to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Regarding the specific issues related to criteria for selection to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, the Rapporteur remarked that proposals connected with wars/armies should be afforded particular attention, especially concerning their historical background, as this was always a highly sensitive issue. On the other hand, the Body was concerned that, in the future, it might be asked to examine practices that could be seen as supporting a specific political agenda. Another set of questions concerned the issue of whether or not such programmes [related to conflict or war] contributed to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Likewise, could this type of commemoration be relevant to other contexts where peace is fragile? Links between peace and sustainable development were particularly important in that regard. As with previous cycles, criterion P.9 was the subject of considerable discussion, i.e. how could the proposal in question be replicated as a model in developing countries? This question raised lively discussion as the circumstances in particular countries were often quite specific, thereby hampering efforts to apply safeguarding models from elsewhere. Hence, did it make sense to formulate the criterion in this way? It was noted that there was a need for good models for safeguarding practices in both developed and developing countries.

352. Regarding the <u>transfer of an element from one List to another</u>, the **Rapporteur** reported that, for the first time, the Body had examined a case in which a State Party wished to remove an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and transfer it to the Representative List. The Body began by evaluating the report on the status of the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List to assess whether the element could be removed from this List. As the format of the report on the status of the element did not use the same sequence as the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Body considered that the information contained in the report on the status of the element was insufficient as a whole to ascertain whether the element still needed urgent safeguarding. As a second step, the Body evaluated

the nomination file submitted by Viet Nam for inscription of the element on the Representative List on a criterion-by-criterion basis. As decided by the Committee, the Body carried out this process on an experimental basis, subsequently identifying the lessons learned. The Body considered that submitting States should provide proof of the communities' consent for the removal of an element from one List and/or its transfer to another. Concerning the removal of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Body was asked to draw conclusions and offer an informed recommendation based on the periodic report on the safeguarding of the element; without sufficient evidence, the Body was necessarily basing its evaluation on trust alone. Based on this experience, the Body recommended that a new, dedicated form be developed specifically for the removal of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Furthermore, the Body noted that the State Party concerned had decided to request the removal of the element from one List and its transfer to another before fully implementing its safeguarding plan (which was due to be completed only in 2020). The removal or transfer process needed to be carried out using an established order of activities and with an appropriate procedure as neither the available forms nor the Operational Directives provided an adequate mechanism for dealing with the transfer case in question. It was also important to note that the removal of an element from one List did not necessarily result in its transfer to another. Indeed, a transfer to the Representative List, following a successful safeguarding process, could in fact make a case for its transfer to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. This case also raised the question of how long an element under threat could stay on the Urgent Safeguarding List, so that the effects of inscription on the List could be assessed and ascertained. This, in turn, again raised the question of the purpose of the Urgent Safeguarding List.

353. Regarding specific issues related to International Assistance, the **Rapporteur** remarked on the Body's wish to draw the Committee's attention to requests pertaining to safeguarding activities implemented by universities, as this constituted a relatively new approach to safeguarding projects. It wished to stress that the primary focus of such projects should ensure that the safeguarding activities be carried out in close collaboration with the bearer communities, rather than exclusively on research and teaching activities. The Body underscored the need to monitor the implementation of International Assistance granted to States Parties. It also stressed the importance of following up on the future development and sustainability of projects after their formal termination, given the importance of assessing the impact and effects of such projects in the long term. The Rapporteur concluded by expressing sincere thanks to the members of the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat.

354. The **delegation of Turkey** did not have any specific questions but rather comments on the Report of the Evaluation Body. It began by thanking the Evaluation Body for its extensive work, acknowledging with appreciation the tremendous amount of work undertaken. The delegation welcomed the comprehensive report, which covered many important observations and recommendations. It was a report that all States Parties should take into consideration in the preparation and submission of their nomination files. It also appreciated the support of the Secretariat for the smooth work of the Evaluation Body. To begin with, it found the dual system approach very innovative, giving a chance for those files that only lacked some factual information to become inscribed. The delegation fully agreed with the observation that States should refrain from inscribing elements on the List to authenticate the practice of an element that might be shared by different communities, as certain elements were not restricted to one specific country. It also concurred with the observation that the use of adjectives of nationality that might reflect national ownership was against the ideals and objectives of the Convention. In the meantime, when examining the nomination files, the delegation invited the Evaluation Body to pay attention to the geographical coverage of the nominated element as requested in Section D of the files, which requires clarification on the geographic location and range of the element. Upon examination of the section in detail, the delegation expected the Body to reflect on its decisions properly. It also encouraged States Parties to utilize the mechanisms of the Convention that encouraged multinational nomination files. In this respect, the delegation had some amendments to the general decision under this agenda item. The Evaluation Body had pointed out that there was some confusion between the 1972 and 2003

Conventions, and States should bear in mind that they are not identical and understand how these two Conventions differ from each other. The delegation suggested that a comparative study might be useful that could be prepared by the two Secretariats to make the distinction clear. It appreciated the recommendations regarding the removal and transfer process that should be taken into account in future deliberations. The delegation encouraged all States Parties to study the observations of the Evaluation Body carefully before submitting nominations. With regard to the format of the report itself, the delegation found the report confusing. Some observations had recommendations while others did not. For instance, paragraph 18 included a recommendation, but the only explicit recommendation of the Body was under paragraph 57 on the removal and transfer process. Accordingly, the draft decision partially reflected the Evaluation Body's recommendations or observations. It might be useful if the reporting format were simplified and made clear in terms of its recommendations. The delegation invited the Evaluation Body together with the Secretariat to consider its reporting format with a view to making it more user-friendly for decision-makers.

355. The **Chairperson** adjourned the day's session.

[Wednesday, 6 December 2017, morning session]

ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]
REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2017

356. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had for the second time in the morning discussed a slight revision to the timetable.

357. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates of a number of activities taking place. There would be two information sessions on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education organized by UNESCO, and the ICHNGO Forum working group meeting on research.

358. The **Chairperson** remarked on the efficient work so far, having successfully examined agenda items 7 to 10 in the previous day's session. With regard to item 11, the afternoon session had concluded with the report of the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body who had presented a number of cross-cutting and specific issues raised during the Body's work. The Chairperson resumed the debate, opening the floor for questions on the report.

359. The **delegation of Austria** congratulated the Evaluation Body for the coherence of its work and the detailed and insightful report, as well as the accredited NGOs and experts that had worked on the files. It noted and appreciated the proposed way forward regarding criteria R.5 and U.5, which allowed States Parties to provide evidence of the missing information on an exceptional basis during the present session. Thus, the revised format for Section 5 would support States Parties in providing sufficient information from the next cycle onwards so that inscriptions were based only on the adequacy of the information presented in the nomination file and not at the meeting of the Committee. The delegation also noted the Evaluation Body's concerns, which were directly linked to the Agenda 2030 regarding, for instance, the over-commercialization of elements, as well as gender issues and environmental sustainability. These were important issues, which States Parties might wish to address in their periodic reports. Paragraph 64 addressed another very important and sensitive topic that was directly related to SDG16 [Peace, justice and strong institutions]. As mentioned in Chapter 6 of the Operational Directives, intangible cultural heritage should acknowledge the contribution of its safeguarding to fostering peace – a core objective of UNESCO. In addition, spaces of memory, which are addressed by the Convention, are matters of education (SDG4 had already been emphasized during the present Committee session). The delegation therefore wished to encourage States Parties to continue recognizing, promoting and enhancing intangible cultural heritage expressions and practices related to peace-making and peace-building. It further welcomed the formulation of additional questions in Section R.2, adding that perhaps the Committee could consider defining a set of indicators for the section as to what information could be considered signs of success of inscription (presently the

information provided often contained wishful statements or assertions without proper justification or concrete cases). Moreover, as this criterion encapsulated the fundamental purposes of the Representative List, as set out in Article 6 of the Convention, the delegation believed it would make sense to further align the questions in the intangible cultural heritage nomination form with the form used for the periodic report to provide a better understanding of the outcomes of inscription. Finally, the delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for paying close attention to the linguistic quality of the files and thereby ensuring consistency. However, when a file only contained one inappropriate expression then the Body might show some flexibility and indulgence when making its recommendations. Overall, the delegation was impressed by the level and quality of explanations and recommendations, which assisted States Parties in preparing the nominations in the future. It therefore congratulated the Evaluation Body again on its work for the Convention.

360. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Body for its work and for the detailed report. It was especially appreciative of the key issues that were highlighted and that are currently linked to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, particularly the question of gender, the environment, the involvement of universities, and education. The delegation gave the example of the djembé, a West African tamtam and a cultural ambassador of those countries, adding that the production of the djembé should not be associated with deforestation as long as there is replanting, even though the djembé as a cultural object still had an environmental impact. With regard to a second point on the transfer of an element from one List to another, the delegation believed the issue deserved the Committee's attention, which meant some work on the Operational Directives was required to settle these issues definitively. Regarding the issue of communication, the delegation was pleased to note that States Parties could provide additional information in place of a referral. However, it wondered whether this could be taken even further by allowing for upstream communication with the States Parties that could resolve these issues prior to the Committee session. The delegation looked to standardization with the other Conventions, for example the 1972 Convention, in which States submit interim reports before the final evaluation and occasionally meetings are held with the States Parties.

361. The **delegation of Cyprus** also congratulated the Evaluation Body for its titanic work and thanked the Secretariat for its contribution to the examination of the files. It also expressed appreciation for the referral system and the newly introduced dual system of draft decisions. Both innovations allowed for the improvement of nomination files and the expedience of the procedure. The delegation also commended the Body's reiteration of and strong emphas on the fact that the inscription of an element by a State Party on one of the Convention's Lists did not imply paternity, ownership or exclusivity for the nominating country. This was a problem Cyprus also faced with the inscription of elements on national inventories with communities considering inscription as a way of establish geographical origin and promoting commercialization.

362. The **delegation of Hungary** warmly congratulated the Evaluation Body for its work and for its report, noting that it had identified a number of very important issues that should guide both States Parties and the Committee in their future work in the preparation of nominations. This not only added food for thought but it is also provided inspiration for action. The delegation wished to highlight three serious points. The first point concerned the issue of shared heritage, as raised by Cyprus and Turkey, which is a very important issue for the implementation of the Convention, and one that touches upon the inscription mechanism. The inscription mechanism should in no way be used to appropriate intangible cultural heritage or as a means to authenticate the practice in a specific country. Intangible cultural heritage is shared among countries. This is the norm. Intangible cultural heritage lives in the exchange and interaction between communities, and the boundaries of States do not respect those interactions. Indeed, UNESCO fosters building bridges between cultures. Article 2 of this Convention specifically refers to ensuring respect for the intangible cultural heritage of communities, raising awareness at the local, national and international levels, and mutual appreciation. This was therefore an issue that should be dealt with seriously in the Committee, and the delegation appreciated the formulation in paragraph 27 of the report and,

together with other countries, would like to propose further amendments to paragraph 8 in the draft decision. Gender is another important issue. Indeed, it is very important that intangible cultural heritage be compatible with human rights instruments, as stated in Article 2 of the Convention, which refers to mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals. The delegation also drew attention to a slight discrepancy in the text in paragraph 33, which read, 'other intangible cultural heritage practices may in fact be seen as reinforcing gender inequalities.' Strictly speaking, in the language of the Convention, if a practice reinforces gender inequality then it is not intangible cultural heritage under the Convention. It suggested avoiding using this terminology in which intangible cultural heritage is said to reinforce gender inequalities. Finally, the delegation highlighted the issue raised by the Evaluation Body concerning criterion R.2 and its application, adding that there were two nominations in the present session in which this was applicable, which should be borne in mind when making decisions on those items.

363. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the information, and the Evaluation Body for its report. It wished to highlight some issues about working methods. However, as the Committee would later examine the draft decision concerning the extension of the Working Group that would continue to reflect on the best practices and the best working methods for this Evaluation Body, the delegation would reserve its comments until that time.

364. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its important work, as well as for the dual option presented in this cycle as this would open up a space for discussion and to reflect on the contents and technical aspects of the Convention. The delegation sought to see the important aspects raised by the Evaluation Body identified and integrated into the overall results framework of the Convention. It also sought to invite other States Parties to integrate their own national and local policies for intangible cultural heritage conservation.

365. The **delegation of Mongolia** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its hard work on the nomination files. After careful examination of all the preliminary decisions and the files examined by the Evaluation Body, the delegation noted that many of the nominations had a problem with criteria R.5 and U.5. This implied that criteria R.5 and U.5 should be more precise, more clearly explained. The delegation believed that there was a mismatch between the expectations of the Evaluation Body and the States Parties in nominating their files and what they should include in R.5 and U.5. Also, the States Parties should be better informed about the updated inventory regarding this criterion.

366. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** expressed its sincere appreciation to the Evaluation Body for its tremendous work and for its rich and instructive report. It wished to highlight three issues. The first concerned the issue of over-commercialization, which had come up repeatedly and was very complex such that the delegation felt it would benefit from shared experiences. The second concerned its appreciation of the dual system. One concern, however, with the missing information, even in its resubmitted form, was that it should benefit from guidance from the Evaluation Body as to whether the submitted information was in fact sufficient to meet the criterion. The final issue concerned the transfer of an element from one List to another. The delegation believed that there was in fact two distinct requests that should be treated separately: one request for the removal of the element from the List, and then another request for its inscription onto another List. Thus, the same level of stringent process and criteria should be applied before the Committee decided on the removal, i.e. that guides the Evaluation Body in deciding on a removal. Such questions include: Who determines the request? Who can ask for a removal? Who decides? A removal was a serious issue deserving the same stringent process as an inscription.

367. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Evaluation Body for its remarkable and extensive work. It wished to underline the concern expressed by the Evaluation Body in paragraph 40 of the report where it was stated that people working in the communities at the regional and local levels had difficulties in understanding and expressing how the inscription of an element could increase the visibility of living heritage at the international level [under criterion R.2]. This issue should thus be properly addressed to avoid situations that were counter to the spirit of the Convention.

368. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Evaluation Body for its valuable work and report. It believed that the dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the nominating States would be valuable in clarifying questions pertaining to R.2 as well as other criteria, as mentioned by previous delegations. The delegation further believed that this was related to the short amount of space, only 100–150 words, that States Parties were given to answer the complex and nuanced questions in the nomination forms. On the one hand, it understood the constraints to limit answers, but on the other hand, it seemed contradictory to request simplified, boxed or canned responses on elements that sometimes pre-dated writing itself. The delegation also sought the views of the Evaluation Body on this matter, and precisely how nomination forms and procedures could be improved, as well as geographical representation on the Representative List.

369. The **Rapporteur** noted that a number of issues had been raised and took the opportunity to thank the Committee Members for their appreciation of the collective work on the different cross-cutting issues. Regarding the question of the timely submission of additional information to the dual option, the Rapporteur surmised that the Secretariat would interpret these options as some form of submission prior to the Committee. As was known, this would be done on an experimental basis that year and the following year with the introduction of the new amended nomination form, especially in R.5, which would be divided into more subsections for clarity. As a result, it might be unnecessary to have some additional stages of submissions of documentation. As regards missing information, the Body was doing its best to deal with the most problematic sections, as reflected in the report, for instance, in criteria R.2, R.5 and U.5. The suggestion was that they be divided into subsections that made the expectations clearer. For example, R.2 might appear very abstract, especially for the communities, if not illustrated by some concrete examples. These solutions might be enough for the Body to deliberate and evaluate the files in the best possible way.

370. The **Secretary** wished to respond to the remarks by Mongolia. Indeed, concerning R.5 and U.5, the Secretariat had tried to ensure that the new form indicated every single aspect as a separate box that the Evaluation Body wished to see. This helped the Secretariat undertake a completeness check, making sure that each box had been filled. If a box was empty, then the criterion was considered as incomplete and the file was returned to the State Party. The form had been introduced the previous year, so unfortunately the files treated that year did not benefit from that reform. However, the files in the current cycle would benefit. Concerning R.2, the new form was now online; it also broke down each sub-component of the question into a separate box. Again, the files treated at the next Committee session were submitted in 2016, as it took two sessions before this new form would be presented at the Committee.

371. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the general debate and examination of draft decision 12.COM.11 would take place *after* the examination of the individual decisions under agenda items 11.a, 11.b, 11.c, 11.d and 11.e. It was also noted that the evaluation of the nine individual files with dual options would be opened automatically. All nine submitting States had sent information to the Secretariat in writing, which had been distributed to Committee Members. In addition, the Secretariat had received requests to open the debate on two nominations to the Representative List: i) from Panama on 'Artisanal processes and plant fibers techniques for talcos, crinejas and pintas weaving of the pinta'o hat'; and ii) from Saudi Arabia on 'Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, female traditional interior wall decoration in Asir, Saudi Arabia'.

ITEM 11.a OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11.a Rev.*
Files: *6 nominations*

372. The **Chairperson** turned to the first sub-item 11.a and the examination of six nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List submitted by Botswana, Mongolia, Morocco,

Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, together with one multinational file by Colombia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. As a reminder, the Chairperson projected the inscription criteria onto the screen. He then turned to the first examination, on Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District, and its draft decision 11.a.1 submitted by Botswana, inviting the Secretary to present some clarification regarding this file.

373. The **Secretary** explained that the Evaluation Body had initially recommended a referral on the basis of criterion U.3, particularly as 'the file does not include a budget, mention of the available funding or a precise timetable; these are considered as indispensable requirements for the safeguarding plan for an element in need of urgent safeguarding'. However, following the publication of the document on 27 October 2017, Botswana contacted the Secretariat to point out that it had in fact submitted the information mentioned. After checking the file, the Secretariat realized that the submitting State had indeed sent the budget and timetable for the safeguarding plan at the time of initial submission in March 2016. However, as this document was submitted separately and in separate emails, the Secretariat had not taken note of this information. As the information was not integrated into the official nomination Form ICH-01, it was not transmitted to the Evaluation Body and was thus not evaluated. Noting the regrettable oversight, the Evaluation Body was asked in November 2017 to review the file in light of the information provided and considered that it addressed the concerns raised in its initial recommendation. The twelve Members had reached consensus on a new draft decision, recommending that the Committee inscribe the element concerned on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Secretary apologized to the submitting State for this unfortunate oversight, while thanking the members of the Evaluation Body for their prompt reaction.

374. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination, '**Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.1] submitted by Botswana**.** Dikopelo involves vocal singing and dancing in a patterned choreography without musical instruments, and is in need of urgent safeguarding, primarily as a result of migration from farmlands to villages, as well as modern entertainment practices, which threaten its viability. The community and the practitioners are nonetheless committed to safeguarding the element. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria: i) U.1: The element is clearly described in terms of its practice, the bearers involved, its transmission and its cultural relevance for the community, including an explanation of its historical development and contemporary needs. The practice provides an avenue for rural communities to forge solidarity and share common values that can be shared by a wider community, including their well-wishers; ii) U.2: The endangered status of the element is fully substantiated by the threats identified in its social and economic contexts, including the migration of young people, a lack of cultural spaces and opportunities to practise the element, the popularity of various forms of modern music, misapropriation by some modern artists, among others; iii) U.3: Developed with the active participation of communities, the safeguarding plan includes measures addressing threats to the element, and it incorporates a diversity of safeguarding initiatives, such as research and documentation activities aimed at raising the awareness of the public, the development of educational materials and promotional activities through various media, which are expected to increase the visibility of the element at the national and international levels; iv) U.4: The active participation of the communities was ensured throughout the nomination process, who expressed concerns about the future viability of the element, and associations of bearers, institutions and traditional and formal authorities also provided their consent; and v) U.5: Since 2010, the element has been registered in the intangible cultural heritage inventory in Kgatleng District, which is regularly updated and managed by the Phuthadikobo Museum and the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture. Evidence of the participation of the communities concerned was also provided. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended the inscription of Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District on the Urgent Safeguarding List.

375. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation of the different issues, noting no forthcoming comments or objections. **The**

Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.a.1 adopted to inscribe 'Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.

376. The **delegation of Botswana** applauded the Committee for receiving and making a thorough assessment of its nomination file submitted for the first time in 2012. A lot of effort had been made to close all the identified gaps in the file and in March 2016 it had been resubmitted for inscription for the third time. The time and effort taken by the community to close the gaps had given Botswana an opportunity to grow in terms of compiling a successful nomination file. Botswana was delighted to receive the adopted decision to inscribe the element of the Dikopelo folk music of Bakgatla ba Kgafela in Kgatleng District and was committed to the implementation of the safeguarding plan, as well as the submission of periodic reports. The decision to inscribe the element had motivated Botswana to continue using UNESCO to safeguard its diverse intangible cultural heritage.

[A short film on the element was projected]

377. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Colombian-Venezuelan llano work songs'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.2] submitted by Colombia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. Llano work songs consist of tunes sung individually *a capella* on the themes of herding and milking. The songs are repositories of the individual and collective stories of the llaneros. The practice nonetheless faces numerous threats to its viability, such as the modification of the social, cultural and natural sites of the songs and alterations to the demographic composition of llanero society. Safeguarding efforts include a pedagogical strategy for bearers and young people, training for schoolteachers and festivals. The Evaluation Body considered that the following criteria were met: i) U.1: The element constitutes a practice of intangible cultural heritage of the communities concerned and unites them, and the highly expressive songs help to accustom cattle to the presence of humans, mainly during the milking process; ii) U.2: A comprehensive analysis of the different threats was provided: the government's legislation; oil and gas extraction; large-scale irrigation, the exploitation of bio-fuels; the delimitation of properties with barbed wire; the construction of road networks; migration to urban areas, among others; and the use of new media forms and technologies substituting the human voice were also perceived as threats; iii) U.3: A five-year plan is structured around knowledge, revitalization and the transmission of the llano songs, and also includes joint actions between the two countries where practitioners can benefit from an exchange of experiences, showing the commitment of the communities and institutions involved; iv) U.4: The fruitful synergies between the efforts of communities, associations and the respective institutions are evident, and diverse and numerous expressions of consent encompass creative written testimonies, fingerprints, palm imprints and photographs. However, in U.5, although the element is included in inventories of intangible cultural heritage in both Colombia and Venezuela, the frequency with which the inventory is updated and community participation in drafting the entry are missing in the case of Colombia. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended referring the nomination to the submitting States Parties. The file was nonetheless well-conceived and carefully prepared, notably in relation to the description of the threats to the element.

378. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation, noting that this was the first case of the dual system of draft decisions. As previously explained, the Bureau had decided to open the debate on this file, and the Committee had received written information from the submitting States concerning the questions raised. This information was attached to the nomination file. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, the submitting States were given the floor to provide only the relevant information on two issues: community participation in the inventorying process in Colombia, and the frequency of inventory updating in Colombia.

379. The **delegation of Colombia** noted that the Evaluation Body had two main questions regarding U.5. Responding to the question on the frequency of updating of the inventory, the delegation wished to explain how relations work in Colombia and how the inscription of an element in the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage works according to its law and

regulations. The main instrument that serves as an inventory of Colombia in cultural heritage is the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage at the national level. This list contains the development of an up-to-date regulation, which explains the procedure by which interested communities can register cultural manifestations and practices, undertaking in turn a Special Safeguarding Plan, which must be built and agreed upon by the bearers and social actors related to the cultural manifestation in question. The participatory preparation of the Special Safeguarding Plan is a mandatory requirement to join the list, and is the basis for the registry that had been presented along with the nomination file. This entire procedure is stipulated in the General Law of Culture and is explained in the section 'Intangible Cultural Heritage'. With respect to the submission as presented, the delegation clarified that in Colombia, the 'llano work songs' are inscribed in inventories at the local, regional and national levels. The inventories at the local and regional levels are updated according to the requirements of the authorities and communities. However, and most importantly, the 'llano work songs' are inscribed in Colombia's main registry of intangible cultural heritage elements, administered by the Ministry of Culture. Its inclusion was only possible after the development of the Special Safeguarding Plan, which was constructed through a participatory process with the communities, bearers, cultural agents, researchers and local authorities. As explained, the Special Safeguarding Plan is the basis for the registration of an element in the national Intangible Cultural Heritage Representative List, containing a detailed description, its social function, the modes of transmission as well as the risk, opportunities and safeguarding initiatives that are a result of the participatory process. The national laws establish that the Special Safeguarding Plan must be reviewed and renewed every five years by the Ministry of Culture. This action constitutes the main mechanism for updating the inventory as it makes it possible to review the status of the manifestation in question, and that action has been undertaken to warrant its sustainability and safeguarding in the medium term. The element presented to the Committee was inscribed in the National Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2003, which means that the revision and updating of the Special Safeguarding Plan would take place in 2018.

380. The **delegation of Colombia** referred to the second question concerning community participation in drafting the inventory, explaining that the current regulations in Colombia define the Special Safeguarding Plan as a social and administrative agreement by the community involved in the element. The laws regarding safeguarding intangible cultural heritage explicitly state that the consultation and participation mechanisms are mandatory for the Special Safeguarding Plan to be approved as the main tool for the management and safeguarding of the element. This participation was also secured as evidence in the records and as presented in the nomination file. Since 2011, a working group led by the NGO Fundaset, and supervised by the Ministry of Culture, had undertaken a tour through the Llanos region gathering testimonies with elder bearers with their respective informed consent forms on different characteristics of the llanos work songs and their historical memory in order to construct a robust description of the element for the Special Safeguarding Plan. Furthermore, in each of the four departments of the Llanos region of Colombia, forums were conducted that were open to all interested actors to build a Special Safeguarding Plan for the inclusion of an element on the Representative List. An important representation of musicians, of cattle, cattle dealers, cultural managers, representatives of educational institutions and researchers was achieved. They contributed to the reconstruction of what the llano work songs represented for llano culture in general and how to plan for its safeguarding and management.

381. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked Colombia for the information provided, adding that this information allayed any doubts presented by the Evaluation Body. It thus agreed that the element should be inscribed.

382. The **delegation of Palestine** echoed the remarks by Cuba. Indeed, the clarifications from Colombia, as well as the document distributed in the room from Venezuela and Colombia, provided all the information required to demonstrate the merits of inscribing this element. It therefore supported the inscription of this element and not a deferral.

383. The **delegation of Bulgaria** expressed appreciation for the work by the Evaluation Body and for the extremely rich report. Regarding the nomination, the delegation was satisfied with the additional explanations provided as they gave clear evidence of the continuous and systematic updating of inventorying at the local and regional levels in close connection with the five-year safeguarding plan, as well as the wide participation of communities and bearers in the inventorying process.

384. The **Chairperson** noted that the file enjoyed wide support, with many Members wishing to speak, including: Armenia, Turkey, Saint Lucia, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Lebanon, Philippines, Côte d'Ivoire, India and Mongolia, Zambia, Afghanistan and Algeria. He therefore asked whether there were any opposing views among the speakers. Otherwise, he would record the supporting views.

385. The **delegation of Ethiopia** expressed support.

386. The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that all the speakers wishing to make supporting remarks would be duly reflected in the summary records. He then proceeded with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted.

387. The **delegation of Palestine** suggested that instead of going paragraph by paragraph, knowing there was huge support, the Committee could adopt the inscription option and delete the referral option.

388. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee wished to adopt the decision as a whole. The Chairperson noted that paragraphs 1–3 had been duly edited from referral to inscription.

389. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** remarked that part of what had been deleted was a section that stated, 'commends the State Party for the otherwise well-conceived and carefully prepared file', which it wished to retain, albeit with 'otherwise' deleted.

390. The **delegation of Hungary** remarked that it was following the amendment proposed by Saint Lucia to assess its impact, as this was the first nomination file to deal with the issue in U.5. The delegation explained that the decision had been prepared with a problem in U.5, thus the decision should somehow keep a record of this issue. From this perspective, the delegation would be more comfortable in going along with the original suggestion or finding some language that commended the file overall but kept a record of the U.5 issue. The delegation raised this point at this stage because the method adopted now would likely apply to other nomination files that had U.5 or R.5 issues. Thus, the Committee should come to a structural agreement at this stage.

391. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** agreed with Hungary on this very important point, pointing out that the paragraph made a specific reference to the threats of the element and how the submitting States dealt with those threats, and thus it should be retained.

392. The **delegation of Cuba** understood the concern expressed by Hungary, adding that the text, 'the information included in the file is not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether the following criterion for inscription […]', was a bit strong because the file did eventually lead to an inscription. It suggested instead, 'on the basis of information submitted by the State, the Committee decides to inscribe', as there were two options suggested by the Evaluation Body. Starting the paragraph with a negative sentence was not a good way to proceed for this file and for the others that would follow.

393. From a procedural point of view, the **Secretary** explained that the additional information submitted in writing would be attached to the nomination and that all discussions would be recorded. This was why the Secretariat encouraged written submissions so that they could be attached to the nomination file for the record.

394. The **delegation of Palestine** was of the understanding that the Evaluation Body had proposed two options: either the Committee took the whole first option or the second option. Nevertheless, it understood the concerns of Saint Lucia and Hungary, but remarked that including negative elements in the decision was not appropriate. If the Committee wished to

commend the submitting State Parties for the notable description of the threats, in particular, then it should retain only that aspect without mentioning the file, as addressed by Hungary. Otherwise, its proposal was to be as simple as possible, i.e. to take one option or the other, which would simplify the procedure for the upcoming files with this kind of dual option.

395. The **delegation of Ethiopia** remarked that if the Committee accepted option 2 (the inscription option) then the Committee was basically saying that the file was complete, but somehow there was a misunderstanding (in terms of the missing information), which the submitting State had cleared up with a clarification. Should the Committee agree with the clarification, which was the case, then there was no need to refer back to the fact that there was an issue. The delegation felt that there was no need for a negative remark in the conclusion, especially as all the annexes would be attached for reference, as explained by the Secretary. The decision was thus based on the information later received with the conclusion to inscribe. Thus, the Committee had to standardize the decision simply and positively because the conclusion was ultimately positive. Including any negative remarks in some of the paragraphs would not make sense to the communities. It thus strongly supported the argument put forward by Cuba and Palestine.

396. The **delegation of Algeria** added that it was normal to take some more time with this decision as it would set the example and precedent for future decisions. The delegation was comfortable with both options. What was presented by the Hungarian delegate made sense; however, the fact that the Evaluation Body had proposed two options, as pointed out by Palestine, meant that the Committee was limited to the first or the second option. To have a combination of the two would perhaps be detrimental. The delegation recalled the discussion in Addis Ababa in 2016 when this possibility had been presented, and it was rejected by saying that this would be damaging and create a two-tier list with files that were impeccable and others that had to be somehow corrected. The delegation sought to hear from the Evaluation Body and to have the opinion of the Chairperson who was also present. For Algeria, it was clearly best to retain a clearly defined option, which was the second option.

397. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria, noting that this was indeed the first case after the introduction of the dual system so the Committee was in fact setting a precedent, meaning it was very important to decide upon a working method.

398. The **delegation of Austria** agreed with the valid points made by Saint Lucia and Hungary, but it also agreed with Ethiopia and others not to have any negative connotations in the decision. It suggested that one option might be to include the sentence from 2016 in which the Committee thanked the State for providing additional information that was helpful for the adoption of the decision.

399. The **delegation of Guatemala** did not support the wording that the file was 'not insufficient'. It could however take into account Austria's proposal, or if not, wished to propose, 'Takes note that the information included in the file, as well as on the basis of the information provided by the submitting States to the Committee, as it is presented'. deleting the text, 'was not sufficient to determine whether criterion U.5 is satisfied but further decides that […]'.

400. The **Secretary** remarked that the dual options had taken into account the spirit of the discussion in Addis Ababa. For example, in the case of an inscription option, it read, 'takes note' and then 'further decides on the basis of the information provided by the submitting States to the Committee at its present session concerning community participation in the inventory process and the frequency of updating of the inventory in Colombia, the following criterion […] is satisfied'. It was also the suggestion by the Secretariat to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis so as to understand the process. The Secretary reiterated that inscription was clearly mentioned, as well as the earlier debate in the Committee in the referral option.

401. The **delegation of Afghanistan** proposed removing the negative connotation 'the information included in the file is not sufficient', and to add 'incomplete'.

402. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that Algeria had requested to hear from the Evaluation Body and sought its opinion.

403. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** returned to the question by Algeria, adding that it would be better answered with a legal opinion, i.e. would the decision taken in the case of an inscription be the same decision in the case of the other nominations that were not referrals? Or did the Committee wish to differentiate between nominations that were inscribed de facto and those where a request for clarification was made to the submitting State Party? In this scenario, the Committee might wish to distinguish between the treatment at the level of those two decisions. This required a legal opinion, however.

404. The **delegation of Zambia** did not have an issue with the information being 'not sufficient'. However, it wished to return to the remark by Saint Lucia concerning paragraph 5 in the option for referral. It suggested deleting paragraph 5 [that 'commends the States Parties'] in the option for referral and placing it as paragraph 4 in the option for inscription, which states that, following the explanation, the additional information had been received. The Committee would then commend the States Parties for their work and the carefully prepared file, notably in relation to the description of the threats.

405. The **delegation of Turkey** understood the merits of both arguments, i.e. one that reflected the discussions in the decision, but also commending the States Parties. It was going to support Austria but could go with Zambia's proposal, as commending the State Party would be a positive remark, while still reflecting the discussions regarding the inventory and the explanations in the decision itself.

406. The **delegation of Mauritius** believed that there was a need to maintain the integrity of the proceedings, but also that the decision should be phrased in a positive manner, while distinguishing between an outright accepted file and one where information had been submitted during the session. Thus, the delegation believed that there should be a separate paragraph to state that the information had been submitted and was followed by inscription.

407. The **Chairperson** remarked that as this was the first introduction of the dual-option system, it was best to proceed with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. Under paragraph 2, criteria U.1–U.4 were duly adopted. Based on the interventions, and the fact that the information considered missing had been provided by the submitting States at the present meeting, the Chairperson invited the Secretariat to explain paragraph 3.

408. The **Secretary** explained that the beginning of paragraph 3 addressed the issues raised in Addis Ababa in 2016 about the inscription of files as a result of discussions held during the Committee session. This was therefore the proposed model.

409. Regarding paragraph 3, the **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** noted that the first part was problematic, 'the information in the file is not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether the criterion […] was satisfied'. Côte d'Ivoire thus proposed deleting this part, and starting paragraph 3 with, 'Decides that on the basis of information provided by States […], on this basis criterion U.5 is satisfied'. In this way, the first two sentences would be deleted, and paragraph 3 would begin with 'Decides'.

410. The **delegation of Ethiopia** remarked that the consensus was to welcome the information, which brought about the decision to inscribe, while keeping the positivity of the decision as there was no need to infer that something was lacking in the nomination. Thus, the Committee should develop a new standardized paragraph for all decisions that welcomed the additional information. The summary records would also reflect the discussion, so U.5 could align with criteria U.1, U.2, U.3 and U.4, with wording along the lines of 'welcomes the additional information provided by the State Party of Colombia'.

411. The **delegation of Cuba** fully agreed with the proposal by Côte d'Ivoire to preserve the spirit of Addis Ababa and to avoid placing the incomplete files and the complete files at the same level. Nevertheless, it reaffirmed the importance of using positive language.

412. The **delegation of Mauritius** subscribed to the remarks by Côte d'Ivoire and suggested that 'additional' be added just before 'information' for the sake of clarity.

413. The **delegation of Guatemala** fully supported the proposal by Côte d'Ivoire, adding that it was unnecessary to insist on the use of 'not sufficient' as the decision to inscribe had been taken as a result of the information provided by the submitting States at the present session. This wording thus stated that it was necessary to have this additional information, but it was not negative in the sense that the information was insufficient.

414. The **delegation of Senegal** supported the proposal by Côte d'Ivoire.

415. The **delegation of Palestine** voiced its support for Côte d'Ivoire's proposal. It also raised the issue of the use of 'additional', as additional information was not accepted by the Committee. The standard paragraph that had been proposed by Austria mentioned 'clarification'. It thus preferred the wording 'further decides that on the basis of the information provided'.

416. The **delegation of Algeria** responded to the remark by Palestine. Indeed, the Rules of Procedure did not allow the Committee to take into account additional information, although it could accept amendments. Thus, the delegation proposed that, instead of using 'additional information', they go back to the term 'clarification'.

417. The **delegation of Congo** supported the position of Côte d'Ivoire.

418. The **Secretary** understood that Palestine and Algeria had raised concerns about the use of the word 'additional' and suggested its deletion.

419. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** remarked that Turkey had suggested deleting 'information' and adding 'clarification' instead.

420. The **Secretary** explained that 'information' was used in the dual option because the Evaluation Body sought missing factual information. Of course, 'clarification' could also be used but it inferred a different context from the way of working in Addis Ababa. Indeed, it was the practice of Committees to accept additional information, but admittedly the dual option provided a different context.

421. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it could agree to removing 'additional' and retaining 'information', which implied clarification, as explained by the Secretariat. With no objections, paragraph 3, as proposed on the inscription option, was adopted as amended. An amendment in paragraph 4 received from Saint Lucia, Zambia and Turkey was noted.

422. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** explained that this paragraph was useful to other States Parties when preparing files as it specifically showed how the submitting State had dealt with the description of the threats to the element. This would thus serve as a model for others.

423. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the new paragraph 4, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 5 and 6 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.a.2 adopted to inscribe 'Colombian-Venezuelan llano work songs' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.**

424. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson for the inclusive and participative approach to the inscription. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its professional work on the examination of the file, and the Committee Members for considering the inclusion of the llano work songs with a positive verdict. This Colombian and Venezuelan element is an expression of the cultural universe of the Llanos region, which is associated with the traditional activities of extensive cattle-raising that had been alive for hundreds of years. This was also an expression of how intangible cultural heritage contributes to consolidating the daily life practices of the communities and serves to establish bridges of communication with other countries like Venezuela as a national effort to enhance the cultural traditions of the llano work songs. Singers, in order to support sustainable development practices, live in the community.

425. The **delegation of Venezuela** (**Bolivarian Republic of**), on behalf of the Vice-Minister of Cultural Identity and Diversity, Mr Benito Irady, the Government of President Nicolás Maduro

and the Venezuelan people, congratulated the Chairperson on his election and thanked the Republic of Korea for its hospitality and excellent organization. With great emotion and gratitude, Venezuela was honoured to receive, along with Colombia, the inscription of 'Colombian-Venezuelan llano work songs' as intangible cultural heritage. This sixth inscription on the UNESCO Lists demonstrated once again the commitment of its peace, diplomacy and public policies for the promotion of a cultural multilateralism based on respect for human rights, solidarity and international cooperation. Based on these principles, Venezuelan culture had become a State priority where the defense and safeguarding of heritage and cultural diversity were fundamental elements of its participatory democracy. In this context, llanos work songs not only represented a commitment to the urgent safeguarding of this practice, but were also an example of good practices in favour of sustainable development and the cooperation promoted by UNESCO in Agenda 2030. The delegation gave the floor to Mr Angel Emilio Tobal and Mr Vidal Colmenares, so that they might express their feelings about this practice relating to singing on the plain.

[A performance of llano work songs]

426. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Mongolian traditional practices of worshipping the sacred sites**' [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.3] submitted by Mongolia. According to ancient shamanism, the Mongolian practices of worshipping sacred sites are based on the belief in invisible deities of the natural surroundings. The practice builds a sense of community and raises awareness about the interdependence of human beings and the environment. During the communist regime in Mongolia, the worship of sacred sites was banned, threatening its viability. Communities have been actively reviving the tradition, but several challenges remain, including globalization, urbanization, and a drastic reduction in the number of practitioners and masters. The Evaluation Body considered that the following criteria were met: i) U.1: the element is well-defined and described in its relationship between tangible and intangible heritage and between the element and its natural environment, and the element also contributes to the preservation of biological and cultural diversity; ii) U.2: despite efforts by the communities and the State Party to revive it, the tradition is still threatened by the loss of practitioners, diminished active sacred sites, migrations to urban areas, and mining operations that are home to some of the sacred sites; U.3: significant efforts have been made since the end of the communist regime to support and strengthen the remaining practices and their transmission; the safeguarding measures adequately respond to the threats identified and include research, documentation, awareness-raising and educational activities; and legal requirements for heritage assessments are also planned before mining licenses can be issued; and iv) U.4: the nomination describes widespread efforts to revitalize the related ceremonies, involving various stakeholders who actively participated in the design and preparation of the nomination, with evidence of their free, prior and informed consent. However, in U.5, although the Evaluation Body recognized that the element was included in the national inventory and maintained by the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, the extract included a list of elements without any reference to their description or viability. Evidence about the communities' involvement was also lacking. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended referring the nomination to the submitting State Party. The Committee may however wish to commend the State Party for its strong commitment, while regretting that the nomination did not fulfil all the requirements stipulated for U.5.

427. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation of the different issues raised during the evaluation of this file. This was the second instance of a dual system of draft decisions, and the Chairperson proceeded in the same manner as in the previous nomination. Pursuant to the working method, the Committee received written information from the submitting States concerning the questions raised by the Evaluation Body in its recommendation, which would be attached for the record to the nomination file. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, the submitting State was given the floor to provide the relevant information on: the element's

description and viability in the inventory; and evidence of the communities' involvement in the inventorying process.

428. The **delegation of Mongolia** confirmed that it had provided the Committee with extracts showing the process of recordings with regard to the element, as well as those related to the involvement of communities and NGOs concerned in the updating of the inventory. The Center of Cultural Heritage under the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Sports maintains the National Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage and the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and conducts the inventorying, documentation, and safeguarding measures of the elements with its practitioners. All the gathered data from state inventorying, registration and documentation of the elements and its practitioners (such as audio and video recordings, photographs, descriptions, viability of safeguarding measures, risks, threats related to intangible cultural heritage) are kept in the Registration and Information State Database of Cultural Heritage, and used for research studies and safeguarding measures. Some information was extracted from the general database, for instance, the list of intangible cultural heritage elements listed on national lists, practitioner's information, and the report on how inventorying is used and updated. The government has undertaken an active policy to promote national culture, customs and traditions. This policy of sacred sites provides the conditions to involve and introduce traditional sacred site worship. For instance, in 2016, the law on the protection of cultural heritage, which was newly revised and passed by parliament, were added to the articles related to intangible cultural heritage, including sacred mountains and sites. It outlines cultural heritage landscapes, mystic cultures and space, and tangible and intangible cultural heritage linked with the natural environment, and traditional livelihoods. It also states that the president has the power to protect cultural heritage properties and to make decisions for the benefit of sacred mountains and waters to become state worship sites. It also states that parliament shall have the power to grant cultural heritage landscapes, including sacred sites, special state protection and delineate their boundaries. In terms of enhancing visibility and the importance of sacred sites and worshipping rituals, in 2015 the government included six main sacred mountains of Mongolia on the newly revised and approved National Tentative List for nomination to the World Heritage List. The government and local communities play an active role in reviving the tradition. For example, in 2015, the National Workshop for intangible cultural heritage practices was organized and more than twenty practitioners of worshipping rituals from rural areas made their own presentations of best practices. Recently, in 2016, some sacred sites, i.e. sacred mountains, were included in the law by parliament. In this newly revised law for the protection of cultural heritage, new requirements were added that included preliminary research by archaeological, ethnological and scientific organizations prior to the use of the land for the purpose of economic activities.

429. The **delegation of Turkey** expressed its appreciation for the Evaluation Body's diligent efforts on the nomination files, and thanked Mongolia for the information submitted. Following the clarifications, Turkey considered that the inventory was updated regularly and the participation of consenting communities was adequate. In addition, Mongolia had provided information indicating the process of registration of the element, which included community participation on the inventory. The delegation expressed its positive opinion of the nomination file and, considering that four criteria were found satisfactory by the Evaluation Body, would support the inscription option for this element.

430. The **delegation of Bulgaria** was satisfied with the explanation provided by Mongolia, underlining that this information required the viability of the element, as well as the participation of the local communities in the inventorying process.

431. The **delegation of India** believed that the information considered missing by the Evaluation Body had been provided by the submitting State, and it supported an inscription.

432. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the inscription of this element because the clarifications provided were sufficient.

433. The **Chairperson** noted the many speakers – Turkey, Colombia, Palestine, India, Philippines, Armenia, Ethiopia, Hungary, Algeria, Senegal, Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire – and wished to hear any opposing views or specific questions addressed to the submitting State. Otherwise, he proposed stopping the debate and moving to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no further comments or objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. Criteria U.1, U.2, U.3 and U.4 were also adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted as a whole. Based on the interventions, the Committee was satisfied that the missing information had been provided by the submitting State at the present session. Thus, paragraph 3, with the adopted U.5, was adopted. He then turned to paragraph 4 with the inscription option.

434. The **delegation of Turkey** believed that it would be more appropriate to adopt the same approach towards all files. In the previous file, a paragraph was revised to commend the States Parties. It was thus appropriate to equally insert the same paragraph for the sake of consistency in all the files.

435. The **Secretary** explained that in the last case the paragraph had originally been included at the request of the Evaluation Body, i.e. it was not an addendum to the draft decision. Saint Lucia was concerned that it would be deleted under the referral option and still wanted to commend the States Parties, thus the paragraph concerned a particular aspect of the file. Consequently, it would not make sense to apply the specific paragraph in every case, even if the Secretary understood the rationale behind it.

436. The **delegation of Turkey** wished to add a positive note to the decision by adding, 'Commends the State Party for the strong commitment demonstrated', as it was already in paragraph 5.

437. The **Secretary** concurred that this paragraph appeared in paragraph 5 under the referral option. He therefore understood that Turkey wished to take that standard paragraph under the referral option and include it the inscription option.

438. The **delegation of Turkey** concurred with that understanding.

439. The **delegation of Zambia** remarked that paragraph 5 also required editing so that it would have a positive tone, and suggested 'commends the State Party for the strong commitment demonstrated towards fulfilment of all the requirements stipulated for criterion U.5', while deleting 'regretting that the nomination did not fulfil all the requirements […]'.

440. The **delegation of Hungary** fully agreed with the direction given by Turkey to take the positive 'commends' paragraph from the referral option and to include it in the inscription option. However, it was of the understanding that the commitment of the State Party was towards the safeguarding of the element and not in regard to U.5. Thus, if this direction was to be taken, then it should mention the safeguarding of the element. The delegation raised another point of interest in that the element was inscribed on the Tentative List for the World Heritage List as well, which was a good example of interaction between the two Conventions. The delegation wondered whether this point deserved mention in the draft decision.

441. The **delegation of Turkey** also agreed with Hungary that the commitment shown was towards the safeguarding of the element, and limiting it to U.5 was not appropriate.

442. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred with Hungary that the commitment was towards safeguarding the element itself and not U.5. It also agreed on the importance of highlighting the synergy between the culture Conventions of UNESCO, and suggested adding a small paragraph that welcomed the inscription on the Tentative List for the World Heritage List.

443. The **delegation of Zambia** agreed with the previous speakers; however, paragraph 5 appeared to commend the State Party for the effort made towards achieving U.5. It added that the Evaluation Body might be able to shed light on the intent of the commendation.

444. The **delegation of Palestine** clarified that the paragraph would welcome the inscription of the site, not the practice itself, as this could not appear on the Tentative List of World Heritage. In this case, the paragraph would welcome the inscription of the sacred mountains of Mongolia.

445. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that in terms of the Tentative List, sites are included on the List but they are not inscribed.

446. The **delegation of Mongolia** had no issue with the proposed paragraph.

447. The **delegation of Ethiopia** asked the Secretariat whether the Committee had the mandate to 'welcome' with regard to another Convention.

448. The **Secretary** explained that the Committee did not have a mandate on the World Heritage Convention. The question concerned a positive recommendation of an element that was linked to a World Heritage site, but in the past they were sites that had already been inscribed. In this case, this involved a Tentative List site, and thus a site that had not been inscribed. The Secretary was of the understanding that the Tentative List was established by States Parties themselves and was not therefore an intergovernmental process, though he conceded that he could not speak authoritatively on the 1972 Convention. Nevertheless, careful language was required as a Tentative List was not an inscription. The Secretary welcomed the synergies between the Conventions but exercised caution in employing the correct language, as in past cases the synergies of the site and the element were actually included in the original nomination file. However, in this case, he was not sure that this linkage was mentioned in this particular file. Nevertheless, the Committee had no authority to make any decision of influence in the 1972 Convention.

449. The **delegation of Ethiopia** thanked the Secretary for the clear explanation. The Committee's domain of mandate was to this Convention, and the domain of mandate of the 1972 Convention Committee should thus be respected. The Committee could thus welcome the inclusion of the element within the framework of its own mandate, but it could not infer its possible inscription in another Convention. The language would therefore have to be very well crafted and qualified, otherwise it would be very challenging from the perspective of the Committee of the 1972 Convention.

450. The **delegation of Hungary** remarked that the information about the Tentative List was among the information provided by Mongolia in the form of a letter by Dr Mechtild Rössler to Mongolia, in which the Director of the World Heritage Centre acknowledged "with thanks receipt of your letter dated 6 November 2015, concerning the addition of the Sacred Mountains of Mongolia site on the Tentative List". The letter also stated, "I am pleased to inform you that the documentation submitted complies with the Operational Guidelines and that the site was included on the Tentative List of Mongolia". The procedure of the World Heritage Convention is that States Parties submit their updated Tentative Lists and the Committee acknowledges this at its upcoming session. Thus, this had gone through the Committee's procedure as a way of acknowledgement. As for the language of the paragraph, it noted that the paragraph ended 'for possible inscription on the World Heritage Convention', when in fact it should read 'List'. The delegation would have to check the formulation in the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention, but it was confident in this 'welcoming' paragraph. As for the procedure, the Committee had the possibility of including the documentation just provided in the nomination file if it so wished.

451. The **delegation of Palestine** fully echoed the remarks made by Hungary. With regard to Ethiopia's concerns, the inclusion of a site on the Tentative List for possible inscription was not binding, i.e. the paragraph was not saying that the element would be inscribed. Also, 'welcomes' could be replaced with 'takes note', but the most important point was to highlight the synergies between the culture Conventions and to encourage these synergies.

452. The **delegation of Senegal** concurred with the comments made by the Secretariat in exercising caution when employing terms between the two Conventions whose procedures were not the same. The Committee could congratulate itself for the synergy as links between tangible and intangible heritage were dialectical, especially for some sacred sites. Nevertheless, the Committee could not give the impression of interfering and inferring the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List, which had additional requirements in relation to the State Party and other bodies. It fully understood the remarks by Palestine; however,

the Committee could limit itself to 'welcoming this site on the World Heritage Tentative List' rather than suggesting a 'possible inscription', which could be misinterpreted.

453. The **delegation of the Philippines** acknowledged the views of Ethiopia and Senegal, in particular, in this regard, adding that the suggestion made by Palestine to just 'take note' could cover this. It sought a general and coherent approach should the Committee wish to welcome the inclusion of this particular site on the Tentative List of one State Party, as this would then have to be applied for all Tentative Lists of States Parties, which was probably not the intention. The delegation reiterated that 'take note' could be the way forward, with perhaps further context being added by including 'in view of synergies between culture Conventions'.

454. The **delegation of Turkey**, together with Senegal, Ethiopia and the Philippines, also believed in treading cautiously and not interfering with the World Heritage Convention. It preferred to delete the paragraph and have this reflected in the summary report, but if there was general consensus towards keeping the paragraph then it would not object to 'take note', including the amendment by the Philippines.

455. The **delegation of Palestine** was flexible, however for many years the different Conventions had sought to enhance and encourage synergies, in which case it found the suggestion by the Philippines to be appropriate and would allay all the concerns. The paragraph would read, 'takes note of the inclusion of the Sacred Mountains of Mongolia on the Tentative List in view of synergies between the cultural Conventions of UNESCO'. It remarked that it was the mandate of all the Committees of the culture Conventions to keep in mind the synergies between Conventions. Moreover, the minutes in the summary report would not be as visible.

456. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine but was of the opinion that this kind of paragraph should have been raised by the submitting State.

457. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** supported the side of caution, adding that it was uncomfortable with the implications of the paragraph and thus preferred to side with Turkey to delete the paragraph, while reflecting the sentiment in the summary report.

458. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** was uncertain of the paragraph put forward by Palestine and supported the proposal by Turkey to delete the paragraph, but in case of consensus for the paragraph, it would prefer the latest modification.

459. The **delegation of the Philippines** reiterated that it was for flexibility, and that it was fine with 'takes note'. However, having listened closely to the Committee Members, it could delete the last part of the paragraph, and instead insert some wording in the *chapeau* draft decision under item 11 on the need to encourage further synergies between the culture Conventions, along the lines proposed by Palestine. In this case, the delegation would seek some guidance with the appropriate formulation and its placement.

460. The **Chairperson** thanked the Philippines, and returned to the new paragraph 4 put forward by Turkey and supported by many Members. With no objections, it was duly adopted.

461. The **delegation of Hungary** noted a missing preposition in the text.

462. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 5 and the proposal by Palestine.

463. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with the very constructive and positive proposal by the Philippines, to delete the paragraph and add it to the *chapeau* of the draft decision under agenda item 11.

464. The **delegation of Turkey** concurred with the proposal.

465. The **delegation of Algeria** did not wish to go against the consensus, but sought to recall paragraph 3 of Article 3 to the Convention, which states with regard to international instruments, 'Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as altering the status or diminishing the level of protection under the 1972 Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage of World Heritage properties, with which an item of the intangible cultural heritage is directly associated'. This paragraph partially reflected the

case in this instance, as other Conventions already supported the interaction between the 1972 and the 2003 Conventions. Thus, the Committee was well within its mandate.

466. The **Chairperson** therefore pronounced paragraph 5 adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.a.3 adopted to inscribe 'Mongolian traditional practices of worshipping the sacred sites' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.**

467. The **delegation of Mongolia** remarked that the traditional worship of sacred mountains and waters is one of the well-known elements created, developed and practised by nomadic Mongolians since ancient times. This traditional knowledge system had been ignored or even prohibited for a certain period of time in the 20th century. Since 1990, Mongolian national traditions had started to revive. Mongolians felt that this lost tradition greatly supported natural and cultural diversity. The government had made continuous efforts to safeguard intangible heritage in cooperation with UNESCO and had provided the sustainability and stability of several intangible cultural heritage elements that were in danger of disappearing. On behalf of the government, the delegation expressed appreciation to the Committee for its support of the nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List. Special thanks went to the Evaluation Body for its hard work, adding that the inscription would significantly change the present status of the element and bring the element into focus, not only among Mongolian people but also in the world.

[A performance of Mongolian music and song]

468. Congratulating Mongolia, the **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination submitted by Morocco, recalling past practice that excluded a member of the Evaluation Body from participating in the evaluation of a nomination submitted by the country of domiciliation of the NGO or the country of nationality of the expert. He therefore invited Ms Amélia Frazão Moreira (Portugal), the Vice-Chair, to present the findings of the Body on the nomination.

469. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination **'Taskiwin, martial dance of the western High Atlas**' [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.4] submitted by Morocco. Taskiwin is a martial dance specific to the western High Atlas that gets its name from the horn each dancer carries. It involves shaking one's shoulders to the rhythm of tambourines and flutes. The practice is threatened by several factors including globalization, young people's increasing disdain for traditional heritage practices, and a decline in the related craftsmanship. The last two decades have nonetheless seen an increased collective awareness among communities, and dedicated associations have been set up. The Evaluation Body considered that the following criteria were met: i) U.1: the element consists of an artistic dance practised during festive occasions, and despite its martial origin, its social functions have evolved over time and now serve to accompany celebrations, peacefully resolve tensions within or between communities, and foster community integration; ii) U.2: the threats to the viability are identified, including the loss of bearers, the emigration of young people to urban centres, a lack of interest in apprenticeship, the craft of making the related music instruments, and undue commercialization of folk dance, among others; iii) U.3: efforts to revitalize the element were initiated by young community members and fully supported by elders, and the safeguarding plan is coherent and feasible with clear objectives and measures that include awareness raising, research and documentation, promotion, the creation of a federation of Taskiwin associations, the diversification of sources of funding for activities, apprenticeships with elders, and the establishment of archives; iv) U.4: a local association initiated the nomination process, and the file was prepared with the active participation of stakeholders and representatives including elderly persons, youth, women, a variety of bearers and researchers, with written consent and video clips attesting to broad community endorsement; and v) U.5: the element has been included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage since 2014, with the participation of the communities concerned, and administered and updated by the Cultural Heritage Directorate at the Ministry of Culture. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended inscribing Taskiwin, martial dance of the western High Atlas on the Urgent Safeguarding List.

470. The **Chairperson** noted that the Bureau had not received a request for debate or amendment, and thus proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.a.4 adopted to inscribe 'Taskiwin, martial dance of the western High Atlas' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.**

471. The **delegation of Morocco** thanked the Republic of Korea for its hospitality and the excellent organization of this session. It thanked the Committee for agreeing to include Taskiwin on the Urgent Safeguarding List; the first element of Moroccan cultural heritage to be inscribed on this List. Sincere thanks also went to the Evaluation Body, as well as to the Secretariat for providing effective and professional support to States Parties, particularly in submitting nominations, their evaluation, and the inscription of elements. Morocco also reiterated its thanks to the Secretariat and the Committee for granting Morocco preparatory assistance in 2013, which had enabled the NGO Targa-Aide, the main entity representing the communities and the initiator of the nomination, to work under better conditions. Morocco understood that it now had the heavy task of accompanying the communities in the implementation of the safeguarding plan. Several activities had already begun to revitalize, safeguard and promote this dance, which had been at risk of disappearing a few years ago. Finally, a high level of awareness had been generated by the process of preparing this nomination in the various other communities in the region. A real dynamic was indeed taking place, aimed at safeguarding a greater number of elements of intangible cultural heritage. This implicated not only the Ministry of Culture, the main institution responsible for the implementation of the Convention at the national level, but also the very future of the Convention as requests for nominations from the communities continued to grow.

[The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body reprised his role]

472. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Whistled language'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.5], submitted by Turkey. Whistled language is a form of communication that uses whistling to simulate and articulate words. It is connected to the rugged topography of the region, which required finding ways to communicate across long distances. Technological developments and socioeconomic changes have led to a decline in practitioners, and the new generation's interest in the practice has diminished considerably. Communities concerned are nonetheless committed to actively promoting this linguistic practice both nationally and internationally. The Evaluation Body considered that the following criteria were met: i) U.1: the element constitutes intangible cultural heritage and reinforces social bonds among local people living in a rugged environment; it is a cultural means of expression used and transmitted by all segments of society and reflects human creativity; ii) U.2: the threats described encompass the decline in the number of practitioners, the lack of interest among young people, rural-urban migrations, the decrease in locations in which the element is practised, and the influence of mass media and an increased use of mobile phones; iii) U.3: the four-year safeguarding plan was developed with the communities concerned and includes documentation, support for tradition bearers, promotion through festivals, a pilot project to teach parents who use the whistled language how to transmit the element to their children, the organization of competitions, and the provision of promotional materials, among others; iv) U.4: communities were involved both in the early stages of research and later in the nomination process; and personalized free, prior and informed consent letters from community members and practitioners were provided; and vi) U.5: the element was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Turkey in 2010 with the participation of the bearers. It is managed and regularly updated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended inscribing Whistled language on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Committee might wish to remind Turkey to take particular heed of the impact of tourism and commercialization in order to prevent decontextualization.

473. The **Chairperson** noted that the Bureau did not receive a request for debate or amendment, and thus proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. **The Chairperson declared**

Decision 12.COM 11.a.5 adopted to inscribe 'Whistled language' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.

474. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that whistled language is practised in Turkey's Eastern Black Sea Region. Unfortunately, as a result of technological developments and socioeconomic changes, there had been a decline, both in the number of people using the whistled language and the areas where it is spoken. Whistled language, seen in various other regions of the world, is an environmentally-friendly form of communication. The element makes life easier and more harmonious and at the same time reinforces social bonds for its community. The delegation believed that the element's viability should be ensured by taking safeguarding measures, and also bearers need to be encouraged to transmit their cultural heritage. In this regard, the nomination process started with the communities concerned deciding to sustain the whistled language and transmit it to future generations by safeguarding it and preventing its disappearance through its promotion at local, national and international levels. Since the communities concerned consider whistled language as a reflection of their cultural identity, they wholeheartedly participated in the process of preparing the file. Therefore, the preparation of the safeguarding plan was easily constructed by all the stakeholders of the element. On behalf of the community concerned, Turkey thanked the Committee and extended its sincere gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its support. It believed that the inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List would create a positive atmosphere in the community concerned, which would considerably enhance the efforts of safeguarding and ensure the viability of the element. Finally, the inscription of the whistled language is not only a contribution to the viability of the element, but also raises awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general.

[A short film on the element was projected]

475. The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

[Wednesday, 6 December 2017, afternoon session]

ITEM 11.a OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

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

476. The **Chairperson** turned to the last nomination under item 11.a, **'Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry'**, inviting the Chairperson of the Body to present the file.

477. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.a.6], submitted by the United Arab Emirates. Al Azi is a traditional poetry recital performed by a group of individuals without instruments. The practice strengthens bonds in the community and is connected with knowledge and practices related to nature. Due to migration, the enactment of State laws instead of traditional tribal customs and a loss of spontaneity in the art, performance of the practice has diminished considerably. Al Azi has nonetheless withstood extinction thanks to successful safeguarding efforts by the communities concerned, and has recently enjoyed a revival. Criterion U.1 is met. This element is a Bedouin traditional art practised by many groups that served in the past as the reception ceremony for people returning from a mission. The tradition has evolved, with the recitals expanding to cover wider topics, and with the performances taking place on various occasions including ceremonies, festive events and solemn occasions. Criterion U.2 is also met. Threats to the viability of the element include the decline in the frequency of performances since the 1960s, the migration of bearers to cities, the limitation of public spaces of practice, the precedence of State laws over tribal customary laws, the loss of human resources and their know-how, and the consequent declining spontaneity of performances. Criterion U.3 is satisfied. Efforts to safeguard the element include the identification of bearers, research, documentation and publishing activities, public performances such as festivals and contests, educational

activities at various informal and formal levels and financial support from the authorities. Criterion U.4 is met as community and civil society representatives, including performers of Al Azi, actively participated in the preparation of the nomination, along with researchers and administration officials. Finally, criterion U.5 is satisfied. The element has been included in the intangible cultural heritage inventory of the city of Abu Dhabi since 2016, with the participation of local communities, NGOs and bearers. It is managed by the Department of Tourism and Culture Authority and updated every five years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended inscribing Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry, on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Committee might also recommend that the State Party ensure the full participation of the communities throughout all stages of the implementation of the safeguarding activities, and invite the State Party to pay particular heed to avoiding the possible negative consequences of the inscription of the element, such as its over-commercialization and folklorization.

478. The **Secretary** confirmed that an amendment had been received from Palestine.

479. The **delegation of Palestine** presented a very technical but slight amendment that had been discussed after consultation with the Arab Group and the parties concerned. The amendment was: 'takes note that the element is shared by other communities in the region, and that it was inscribed on the Representative List in 2012'.

480. The **delegation of Hungary** was assessing the impact of this amendment for the time being, and sought more time for reflection. It felt that this was a cross-cutting issue because if it was included in the draft decision, then similar statements could be made by other inscriptions.

481. The **delegation of Algeria** explained that there was no issue with inscription as such, but it had worked very closely with colleagues from both the United Arab Emirates and Oman, and wished to highlight that there were in fact two different elements: Al'azi, inscribed on the Representative List in 2012 by Oman, and this element for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The delegation thus wished to make a distinction between the element in another region that was doing very well, and the support for this element, which was at risk.

482. The **delegation of Hungary** still wished to reflect on this amendment, as it had important repercussions. For example, the Committee had just inscribed 'Whistled language' in Turkey, but there was also a whistled language (the Silbo Gomero) on the island of Gomero in the Canary Islands inscribed in 2009 on the Representative List, yet this point of distinction had not been raised. The delegation also noted that they were under different lists: the Urgent Safeguarding List in the case, and the Representative List for the other. It thus wondered whether such statements would require making similar statements at subsequent inscriptions when an element had already been inscribed on one or other List.

483. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked Hungary for its very pertinent remarks and concern. However, the delegation explained that this was not the first time that such language had been proposed, and that this previously agreed language had been used in other files.

484. The **delegation of Guatemala** felt that if the amendment in paragraph 6 was to help the safeguarding of the element inscribed, it would note that they were in fact two different inscriptions, albeit the same practice, with one element on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the other on the Representative List. However, if the purpose of paragraph 6 was to see which elements of the Representative List could help safeguard the element in question, then the amendment would make more sense. Thus, what was the motivation of the amendment?

485. The **Secretary** noted the reference made to a precedent where a similar paragraph was adopted, but there was a slight difference. Should the Committee decide to follow the precedent, it would 'take note that Al 'Azi is shared by other communities in the region and recalls that inscription on any list does not imply exclusivity'. In this case, it referred to the Representative List.

486. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** found this to be an interesting and important point, especially as this issue of ownership had not been brought up by the Evaluation Body. Thus, like the

previous speaker, the delegation was interested in understanding the motivation behind the paragraph, particularly as there were a number of cross-border files coming up.

487. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that the element as stated made it appear as if the same element was inscribed on both Lists, adding that the element's full title should thus be used. Otherwise, it was counter to Rule 38 of the Operational Directive.

488. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with Austria that the full name of the element should be included in the paragraph. Otherwise, as explained by the Secretary, this would become a technical issue, creating a precedent. The delegation added that this was not new and it did not affect the element on either List.

489. The **Secretary** requested some time to find the full name of the element, noting that Al Azi, inscribed in 2012, was shared by other regions, and that the present file was not the same element. The paragraph would only make sense if the title of this nomination were used. The other issue that arose was that an element could not be listed on both Lists at the same time, but in this case, it concerned a similar element submitted by two different States, so it was not sure how the rule would apply. After a lengthy pause, the Secretary explained that the file inscribed in 2012 was called 'Al azi elegy professional march and poetry' (Oman), while the file the Committee had before it was 'Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry'. Thus, by using the title of 2012, the Committee was acknowledging an unrelated file.

490. The **delegation of Algeria** wished to return to the initial proposal and retain the generic name of Al 'azi as presented. Having worked closely with the two submitting States, the delegation believed that the amendment would be better focused on the generic element Al 'azi, which was shared in the region and had multiple practitioners. The amendment would thus make a distinction between the element on the Representative List and the element that needs support and safeguarding on the other List.

491. The **Secretary** believed that the proposal as it stood now worked, as it addressed the concern. The paragraph would thus read, 'takes note that Al Azi is shared by other communities in the region and that Al 'azi elegy professional march and poetry was inscribed on the Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2012 and recalls […]'. Thus, his concern regarding the confusion between the elements was tackled with this approach.

492. The **delegation of the Philippines** sought clarification in the Operational Guidelines, as raised by Austria, i.e. the same element could not be on two different Lists. It reminded the Committee that it would later discuss agenda item 14 (on the transfer of an element from one List to the other), and thus the issue should be legally clarified because the name of the elements was similar. The delegation sought reassurance that the Committee was not contravening its own rules on this matter.

493. The **Secretary** concurred that an element could not be inscribed on both the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, although the element was similar it had two different States Parties. So, the question was whether this rule applied if the element was submitted by two separate State Parties. The Secretary noted that the reference could be found on page 35 of the English version of the Operational Directive 38.

494. The **delegation of Hungary** shared the concerns raised by the Philippines, adding that it sought assurance that the Committee was abiding by its own rules. It therefore requested that time be given to this issue and suggested proceeding with the adoption of the rest of the decision and returning to this paragraph at a later stage.

495. The **Legal Advisor** wished to clarify the situation and respond to the question by the Philippines. Whenever there are elements submitted by different State Parties, even if they are quite similar, it depends on whether there are two different nomination files. The circumstances apply to each nomination file specifically. Thus, the criteria and circumstances in one nomination file, which meant that the element should be inscribed on one List, do not infer that this condition would necessarily apply to the other nomination file. In this way, each nomination file is considered on a case-by-case basis.

496. Based on this understanding, the **delegation of the Philippines** was willing to proceed with the amendment as presented.

497. The **delegation of Hungary** would not object to the consensus of the Committee.

498. The **Chairperson** thanked Hungary for its spirit of cooperation and consensus. With no further comments or objection, **the Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.a.6 adopted to inscribe 'Al Azi, art of performing praise, pride and fortitude poetry' on the Urgent Safeguarding List.**

499. The **delegation of the United Arab Emirates** expressed sincere gratitude to the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee, as this would make it possible for the element to be viable. It noted that there was real interest in this popular art at different cultural events, which was of great benefit to the bearers. Inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List would mean that it could strengthen the links between the country and UNESCO. The delegation was committed to preparing all the mandatory reports, which would also help make Al Azi an ongoing practice.

[A short film on the element was projected]

ITEM 11.b OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11.b+Add.*
Files: *35 nominations*

500. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item 11.b and the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List. It was noted that Algeria had withdrawn its file, leaving thirty-four nominations to examine. Before starting the examination, the Chairperson recalled the five criteria for inscription. It was also noted that a request had been made by Saudi Arabia to first examine its nomination and draft decision 11.b.27 due to an unforeseen early departure, which was favourably granted by the Committee.

501. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination '**Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, female traditional interior wall decoration in Asir, Saudi Arabia'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.27], submitted by Saudi Arabia**.** Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, a traditional interior wall decoration, is an ancient art form carried out by women in the community that involves decorating the interior walls of their houses, specifically rooms for visiting guests. Nowadays, male and female artists, designers, and architects also practise the element. The art enhances social bonding and solidarity among the female community and its application in most households ensures its viability. Observation and practice are the key methods for transmitting knowledge and skills related to the element. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfies the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. R.1: Al-Qatt Al-Asiri is a spontaneous art technique, initially performed by women. The element reflects the aesthetic traditions and local understanding of the natural and cultural symbols of Saudi Arabians through a traditional form of interior decoration. The way in which the walls are decorated also reflects the taste of the lady of the house and represents a sense of pride for the owner. R.3: Wide community and public actions are carried out to enhance the status and viability of Al-Qatt. The viability of the element is ensured through its transmission within families and training courses, its application in households, contemporary interpretations in numerous public locations, research, inventorying, documentation and awareness-raising activities, legal protection and the establishment of a centre for world cultures. R.4: The initiative for the nomination came from the bearers of Al-Qatt and related information was first disseminated by the media. A workshop on community-based inventorying held in 2016 instigated the process, leading to the nomination and the communities' free, prior and informed consent. R.5: The element was included in the Intangible Heritage of Saudi Arabia Inventory in 2016, and was drawn up with

the active participation of the communities concerned, researchers, NGOs and government representatives. Maintained by the Ministry of Culture, the inventory is updated every five years. The Evaluation Body considered that the information included in the file was not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether the following criterion for inscription on the Representative List was satisfied. This related to R.2. At the local level, the inscription may raise awareness about the values of traditional crafts that nowadays incorporate modern techniques and may encourage the development of creative skills. However, the nomination does not describe how the inscription of the element would contribute to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Moreover, the file focuses mainly on the impact of the inscription within the community. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, female traditional interior wall decoration in Asir, Saudi Arabia, to the submitting State Party. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to avoid measures such as granting licenses for practitioners, which may limit community access to the practice of intangible cultural heritage.

502. The **Chairperson** noted that the Bureau had received an amendment for this file, opening the floor to Committee Members.

503. The **delegation of Algeria** noted that a number of concerns had been expressed about this inscription over the last couple of days, and it had two questions. First of all, the delegation, as well as the Committee, were fully aware of the difficulty of adequately demonstrating R.2. The delegation wished to know of the difficulties experienced by Saudi Arabia when drafting this criterion so as to see how the Committee could benefit from its experience. Secondly, reference was made in the presentation of the element to the use of old painting techniques. The delegation wished to know whether this was ongoing or whether there had been a shift to modern painting.

504. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that having examined the nomination file and consulted with the experts from Saudi Arabia, it concluded that the element easily met R.2 concerning its contribution to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and awareness of the significance of the element. Therefore, it requested that the Committee reevaluate the file in accordance with the amendment proposed on the screen.

505. Having analysed the file, the **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** found that the following criteria were met: R.3, R.4 and R.5, which was confirmed by the earlier remarks made by the experts. The delegation requested that Saudi Arabia be given a chance to explain how the element contributed to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage, and satisfied criterion R.2.

506. The **Chairperson** invited Saudi Arabia to reply to the specific questions.

507. The **delegation of Saudi Arabia** thanked the Chairperson and the Members of the Committee, adding that the Saudi expert would respond.

508. The **delegation of Palestine** asked that the Saudi expert be given the opportunity to speak.

509. Responding to the question by Algeria on R.2, the **Expert from Saudi Arabia** explained that the many actions to raise the visibility of the element at the national and international levels had not been mentioned during the presentation of the nomination file. Yet throughout 2017, since the date of the presentation of the file to the present day, a lot of effort had been made by the community to raise the visibility at different levels. For example, an 18-metre painting made by twenty-three women was displayed at the United Nations, and this painting was now on tour throughout the United States and on display at the Arab American National Museum in Detroit. Another example is of an artist who has conducted a few workshops in the United States, one of which was at a college in New York with the aim of raising the visibility of cultural craftsmanship among young students. Regarding the second question by Algeria about using modern techniques or old painting: from experience in Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, it was found that both techniques still applied. People still used old techniques and old material, and people also used modern paint and techniques. With regard to the question posed by Côte d'Ivoire, the efforts shown by the practitioners of Al-Qatt showed that they were committed to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage worldwide. Al-Qatt is an artistic

message, which has no borders. Tourists have been able to learn and practice the techniques of Al-Qatt when visiting the women of Al-Asiri. The element has also had a large impact on artists around the world, including local artists. Many international visiting artists have been inspired by Al-Qatt and are implementing its techniques within their art, thereby raising awareness of this ancient tradition worldwide. Inscription on the Representative List would thus optimize the cultural value of the element, which would encourage dialogue and mutual respect among the communities by publicizing Al-Qatt at the national and international levels.

510. Having listened to the explanation, the **delegation of Senegal** was comforted by the fact that this know-how, exercised by women but also transmitted in groups to young people, could inspire contemporary architects and designers. Indeed, the explanation provided on the activities in the United States demonstrated how this traditional know-how was made visible at the international level. It was true that R.2 was always difficult to satisfy and did not always provide concrete evidence, but the explanations by Saudi Arabia were sufficient to demonstrate that R.2 was satisfied. The delegation thus supported the acceptance of R.2.

511. The **delegation of Cyprus** remarked that its question had been very satisfactorily answered by the expert.

512. The **delegation of Hungary** asked the sponsor of the amendment to clarify the rationale behind the use of 'at local, regional and international levels', rather than 'local, national and international' as contained in the nomination format in relation to awareness raising.

513. The **Chairperson** invited the submitting State to respond to the question by Senegal and Hungary.

514. The **delegation of Saudi Arabia** clarified that Saudi Arabia is a big country with thirteen different regions. Thus, cultural diversity within Saudi Arabia enjoys a very broad spectrum but Al-Qatt Al-Asiri is specific to the region of Asiri and thus at the regional level, but also some other entities, organizations and communities not located in Al-Asiri have taken a special interest in Al-Qatt and in implementing a local traditional design of Saudi Arabia.

515. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred that this criterion was very complex, recalling the discussion in the Working Group about revising the criteria, especially R.2. It agreed with Hungary that 'regional' was not found in the texts of the Convention; usually national and international were used. In this regard, it could amend the paragraph to, 'at local, national and international levels'.

516. The **delegation of Ethiopia** believed that Al-Qatt was indeed one of the leading heritage elements in Saudi Arabia and had caught the attention of many groups and NGOs. Thus, this already demonstrated its visibility and would therefore contribute to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage, dialogue and mutual respect among communities. The delegation therefore co-sponsored the amendment.

517. The **delegation of Cuba** supported the paragraphs and the proposal, adding that the information provided by Saudi Arabia was clear on the visibility of the Convention.

518. The **delegation of Hungary** was satisfied with the amendment by Palestine and could also go along with 'regional' based on the answer given by the State Party, which referred to its specific situation. However, 'local, national and international' also had to be used.

519. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed with the amendment as presented.

520. The **delegation of Congo** remarked that with the current amendment, the element should be given the chance to be inscribed.

521. The **delegation of India** supported inscription of the element.

522. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Criteria R.1, R.2, as amended, R.3, R.4 and R.5 in paragraph 2 were duly adopted. Paragraph 3 with the amendment proposed by Palestine, Lebanon, Algeria, Cyprus, Philippines, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, Bulgaria, Afghanistan and Turkey was adopted. Paragraph 4 in its original formulation was also adopted. Paragraph 5

with an amendment proposed by Palestine, Lebanon, Algeria, Cyprus, Philippines, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire, Bulgaria and Turkey was adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.27 adopted to inscribe 'Al-Qatt Al-Asiri, female traditional interior wall decoration in Asir, Saudi Arabia' on the Representative List.**

523. The **delegation of Saudi Arabia** expressed gratitude to the members of the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the inscription of this element on the Representative List. This inscription would help preserve the identity of the element and bolster its function, which was a continuation of what it had done over the last few hundred years in spreading its influence over several cultures and civilizations. This art had been influenced by society and influenced society, and was of great importance for the culture of the Al-Asiri region. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was committed to doing its upmost to safeguard its intangible heritage and supported all of UNESCO's efforts in promoting and safeguarding the intangible heritage of humanity for all.

[A short film on the element was projected]

524. The **Chairperson** congratulated Saudi Arabia and turned to the next nomination.

525. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination **'Kochari, traditional group dance'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.2], submitted by Armenia. Kochari is a traditional dance that is widely performed during holidays, festive celebrations and family ceremonies. It is open to all participants and provides a sense of shared identity, solidarity and mutual respect. Non-formal transmission occurs within families and from older to younger people, while methods of formal transmission include educational programmes in youth art centres, regular dance classes and institutional initiatives. Experienced practitioners play a key role in safeguarding the element and ensuring its viability. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Kochari possesses a symbolic, social and creative meaning in Armenian society as well as in the diaspora. It is actively transmitted using both informal and formal methods. Kochari contributes greatly to intergenerational relationships and the socialization of youth, and conveys messages about historical memory and ancestral traditions. R.2: The element evokes a sense of solidarity among numerous practitioners, thereby widening the platform of cultural dialogue. Apart from Armenians themselves, various ethnic communities and minorities practise the element, which thereby ensures respect for cultural diversity. R.3: The State Party has developed safeguarding measures undertaken by the communities, groups and individuals concerned to protect and promote the element. These measures have been proposed by the bearer communities themselves, traditional song and dance ensembles, and individual practitioners. R.4: The State Party has demonstrated the participation of various stakeholders in the nomination process, such as individual bearers, practitioners, NGOs and authorities. R.5: The element has been included in Armenia's list of intangible cultural heritage since 2010, maintained and updated by the Ministry of Culture with the full participation of the local communities. An extract of the inventory was enclosed. The Evaluation Body thus recommended the inscription of Kochari traditional group dance on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for the improved file following the referral of the nomination in 2015.

526. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation of the different issues raised on this file. Before going further, he wished to suspend the meeting for a few moments for a discussion among the interested Parties.

[five-minute pause]

527. The **Chairperson** noted that the Bureau had not received any requests for debate or amendment, and requested the adoption of the draft decision as a whole.

528. The **delegation of Zambia** raised a small point in R.2 on cultural dialogue, remarking that the paragraph read, 'apart from Armenians themselves, various ethnic communities and

minorities practise the element […]'. It sought to replace ethnic 'minorities' with ethnic 'communities in neighbouring countries'. The delegation explained that 'various ethnic communities' was not clear, as 'Armenians' had already been mentioned, and that this implied communities outside Armenia and, in addition, the minorities.

529. The **Chairperson** explained that the file had come about after a long and heated debate, and a conclusion had been reached. It was thus the Chairperson's intention to move to the adoption without any debate or amendment. With permission from Zambia, the Chairperson proceeded. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.2 adopted to inscribe 'Kochari, traditional group dance' on the Representative List.**

530. The **delegation of Armenia** congratulated the Chairperson for his excellent conduct of the debates, and thanked the Korean authorities for the warm welcome, and the Secretariat for its magnificent organization of the work. It also thanked the Members of the Committee, the Evaluation Body, UNESCO officials, the Ministry of Culture of Armenia, the National Commission of Armenia to UNESCO, the National Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences, as well as a large community of kochari dancers in Armenia and the diaspora, whose inscription on the Representative List was an indispensable element of Armenian identity. The delegation noted that this was the fifth element on the Representative List, which included: Duduk and its music in 2008; Armenian cross-stones art. Symbolism and craftsmanship of the Khachkars in 2010; Performance of Armenian epic of 'The daredevils of Sassoun' or 'David of Sassoun' in 2012; and Lavash, the preparation, meaning and appearance of traditional bread as an expression of culture in Armenia in 2014. Unfortunately, some delegations were not oriented towards the safeguarding of cultural heritage but present their national interests to politicize culture. The delegation warmly thanked all the countries that took part in this cultural dialogue.

[A short film on the element was projected]

531. The **Chairperson** congratulated Armenia and turned to the next nomination.

532. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination **'Dolma making and sharing tradition, a marker of cultural identity'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.3], submitted by Azerbaijan. Dolma tradition relates to the preparation of the traditional meal 'dolma', which consists of small fillings wrapped in fresh or pre-cooked leaves or stuffed in fruits and vegetables. The meal is enjoyed on special occasions and at gatherings within families or local communities. The practice expresses solidarity, respect and hospitality. Communities are actively involved in safeguarding its viability through awareness-raising activities and it is transmitted primarily within families and vocational and apprenticeship schools. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Dolma is perceived as a central culinary practice by the communities concerned. It is practised and transmitted both by individuals and collectively by women preparing the meal during a wide range of cultural and social activities. R.2: The inscription of the dolma tradition would contribute to fostering dialogue between community-bearers from different backgrounds. It would also promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity in a multi-ethnic context and raise awareness about the nutritional values of traditional culinary practices. R.3: The viability of the element is safeguarded by the communities, groups, individuals and authorities concerned through awareness-raising events, publications aimed at enhancing the promotion of dolma making and its social and cultural functions within society, capacity-building sessions and the organization of dolma festivals. R.4: Initiated by the Azerbaijan Culinary Association, the communities concerned, the NGO Simurg, local municipality representatives, and a number of individual dolma bearers and practitioners actively participated in all stages of the preparation of the nomination and signed letters of consent. R.5: The element was included in Azerbaijan's Register of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2010, established by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and updated every three years. The enclosed extract provides information on the element. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe 'Dolma making and sharing tradition, a marker of cultural identity' on the Representative List. The

Committee might wish to invite the State Party to ensure access to the knowledge, practice and transmission of the element for all regardless of their gender and social affiliations, and encourage the broad participation of the communities concerned in the safeguarding measures. The Committee might also encourage the State Party to share safeguarding experiences with other States Parties with similar elements.

533. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation on this nomination file. The Bureau had not received any amendments for this file and the Chairperson did not wish to open a debate before the adoption of the draft decision.

534. The **delegation of Armenia** stated that it could not agree with the with the draft decision as whole or any of its paragraphs. It could not agree to the adoption of this draft, and therefore disassociated itself from this decision and requested that this statement be reflected in the summary records.

535. The **Chairperson** thanked Armenia, whose remarks would be duly reflected. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.3 adopted to inscribe 'Dolma making and sharing tradition, a marker of cultural identity' on the Representative List.**

536. The **Chairperson** congratulated Azerbaijan, giving the floor first to Armenia.

537. The **delegation of Armenia** offered its reflections on this nomination file and adopted decision. It was a very interesting nomination file that could have served to establish bridges of culture in the region because the element is really shared in the widest possible region in the Middle East, the Caucasus and Mediterranean. Unfortunately, Armenia had to disassociate itself from the decision because the nomination file contained several unacceptable elements for it. Firstly, it could not accept a nomination prepared by an NGO known for its anti-Armenian, anti-Christian, hate-speech and xenophobic statements reflected in their publications and media statements, which created antagonism towards Armenia and Christians in the region. The deletation considered that its involvement in the nomination was thus a slap in the face of this Committee. Another problem lay in the explanation of the name of Dolma claimed to be derived from the Turkish language, as any language could bring its own explanations to a name. But most importantly and surprisingly, the nomination file made references to different regions of Azerbaijan, which two months ago, the President of Azerbaijan stated at the General Assembly in New York were beyond the control of the Azerbaijani Government, which had no control over those regions. Thus, it was very surprising to note that these regions and their practitioners had participated in the preparation of the nomination file, and despite their mention there were no letters of consent from those communities.

538. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** began by congratulating the Chairperson and his government for the excellent organization of this session. On behalf of the government, the delegation thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe 'Dolma making and sharing tradition' as a marker of cultural identity on the Representative List. It also commended the Evaluation Body for having carefully examined the file and recommending its inscription. Dolma making and sharing is a highly widespread practice that builds the cultural values and identity of Azerbaijani communities. The element represents a wealth of very diverse traditions. This inscription was the result of the hard work and cooperation of an excellent team of experts that coordinated the preparation of the file. Originating from the shortened Turkic word 'doldurma', which means 'stuffed', Dolma making and sharing serves as a marker of hospitality, conviviality and friendliness within and among communities, and the result of centuries-old creativity. The Dolma tradition has transformed into one of the symbols of Azerbaijani intangible heritage and a strong marker of cultural belonging. The delegation was grateful to everybody who had extended support to the file's preparation and its inscription. It would also raise awareness about the diversity of dolma culture in and among Azerbaijani communities living in urban and rural areas.

539. Returning to Armenia's intervention, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that it had not raised its concerns during the consideration of the Kochari file despite several serious concerns, namely the recognition of the regional context. This was out of respect for the Evaluation Body's recommendation and to avoid any political issues during the Committee session. However, in view of Armenia's intervention, the delegation noted at least three important issues. The first issue concerned competence. In the preceding years, Armenia proposed ammendments to the titles and draft decisions of national and multinational nominations from Azerbaijan that had been recommended for inscription by the Evaluation Body. In some cases, these nominations were considered by experts as exemplary nominations. However, in this instance, the delegation considered that Armenia went too far in questioning and trying to amend the nomination text itself. This was not only a violation of existing legal procedures and the adopted methodology, but also a violation of the spirit and principles of the Convention, which is about inclusiveness and cooperation. They sought to remove Karabakh and its community from the nomination text. The delegation was clear that the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan was not subject to discussion, adding that there were four UN Security Councils resolutions on this matter.

540. The **delegation of Armenia** called for a point of order.

541. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** explained that he [on a personal note] came from Karabakh.

542. The **delegation of Armenia** repeated the point of order.

543. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** asked the Chairperson to allow it to continue.

544. The **delegation of Armenia** noted that the two-minute agreement had expired.

545. The **Chairperson** asked that the delegation of Azerbaijan terminate within thirty seconds.

546. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** explained [on a personal note] that, coming from Karabakh, he was unable to visit his homeland due to the occupation and ethnic cleansing by Armenians. The graves of his grandparents had been destroyed, and he was now being deprived from practising the traditions of his country.

547. The **delegation of Armenia** would not allow this kind of statement in the Committee, adding that this kind of language in the UNESCO texts was being done on purpose to jeopardize and abuse the work of the Committee and to bring the Security Council and the United Nations language here, which is unacceptable.

548. The **Chairperson** urged the delegations to cease their interventions and asked the Secretariat to cut the microphones.

549. The **delegation of Armenia** found it unacceptable and requested that the statement end.

550. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** sought to continue.

551. The **Chairperson** urged the delegations to calm down.

552. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** added that Armenia was in breach of the agreement not to interrupt, asking that Armenia abide by common sense.

553. The **Chairperson** clarified that Azerbaijan had already had five minutes and Armenia three.

554. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** reiterated that Armenia had intervened and interrupted its statement, which highlighted Armenia's political bias.

555. The **Chairperson** urged the delegation of Azerbaijan to calm down. He thanked Armenia and Azerbaijan for sharing their sense of compromise, dialogue and cooperation, adding that the intangible cultural heritage session was not an appropriate forum, even if Nagorno-Karabakh was a delicate and provocative issue. He congratulated Azerbaijan and Armenia for the inscription of their nominations. The Chairperson was very thankful to the Ambassador of the Philippines and other ambassadors who had successfully played the role of facilitators, adding that without their tireless efforts, the Committee could not have come to this compromise and formulation. He then turned to the next nomination file.

556. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination **'Traditional art of Shital Pati weaving of Sylhet'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.4], submitted by Bangladesh. Shital Pati is the traditional art of making a handcrafted mat by weaving together strips of a green cane known as 'Murta'. The mat is used by people all over Bangladesh as a sitting mat, bedspread or prayer mat. Shital Pati is a major source of livelihood that reinforces family bonding and empowers communities. The craft is primarily transmitted from generation to generation within the family and Shital Pati communities are increasingly being organized into cooperatives to ensure its effective safeguarding and transmission. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The weaving of mats constitutes an element of intangible cultural heritage practised and transmitted by several communities in Bangladesh. The mats feature motifs such as natural and religious symbols and hold a strongly recognizable value for the communities concerned. R.2: The inscription of the element would increase the visibility of the role of traditional knowledge and craftsmanship in contemporary society. The design and motifs of Shital Pati have influenced many other types of mats and quilts, thereby testifying to its impact on human creativity. R.3: The safeguarding measures described include research, inventorying, documentation, promotion and awareness-raising activities, as well as following up on the impact of the possible inscription of the element. The government and communities are committed to ensuring the viability of the element. R.4: The preparation of the nomination was organized by the Ministry of Culture and involved the widest possible participation of the communities concerned, as well as experts and NGOs. R.5: In 2007, Shital Pati was included in an inventory maintained and updated by the Intangible Cultural Heritage National Committee. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional art of Shital Pati weaving of Sylhe on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to encourage the State Party to monitor the impact of the increased visibility of the element as well to mitigate adverse impacts related to its commercialization.

557. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for this detailed explanation on the file. The Bureau had not received any request for debate or amendment for this file. He therefore proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.

558. The **Secretary** pointed out a small factual error under R.5 in which the inventory should read eleventh volume and not the seventh volume.

559. The **Chairperson** noted the slight cosmetic change in R.5, to which there were no objections. **The Chairperson declared adopted Decision 12.COM 11.b.4 to inscribe 'Traditional art of Shital Pati weaving of Sylhet' on the Representative List.**

560. The **delegation of Bangladesh** spoke of this moment of joy and pride for the members of the Bangladesh delegation. On behalf of the government, it expressed sincere thanks and gratitude to all the Members of Committee for inscribing the nominated element on the Representative List. Special thanks were expressed to the distinguished experts of the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat. Shital Pati is a woven mat made out of green cane. This product involves traditional techniques, and the intricate process of procuring the cane strips and dyeing them has been handed down across the generations by local artisans called *patial*. The craftsmanship is fully compatible with principles of biodiversity and sustainable development. The Shital Pati or 'cool mat' earned its name from the cold comfort it offers in the tropical weather of Bangladesh. Its quality is judged by its glossiness, smoothness and fine texture. Legend has it that a fine Shital Pati is so smooth that even a snake cannot glide over it. The inscription of the element would not only encourage its bearers and practitioners to ensure the viability of the element, but would also raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general and strengthen its safeguarding. The delegation was thankful to the Republic of Korea for hosting this session of the Committee, adding that it constituted a milestone in the history of efforts to promote world heritage as it clearly signified the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to the essential task of preserving cultural diversity. The delegation was pleased to inform the Committee that two local Shital Pati master weavers were participating in this session as part of the Bangladesh delegation. They stood

up by the stage, displaying a Shital Pati to demonstrate its fine quality and their high craftsmanship.

[A short film of the element was projected]

561. The **Chairperson** congratulated Bangladesh, and then turned to the next nomination.

562. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Ritual journeys in La Paz during Alasita'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.5], submitted by Bolivia (Plurinational State of). During the ritual journeys in La Paz during Alasita, participants procure 'good luck' miniatures associated with Ekeko, the city's beneficent god of fertility. This is followed by their consecration with the different Andean ritualists or their blessing by the Catholic Church. The practice promotes social cohesion and intergenerational transmission. Alasita rituals are primarily transmitted naturally within families and efforts to safeguard the practice, primarily by civil society, have been continuous. Museum exhibitions have raised awareness of the practice and municipal contests encourage the production of the miniatures. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: the Alasita celebration includes ritual, social and commercial activities. The practice is embraced by the population of La Paz, and constitutes a propitious opportunity to renew hopes of wellbeing and prosperity, family unity and union with friends and city inhabitants. R.2: The Alista contributes to the visibility of traditions that facilitate social dialogue in its various forms. Participants engage in different forms of exchange. The element further represents a syncretism of magic and religious beliefs and contributes to the sense of human creativity. R.3: The safeguarding measures were developed together with the communities concerned and include: documentation and research; the creation of educational tools; the strengthening of Alasita competitions; and the dissemination of information using new technologies. The safeguarding measures proposed also include the establishment of a Museum of Alasita in La Paz. R.4: Different stakeholders and communities, institutions, groups and individuals concerned cooperated throughout the preparation of the file in close coordination with the Promotion Committee. Informed consent was acquired through a campaign requesting that inhabitants of La Paz show their support. R.5: The Alasita inventory was drawn up between 2013 and 2015 by the Intangible Heritage Unit of the Ministry of Cultures and Tourism with the participation of the communities and related groups as well as other stakeholders. The current inventory is updated accordingly following each new event dedicated to the Alasita tradition. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Ritual journeys in La Paz during Alasita on the Representative List.

563. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.5 adopted to inscribe 'Ritual journeys in La Paz during Alasita' on the Representative List.**

564. The **delegation of Bolivia** thanked Korea as the host country, the Committee, and the Evaluation Body for the inscription of this cultural expression, very dear to the people of Bolivia, which constituted an element of their identity. It also took the idea of having big dreams seriously: from the manufacture of 'good luck' miniatures to the belief that deep-seated desires would one day be realized. The people of La Paz have exercised their best efforts to safeguard the tradition of Alasita, even in the most difficult moments of the city's political life, which prohibits freedom of expression. Bolivians believe in Alasita as an example, as a space to develop multiple forms of social dialogue and the active coexistence of several religions.

565. The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, submitted by Bosnia and Herzegovina.

566. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Konjic woodcarving'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.6], submitted by Bosnia and Herzegovina**.** Konjic woodcarving is an artistic craft with a long tradition in the Konjic municipality. The woodcarvings – which include furniture, sophisticated interiors and small decorative objects

– stand out for their recognizable hand-carved motifs and overall visual identity. The craft is a key part of the local community's culture that forges a sense of community and belonging. It is primarily transmitted intergenerationally within the family and through on-the-job training and family-run woodcarving workshops, which train apprentice woodcarvers and help popularize the craft. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Konjic woodcarving serves a social function by reinforcing the cultural identity of the communities concerned, providing them with a sense of continuity and belonging and even serving as a catalyst of social cohesion. It is a powerful symbol of traditional interior design in both public and private spaces. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to the reinstatement of traditional crafts as a socially inclusive and viable economic sector in the post-industrial world. It would also serve as a testimony that the practice of heritage traditions based on collaboration between different generations, genders, ethnic groups and religions would encourage other communities to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage. R.3: To ensure the viability of the element, representatives of Konjic woodcarvers have begun undertaking various activities such as research, documentation and seminars on the craft, novice training, the introduction of the element into school curricula, the recruitment of professional designers for workshops, and the design of tourist brochures, among others. R.4: The communities, groups and individuals concerned have participated actively in preparing the nomination of the element at all stages, paying attention to the role of gender, in collaboration with various NGOs, business actors, museums, institutions of higher education, and local, cantonal and federal governments who gave their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: Konjic woodcarving was included in the Preliminary Open List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2012 by the Federal Ministry of Culture and Sports with a large number of local bearers, inheritors and various stakeholders. The inventory was last updated in 2016. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Konjic woodcarving on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for the improved file following the referral of this nomination in 2015.

567. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.6 adopted to inscribe 'Konjic woodcarving' on the Representative List.**

568. The **delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina** thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Chairperson personally for organizing this very important meeting. It also thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed description of the arts crafts woodcarving, which was of crucial importance in Bosnia and Herzegovina in its post-conflict reconciliation. Many of the delegates understood what this meant for Bosnia and Herzegovina, and now the people had the chance to restart this craft and to restart their communication and reconciliation after a long time.

569. The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination, submitted by Bulgaria.

570. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Cultural Practices Associated to the 1st of March'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.7], submitted by Bulgaria, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and Romania. The element comprises traditions to celebrate the beginning of spring. The main practice consists of wearing a red and white thread to ensure the safe, harmonious passage from winter to spring. All members of the communities concerned participate, irrespective of age, and the practice contributes to social cohesion, intergenerational exchange and interaction with nature, fostering diversity and creativity. Transmission is spontaneous and occurs through informal learning in families, neighbourhoods and workshops, as well as through dedicated school and museum programmes. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element has deep roots in the beliefs and traditions of the population of the urban and rural regions across all four countries. The submitting States have indicated the social functions of the element, which enhances the cohesion of the communities concerned, marks

the beginning of agricultural activities, serves a psychological and magic function, and helps foster a sense of identity. R.2: As the element is very popular in all four submitting countries, its inscription would raise public awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage and enrich the Representative List with an element based on ancient knowledge about nature and the universe, providing an example of people living harmoniously, in accordance with their traditional, inherited calendars. The inscription of the element would encourage communities in both rural and urban areas to discover intangible cultural heritage and recognize their shared heritage. R.3: The viability of the element is ensured by the communities, groups and individuals concerned through its transmission and informal learning within families and neighbourhoods, as well as through workshops and dedicated optional school programmes and educational museum programmes. R.4: The four States Parties prepared the nomination file in close collaboration and with the active participation of a wide variety of community representatives, experts, NGOs and other relevant cultural actors. The file provides evidence of the consent of all the stakeholders involved in the nomination process. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognized that all four States Parties have several intangible cultural heritage inventories in which the element is included. The inventories were drawn up and are maintained by relevant ministries of culture and similar agencies in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. However, the manner in which the inventories is updated is not clearly indicated in the case of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia or the Republic of Moldova, nor is it clear how the communities were involved in the updating process. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Cultural practices associated to the 1st of March to the submitting States Parties.

571. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation, noting that this was another case of the dual system of draft decisions. Pursuant to the working method already presented, the Committee had received written information from the submitting States concerning the questions raised by the Evaluation Body. This written information would be attached for the record to the nomination file. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures, the submitting States were given the opportunity to provide the Committee with relevant information on procedures for updating the inventories and involvement of the communities in the inventorying process.

572. With regard to the remarks on criterion R.5, the **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** explained that the updating of the inventories in Macedonia was carried out with the involvement of the communities concerned. The digital character of the inventory assured permanent updates and access to communities and all the stakeholders involved in this process. The communities, bearers and individuals involved in the nomination process regularly send hard-copy presentations of their safeguarding activities of the element to the Directorate for the Protection of Cultural Heritage. Several hundred units had been registered so far, serving as material for updating the digital inventory, together with the community's involvement in this ongoing process of permanent updating. The delegation was confident that the Committee would take into consideration its explanation, which strongly supported the inscription of the element on the Representative List.

573. Regarding the inventories and the involvement of communities, the **delegation of Moldova** further explained that according to the law on the protection of intangible cultural heritage of Moldova, the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research – together with the National Commission for Intangible Heritage – is responsible for maintaining a permanent updating of the inventory with the participation of research specialists, the communities, and relevant NGOs in the field. The action to maintain the inventory implies a legal provision of national legislation as a sine qua non condition of the permanent updating of the inventory as a national legal obligation of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research. In the process of inventorying and permanent updating held during 2016, several types of questionnaires were developed and addressed to local administrations and communities at the local level. The legislation was improved in 2016 by a new government regulation on national and local inventories of intangible cultural heritage, which included provisions for the updating of heritage files in the national inventory. Several local seminars and meetings had been

organized to improve the capacity of local communities to develop their local inventories. Having the national inventory for tangible heritage as a model, local communities and specialized institutions were able to take part in the development and updating of the inventories.

574. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that during its preparation meeting of the nomination file with Macedonia and Moldova, it had seen the inventory system and observed the importance given to the community in the inventory process. The delegation thus believed that the explanation in relation to R.5 was sufficient for the inscription of the nomination file.

575. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the submitting States Parties for the information provided both in writing and orally. Based on this information, it was convinced that R.5 was met and was thus in favour of inscribing this element on the Representative List. The delegation warmly commended and thanked the States Parties for submitting a multinational file of the cultural practices associated with the 1st of March. Indeed, this is an element that is shared in the region, and which is very important in the context of this Convention.

576. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the submitting States, adding that this element did indeed stand out as an element in line with the Convention. It is an important element shared by a number of countries and a number of communities. The delegation agreed with the previous speakers that the documents provided showed that R.5 had been taken into account, and it therefore strongly supported the inscription of the element.

577. The **delegation of Cyprus** advised the Committee to use the correct country name of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It also supported inscription.

578. The **delegation of Colombia** supported the inscription of this element, adding that this was very important intangible cultural heritage for the region. In addition, the Committee should support these regional and intergovernmental inscriptions that bring about dialogue between countries. This specific element was not only alive in the region, but it also followed the people of the submitting States wherever they went and was thus important. The delegation supported the inscription of the element.

579. The **Chairperson** noted the many supporting remarks and no opposing views. He therefore turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, and R.4 were duly adopted. Based on the interventions, the Committee appeared satisfied with the information provided by the submitting States. Consequently, criterion R.5 was adopted. The chapeau paragraph 3 was the standard wording that was agreed to, which was adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.7 adopted to inscribe 'Cultural Practices Associated to the 1st of March' on the Representative List**.

580. The **delegation of Bulgaria** thanked the Evaluation Body and expressed deep appreciation to the Committee for the positive decisions on the inscription of this multinational nomination, which demonstrated the importance of shared traditions. On behalf of thousands of communities, practitioners and tradition bearers living in a vast geographical area, the delegation expressed its great joy, as well as theirs, following this inscription. The delegation took this opportunity to highlight the fruitful and rewarding multinational collaboration with Moldova, Romania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

581. The **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Culture of Macedonia and all the partners who had participated in the process of preparing this multinational nomination file, to cordially thank the Committee for their understanding and acceptance of the explanations presented at the present session. In this regard, it thanked the colleagues from Romania, Bulgaria and Moldova for their excellent cooperation and high professionalism during the long-term process of preparing and submitting the joint nomination file. The inscription of the element on the Representative List was a great honour for Macedonia, but it was also an obligation to promote the safeguarding of this element, as well as to stimulate the bearers to educate the new generation of practitioners and their communities. The delegation deeply believed that this inscription

would succeed in terms of the implementation and promotion of the Convention in Macedonia. The delegation congratulated the Republic of Korea and UNESCO for the excellent organization of this Committee.

582. The **delegation of Moldova** spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Research to thank the Committee for its support and understanding of the values of this multinational nomination file. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its comments, views and understanding regarding this important element, adding that the local communities and the intangible cultural heritage specialists would be very proud of this decision. The delegation thanked the colleagues from Romania, Macedonia and Bulgaria for their hard work and the excellent job done.

583. The **delegation of Romania** noted that once again the Committee had come to a point when not only national but also transnational values had come to the forefront and claimed their importance on the heritage map. It was also a demonstration of teamwork at both the national and transnational levels that represented an essential pathway to success. The delegation thanked all those involved in this project and its inscription, which was a step forward in terms of the safeguarding and transmission of the element in the future. It remarked that the Members of the Committee and the submitting States fully acknowledged the importance of this adoption, for which it was grateful. The delegation also paid tribute to the efforts, understanding and dedication of the bearers, the communities and the authorities involved, as well as the Korean Government and everybody involved for their outstanding hospitality in hosting this important Committee meeting.

584. The **Chairperson** congratulated the States Parties and turned to the next nomination.

585. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Zaouli, popular music and dance of the Guro communities in Côte d'Ivoire'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.8], submitted by Côte d'Ivoire. Zaouli is a popular music and dance practised by the Guro of Côte d'Ivoire. A homage to feminine beauty, Zaouli is inspired by two masks: the Blou and the Djela. The practice brings together sculpture, weaving, music and dance. Zaouli conveys the cultural identity of its bearers and promotes social cohesion and environmental preservation. Transmission occurs during musical performances and learning sessions, and the viability of the practice is ensured, for example, through regular performances organized by the communities, as well as intervillage dance competitions and festivals. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element is a traditional performing art that was originally practised on festive occasions only, but which is now also practised during funerals. It plays an important role in education, conveys a sense a beauty, strengthens gender relationships and social integration, provides a form of entertainment and plays an environmental role. R.2: The inscription of the element would promote all the cultural practices and expressions and raise international awareness of the importance of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. It would also create a favourable environment for the blossoming of talents and human creativity R.3: The viability of Zaouli is enhanced through the identification of talented performers during popular performances and their continued learning under experienced practitioners. The proposed safeguarding measures focus on inventorying and awareness-raising activities, the dissemination of documents, digitization efforts, scientific meetings and activities geared at the revitalization of handicrafts. R.4: The Guro communities that act as the bearers and practitioners of Zaouli were fully involved in all stages of the preparation of the nomination file through their spokespersons and representatives. They expressed their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognizes that the element has been registered in the National Inventory of Cultural Heritage since 2016. The inventory is managed and regularly updated by the Ministry of Culture and Francophonie, and is carried out in collaboration with local communities, groups and associations. However, the extract presented in the nomination is only in the form of a list without any description of the element. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Zaouli, popular music and dance of the Guro communities in Côte d'Ivoire, to the submitting State.

586. The **Chairperson** noted that this was another case of a dual system of draft decision. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, the Chairperson would give the floor to the submitting States to provide the relevant information regarding the extract presented in the form of a list with no description of the element.

587. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** explained that Law No. 87-806 of 28 July 1987 on the protection of cultural heritage in Côte d'Ivoire stipulated, in Article 4, that a general inventory of cultural heritage shall be updated annually and draw up an inventory of sites and monuments, movable property, and arts and popular traditions. In accordance with this law, the inventory of national cultural heritage is managed and regularly updated by the Ministry of Culture and Francophonie in collaboration with the community, associations and local groups, as recognized in the draft decision. The Zaouli, popular music and dance of the Guro communities in Côte d'Ivoire, had been included in the national cultural heritage inventory since 2016, as recorded by official text in decree n°001MCF / 4 of 14 January 2016 by the Minister of Culture and the Francophonie, which was available on the UNESCO website. Prior to the International Assistance granted to the Directorate of Cultural Heritage for the inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present on the Ivorian territory for urgent safeguarding, the element was included in a national inventory of the Ministry of Culture and Francophonie. This inventory was not in a searchable database, but the current inventory, led by the Directorate of Cultural Heritage, would lead to a national intangible cultural heritage database where all the elements of intangible cultural heritage would be recorded, previously inventoried and inscribed on the national cultural heritage inventory list, including Zaouli. This database would be available at the end of the inventory and would provide information on the places of practice, the communities concerned, and the viability of the elements.

588. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that after having read the document provided by the delegation of Côte d'Ivoire, and having listened to Côte d'Ivoire, it believed that the inscription of Zaouli, popular music and dance, was fully justified.

589. The **delegation of Senegal** believed that the inventory that was carried out in 2016, which included Zaouli, responded to an inventory as required. Moreover, the database that was currently being established with the new inventory, which was funded and supported by UNESCO, should also respond to the requirements set by the Evaluation Body. The delegation welcomed the clear explanations given by the Evaluation Body on this issue, but it also noted that Côte d'Ivoire was currently working on this inventory, and it was obvious that this inventory would lead to a database containing all intangible cultural heritage elements. In this regard, the Committee could accept the inscription of the element. The delegation believed that Côte d'Ivoire had already started its work on the inventory – as was seen in the report provided on the current inventory and supported by UNESCO – and it thus supported inscription.

590. In addition to Palestine, the **Chairperson** noted support from Turkey, Cuba, Congo, Algeria, Cyprus, India, Zambia, Mauritius, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Colombia, Ethiopia and Hungary. With no speakers with opposing views, the Chairperson moved to the adoption of the draft decision. Paragraph 1, and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was also adopted. Based on the interventions, the Committee now seemed satisfied with the information provided by the submitting State. Criterion R.5 was thus adopted, as well as paragraphs 3–6. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.8 adopted to inscribe 'Zaouli, popular music and dance of the Guro communities in Côte d'Ivoire' on the Representative List.**

591. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** welcomed the inscription of Zaouli on the Representative List, and thanked the Chairperson for his excellent conduct of the proceedings, as well as the Committee, UNESCO and all those who had contributed to the inscription of this element. Rich in its cultural diversity, Côte d'Ivoire was happy to be a State Party to this Convention, whose main characteristic was that it placed communities at the heart of its implementation. In this regard, the delegation wished to give the floor to the President of the Regional Council of Marahoué for a brief address on behalf of the communities.

592. In his capacity as **President of the Regional Council of Marahoué** of the region from which Zaouli, the popular music and dance of the Guro communities, came, he spoke of the element as a symbol of beauty and social cohesion. He noted the interest in Zaouli demonstrated by the Committee, UNESCO and all the States present. The President also spoke of the role of the Regional Council in supporting the local communities for the best outcome of the inscription of Zaouli on the Representative List. Zaouli is a symbol of beauty, a prized object of curiosity. When something is beautiful, it is said that it is *Marahoué*, its home.

593. The **Chairperson** congratulated Côte d'Ivoire and turned to the next nomination.

594. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Punto'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.9], submitted by Cuba. Punto is the poetry and music of Cuban peasants, consisting of a tune or melody over which a person sings an improvized or learned stanza based on a rhyming scheme. Punto is an essential element of Cuban intangible cultural heritage that promotes dialogue and expresses the identity of the communities concerned. Knowledge and skills are transmitted primarily through imitation and via teaching programmes involving workshops delivered by bearers and practitioners of the element in Houses of Culture across the country. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Punto is the poetry and music of Cuban peasants, accompanied by string and percussion instruments. The element is transmitted orally by imitation from one generation to the next and is constantly re-created by its practitioners. It plays a significant role in rituals and other sociocultural practices of the communities concerned. R.2: Punto is an expression that is essentially based on dialogue, which is pertinent when considering its potential to contribute to the international visibility of intangible cultural heritage. It promotes mutual respect and the diversity of cultural manifestations. R.3: The viability of Punto is ensured through transmission, research and awareness-raising activities. The proposed measures aimed at encouraging practice and transmission are well-defined and clearly presented with the communities, agencies, and institutions concerned. R.4: Cultural institutions, groups and individual bearers of the element participated in the nomination process through several stages. The file presents letters expressing the free, prior and informed consent of the institutional representatives, as well as the practitioners of Punto. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognizes that the element was inventoried for the preparation of the Atlas of the Instruments of Folk and Popular Music of Cuba in 1997 and the Ethnographic Atlas of Cuba: Popular and Traditional Culture in 2000. However, the nomination file did not identify the body responsible for maintaining the inventory nor the frequency with which it is updated. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Punto to the submitting State.

595. As was customary, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the submitting State to provide the relevant information regarding the institution responsible for maintaining and updating the inventory and the frequency which which it is updated.

596. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Chairperson and the Evaluation Body for the evaluation and for its report. In accordance with the Cuban National Heritage Law and the Republic of Cuba's Heritage Laws 1 and 2, the National Council for Cultural Heritage is the competent national institution to manage and safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of the country. The organizational chart of the National Council for Cultural Heritage reflects the administrative political division of Cuba across fifteen provinces. The National Council was represented in each province by a regional heritage centre, which is responsible for establishing inventories in their own region on the basis of the culture section of the Ministry of Culture, which is also represented locally in each province. All the information collected by these centres is transmitted to the National Council for Cultural Heritage and kept in accordance with the provisions of Articles 1 and 12 of the Convention. These inventories and activities are updated, managed and controlled by the Council. The delegation added that there was a lot of information contained in the file, which reflected all the work done on the Punto, which included over one hundred publications. The cultural heritage centre is the organization responsible for gathering information, and it manages the entire inventory process on a regular basis, which is carried out every two years. The delegation remarked

that written information had been shared with all Members of the Committee, and there was currently a process to update these inventories in accordance with the legislation in Cuba, as explained in the file. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body, the Secretariat and the Committee for receiving all the information presented.

597. The **delegation of Palestine** believed that this was an important element. Regarding R.5, it was noted that the concern was simply a question of the body responsible for the update and its frequency, which had been adequately explained by the delegation of Cuba, both in writing and orally. The delegation thus strongly recommended the inscription of Punto on the Representative List.

598. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine and noted the many supporting speakers but no opposing positions. He therefore turned to the adoption of the draft decision. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted, as was criterion R.5. Paragraphs 3 and paragraph 4 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.9 adopted to inscribe 'Punto' on the Representative List.**

599. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Committee for its decision, which was result of the participation of hundreds of men and women who gave life to these manifestations of songs, poetry, music and creation. Punto is the traditional heritage of the Cuban countryside. It is the story of people singing about their daily lives. It is a symbol of togetherness, respect for cultural diversity and intercultural dialogues. The delegation dedicated this declaration to all the farmers and bearers of these Cuban manifestations, which occupied a fundamental place in Cuban culture. The delegation presented a short film with a message to the Committee by a 'bearer' of the community, followed by a small tribute to Rosario Fernando, a Cuban poet and author of Guantanamera.

[A short film on the element was projected]

600. The **Chairperson** adjourned the day's session.

[Thursday, 7 December, morning session]

ITEM 11.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

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

601. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning for the third time and identified the new Members of the Bureau for the thirteenth session of the Committee within each Electoral Group. The Vice-Chairs and the Rapporteur would be elected on Saturday. It was noted that there were still twenty-five nominations to the Representative List, one element for removal and transfer, four requests for International Assistance and two proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices to examine before the adoption of the overall decision 12.COM 11. The Committee clearly had to move faster to proceed with the schedule. The Bureau had received a request from Kazakhstan to examine its nomination file, as they had have planned a school performance. A similar request came from Portugal.

602. The **delegation of Turkey** asked whether the Chairperson would provide a clarification regarding the incident from the previous day.

603. The **Chairperson** added that it would be addressed at a later time.

604. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Kazakh traditional Assyk games'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.18], submitted by Kazakhstan. Kazakh traditional Assyk games are an ancient tradition in Kazakhstan. Each player has their own set of Assyks traditionally made out of a sheep bone and a Saka dyed in bright colours. The community of practitioners mainly comprises children aged between four and eighteen, but young people and adults are also involved. The game is a good model for positive

collaboration, social inclusiveness and a sense of friendship, and is primarily transmitted through the observation of older boys by younger ones. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Traditional Assyk games are mostly played outdoors by children, although adults are also involved. The games contribute to the development of the community and physical skills, and promote a sense of identity. Assyk is considered as a strong symbol of childhood in the country. R.2: The inscription of the element would raise public interest in traditional games; it would also foster a sense of brotherhood and unity among children from different social, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The inscription of the element would also inspire the wide and creative application of traditional attire and traditional patterns in modern design. R.3: The viability of the element is ensured by the communities, groups and individuals concerned. The proposed measures include: the organization of tournaments; the provision of administrative and legal assistance; television documentaries; the creation and updating of an open-source online database; the production of national souvenirs featuring imagery related to the practice; and academic research, among other measures. R.4: During the preparation of the nomination, a series of meetings was organized with the active participation of the communities concerned, and letters attesting to their free, prior and informed consent were also provided. R.5: In 2013, the element was included in the national register of the intangible cultural heritage of Kazakhstan, with the wide participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned. The register is maintained and regularly updated every two to three years by the Ministry of Culture and Information. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Kazakh traditional Assyk games on the Representative List. The Committee reminded the State Party to avoid making reference to private companies or brands in relation to activities aimed at safeguarding the element, and to be aware of commercialization that could lead to decontextualization. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to fully involve children in the implementation of the safeguarding measures, considering that they are the main bearers of the element.

605. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.18 adopted to inscribe 'Kazakh traditional Assyk games' on the Representative List.**

606. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** spoke on behalf of the government to express gratitude to the Republic of Korea for its warm welcome, the Chairperson for his effective leadership, and the Secretariat for the successful organization of the session. It also thanked the Members of the Committee for the endorsement of the recommendations of the Evaluation Body to inscribe the Kazakh traditional Assyk games on the Representative List. Special thanks were extended to all partners who had taken part in the process of preparing the dossier, particularly to the Kazakhstan National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee and the Committee for Sport and Physical Education of the Ministry of Culture and Sport for their constant support and consultations. Traditional Assyk games contribute to the development of cognitive and physical skills in children, and serve to improve the socialization of young people in place of post-modern media such as computers, TV and videogames, etc. Assyk games teach young people to cultivate friendship, promote tolerance by transcending social, religious, racial and other differences through these games, which are played mostly outdoors. Today's inscription seals Kazakhstan's commitment to safeguarding, protecting and popularizing Assyk, particularly among Kazakh youth. It pledged to give continued support to UNESCO's important mission and activities in all spheres of its mandate, and particularly in the field of intangible cultural heritage. In this regard, Kazakhstan stood as a candidate to the Committee for 2018 and 2022 at the elections in June.

[*Demonstration of the Assyk game performed on stage*]

607. The **Chairperson** congratulated Kazakhstan and turned to the next nomination file.

608. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Craftmanship of Estremoz clay figures'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.26], submitted by Portugal. The

craftmanship of the Estremoz clay figures dates back to the 17th century and involves a process lasting several days. The clay figures are dressed in regional attires of Alentejo or religious clothing and follow specific themes. The very characteristic, aesthetic features of the figures make them immediately identifiable, and the craft is strongly attached to the region. Artisans ensure the viability and recognition of their craft through non-formal workshops and pedagogical initiatives, as well as through local, national and international fairs. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The Craftsmanship of Estremoz clay figures in Portugal was initially linked to the tradition of nativity scenes, but the figures also depict natural elements, local trades and events, popular traditions and everyday life. It is related to the representation of the natural world, religious beliefs and the historical memory of the society in question, and reflects its social changes over time. R.2: The inscription of the element would promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity in general, while encouraging mutual understanding among communities that share some of the features depicted by the clay figures. It would also foster greater appreciation of the craft and could encourage dialogue among people interested in exchanging views about their lives and traditions. R.3: The viability of the element is ensured through the artisan community's participation in safeguarding actions. Such measures include: non-formal education workshops; itinerant exhibitions; local, regional, national and international fairs; and pedagogical initiatives organized in partnership with the Estremoz Municipal Museum. Measures were also taken to protect artisans and their practice from any adverse effects of industrial production. R.4: From 2012 to 2016, Estremoz City Hall had coordinated the process of preparing the nomination for the inscription of the Craftsmanship of Estremoz clay figures with the active participation of the local artisans and the regional authorities, who had given their free, prior and informed consent, demonstrating a keen interest in the inscription. R.5: In 2015, the element was included in the national inventory of intangible cultural heritage, maintained by the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage. Carried out by the Municipal Museum of Estremoz, with the artisans' participation, the inventory would be updated every ten years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe the Craftsmanship of Estremoz clay figures on the Representative List.

609. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.26 adopted to inscribe 'Craftmanship of Estremoz clay figures' on the Representative List.**

610. The **delegation of Portugal** remarked that this this was the seventh Portuguese element inscribed on the Convention's List, and it was truly glad that Portugal had been able to successfully safeguard several elements of its intangible cultural heritage at the international level. The production of clay figures is a widespread practice that is well-known to most people in the world, and the visibility that this inscription on the Convention's List brought would undoubtedly be similarly positive for the safeguarding of similar elements at the local, national and international levels. Clay figures are produced in all regions of the world – a fact that points to the significance of these practices for communities with very different cultures, backgrounds and beliefs. It is an old, widespread traditional craft. The delegation was sure that the inscription of this traditional craftsmanship on the Representative List would foster acknowledgement and appreciation of the artists' and artisans' works all over the world, and would encourage dialogue among different people by exchanging and sharing views related to their daily life and traditions. In this sense, this inscription encouraged dialogue based on respect for cultural diversity, but also on shared experiences, since the figures depict scenes that are common to many cultures of the world, such as people carrying water, taking care of animals, selling farm products and washing clothes. Regarding the safeguarding of the craftsmanship of the Estremoz clay figures, the Municipality of Estremoz had already started implementing the safeguarding plan proposed in the file, thus fulfilling its commitment to the implementation of the Convention.

611. The **Chairperson** congratulated Portugal and turned to the next nomination file.

612. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Organ craftsmanship and music'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.10], submitted by Germany. Organ craftsmanship and music has shaped Germany's musical and instrument-making landscape for centuries, and there are a diverse number of traditions around constructing and playing the organ. The highly specialized knowledge and skills of organ makers are significant markers of group identity, and organ music constitutes a universal language that fosters interreligious understanding. Knowledge and skills related to the element are transmitted through a direct teacher-pupil experience, as well as vocational schools, universities and organ construction workshops. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfies the following criteria for inscription. R.1: Organ construction and music is an artistic practice that combines innovative techniques and knowledge about the nature and creative improvization of performing organ music. There is a wide range of traditions around constructing and playing the organ in Germany, with several thousand organ builders and organists throughout the country. R.2: The element fosters interreligious understanding, and even acts as a connecting factor between believers and non-believers. Its inscription would enhance dialogue among various communities and foster connections between them, both within Germany and beyond. R.3: Comprehensive educational activities at both the formal and non-formal levels and activities related to the transmission and dissemination of the element are planned or already underway. One of the goals is to foster the network of stakeholders in order to exploit synergies and strengthen advocacy. R.4: With the support of the German National Commission for UNESCO, numerous committee members and institutions interested in organs were actively involved in all stages of the preparation of this nomination file and expressed their free, prior and informed consent. R.5: The element was included in the national German inventory of intangible cultural heritage in 2014. The inventory, maintained by the German National Commission for UNESCO, was drawn up with the active participation of the communities, traditional bearers and NGOs concerned. The Evaluation Body thus recommended inscribing Organ craftsmanship and music on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to remind the State Party that references to the universality of an element are not in line with the spirit of the Convention.

613. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.10 adopted to inscribe 'Organ craftsmanship and music' on the Representative List.**

614. The **delegation of Germany** thanked the Committee for the positive decision on the inscription on behalf of around 2,800 organ builders and 180 apprentices in 400 workshops in Germany, as well as 3,500 full-time and several tens of thousand part-time voluntary organists all over Germany. They had all been looking forward to the decision. Imagine listening to the joyful sound of about 50,000 organs in Germany, located in churches in small villages, up to big concert halls in major cities, playing all at the same time. This inscription would definitely boost the motivation to continue promoting the many facets and perspectives of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Germany. The delegation expressed its warm thanks to the Republic of Korea and to the Chairperson and its team for organizing this Committee meeting and for being wonderful hosts here in Jeju.

[A short film on the element was projected]

615. The **Chairperson** congratulated Germany and turned to the next nomination file.

616. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Rebetiko'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.11], submitted by Greece. Rebetiko is a musical and cultural expression directly linked to the song and dance that initially spread among the urban working-class population. Rebetiko songs are now a standardized repertoire in social occasions, containing invaluable references to the customs and traditions of a particular way of life. Rebetiko is transmitted orally as well as by the media and in music schools, conservatories and universities, and musicians and enthusiasts continue to play a key role in keeping the practice alive. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied

the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Rebetiko is a form of music and dance that is widespread among a vast audience in Greece and other parts of the world, particularly among Greek-speaking people. Rebetiko has symbolic and aesthetic functions and plays an important role for social identity and collective memory. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage at the regional and international levels. Rebetiko is part of a diverse range of urban musical traditions that contribute to the integration of marginalized social groups and refugees, thus fostering intercultural connections. R.3: The viability of the element is ensured by the communities, groups and individuals concerned through measures such as research, documentation, transmission and awareness-raising activities. The bearer communities took an active part in the long consultation process and in the safeguarding measures. R.4: The meetings organized to obtain consent are well-explained with sufficient details provided. Many highly personalized letters of consent are provided, describing the personal histories behind the element. R.5: The element was included in the Greek national inventory of intangible cultural heritage in 2016 by the Ministry of Culture and Sports, following a series of consultations with Rebetiko community performers, bearers and researchers. The inventory is to be updated every five years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Rebetiko on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to actively support initiatives from traditional bearers and practitioners aimed at safeguarding the element. The Committee might also commend the State Party for the quality of the safeguarding activities, particularly as regards the cooperation between musicians and educational programmes in music.

617. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.11 adopted to inscribe 'Rebetiko' on the Representative List.**

618. The **delegation of Greece** spoke on behalf of the members of the Rebetiko cultural community, addressing them in their own words taken from the lyrics of one well-known Rebetiko song in Greek [recited]. The delegation thanked all the people of the Rebetiko cultural community all over the world. On their behalf, it wished to thank the Korean Government for hosting this meeting, the Evaluation Body for the high-quality work, and the Secretariat for facilitating and running intangible cultural heritage business as efficiently as always. The Rebetiko song and dance tradition has a long history and draws heavily from a widespread Eastern Mediterranean musical tradition. Some of the most influential people in this tradition in Greece come from diverse ethnic and religious backgrounds. The most important female singer, for example, in the 1940s and 1950s, was Marika Ninou of Armenian origin. Her interpretations shaped singing and set the rules for the 1920s onwards until today. Another singer was Roza Eskenazi of Jewish origin, and she was the first woman that not only sang, but also danced on the stage. The first well-known composer of Rebetiko – a passionate composer – was Markos Vamvakaris, and he grew up among the urban poor of Syros, home to the second largest Roman Catholic community in Greece and an important port city back then. What was inscribed today was not the historical trajectory of an element, but the meaning it holds for the current community of bearers in Greece and everywhere.

[A short film on the element was projected]

619. The **Chairperson** congratulated Greece, and turned to the next nomination file.

620. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Kumbh Mela'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.12], submitted by India. Kumbh Mela, the festival of the Sacred Pitcher, is a peaceful congregation of pilgrims during which participants bathe or take a dip in a sacred river. The congregation includes ascetics, saints, sadhus, aspirants-kalpavasis and visitors. The tradition plays a central spiritual role in the country, encapsulating a diverse range of cultural customs. Knowledge and skills relating to Kumbh Mela are mainly imparted through the teacher-student relationship, but transmission and safeguarding are also ensured through oral traditions, and religious and historical texts. From the information included in the

file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Kumbh Mela, which attracts millions of spiritual seekers and visitors, represents a syncretic set of rituals related to worship and ritual cleansing in holy rivers in India. The file describes the element as an important event in the spiritual lives of Hindus and non-Hindus alike. It is a social ritual and festive event that is closely linked to the community's perception of its own history and memory. R.2: The inscription of the element would underline its contribution to cultural diversity and creativity, as well as tolerance and learning. Since many of the pilgrims who participate have different origins, creeds and traditions, the inscription of the element would promote respect for dialogue. R.3: The viability of the element is primarily ensured by saints and sadhus teaching their disciples about traditional rituals and chants. The State Party has established a set of short-term and long-term measures that are implemented with the participation and support of the bearer communities, the government and NGOs. R.4: The nomination was initiated within the community of bearers. The process was supported by the holy men of the various akhadas, members of temple trusts, NGOs, eminent scholars and State Party officials, and the stakeholders concerned expressed their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: Kumbh Mela was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2016, maintained by the Sangeet Natak Akademi. The inventory was drawn up with the active participation of the community-bearers. It is accessed through the website link provided and is planned to be regularly updated. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Kumbh Mela on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to avoid the use of inappropriate vocabulary such as 'intact' and 'purest form', which runs contrary to the constant re-creation of living traditions. The Committee might also encourage the State to take due consideration in its safeguarding measures of any risks to the element associated with tourism and increasing visitor numbers, including those impacting the environment. The Committee might further encourage the State, when submitting files in the future, to avoid standardized consent letters, ensuring that they are as varied as possible.

621. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.12 adopted to inscribe 'Kumbh Mela' on the Representative List.**

622. The **delegation of India** extended its gratitude to the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for their efforts towards the inscription of Kumbh Mela, the festival of the Sacred Pitcher, the largest peaceful congregation of pilgrims on Earth. It took note of the observations made by the Evaluation Body regarding the use of inappropriate language and standardized consent letters, and would strive to incorporate them in future nominations. The Evaluation Body had also expressed its concerns regarding the risks to the element associated with tourism and increased visitor participation. It was noted that the Maha Kumbh or the Grand Kumbh Mela held at Allahabad in 2013 had seen the participation of 130 million people, of which 30 million arrived in the course of a single day. This showed that both governmental authorities and community stakeholders had already put in place mechanisms and safeguarding measures to ensure the continued protection of the element, and would continue to improve upon them in the future. Getting lost or separated from the family during a Kumbh Mela used to be so commonplace that it found its way into an idiom; siblings separated at the Kumbh Mela is still used to refer to strangers who show remarkable similarities or those who get along surprisingly well. In 2015, during the Mela in Nashik, a web-based lost-and-found platform online application called 'Milaap', meaning reunion, was launched to prevent such cases from occurring in the future. It was launched during a technology festival called Kumbha Thon organized for the sole purpose of finding ways to solve Kumbh Mela-related problems by means of technology. This demonstrated the participation of communities in the festival, and the festival's ability to adapt to and benefit from the modern world. The ritual bathing in the holy rivers during the festival is supposed to cleanse an individual of all his sins – the desire to be reborn, to lay the ghosts of the past to rest and to start afresh. This opportunity to renew oneself is the reason millions of people – from the ordinary householder to the ash-covered Naga ascetic – participate in this festival.

The delegation not only thanked this Committee for the inscription, but also invited everyone to participate in its next edition.

623. The **Chairperson** congratulated India, and turned to the next nomination file.

624. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Pinisi, art of boatbuilding in South Sulawesi'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.13], submitted by Indonesia. The element refers to the famed 'Sulawesi' schooner and represents the epitome of the Archipelago's indigenous sailing craft. Today, boatbuilding centres are located at Tana Beru, Bira and Batu Licin, where shipbuilding and sailing are central to the communities' social, economic and cultural fabric. Knowledge and skills are transmitted from generation to generation, both within and outside the family circle, and local shipwrights are engaged in active marketing initiatives to safeguard the practice. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Pinisi, or the art of boatbuilding in South Sulawesi, is a practice involving sophisticated cognitive concepts that outline the three-dimensional form of a ship and its countless components, as well as the advanced social organization necessary to successfully build, operate and navigate trading vessels. Nowadays, the Pinisi schooner symbolizes erudition and customs, and has become an epitome of the Archipelago's maritime tradition per se. R.2: The inscription of the element would raise awareness of the importance of indigenous knowledge systems and local wisdom. Recognition of the art of boat construction and marine culture would promote respect for human creativity, mutual understanding and intercultural dialogue. R.3: Around 500 people have been directly employed in the construction and outfitting of the ships, thus contributing to the viability of the element. The proposed safeguarding measures comprise: inventorying and documentation; the provision of raw materials; the preparation of teaching materials; the promotion of design and artwork competitions; the organization of annual boat festivals; and awareness raising among visitors, among other activities. R.4: The preparation of the nomination file involved a wide spectrum of relevant stakeholders, including the bearer communities, NGOs, researchers and academics, government institutions and public figures, all of whom provided their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognized that the element was included on the Inventory List of the Cultural Wealth of Indonesia in 2010. However, there is no clear explanation of who is responsible for maintaining the inventory, or the involvement of communities, groups and relevant NGOs in its drafting. Information on the frequency with which it is updated was also missing in the file. Thus, the Committee recommended referring the nomination to the submitting State Party.

625. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson for the detailed explanation of the different issues. This was another case of a dual system of draft decisions. Pursuant to the established working method, the Committee had received written information from the submitting State concerning the questions raised by the Evaluation Body in its recommendation. This written information would be attached for the record to the nomination file. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, the submitting State was given the floor to provide the relevant information regarding the institution responsible for maintaining the inventory, the involvement of communities, groups and relevant NGOs in its drafting, and the periodicity of updating of the inventory.

626. The **delegation of Indonesia** expressed its appreciation to the Chairperson and the Government of the Republic of Korea for hosting this session. The delegation explained that the process of listing Indonesia's intangible cultural heritage was carried out on its website. Indonesia adopted two types of listing of its intangible cultural heritage. The first one, called *Pencatatan* or 'recorded', was listed by communities, groups, individuals, researchers and so on, from their respective regions. By the end of 2016, 7,241 elements had been submitted to the list. The second one, called *Penetapan*, or the 'designation' or 'declared', was the list of intangible cultural heritage taken from the first list after its evaluation by a team of experts and declared by the Minister of Education and Culture through several decrees. Up until 2017, there were 594 elements on this list. The delegation further explained that both the 'recorded' and the 'declared' lists of intangible cultural heritage were maintained by the

Minister of Education and Culture. Both lists were also created with the involvement of communities, groups and NGOs, among others. The parties who had been involved in drafting the file for Pinisi had been presented in the recent email sent last week, as requested. The recorded list could be updated at any time since 2010. The declared list, in accordance with national status, was updated once a year. The first update had been declared on 13 December 2013 and the most recent one on 29 September 2017. The lists were available on the website, but the declared lists were published once a year. A copy of the publication was available for consultation.

627. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that Pinisi manifests a longstanding boatbuilding and navigation tradition in Indonesia. As an archipelagic country, the Philippines shared a similar tradition. It thanked Indonesia for submitting additional information to show that the file also met criterion R.5, and cooperation among local and central government officials, academicians, communities and NGOs ensured the inclusion of Pinisi in the inventory list of cultural wealth in 2010. According to Indonesia, this inventory list had been evaluated annually by a pool of experts on history, folklore ceremony and ritual, among others, since 2013. The delegation thus supported the inscription of the element.

628. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that the element celebrated indigenous know-how and knowledge and was transmitted from generation to generation. The wide involvement of all stakeholders – NGOs, stakeholders and practitioners – was noted in the Body's evaluation, which it welcomed. In addition, the explanations provided, including the first list produced by the communities and the bearers, and the second list, which was the subject of a selection by the Ministry, proved that the communities had been involved in the development of this file in a direct and indirect way. From that point of view, and also from the books presented, as well as from the clear explanation by Indonesia of the updating and recording of intangible cultural heritage during 2013–2017, the delegation remarked that it would be a pity not to inscribe this important element.

629. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the delegations of Philippines and Senegal for their interventions and added that it strongly supported the option of inscription of this element.

630. The **Chairperson** noted the many speakers – the Republic of Korea, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Saint Lucia, Ethiopia, Colombia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Hungary and Turkey – but no opposing views. The Chairperson thus turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted. Based on the interventions, it seemed that the Committee was now satisfied with the information provided. Criterion R.5 was duly adopted. Paragraphs 3–6 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.13 adopted to inscribe 'Pinisi, art of boatbuilding in South Sulawesi' on the Representative List.**

631. The **delegation of Indonesia** was very grateful for the decision, and thanked all the Committee Members, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body. It was committed to the preservation and safeguarding of Pinisi, the art of boatbuilding in South Sulawesi, and would continue to pay attention to the impact of the inscription on environmental sustainability. The delegation had enforced a plan for the trees used as the raw material for the boats, and it would ensure the effective and practical transmission of the relevant know-how on boatbuilding to the younger generation. It invited the Deputy Regent of Bulukumba, where Pinisi has been built for generations since the 14th century, to say a few words.

632. The **Deputy Regent of Bulukumba** spoke on behalf of the people of the Regency of Bulukumba, the Province of South Sulawesi and the people of Indonesia, He thanked the Committee for the inscription of Pinisi, remarking that this decision provided more confidence to help protect and preserve this culture and tradition.

[A short film on the element was projected]

633. The **Chairperson** congratulated Kazakhstan, and turned to the next nomination file.

634. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Chogān, a horse-riding game accompanied by music and storytelling'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.14], submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Chogān is a horse-riding game traditionally played in royal courts and urban fields and accompanied by music and storytelling. In Chogān, two rider teams compete and the aim is to pass the ball through the opposing team's goal by using a wooden stick. Chogān has a strong connection with the identity and history of its bearers and practitioners. It is transmitted informally within the family sphere, as well as by dedicated associations through training and support for local masters. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element refers to a traditional horse-riding game, accompanied by music and storytelling. The file describes the variety of values associated with Chogān, the connection between nature, humankind and horses that it establishes, the exhilaration and entertainment value of the game and the sense of belonging to society and history that it fosters. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and raising awareness of its importance, since the element fosters an interaction and engagement between humankind, nature, oral traditions and craftsmanship. It would also encourage dialogue at the national and international levels. R.3: Past and current efforts to safeguard the element have been constantly undertaken. A five-year safeguarding plan covers funding for seasonal and annual festival, research activities, the publication of booklets, annual tribute ceremonies, the establishment of an archive for the element, and training activities for players and apprentices. R.4: The nomination file has been compiled by an Inscription Committee formed by the representatives of the five provincial associations, the representative of the Office for Inscription of Heritage, and the representative of the Iranian National Commission for UNESCO. Various stakeholders provided their consent to the nomination. R.5: The element was included in the National Representative Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2010, maintained by the Office for Inscriptions, Preservation and Revitalization of Intangible and Natural Heritage. Drawn up with the participation of the communities concerned, it was updated every one to three years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Chogān, a horse-riding game accompanied by music and storytelling, on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for the innovative safeguarding initiatives involving awareness raising among youth through the creative use of multimedia, and invite it to report the outcomes of such initiatives in the following periodic report. The Committee might further invite the State Party to avoid the use of inappropriate vocabulary when referring to intangible cultural heritage, such as the 'World ICH List', which may lead to confusion with the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

635. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.14 adopted to inscribe 'Chogān, a horse-riding game accompanied by music and storytelling' on the Representative List.**

636. The **delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** remarked in the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful [recites in Persian] in the cosmic game of Chogān, you are the ball. The mallets left and right become your call, he who causes your movement, your rise and fall, he is the one, the only one, who knows it all – Omar Khayam, 1123 AD. The delegation extended its gratitude for the warm hospitality and excellent organization of the session by the Korean hosts. It was an honour to have the opportunity to bolster friendship, peace and reconciliation among all the Member States of the Convention. Chogān, a horse-riding game accompanied by music and storytelling contributes to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Chogān is a part of the Iranian worldview, which has managed and showcased diverse cultural and artistic trades in the shape of a ritual game. One of the capabilities of this game is to bolster connections between humankind, nature and the horse, using the game, music and performance. This game is considered to be the game of kings and the king of games in Iran, and its symbols have managed to ingrain themselves in all the facets of Iranian day-to-day life. The game of polo, which had currently expanded to the

majority of the countries in the world, had its roots in the physical parts of Chogān. The delegation was pleased to share this valuable element with the world, and it expressed its gratitude towards the Secretariat and all the delegates.

637. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Islamic Republic of Iran. Returning to the incident, the Chairperson recalled that, on the first day, he had announced, in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Rules of Procedure, that his duty as Chairperson was to ensure the smooth conduct of the proceedings and the maintenance of order. This would be his main line of action during the debates. Based on this guideline, he had allowed delegation members to speak a little longer than two minutes. However, as from today he would introduce a new system, which the Secretariat would explain. When one delegation took the floor upon the invitation of the Chairperson, another delegation cutting in without permission would be considered damaging behaviour, encroaching upon the authority of the Chairperson. In his capacity as Chairperson, he expressed deep regret about the delegation concerned for this inappropriate conduct and requested that this not be repeated in the future.

638. The **Secretary** informed the delegates that as of today, the Chairperson could request that all the microphones be cut in the room at the same time.

639. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Islamic Republic of Iran, turning to the next nomination.

640. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Art of crafting and playing with Kamantcheh/Kamancha, a bowed string musical instrument'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.15], submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran and Azerbaijan. The element, a bowed string instrument, has existed for over 1,000 years. In the Islamic Republic of Iran and Azerbaijan, it is a major element of classical and folkloric music, and performances occupy a central place in many gatherings. Kamantcheh/Kamancha is both a key source of earning a living, and a strong part of the communities' living heritage. Knowledge relating to the art of crafting and playing Kamantcheh/Kamancha is transmitted both within families and in musical institutions. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The art of crafting and playing with Kamantcheh/Kamancha is practised and transmitted both as an expression of vernacular culture and as a professional art. It represents a strong source of cultural identity, including for many Iranians and Azerbaijanis living abroad. R.2: The inscription of an element made up of various arts would raise awareness about the diversity and manifold expressions of intangible cultural heritage. The inscription would also strengthen cultural ties and dialogue between both amateur and professional craftspeople and performers in the two countries, as well as between their audiences. R.3: In both countries, communities have undertaken various efforts to ensure the viability of the element. Submitting States Parties plan to apply the existing legislation and institutional framework to allocate funds and human resources, and to avoid large-scale uncontrolled production of the instrument. R.4: The nomination of the element was carried out at the initiative of the community, in collaboration with other stakeholders and coordinated by the Iran House of Music. The community members declared their free, prior and informed consent to the joint nomination. R.5: The element was included in the National Inventory List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Islamic Republic of Iran in 2014, maintained by the Office for Inscriptions and Preservation and Revitalization of Intangible and Natural Heritage, and updated every one to three years. The element was included in the Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Azerbaijan in 2013, supervised by the Documentation and Inventory Board and was last updated in 2015. Both States Parties demonstrated the involvement of the communities concerned in drawing up the inventories. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe art of crafting and playing with Kamantcheh/Kamancha, a bowed string instrument on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the States Parties for the inclusion in the safeguarding measures of a committee established to monitor the impact of the increased visibility resulting from an inscription.

641. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received.

642. The **delegation of Armenia** could not agree to this draft decision as a whole or to any of its paragraphs, and was against the adoption of this draft decision. Armenia dissociated itself from this decision and requested that this statement be reflected in the summary records. At the same time, it congratulated the Islamic Republic of Iran for presenting such an impeccable file. Armenia would not have dissociated itself from the file if there had not been inaccuracies contained in the second part of the nomination file. The Islamic Republic of Iran had done a meticulous job with its part of the file. In 2012, the 300th anniversary of the birth of Sayat-Nova had been celebrated in association with UNESCO. He was a poet, musician and also a Kamancha-player, whose art was renowned throughout the Caucasus and brought people closer. He sang in Armenian, Georgian, Farsi and Turkish, which reflected multinationalism. The delegation concluded by remarking that the Azerbaijani permanent representative had yesterday confirmed that he had no access to Karabakh, and thus how could the State-financed workshop in Shushi be organized over the last few decades. For the last few decades, Shushi had been financed from the State budget of Artsakh.

643. The **delegation of Turkey** welcomed that the element was also practised, especially in the north of Turkey, under the name Kamantcheh, and that it had been presented by Azerbaijan and Iran for its inscription on the Representative List. Kamantcheh, which is a major folkloric instrument, occupies a central role in the identity of mostly Black Sea people. The art of playing and crafting is transmitted from generation to generation. It is also registered in Turkey's inventory. As is obvious, Kamantcheh is yet another element shared across different countries; as such, it is an ideal element for a possible multinational file as well. On this occasion, it invited all States Parties to make use of their shared elements through multinational files in order to facilitate dialogue between cultures and communities, and Turkey would be happy to join the extended file in the future if the States Parties should so consider it. However, at a time when almost all UNESCO members were concerned about the increasing politicization of this Organization, and repeatedly calling for dialogue, mutual understanding and respect for each other, regretfully there was yet again another Committee meeting hijacked by one country purely on political grounds. Since yesterday, Committee Members had once again been held hostage by the political claims of one single country. They were not here to accommodate the political interests of one State Party who could not act in goodwill and acted against the principles of this Convention. Committee Members had a responsibility to make sure that interventions were in line with the spirit of this Convention. They called on the Committee not to allow the consideration of such bilateral political problems in their meeting, but to focus on the element and its contributions to the intangible cultural heritage of humanity. The delegation concluded by congratulating Azerbaijan and Iran for successfully presenting this old tradition of the region for inscription on the Representative List.

644. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.15 adopted to inscribe 'Art of crafting and playing with Kamantcheh/Kamancha, a bowed string musical instrument' on the Representative List.**

645. The **delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** remarked in the name of God its honour in sharing joy at the inscription of Kamantcheh or Kamancha proposed with Azerbaijan. In harmony with its belief in promoting the spirit of the Convention, as well as its appreciation of shared cultural diversity, this nomination file was another practical step in this direction. It therefore welcomed other Member States who shared the same element to join the nomination. The delegation also expressed its thanks and sincerest congratulations to the Azeri colleagues whose heartfelt efforts in co-preparing the nomination were once again proved. It was known that the field of music is rich and diverse and that the more you work on it, the less your efforts seem. Finally, the Islamic Republic of Iran saw intangible cultural heritage as an important and effective vehicle for the rapprochement of diverse cultures, and it expressed its readiness for more active and practical cooperation for a multinational nomination file.

646. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Chairperson for his earlier clarification regarding the incident the previous day, apologizing for the regrettable and unintended outburst, which

was a reaction to the misconduct and unethical behaviour demonstrated. The delegation profoundly thanked the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran for its cooperation and excellent work coordination, and expressed deep gratitude to the Committee for inscribing Kamancha Art on the Representative List. This was actually a historical moment for Kamancha practitioners, to see their heritage recognized at the international level, and jointly with communities from the Islamic Republic of Iran. The inscription of Kamancha actually raised the unity and diversity of the heritage for the sake of peace and mutual respect. It demonstrates how a single intangible heritage element shared across borders could help communities accept each other's differences. This nomination represented an exemplary form of contribution to enhancing international cooperation, one of the core principles of this Convention, which Azerbaijan has been doing for many years in preparing joint nomination files with neighbouring countries. In this spirit, the delegation invited Turkey and other countries where this element exists to join this multinational nomination.

647. The **Chairperson** congratulated the submitting countries and turned to the next nomination.

648. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Uilleann piping'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.16], submitted by Ireland. Uilleann piping is a musical practice in which a particular type of bagpipe, known as the 'uilleann', 'Irish' or 'union' pipes, is used to play traditional music. Bearers and practitioners include participants of all ages, dispersed throughout the world. Uilleann piping offers an important way of socializing, providing a sense of rootedness and a connection to the past. Knowledge and skills are transmitted using both long-established and modern practices, and the practice is primarily safeguarded through the efforts of the group Na Piorabairi Uilleann. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The practice is recognized within bearer communities and more broadly as part of Irish heritage. It is informed by a centuries-old tradition and is constantly evolving. For community members, the element forms a very strong and valuable bond, allowing them to take pride in a native form of cultural expression and consequently enjoy a sense of self-worth. R.2: The inscription of the element would help raise awareness about the values of indigenous art forms. It would also heighten the visibility of the element and, in turn, of living heritage in general. As this is the first nomination from Ireland, the inscription would foster discussions on the importance of living heritage in the country. R.3: Since 1968, the NGO the Society of Irish Pipers (NPU) has carried out the safeguarding activities with constant and active support from the bearer communities and government agencies. Measures include transmission, an instrument bank, a historical house for activities in Dublin, educational activities and awareness raising, among other measures. R.4: Through the NPU, the communities concerned were central to the nomination process. The input, support and consent of the communities was openly sought through the NPU's website and publications. The groups and individuals concerned consented widely across the highly personalized letters. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognized that the element was included in the interim National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2016, supervised by the Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. However, the nomination file did not demonstrate clearly how the inventory was drawn up with the participation of the communities, groups and NGOs concerned. Moreover, it did not indicate how regularly the inventory is updated. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Uilleann piping to the submitting State.

649. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson for its detailed explanation of the different issues. He gave the floor to the submitting State to provide the relevant information regarding the participation of communities in the inventorying process, and the periodicity with which the inventory is updated.

650. The **delegation of Ireland** thanked the Government of Korea and Jeju for their generous hospitality and warm welcome. This was Ireland's first nomination for inscription, which had generated huge interest and excitement within the Uilleann piping community and within the wider traditional music community in Ireland. When Ireland ratified the Convention on 22 December 2015, the Minister for Culture moved to put in place an intranational inventory, as provided for in Article 11(b) of the Convention. This was to enable Ireland to respond quickly

to the requests from a number of communities for recognition under the Convention. A steering group met on 27 February 2016, and since then the Minister had moved to put this in place on a more formal basis, with a national call recently issued. This national call was an invitation across communities to nominate – through an application system available on the website of the Department of Culture – any element of intangible cultural heritage that they believed met the specific criteria. The call for applications would remain open until 31 January 2018. Applications arising from this process would be considered by an expanded advisory steering committee comprising practitioners and experts, with an equal gender balance, from the field of intangible cultural heritage who would meet in the spring of 2018 to discuss these nominations. The open call procedure would occur every two years, following which the inventory would be updated with the new elements being added to the existing two elements, of which Uilleann piping was one. The piping community had been fully consulted in the preliminary process of drafting the nomination prior to its submission to the initial steering group, and actually it was the community of pipers who had encouraged its representative organization, Na Piorabairi Uilleann, to seek UNESCO accreditation as a recognized NGO in 2014.

651. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked Ireland for the explanation, adding that it believed that Uilleann piping, Ireland's first nomination file, was well-prepared in general. It noted that Ireland, having constituted their inventory system recently, had encountered some problems in the inventorying process, which should be taken into consideration by the Committee. The delegation found that Ireland's explanation on R.5 was clear and satisfactory.

652. The **delegation of Mauritius** found the explanation to be clear, and it supported inscription.

653. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked Ireland for the additional information provided, and it fully supported its first inscription and encouraged it to continue.

654. The **Chairperson** noted the many speakers – Turkey, Cyprus, Hungary, Mauritius, Mongolia, Palestine, Bulgaria, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Algeria, Zambia, Senegal, Côte d'Ivoire and Lebanon – but no opposing views. The Chairperson thus turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted. Based on the interventions, it seemed that the Committee was now satisfied with the information provided. Criterion R.5 was thus duly adopted. Paragraphs 3–5 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.16 adopted to inscribe 'Uilleann piping' on the Representative List.**

655. The **delegation of Ireland** spoke on behalf of the government to thank the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their efforts on its submission of Uilleann piping. It was deeply honoured to have its first element inscribed on the Representative List. Ireland is a country with a strong tradition of sharing culture around the world, and it understood the importance of safeguarding, respecting and passing on living culture in its many forms. The delegation particularly thanked Na Piorabairi Uilleann and the bearers of the tradition of Uilleann piping for their efforts over many years not only to strengthen and develop this tradition but also to ensure its transition to new generations. Their support of and involvement with this process was essential to its success. This inscription was only the start of further engagement by Ireland with the work of UNESCO and the Committee.

[A short film on the element was projected]

656. The **Chairperson** congratulated Ireland and turned to the next nomination file.

657. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'The art of the Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo''** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.17], submitted by Italy. The element is a culinary practice consisting of four different phases relating to the preparation of the dough and its baking in a wood-fired oven. The practice originates in Naples, where about 3,000 Pizzaiuoli now live and perform, and plays a key role in fostering social gatherings and intergenerational exchange. Knowledge and skills related to the element are primarily transmitted in the 'bottega' of the 'Pizzaiuolo' where young apprentices can observe their

master at work. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element represents the culinary know-how related to pizza-making, involving gestures, songs, facial expressions, local slang, the skills of manipulating pizza dough, performing and sharing. The bearers and guests engage in a social ritual with the Pizzaiuolo, whose bench and oven serve as a 'stage' during the pizza-making process. R.2: The inscription of the element would point to the importance of food traditions as strong identity markers that are easily accessible to a wide audience from different cultural backgrounds. The skills involved are a testimony to the creativity of the practitioners. It would further foster dialogue between the community concerned, both in Italy and worldwide. R.3: The viability of the element has so far been ensured by the communities concerned through a wide range of activities. The safeguarding measures proposed include: educational programmes and vocational training; the International Exhibition of Pizzaiuolo Napoletano; research and cultural mapping; collecting oral histories of master bearers; and a mobile application related to the element, among other measures. R.4: The nomination has been prepared by the Association of Neapolitan Pizzaiuoli and the Ministry of Agriculture, with the participation of community members, including related associations, scholars, experts and primary schools. Support has been testified, including through children's artworks, together with other consent letters. R.5: The element is included in the 2010 National Inventory of Artisans and Traditional Techniques, and, in 2012, in the National Register of Traditional Knowledge established by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry Policies. The office responsible for the artisan inventory is the National Committee for the Promotion and Preservation of Italian Foodstuffs and Practices. It was drawn up with the participation of communities, groups and relevant NGOs and is updated annually. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Art of Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo' on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to remind the State Party to avoid expressions such as 'authenticity', 'counterfeit', 'geographic origin', as well as any reference to exclusive ownership of intangible cultural heritage. The Committee might underline that safeguarding measures aimed at preserving the authenticity of an element of intangible cultural heritage are not in line with the spirit of the Convention and would contradict the evolving nature of living heritage, which is by definition constantly re-created by the communities concerned.

658. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.17 adopted to inscribe 'The art of the Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo'' on the Representative List.**

659. The **delegation of Italy** spoke on behalf of Italy to express its warmest thanks to the Committee for inscribing the art of the Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo' on the Representative List. It was an honour, together with a sense of great satisfaction, to see the work of the passionate involvement of the communities concerned recognized. The art of the Neapolitan 'Pizzaiuolo' is a very special and old tradition that is known the world over, which is transmitted from generation to generation and which is constantly evolving, transformed and enriched in response to the environment and living conditions. Italy strongly believes that heritage as a whole, and intangible heritage in particular, is the bedrock of cultural diversity. This diversity is so essential to ensure a sustainable future for humanity, especially today with the threat of the standardization of cultures. The delegation reiterated its government's commitment to the Convention, and the belief that the preservation of intangible heritage in all its diversity is a fundamental instrument for fostering rapprochement, dialogue, social cohesion and feelings of belonging and peace. It expressed thanks to the Neapolitan pizzaiuoli who were gathered in Naples waiting for this inscription.

660. The **Chairperson** congratulated Italy, and turned to the next nomination file.

661. **The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Kok boru, traditional horse game'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.19], submitted by Kyrgyzstan. Kok boru, a traditional horse game, is a synthesis of traditional practices and performances. The game is played by two teams on horseback who compete by trying to score as many 'ulaks'

(a mould in modern-day games) into their opponents' goal as possible. The element is an expression of the cultural and historic tradition of its practitioners, and unites communities regardless of their social status. Related knowledge and skills are primarily transmitted through demonstration, as well as during festive and social events. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Kok boru is a traditional nomadic game involving humans and horses, reflecting their close relationship. It constitutes an important dimension of the cultural heritage of the communities concerned in Kyrgyzstan. The element fosters and transmits a strong code of ethics, including notions of teamwork, patience and mutual respect. R.2: The inscription of the element would raise the visibility of a traditional form of social and spiritual entertainment. It would also reinforce feelings of pride and self-respect of practitioners of traditional sports by highlighting the relevance of such practices in modern societies. R.3: Past and current measures to safeguard the element include the transmission of traditional knowledge and skills, research and documentation activities resulting in publications such as practical guides developed by practitioners, among other measures. R.4: Through a series of consultative meetings, the communities, bearers and practitioners of Kok boru participated actively in all stages of the preparation of the nomination file and gave their consent to the nomination of the element, as demonstrated by the consent letters attached. R.5: Kok Boru was included in the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Inventory in 2015 under the responsibility of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic. Carried out with the participation of representatives of regional federations and communities, the inventory is updated once every three years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Kok boru, traditional horse game on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to remind the State to pay specific attention to the linguistic quality of the file and to avoid inappropriate terms that contradict the spirit of the Convention, such as the notion of 'world culture'. The Committee might commend the State for the submission of an improved file following the referral of the nomination in 2015.

662. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.19 adopted to inscribe 'Kok boru, traditional horse game' on the Representative List.**

663. The **delegation of Kyrgyzstan** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee, the representatives of States Parties, NGOs and Observers. On behalf of the Kyrgyz Republic, the delegation expressed gratitude to the Government of the Republic of Korea and to the Administration of Jeju Island for the excellent organization of the Committee's work. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for its excellent work in evaluating all the nominations, with many thanks to the Committee for the understanding and support of its cultural heritage element. The delegation noted that the Evaluation Body had positively evaluated nomination files from several countries of Central Asia in this cycle. In this regard, it thanked the Secretariat for the capacity-building programme that had made it possible to raise national capacities in the field of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, more specifically, in improving the quality of proposed nominations. Today, hundreds of Kok boru practitioners and thousands of game-lovers and followers throughout the country share in the joy related to the inscription of this traditional horse game on the Representative List. In this regard, the delegation thanked the community that safeguarded, developed and transmitted it from generation to generation. This nomination would not have been possible without their courage and dedication to the game. Once again, it thanked all those who had contributed to the organization of the Committee's work and wished everyone a productive and successful session over the coming days.

[A short film on the element was projected]

664. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Khaen music of the Lao people'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.20], submitted by Lao People's Democratic Republic. The Khaen music of the Lao people is played with a mouth organ that resembles

panpipes but made with bamboo tubes of varying lengths. It is integral to Lao life and promotes family and social cohesion. Families play an important role in transmitting the art, and associations exist in many communities where young people can learn the related skills. To maintain the practice, several local communities and groups have taken various initiatives to safeguard the element through formal and non-formal education. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following the criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The Khaen music is practised widely in many different communities and in numerous settings, including during village festivals, accompanying traditional songs and dances, and at various community and religious ceremonies. It holds diverse functions and meanings within the traditional folk culture of Lao people. R.2: The inscription of Khaen music and its performance would encourage international dialogue across the country and in other countries. It would also demonstrate the relevance of living heritage for creativity and sustainable development in general. R.4: Through a series of consultations and successive workshops organized by the Ministry of Information, Culture and Tourism, the representatives of the communities, associations and individuals concerned participated actively in all stages of the preparation of the nomination. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information included in the file was not sufficient to conclude that the following criteria for inscription were satisfied. R.3: Several local communities, associations, groups or persons have undertaken educational or promotional activities. The government has created a national action plan and adequate policies for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. However, the nomination file did not present any safeguarding measures to be implemented in the future. The measures listed had already been undertaken and also appear to have been designed in a top-down approach. They also seem to be generic rather than specifically designated for the element in question. As for R.5, the element was included in the inventory as reviewed in 2013 and approved in 2014 with the participation of communities. Nevertheless, it was not clear from the file how the inventory was regularly updated and which body was responsible for maintaining it. There was also no relevant extract from the inventory. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Khaen music of the Lao people to the submitting State. The Committee might wish to remind the State of the need to provide information in the appropriate sections of the file.

665. The **delegation of Armenia** supported the nomination of Lao People's Democratic Republic as evidence of the intangible cultural heritage of the country. The delegation suggested that the country provide some explanations regarding safeguarding measures of the element.

666. The **delegation of Cyprus** had received further explanations from the State Party, and it thus supported the nomination, adding that the explanations on both the safeguarding measures and the inventory were satisfactory.

667. The **delegation of Palestine** confirmed that it had indeed received information on R.5 and R.3, which was clearly satisfactory for R.5. For R.3, it wished to hear from the State Party.

668. The **delegation of Lao People's Democratic Republic** wished to make some important clarifications following the comments on sections R.3 and R.5 of the nomination file so as to avoid disappointment for the communities of practitioners. It was noted that this nomination was the first for the country. It had been decided at the previous session of the Committee, held in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia), that should certain nomination files raise questions among the experts, then the States concerned would be consulted to provide the necessary details. However, until today, no request had been received by post or email. It was therefore to its greatest surprise to learn of the expectations on arriving at the meeting. For this reason, the delegation appealed for indulgence and understanding in taking into account its response regarding R.3 on future safeguarding measures. The delegation explained that some safeguarding measures, extending beyond 2017, had been indicated on the submitted document. It remarked that it had not received the necessary advice with regard to the subtleties of the nomination in R.3, which was clearly mastered by some countries with prior experience in the preparation of files. Consequently, the Committee was asked to take into account the three safeguarding measures that it was committed to from 2018. Firstly, the creation of a website dedicated to music, songs and traditional dances of the Lao people that

would valorize Khaen music and integrate information already collected in the form of videos. This action was planned as part of the country's five-year plan for 2018–2023. Currently, a consultation of young practitioners was organized in order to gather testimonials, and to encourage a reflection on the expression in partnership with the schools and associations concerned. These testimonies would be kept in a video format and in written transcription, and would be posted on the aforementioned website. In the case of the various associations, with the support of the Ministry of Information and Culture and the Ministry of Education, a training project to produce Khaen would be organized: training workshops during the school holidays and led by practitioners on the gestures, knowledge and use of the raw materials necessary for the manufacture of instruments, and so on. This project was also planned under the five-year plan for 2018–2023. Various measures would be implemented to protect and promote the element. It was emphasized that the younger generation was becoming increasingly interested in Khaen music, as it embodied their belonging to a common and living culture, and offered a highly appreciated collective sense of shared happiness, and thus benefited from the broad support of the villagers, the Union of Older Persons, the Union of Lao Women, and art and performance associations.

669. The **delegation of Cuba** was satisfied with the information provided by the State Party, as well as the information received in writing. It is a very important element for the culture of this country, and in addition, it was its first nomination, which added value for the country and for the community. The delegation thus supported the inscription of the element.

670. The **delegation of Zambia** supported the nomination, but also remarked that the State Party needed to be prepared to share the information well in advance so that the Committee could make an informed decision. The delegation added that it was in the dark concerning criterion R.3, as well as paragraphs R.3 and R.5 [of the draft decision]. In that vein, it supported the remarks by Cuba that this information be put in writing, which might validate its support for the nomination.

671. The **delegation of the Congo** believed that the information provided, especially on criteria R.3 and R.5, was sufficient to inscribe the element, adding that it was desirable to attach importance to this nomination by giving it the maximum chance for inscription.

672. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee was ready to move to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 and R.1, R.2, R.4, were also adopted. With no further comments on R.3 or R.5, they were duly adopted.

673. The **delegation of Cyprus** remarked that the Committee could not adopt paragraphs 3 and 5, which appeared not to satisfy the Evaluation Body, and would thus have to be modified.

674. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** had the same point, appealing to the Members who were satisfied with the explanations given to propose amendments.

675. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that it was not in a dual option scenario, and for a file to be inscribed, all five criteria needed to be met. Once a paragraph was adopted in which the file did not meet the criteria, it could not adopt the inscription.

676. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to return to R.2, which was already adopted, apologizing for not reacting earlier. However, R.3 and R.5 had already been presented and were met.

677. The **Secretary** clarified that no written amendments or information pertaining to this file had been received from any Committee Member. However, the Committee could always amend on the screen.

678. The **delegation of Mauritius** was concerned with the situation of the statement, as it was the first time that an inscription had been applied for by the State Party. Nevertheless, the delegation sought clarification on the fact that no correspondence had been sent to the State Party regarding the missing information.

679. The **Chairperson** noted that there were now two options, and proposed suspending the debate on this file to give more time to the Committee Members to reflect on the file.

680. The **delegation of the Philippines** agreed with the Chairperson's ruling, but asked that the Secretariat respond to the question raised by Mauritius.

681. The **Secretary** recalled that the question concerned whether the Secretariat had received any information from the submitting State, reminding the Committee that from the dual option scenario, the Chairperson had invited submitting States to send information concerning elements for inscription directly to the Secretariat. Amendments to a decision did not preclude the need for missing or additional information sent in the normal process. Amendments had to be sent by Committee Members, and no proposed amendments had been received from any Committee Members.

682. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretary for his response, but it understood from the delegation of Laos's remarks that it had not received any information about the evaluation. The delegation thus sought clarification on this point, as it was not in relation to any amendments that had or had not been received.

683. The **Secretary** explained that the normal procedure for all nominations was that the Secretariat, in the first year, checks the sections of the file for completeness; the Secretariat makes no analysis of the quality of the file nor any study of its contents. If any elements appear to be missing, i.e. in the case of incomplete boxes, then the Secretariat would send a letter to the State Party informing them that information was missing. The submitting State would then have until September to return any information in the 'completeness check'. Following this phase, the file goes to the Evaluation Body. It is the Evaluation Body that actually conducts the analysis based on the information in the file, and decides whether the information is sufficient to meet the criterion. There is no going back to the submitting State after that phase. Thus, the Secretariat did not inform the State Party at that stage of the procedure, as it is not established in the guidelines. This is to say that the Secretariat does not go back to the State Party once the Evaluation Body has made its recommendation.

684. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretary for the explanation, adding that this was why it was necessary to continue the process of reflection regarding procedures, as the procedures and mechanisms were not always clear for everyone. Furthermore, the Committee could take note of the recommendations of the Evaluation Body, but the Committee had also agreed at the beginning of this session that it also had the right to submit amendments to the draft decision on the screen.

685. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that it now sounded as though the State Party had not been informed at all about the missing information under R.3 and R.5; however, the Report of the Evaluation Body was available online at least four weeks before the Committee session, so it was available.

686. The **Secretary** was of the understanding, from the intervention by the submitting State, that no correspondence had been received on the recommendation under R.3 and R.5. The Secretary clarified that this was standard procedure; the Secretariat did not inform or write letters to any State Party on the outcome of the Evaluation Body prior to the Committee's decision. However, the decisions made by the Evaluation Body were available online for consultation by the States Parties concerned.

687. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked the Secretary for the clarification, noting that there appeared to have been a misunderstanding with Laos. However, now that the procedure was clear, the submitting State should be given time to present the information later.

688. The **delegation of Armenia** agreed with Cyprus, adding that it sought some time to prepare an amendment in this regard.

689. The **delegation of Zambia** supported the remarks by Cyprus to suspend this item so that Laos could be given time to provide the information.

690. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed to suspend this item to give time to the State Party and the Members of the Committee to submit amendments to the Secretariat.

691. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** supported Palestine, adding that it was also ready to work on the amendments.

692. The **Chairperson** thanked Saint Lucia, and agreed to move to the next nomination.

693. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Nsima, the culinary tradition of Malawi'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.21], submitted by Malawi. The element is a compound name for the culinary and dietary tradition of Malawians, as well as a single component of this tradition, a form of thick porridge prepared with maize flour. Nsima is prepared through an elaborate process requiring specific knowledge, and eating it is a communal tradition in families. Communities safeguard the element through continued practice, publications, festivals and revitalization activities, and knowledge transmitted informally between adults and children, as well as through on-the-job training and education. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Nsima is a culinary/dietary tradition accompanied by ritual practices, based on the use of thick porridge, which is usually made with maize flour. Its preparation encompasses a specific body of knowledge, skills and practices concerning nature and the universe. The element plays an essential role in terms of socialization and hospitality. R.2: The inscription of Nsima would help to reintroduce this element into culinary practices in towns where people have moved away from the traditional to modern life. It could therefore contribute to raising awareness among people, as well as improving their nutritional status. The great diversity of traditions relating to the preparation of food could demonstrate the creativity of practitioners and further inspire bearers of similar culinary practices. R.3: The proposed activities relate to: awareness raising; monograph-oriented research into local variations of Nsima; legal protection; and education, training and monitoring. The communities and groups concerned contribute to ensuring the element's viability by publicizing books of recipes, organizing festivals by tribal chiefs, introducing machine mills into the preparation of Nsima to help lower the costs of the practice, and so on. R.4: The nomination process completed the previous inventorying process, which lasted four years. Through a series of meetings, the communities, groups and individuals concerned participated actively in all stages of the preparation of the nomination. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognized that the element was included in the Inventory of Malawi's Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2013, which was created by the Department of Arts and Crafts in collaboration with Museums of Malawi, the National Commission for UNESCO and representatives of eight tribal communities. However, the file did not demonstrate clearly the office, agency, organization or body responsible for maintaining these inventories and how regularly they are updated. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Nsima, culinary tradition of Malawi to the submitting State Party.

694. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson for its detailed explanation of the different issues. This was another case of a dual system of draft decisions, and the submitting State Party would be given the opportunity to provide the Committee with the relevant information regarding the body responsible for the inventory, and the periodicity of updating the inventory.

695. The **delegation of Malawi** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to respond to the Evaluation Body's two concerns, adding that it also appreciated the dual option approach to some referrals that the Evaluation Body had proposed. Regarding the first question on the body responsible for updating the inventories, the delegation explained that the answer was contained in an extract from the inventory referenced in the nomination file, namely, the Inventory of Malawi's Intangible Cultural Heritage, Volume 2. However, this extract, which is the preface to the inventory, was not submitted with the file. The Secretariat had, however, distributed this extract to Members of the Committee. The extract indicated that the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee is the body responsible for maintaining and updating the inventories. The delegation specified that all seventeen ethnic communities in Malawi were represented on the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee through their associations, and were therefore part of the process of maintaining and updating the inventories. The contact details of the National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee and the NGOs were also indicated in 4.d of the nomination file. The National Intangible Cultural

Heritage Committee is in the Department of Culture; now called the Department of Museums and Monuments after a functional review approved in July 2017. This department is in the Ministry of Civic Education, Culture and Community Services. Regarding the second question on how regularly the inventories are updated, the answer was contained in the same extract, which indicated that the inventory shall be updated at least once in six years to coincide with the periodic reporting cycle of the Convention. Section 5 of the nomination file already indicated that the Inventory of Malawi's Cultural Heritage, Volumes 1 and 2, listed Nsima as a culinary tradition of Malawi. Volume 1 was included in 2011, and Volume 2 in 2013. Volume 2 contained updated information on the element. The delegation remarked that through this process, it had learned that it was better to submit the full inventory rather than parts of it, so that essential information is not left out during the extraction of the relevant sections. Thus, it had submitted the full text of the inventory to the Secretariat.

696. The **Chairperson** thanked Malawi and opened the floor to the Committee for comments.

697. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Evaluation Body for the professional manner with which it had conducted this evaluation. It also congratulated Malawi for rising to the occasion and providing the information that had helped clarify this matter. From Malawi's presentation, it was clear that the issues raised by the Evaluation Body had been adequately addressed. In that regard, the nominated element was the responsibility of the Malawi National Intangible Cultural Heritage Committee on behalf of all Malawians. Thus, Zambia proposed inscribing the element on the Representative List as proposed.

698. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** echoed Zambia's sentiments. The notes of the Evaluation Body asked for two things that were missing, but the information provided by Malawi had adequately responded to the concerns. The delegation noted that Malawi had explained its concerns that it should have submitted the entire inventory, and it appealed to States Parties to be more diligent in their submissions to the Evaluation Body. When submitting an excerpt from their inventories, States Parties should ensure that the name of the main person responsible was indicated, which would avoid these slight errors in the future. The delegation proposed inscribing this element, as it fully satisfied the criteria.

699. The **delegation of Mauritius** supported the nomination of Malawi.

700. The **Chairperson** noted the many speakers – Senegal, Ethiopia, Côte d'Ivoire, Bulgaria, Congo, Afghanistan and Hungary – and no opposing views. The Chairperson thus turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted. Based on the interventions, it seemed that the Committee was now satisfied with the information provided. Criterion R.5 was thus duly adopted. Paragraphs 3–5 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.21 adopted to inscribe 'Nsima, the culinary tradition of Malawi' on the Representative List.**

701. The **delegation of Malawi** congratulated the Republic of Korea for hosting this Committee meeting and for the hospitality of its people. It also congratulated the Chairperson on his election, and for his excellent leadership. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its excellent work and technical assistance, which was rendered during the preparation of this nomination file. It was aware of the human resource constraints of the Secretariat, though this was not felt thanks to the dedication of Mr Curtis and his team. The delegation passed on a message of gratitude from the communities in Malawi who had benefited from the Flanders Government's support towards strengthening capacities in the implementation of the Convention in the Southern Africa region in general, and in Malawi particularly. The delegation also mentioned the technical support provided by FARO, one of the accredited NGOs from Flanders, whose work had been invaluable in the establishment of the Southern Africa ICH Platform, now hosted by the University of Chinhoyi in Zimbabwe, to which Malawi had been closely associated. It hoped that this partnership would continue to grow so as to benefit from the success of the Convention. Malawi also thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe Nsima, culinary tradition of Malawi on the Representative List, which would go a long way towards promoting the heritage and identity of the seventy linguistic

communities in Malawi. Malawi also invited its regional neighbours to make this a multinational nomination in future cycles, because it acknowledged that similar elements were practised in other countries such as Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana, to name a few.

[A short film on the element was projected]

702. The **Chairperson** congratulated Malawi and adjourned the morning session.

[Thursday, 7 December, afternoon session]

ITEM 11.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

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

703. The **Chairperson** opened the session, turning to the next nomination, submitted by Mauritius.

704. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the nomination **'Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.22], submitted by Mauritius. Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island is a vibrant performance of music, song and dance, performed all over Rodrigues Island. With its origins in defiance and resilience, it is an important means of conflict resolution that fosters socialization and consolidates bonds. Recognized as a symbol of the history of the Rodriguan community, Sega Tambour is safeguarded through the efforts of numerous groups established since the 1970s. Knowledge and skills are transmitted through imitation and observation, and by means of apprenticeship with experienced craftspeople. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Sega Tambour is an exhilarating, rhythmic performance involving music, song and dance, as well as associated theatrical expressions. It is practised in both formal and non-formal contexts. The element bridges the gap between the class and status of participants, celebrating a common identity. It has essential functions such as conflict resolution and socialization. R.2: Sega Tambour highlights the relevance of living heritage for social cohesion. The inscription of the element would encourage dialogue within various communities and exchange with artists from diverse cultures and backgrounds inside and outside the country. R.3: Sega Tambour is part of a 'creative economy' and contributes to the livelihoods of craftspersons and performers. Proposed measures listed include: research, documentation and archiving activities; and the establishment of national associations and participation in festivals. Challenges are also acknowledged, such as increased visibility following the inscription of the element. R.4: A wide range of representatives of the Sega Tambour community have been fully involved in all stages of the nomination process through various workshops since 2010. In personalized letters and video recordings, they expressed their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2011 and also figures in the official directory approved in 2013, with the participation of representatives of practitioners and community organizations. The inventory is regularly updated and is maintained by the National Heritage Fund. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for the community-based methodology used in the preparation of the nomination. The Committee might also commend the State Party for safeguarding measures aimed at monitoring the possible negative impacts of inscription.

705. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.22 adopted to inscribe 'Sega Tambour of Rodrigues Island' on the Representative List.**

706. The **delegation of Mauritius** spoke of his honour as Minister of Art and Culture, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Mauritius, the Regional Assembly, and the Commissioner for Art and Culture of Rodrigues, who was also present, in expressing sincere thanks to the Committee for the inscription of the Sega Tambour of Rodrigues on the Representative List. He was also most grateful to the Evaluation Body for its support and positive recommendations and for its appreciation of the community-based methodology used in the preparation of the nomination file. The Minister further appreciated that Mauritius' efforts with safeguarding measures aimed at monitoring the possible impact on the element had been noted. It was indeed with great pleasure that the population of Mauritius, especially the Rodriguan community, welcomed the inscription of its third element on this List after the first two inscriptions of 'Traditional Mauritian Sega' in 2014 and the 'Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius, Geet-Gawai' in 2016. This inscription further promoted Mauritius on the international intangible cultural heritage map. Despite its small size, the island of Rodrigues is rich in heritage, and the inscription attested to this fact. Today, Sega Tambour is practised all over Mauritius and by the Rodriguan diaspora. It is an important social medium for communication among family members, as well as the general public, which brings them together for exchanges of meaningful, memorable and emotional moments. The inscription would reinforce the commitment of the Republic of Mauritius to safeguarding, protecting and promoting the Sega Tambour of Rodrigues, especially among the youth, bearers, and the population at large. The Republic of Mauritius fully subscribed to the ideals of UNESCO and its wide range of ratified Conventions, and was fully committed to their effective implementation. The Minister expressed a willingness to collaborate fully with UNESCO in the future, and to help promote and strengthen culture around the world. He concluded by thanking the Government of the Republic of Korea and the Province of Jeju for all the support provided in the successful organization of the twelfth session of the Committee.

[A short film was projected, followed by a stage performance]

707. The **Chairperson** congratulated Mauritius and turned to the next nomination.

708. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Craft of the miller operating windmills and watermill'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.23], submitted by the Netherlands. The craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills involves the knowledge and skills necessary to operate a mill and maintain it in a good state of repair. Millers now also play a key role in transmitting the related cultural history. Mills, and therefore the miller's craft, play a significant social and cultural role in Dutch society. Various safeguarding activities are undertaken, and the Guild of Volunteer Millers, established in 1972, offers training and ongoing support to anyone interested in the craft. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills comprises technical skills and complex knowledge about nature. It also involves an entire ensemble of related craftspeople. Knowledge related to the miller's craft is passed down from master to apprentice. Mills promote sustainable development through sustainable land use and the use of renewable resources, such as water and wind. R.2: The inscription of the miller's craft would enhance people's interaction with their natural environment. It would also contribute to promoting the natural association between efforts to safeguard intangible and tangible cultural heritage. The practice highlights creative solutions to energy problems through the use of renewable resources. R.3: The communities, groups and individuals concerned have played an important role in devising and planning the safeguarding measures, taking responsibility for their implementation. A series of initiatives are undertaken to ensure the viability of the element, such as training courses and qualifications awarded. The possible negative effects of inscription are also addressed. R.4: The millers and other parties concerned with the miller's craft were actively involved in all stages of the nomination process. The four millers' organizations that were directly involved in drafting the nomination file gave their free, prior and informed consent. The consent letters demonstrate the profound attachment of the bearers. R.5: The element was included in the National Inventory of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Netherlands in 2013, coordinated by the Dutch Centre for

Intangible Cultural Heritage in collaboration with the local communities. The national inventory is regularly updated every three years. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe 'Craft of the miller operating windmills and watermills' on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for submitting an exemplary nomination.

709. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.23 adopted to inscribe 'Craft of the miller operating windmills and watermill' on the Representative List**.

710. The **delegation of Netherlands** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to take the floor on this special occasion, the first inscription for the Netherlands. It thanked the Committee for the inscription of the file and also the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their hard work, as well as the Korean Government for its warm welcome. The miller's craft had literally helped to create the Netherlands. Windmills and watermills had been used since medieval times to drain the land. People in the Netherlands still strongly identify with this heritage. To this day, mills and millers continue to generate wind and water power and now experiment with new ways of producing sustainable energy. An important goal of this nomination of the craft of the miller is the cooperation with miller societies around the world. Netherlands aimed to start an international network of mill and miller societies so as to share the knowledge and skills of keeping the craft of the miller alive, especially with the help of voluntary millers. The strong involvement of miller organizations in drafting this file was also very important. Four representatives of the different miller societies were also present at the session.

711. One of the **Representatives of a miller organization** spoke on behalf of the four millers present who represented the several thousand millers who actively work on more than 1,200 historic wind and watermills, keeping the skills and craft of the miller alive for the next generation. The Representative spoke as an apprentice miller, adding that her goal was to earn a living by working her own windmill, grinding flour and baking artisanal bread. She was happy, proud and honoured by this acknowledgement, which was great news for the Netherlands. The millers would show their happiness by setting the wings of the mill in the traditional joyful position.

712. The **Chairperson** congratulated Netherlands and turned to the next nomination.

713. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Artisanal processes and plant fibers techniques for talcos, crinejas, and pintas weaving of the pinta'o hat'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.24], submitted by Panama. The artisanal process of obtaining the plant fibers for weaving talcos, crinejas and pintas to make pinta'o hats is a manual process carried out using plants and swamp mud. Participants either plant or process the raw materials, weave or create the braids used to make the hat, which is part of regional outfits worn throughout the country. The processes and techniques are passed down from generation to generation and numerous efforts to safeguard the element are in place, including the organization of artisanal markets, fairs and contests. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element relates to oral history, social practice, knowledge about nature and traditional crafts. The process and techniques are sophisticated for each stage of the fabrication process resulting in the end product. The production process is carried out in an economically sustainable way, providing benefits for the family as a whole, as well as at a wider scale. R.3: To ensure the viability of the element, the artisans and tradition bearers have formed cooperatives, taught the weaving techniques, and established the Pintao Hat Museum. The proposed safeguarding measures include: the promotion of the element; its incorporation into the school education plan; a project database with audiovisual materials; the acquisition of planting spaces; and training sessions for the bearers, among other measures. R.4: Artisans from the communities concerned and cooperative member groups, as well as the municipal authorities, the Ministry of Commerce and Industries, and scholars from the University of Panama have participated in the preparation of the nomination file

since 2013. They gave their consent in the form of signed letters along with the video provided in support of the nomination. R.5: The element was included in the Inventory of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Panama in 2013, maintained by the Panama Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Project, as well as in provincial and indigenous inventories with the collaboration of the communities concerned. The inventory is updated every two years. However, the information included in the file is not sufficient to conclude that R.2 is satisfied. R.2: The file demonstrates how the inscription could help increase the visibility of the element and associated techniques, attract the interest of younger generations and reinforce the pride of its bearers and practitioners. However, it is not clear how the inscription would contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, or fostering cultural diversity or dialogue among communities. Furthermore, it tended to focus too much on the commercialization of Pinta'o hats through the creation of new designs. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination to the submitting State Party.

714. The **delegation of Guatemala** strongly believed that there were many elements to take into account before making a decision. As stated by the Evaluation Body, it was aware of the difficulties of people working in the communities at the regional and local levels in understanding and expressing how the inscription of an element could increase the visibility of living heritage at the international level. After checking and analysing the file, the delegation had noted many elements that indicated how this element could provide visibility to the Convention, not only at the local level but also at the international level. Panama would also be able to clarify those elements if needed.

715. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Panama for submitting this element, adding that the pinta'o hat was an important element for Panama, but also beyond Panama. It was noted that the Evaluation Body was partially satisfied with R.2. However, when looking carefully at the element and its implications for raising awareness and the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general at the national and international levels, one could clearly see that this element did in fact contribute. The delegation suggested that Panama provide more detail in this regard, even though it had already given some satisfying details for which Palestine would submit an amendment requesting the inscription of the element.

716. The **delegation of Turkey** realized that Panama had ratified the Convention in 2004, but had yet to inscribe any elements on the Representative List. It believed that a possible first inscription would encourage the State Party to submit more files and participate in some multinational files as well. In addition, a first inscription could also contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and raise awareness not only at the national level, but also at the international level. However, while taking into consideration the Evaluation Body's recommendations on R.2, the delegation sought some clarification regarding the commercialization of the pinta'o hats through the creation of new designs, and wished to hear from Panama in this regard.

717. The **delegation of Panama** remarked that the visibility of the sombrero pinta'o starts the moment the communities and the people work the art together in festivities in Panama, and exchange the items, straws and techniques. Then, at the next level, there are all the folkloric events taking place across the country. For several moments, for instance, there is a parade of the pollera (one of Panama's most important national items of clothing), and at that point, the end product is seen. So, it starts with the fairs, with the moment of trading the crafts of straws and techniques, and then goes to the level of information to the public. Regarding Turkey's question, the commercialization mentioned in the file occurrs at the level when families and people gather the straws. The delegation explained that the hat needs five straws to be made, and one has to be with a tint, while the others are the weaving straws. However, they do not all grow in the same area; they grow at different latitudes of the country and in different types of soil. So, the commercialization referred to in the file corresponds to the moment when people in different areas collect the straws and move to different areas of the country to conduct their trade. The commerce is the trade between artisans that have other straws, so that they can both finalize the product. The same thing occurs with the straw that makes the tint colour. Thus, the commercialization comprises the bartering, exchanging

straws, but also exchanging techniques with each person doing his/her part. The end product eventually becomes the hat, which is commercialized because they have to sell the hats, which is now assisted by the Government. The delegation explained that during the work on the file it had realized that it was very difficult for people to move distances to exchange with each other. So, it was helping by setting up land plots to consolidate [the cultivation of] the plants.

718. The **delegation of Colombia** believed that the file clearly mentioned the intercultural dialogue generated in the framework of actions to safeguard the sombrero pinta'o, where dialogue was observed in local as well as national contexts. Panama, as with many Latin American countries, was characterized by a diverse population with a strong mestisaje population and many different ethnicities. Thus, the promotion of dialogues in a national context was fundamental, given the principles of the Convention. Sombrero pinta'o is an expression of their culture and their own mechanisms of exchange. It is also very important for the population and should be inscribed on the List.

719. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that R.2 was indeed a sensitive criterion in this Convention, adding that it implied – from the community perspective – that the element was not completely significant for humanity or for other communities. Throughout this session, the Committee had not asked the Evaluation Body about the reasons for its evaluation of the criteria. In the case of Panama, the problem with R.2 had not been well-explained by the Evaluation Body. In this regard, it supported Colombia's remarks, adding that for the Latin American and Caribbean region, the element is a well-known manifestation that would contribute to the visibility of the Convention. The delegation cautioned the decision on R.2, which would give the community the impression that its element was not important or would not give visibility to the Convention. It thus supported the inscription of the element.

720. The **delegation of Hungary** recalled that the problem with R.2 had already been highlighted [by the Committee], as well as in the Evaluation Body's report. Actually, there were two nominations in this cycle that had problems with R.2: the first was Al-Qatt Al-Asiri from Saudi Arabia, which had been inscribed the previous day despite its initial problem concerning R.2. From the information provided in the file, and also from the presentation by Panama, the element involved the weaving together of the straw elements, just like the talco weaves are woven together with the different designs and pintas. The delegation was of the understanding that this element would indeed contribute to raising awareness and the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in many ways, in particular by highlighting the links between the sustainable use of natural resources and artisanal and social processes. It believed this combination to be very important and was exemplified in the tradition of artisanal processes and plant fibers related to the pinta'o hat. For these reasons, the delegation proposed its inscription.

721. The **delegation of Armenia** took into account the fact that this was the first file for Panama, and thus supported its inscription as it would increase the level of existing communication between ethnicities and the various generations that receive this family legacy.

722. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** strongly empathized and supported Cuba's intervention, adding that some of the doubts were a little perplexing, especially coming from the Caribbean where this element was so widely known and accepted. Moreover, the question of visibility was also perplexing in that, ironically, the inscription of the element would in fact boost its visibility in general, which was what was being asked for in the first place. Regarding the complex but important issue of commercialization, as also raised by Cuba, the delegation added that experiences in this area should be shared so as to really define commercialization and what exactly would hinder the progress of intangible cultural heritage. The element presented was not exactly the end product; the element presented comprised the processes, plant fibers, techniques, and so on, which were not being commercialized. Even so, the delegation believed that the Committee should share ideas about the commercialization of products so as to understand this very concept of commercialization and thus avoid a blanket, negative approach to it. Indeed, it was a very complex issue, but a blanket approach was, to

all intents and purposes, not a good direction to take. The delegation thus strongly supported the inscription of the element.

723. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked [on a personal note] that although he was not from the region where these hats were made but rather a citizen of Africa, he still regularly used these hats, and even offered them because they are so popular. Moreover, a lot was already known about the tradition of sombrero piteado. It thus wished to hear from Panama on how this element contributed to the development of a family economy and served sustainable development.

724. The **delegation of Panama** remarked that this was an important element of the preparation of the hat. The hat's preparation begins in the core of the family. This work linked the children of the family, wives, husbands, sisters, and brothers; they all participate in different ways by gathering and preparing the materials. A member of the family collects the plant, dries it, and chooses the right parts to make the hat. Another person would bring the wood and prepare the pot to boil the plant to start making the tint. A male family member or older child would then barter the product and exchange it for other plants. Thus, it was truly a family process, starting in the core of the family and then growing from the village to the country level.

725. The **Chairperson** noted the wide support by the Committee and turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1, and R.1 in paragraph 2 were duly adopted.

726. The **Chairperson** noted that R.2, in its amended form, was co-sponsored by Guatemala, Palestine, Hungary, Côte d'Ivoire, Philippines, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Turkey, Lebanon, Cuba, Saint Lucia and Senegal. Criterion R.2 was thus duly adopted, as amended. Criteria R.3, R.4 and R.5 were also adopted.

727. The **Chairperson** noted that paragraph 3 was co-sponsored by Guatemala, Palestine, Hungary, Côte d'Ivoire, Philippines, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Turkey, Cuba, Lebanon, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Lebanon, Congo and India. Paragraph 3 was duly adopted, as amended. Paragraph 4 was deleted, and paragraph 5 became a new paragraph 4. The following co-sponsors were noted: Senegal, Lebanon, Congo, Cuba, India, Saint Lucia, Guatemala, Palestine, Hungary, Côte d'Ivoire, Philippines, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Ethiopia, Turkey, Senegal, Lebanon, Cuba, India, Saint Lucia and Congo. Paragraph 4 was adopted, as amended. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.24 adopted to inscribe 'Artisanal processes and plant fibers techniques for talcos, crinejas, and pintas weaving of the pinta'o hat' on the Representative List**.

728. The delegation of **Panama** began by thanking Guatemala, Philippines, Palestine and Hungary who had helped in drafting the documents, and all the delegates who had given their support. This inscription was extremely important for Panama and the artisans. The processes and techniques, as well as the values of social cohesion, organization and sustainable development that were essential knowledge transmitted by the artisans had been clearly explained in the file. Panamanians of all expressions of cultural heritage would celebrate the inscription, which would increase their self-esteem and motivation to continue with this legacy. The recognition by the Committee would provide greater impetus to this valuable work. The delegation thanked the team, including Professor Emma Gomez, who together with her team, the Proyecto Salvaguardia Patrimonio Cultural Immaterial, had done a fantastic job travelling throughout the country, and also Yanett Rodríguez Mendoza, the team working in Coclé, Félix Correa and Luis Cecilio Pérez, as well as many others.

729. The **Chairperson** congratulated Panama and turned to the next nomination.

730. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'The Traditional system of Corongo's water judges'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.25], submitted by Peru. The traditional system of Corongo's water judges is an organizational method developed by the people of the district of Corongo in Northern Peru. The system, which dates back to pre-Inca times, is primarily aimed at supplying water fairly and sustainably through proper land stewardship, thereby ensuring the existence of these two resources for future generations.

The functions, significance and value of the system are transmitted within the family and public spheres, as well as across all school levels, through dances connected with the system. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The Traditional System of Corongo's Water Judges is a complex cultural expression and customary organization that embraces resource management, religious values, historical memory and cultural identity. The element relates to the sustainable stewardship of natural resources by indigenous communities. It is a traditional way to regulate the use of water in agriculture, ensuring a beneficial management system based on the Andean principles of solidarity, equity and respect for nature. R.2: The inscription of the element would promote respect for similar organizational methods, religious coexistence and environmental management around the world. The inscription could also draw attention to water itself, as the most vulnerable yet indispensable resource on earth. Overall, the inscription of the element could draw attention to the close relationship between human beings and nature. R.3: The safeguarding measures proposed, with the participation of the communities concerned, include: developing the interest in and knowledge of the element and disseminating information about it; compiling traditions and customs related to it; creating spaces for its revitalization and safeguarding; and raising awareness about the importance of environmental care, among other measures. R.4: Through a series of meetings and workshops, a committee was established at the request and on behalf of the Corongo people for the preparation of the nomination file in 2014. The file demonstrates the free, prior and informed consent to the nomination of the people who have assumed the roles of water judges, 'campos' and 'cabecillas'. R.5: The Traditional System of Corongo's Water Judges was declared an element of National Cultural Heritage and entered on the Declarations of Cultural Heritage of the Nation in 2013. Maintained by the Ministry of Culture, the inventory is regularly updated by the communities of bearers. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe the Traditional system of Corongo's Water Judges on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for submitting an exemplary nomination.

731. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. No amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.25 adopted to inscribe 'The Traditional system of Corongo's water judges' on the Representative List**.

732. The **delegation of Peru** saluted the Chairperson on behalf of Peru and thanked the Committee for its great job. It assured the delegates that all the discussions and deliberations made during the session would serve in its reflections at the national and regional levels. The delegation was grateful to the Evaluation Body for the kind words expressed in every paragraph of the decision. All of Peru, and especially the Ancash region, recognized that the traditional system of water judges signified its responsibility to maintain over time the meaning and values inherent in its expression. The delegation hoped that its inscription on the Representative List would help other countries disseminate expressions of traditional knowledge that combat the consequences of climate change and teach the next generations to properly manage their natural resources. The delegation invited the water judges present, Mr Fernando Diaz, Mr José Moreno and Mr Jorge Trevejo, who helped in the preparation of the file, to say a few words.

733. A **Water Judge** spoke of his honour in being a Water Judge, and in the name of Peru, Ancash, and his village of Corongo, expressed gratitude to the Committee for its decision.

734. Another **Water Judge** spoke on behalf of other water judges to express feelings of happiness and pride in representing this element that had now been given universal recognition.

735. **Mr Jorge Trevejo** thanked San Pedro de Corongo for this moment. On behalf of the people of Corongo, he expressed his gratitude to the Committee for its decision, which would strengthen the identity and the traditional system for taking care of and distributing water in a reciprocal and equitable way, which had come from their ancestors and would be bequeathed to future generations.

[A short film on the element was projected]

736. The **Chairperson** congratulated Peru and turned to the next nomination.

737. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Kolo, traditional folk dance'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.28], submitted by Serbia. Kolo is a traditional collective folk dance performed by dancers interlinked to form a chain, usually moving in a circle holding hands. It is performed to the accompaniment of music during private and public gatherings, and plays an integrative social role involving all members of the local community. Performances at key events for the lives of individuals and the communities make this element very present and sustainable, and bearers and local communities ensure its visibility through fairs, festivals and competitions. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Kolo is an important folk dance tradition in the daily life of the communities concerned in Serbia, which is performed in family settings and during community celebrations such as weddings, birthdays and local events. As such, Kolo gives local communities a sense of identity, enables social cohesion, and facilitates dialogue among community members. R.2: The element contributes to promoting tolerance and peaceful coexistence between peoples. It would highlight the importance of performing arts and contribute to raising the interest of communities in the transmission and revitalization of cultural practices. It would also raise public awareness of the role of intangible cultural heritage. R.3: The file provides a clear description of past and current safeguarding initiatives by the submitting State, developed in collaboration with representatives from the communities and groups concerned. These measures include a legal framework for the safeguarding of the element, and support to institutions involved in its study, documentation, promotion and dissemination, among other measures. R.4: The community of bearers and practitioners, along with academic institutions and cultural institutions, fully participated in developing the nomination and in planning the safeguarding measures presented in the file. They expressed their free, prior and informed consent, supporting the inscription of the element. R.5: The element was included in the National Register of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Serbia in 2012, following an inventorying process with local communities, institutions and experts. Maintained by the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade, the National Register is regularly updated. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Kolo, traditional folk dance on the Representative List.

738. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.28 adopted to inscribe 'Kolo, traditional folk dance' on the Representative List**.

739. The **delegation of Serbia** congratulated the Chairperson for the excellent organization of this session, and thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe Kolo, traditional folk dance on the Representative List. This inscription was the result of the hard work and cooperation of the experts who had coordinated the preparation of the nomination file with the support of the groups, communities and institutions concerned. Kolo is a vital element of traditional culture, lively and present in the lives of individuals in rural and urban areas in Serbia. This collective dance is performed at private and public gatherings, family and collective facilities, by members of all social, professional and age groups. Along with having a cohesive power and being the symbol of national identity, Kolo is also the hallmark of local and regional community identities. The number and types of different measures of this type of Kolo reflect this. Considering this, the delegation hoped that this inscription would encourage local communities to identify, safeguard and promote local versions of the element, and also to contribute to cultural diversity. All aspects of Kolo and all the values of the Convention for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage would certainly be promoted by this inscription.

740. The **Chairperson** congratulated Serbia and turned to the next nomination.

741. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, '**Multipart Singing of Horehronie'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.29], submitted by Slovakia. The Multipart Singing of Horehronie involves a variable solo melody of pre-singing and more static choir answers. The singing culminates in intertwined parallel melodies with rich variations. Bearers and practitioners are inhabitants of the villages in question, as well as the broader public, and the singing is perceived as a characteristic local phenomenon. The practice is transmitted from generation to generation and through informal education, and bearers endorse the element by practising it and using it in regular cross-generational exchange. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Multipart Singing of Horehronie is a collective artistic expression. The songs are inspired by local professional activities, family events, various celebrations and social situations in everyday life such as weddings, baptisms, funerals and Christmas. The songs express the collective heritage of the communities, and link singers with their villages or regions. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to raising public interest in intangible cultural heritage in general, both in Slovakia and beyond. As the practice is characterized by improvization and diverse interpretations, its inscription would promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. There is a constant demand for the element during official and unofficial occasions, which attests to a broad public awareness. R.3: The State Party has developed a comprehensive set of safeguarding measures focused on public support for research, documentation, education and monitoring. The element is being incorporated into the formal education system, from primary schools to university curricula. Professional institutions also provide measures of support with the involvement of the communities, municipalities, folklore groups, experts and individuals concerned. R.4: Practitioners of the element, as well as representatives of the municipalities concerned, civic associations, folklore groups, national institutions, and an expert in ethnomusicology all participated in the nomination process. They provided their free, prior and informed consent in written form as well as in the short video. R.5: The element was included in the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Slovakia in 2016, which is maintained by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Centre, and was created with the active participation of the communities, groups, individuals and NGOs concerned; the inventory is updated regularly. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Multipart Singing of Horehronie on the Representative List.

742. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.29 adopted to inscribe 'Multipart Singing of Horehronie' on the Representative List**.

743. The **delegation of Slovakia** thanked the organizers of the Committee session, the Republic of Korea for its warm welcome on the beautiful island of Jeju, as well as the brilliant organization and cultural programme that enhanced the friendly atmosphere in general. Slovakia greatly appreciated the work and advice of the Evaluation Body, as well as the time and effort invested into the evaluation process by the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat.

744. The **delegation of Slovakia** [second speaker] spoke on behalf of the members of the communities concerned to thank all the delegations. The multipart singing in the Horehronie region represents a vivid tradition connecting all generations, and not only in the region, as it was also well-known by everyone in the country. Working on the nomination file had brought an interesting development in the region: the inhabitants of the villages, living in a kind of healthy competition between neighbours, found a common language and a way to cooperate, fully supporting the spirit of the Convention. The delegation expressed many thanks for the appreciation of the element.

745. The **Chairperson** congratulated Slovakia and turned to the next nomination.

746. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.30], submitted by Slovenia. Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti is a Shrovetide custom practised from Candlemas to Ash Wednesday. Groups of Kurenti and one or more devils run from house to house and jump around the

owners, brandishing wooden sticks and ringing bells. Kindergartens and schools help safeguard the practice, and some formal education courses and informal workshops help maintain respect for the tradition. Related knowledge and skills are most mainly transmitted within the family, but museums and schools also play a key role in this regard. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative. R.1: Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti encompass several cultural expressions embodied in social practices, performing arts, knowledge concerning nature and traditional craftsmanship. The custom has adapted over time to involve all members of the community (men, women and children), strengthening interpersonal bonds and regional and local identities. R.2: The inscription of the element would raise the general public interest in intangible cultural heritage at the local and national levels and strengthen networks with countries in which similar elements are practised. The inscription would contribute to the celebration of cultural diversity and human creativity. R.3: Past and current initiatives taken to ensure the viability of the element include transmission and awareness-raising measures and the provision of financial resources. The proposed safeguarding measures comprise research, publications, lectures and training workshops, the organization of symposia and raising awareness about cultural heritage. R.4: The federation of Kurenti, together with the local museum of Ptuj, proposed nominating the element for inscription. During all the stages of the preparation, consultations were carried out among the bearers, the Coordinator for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the Ministry of Culture. Numerous personalized consent letters are available in support of the nomination. R.5: Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti was included in the Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2012, with the active participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned. Maintained by the Ministry of Culture, the Register is updated on a regular basis. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for submitting an exemplary nomination.

747. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.30 adopted to inscribe 'Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti' on the Representative List**.

748. The **delegation of Slovenia** thanked the host and the Secretariat for the excellent organization of this meeting and their hospitality. It especially thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for recognizing the element as intangible cultural heritage of humanity. It was convinced that the inscription would contribute to promoting and raising awareness about intangible cultural heritage and would have a positive impact on the implementation of the Convention in Slovenia. The inscription was a great recognition for the bearers of the custom in local communities and would encourage them to transmit the knowledge and skills to younger generations, and to continue practising the Kurenti tradition of chasing everything evil away and bringing happiness to everyone they visit. The representatives of local communities and the Kurenti were also present, though unfortunately not in their Kurenti attire, and would like to say a few words.

749. A **Representative of Kurenti** was honoured and proud that the heritage element, Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti, typical of the area of the town of Ptuj, the oldest town in Slovenia, had found a place among the other elements inscribed on the Representative List. Numerous individuals and many ethnographic carnival groups nurtured and spread the importance of this cultural heritage. Door-to-door rounds of Kurenti was becoming part of the world's treasures thanks to its inscription on the List. The people of Ptuj were proud to have succeeded in safeguarding this custom until now. In fact, there was not the slightest chance that this custom would die away in future, for in every new generation, young boys join their fathers in Kurenti attire. He concluded by expressing the communities' gratitude and pride.

[A short film on the element was projected]

750. The **Chairperson** congratulated Slovenia and turned to the next nomination.

751. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Basel Carnival'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.31], submitted by Switzerland. Basel Carnival is the largest carnival in Switzerland, starting on the Monday following Ash Wednesday; the carnival includes parades, concerts and lantern exhibitions, and can be compared to a huge satirical magazine. The carnival promotes tolerance through social criticism and fosters cohesion. Transmission occurs informally in families, while the 'cliques' also play an important role throughout the year, with several having a section dedicated to encouraging the next generation. The carnival has been successfully safeguarded over past decades thanks to measures taken by the communities. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The Basel Carnival displays various aspects of cultural traditions such as performances of fifes, drums and verses, and the creation and presentation of masks, lanterns and costumes. It contributes to social cohesion, promotes tolerance through social criticism, and contributes to safeguarding the local dialect and promoting cultural creation. R.2: The inscription of the element would raise the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in Switzerland and internationally, especially in urban areas. It would also act as a reminder of the role of language as a vector of intangible cultural heritage. The element promotes human creativity and cultural diversity, as does the know-how linked to the traditional craftsmanship involved. R.3: The file describes past and current safeguarding efforts made by the community over the past decades, with the authorities' constant support. The proposed safeguarding measures encompass the transmission of the element, the adjustment of infrastructure and legislation, preservation and protection, research, documentation, publishing, and awareness-raising activities. R.4: In 2015, the Carnival Committee presented the proposal for the nomination to the representatives of the 222 carnival societies. The latter supported the nomination and formed a steering committee to work on the file. The file presents personalized letters expressing free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. R.5: The element was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2012 with the participation of the communities and groups concerned. The Federal Office of Culture coordinates the updating of the inventory. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Basel Carnival on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to commend the State Party for submitting an exemplary nomination.

752. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.31 adopted to inscribe 'Basel Carnival' on the Representative List**.

753. The **delegation of Switzerland** remarked that with the Carnival of Basel, Switzerland noted with great satisfaction its second living tradition inscribed on the Representative List. It thanked the Committee for the inscription and for its congratulations on the nomination. The delegation also acknowledged the remarkable work of the Evaluation Body and thanked its Members for the report. If the Carnival of Basel is called 'the three most beautiful days', then the inscription on this day would add a fourth exceptional day in Basel and thus a cause for celebration. The delegation welcomed the commitment to the nomination and the exceptional motivation of the Carnival Committee, the authorities of the city, and the canton of Basel, as well as the thousands of participants who had shown their support for the carnival.

754. The **President of the Carnival Committee**, Mr Christophe Bürgin [through a video message], expressed the excitement and happiness of the community, but also its appreciation. The Carnival of Basel is among one of the most beautiful carnivals in the world, and he reiterated thanks to all those who had supported this decision. The inscription underlined its promise to safeguard, maintain and develop this satirical, artistic family-oriented carnival. The city of Basel, at the junction of three countries, expressed its gratitude.

755. The **Chairperson** congratulated Switzerland and turned to the next nomination.

756. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Falak'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.32], submitted by Tajikistan. Falak is a musical genre of traditional music in the mountain Tajiks. Performances of Falak can assume both vocal and instrumental

forms, and its bearers are the singers and instrumentalists who perform the music. Falak is performed during family ceremonies and rites and is a central form of traditional music. The practice is safeguarded through the traditional Ustod-Shogird method of transferring experience and knowledge from generation to generation in art schools, as well as through non-formal education and competitions organized by local residents. The Evaluation Body considered that the information included in the file was not sufficient to allow the Committee to determine whether the following criteria were satisfied for inscription. R.1: The file indicates that Falak is a central and leading phenomenon of traditional music of the mountain Tajiks. Moreover, Falak also has an economic function, since it is how performers earn their living. However, the methods of transmission, such as the Ustod-Shogird method and within the family, were not clearly explained in the file. In addition, the focus on professional performances and formal occasions of Falak may not adequately describe its complexity. R.2: The inscription of Falak would represent a sign of pride in the element and recognition of it as an example of traditional creativity at the international level. It would also lead to the wider involvement of people of all ages in the practice. However, the file focuses on how the inscription would enhance the understanding of 'Tajik culture' at the international level rather than the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, or raise awareness about its importance at the local, national and international levels. The file also fails to show how the inscription would encourage dialogue and promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. R.3: The file lists a number of past and ongoing efforts to safeguard Falak, including competitions and annual festive events for Falak Day and documentation, inventorying, research and publication activities. However, it is not clear how the communities and individuals concerned are concretely involved in these safeguarding measures. Moreover, the nomination does not present any safeguarding measures for the future. There was also a concern that the safeguarding measures could lead to the decontextualization and institutionalization of the element. R.4: The file does not demonstrate how the communities, groups and individuals concerned have actively participated in all stages of the preparation of the nomination. In addition, there is no description of how the communities concerned provided their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. Finally, R.5: The element was included in the National Inventory in 2014. The Ministry of Culture and the Research Institute of Culture and Informatics is responsible for maintaining this inventory. However, the nomination does not indicate how the inventory was drawn up with the participation of the communities, groups and NGOs concerned, or how it is regularly updated. Moreover, the extract is in the form of a list, and there are no important details regarding the description and explanation of the element. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Falak to the submitting State Party. The Committee might wish to remind the State Party to resubmit the nomination, should it wish, and to involve the communities concerned in all stages of the drafting of the nomination file. The Committee might encourage the State Party to ensure that detailed information on the sociological and geographical aspects of the element is provided and that it is consistent throughout the file.

757. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.32 adopted to refer 'Falak' to the submitting State Party**.

758. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'Spring celebration, Hıdrellez'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.33], submitted by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. Spring Celebration Hıdrellez takes place annually on 6 May, which is recognized as Spring Day or the awakening of nature. To mark the occasion, various ceremonies and rituals connected with nature are performed, guaranteeing the wellbeing of the family and community, and protecting livestock and crops. The rituals provide the community with a deep sense of cultural belonging, and the viability of the tradition is ensured primarily through its annual performance and the organization of related events. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Spring celebration, Hıdrellez is celebrated on 6 May to mark the reawakening of nature among different communities in the two submitting

States. The element encompasses different aspects and cultural spaces such as rituals, beliefs, performances and games. There are various social meanings and functions attached to the element, which include healing, environmental protection and uniting families. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to illustrating how different cultures and geographical regions can share similar beliefs and traditions. Its inscription could enhance the active participation of youth and hence improve their understanding of the value of intangible cultural heritage. The element testifies to human creativity, since talent and skill are required to compose and improvize the quatrains carrying specific messages. R.3: The file provides a set of comprehensive safeguarding measures involving transmission, research, documentation, awareness raising, capacity building and the protection of cultural spaces. The file clearly demonstrates that the measures have been proposed and carried out with the participation of the communities, groups and individuals concerned, including the relevant NGOs. R.4: The individuals, communities and NGOs concerned in both States Parties have been involved in all stages of the nomination process. Evidence of the free, prior and informed consent of the related communities in both countries is duly provided. R.5: The Evaluation Body recognized that in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the element was included under the Exceptionally Important Category of Cultural Heritage of the Republic of Macedonia in 2011. It was also added to the National List of Protected Cultural Goods, which is held at the Cultural Heritage Protection Office within the Ministry of Culture. In Turkey, the element was included in the Intangible Cultural Heritage National Inventory of Turkey in 2009, which is maintained and updated twice a year by the Intangible Cultural Heritage Boards jointly established by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, representatives from related institutions and intangible cultural heritage bearers. However, in the case of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, it was clear neither how the communities concerned had participated in the inventorying process nor how its inventory was regularly updated. Thus, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the nomination of Spring celebration, Hıdrellez to the submitting States Parties. The Committee might encourage the States Parties, should they wish to resubmit the nomination during a following cycle, to provide a clear explanation of the participation of the communities in the safeguarding measures, including references to gender roles.

759. The **Chairperson** thanked the Evaluation Body for the recommendation on this file. This was another case of a dual system of draft decisions. Pursuant to the established working method, the Committee had received written information from the submitting States concerning the questions raised by the Evaluation Body in its recommendation. This written information would be attached to the nomination file for the record. In conformity with Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, the floor was given to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to explain its procedures for updating the inventories, and the involvement of the communities in the inventorying process.

760. Regarding the remarks on R.5, the **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** explained that the digital character of the inventory of the cultural heritage assured permanent updating and access for communities and all stakeholders involved in this process. The communities, individuals and NGOs involved in the nomination process regularly sent hard-copy presentations of their activities dedicated to the safeguarding of the element to the Directorate for Protection of the Cultural Heritage. Several hundred units had been registered thus far, including materials for updating the digital inventory, leading to complete information on the updating and community involvement in this ongoing process.

761. The **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** [second speaker] spoke on behalf of the organization that for thirty-six years had organized the Spring festival dedicated to the Hıdrellez element, to thank its partners in the Ministry of Culture in the Republics of Macedonia and Turkey for their support in this process. The element Spring celebration, Hıdrellez is very important for the Turkish community in Macedonia. At the same time, this element is recognized under different names and cultures, and is part of the religious life of various community groups in Macedonia, and is a symbol of the annual renewal of nature. The Macedonian delegation was confident that the Committee would take

into consideration the useful explanation presented, which strongly supported the decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List.

762. The **delegation of Mongolia** supported the inscription of Spring celebration, Hıdrellez on the Representative List, and considered the additional information provided during this session to be sufficient for inscription.

763. The **delegation of Bulgaria** expressed its appreciation of the tradition presented in the nomination file; a vibrant tradition carefully safeguarded by communities across a vast geographic area. The information presented on the regular updating of the inventory and the participation of communities in this process, as presented the previous day by the former Republic of Macedonia, were accepted by the Committee. Today, it had further confirmed its explanation. Therefore, the delegation considered R.5 to be fully satisfied and supported the inscription of Spring celebration, Hıdrellez on the Representative List.

764. The **delegation of Algeria** supported the remarks of the previous speakers and considered that the element deserved to be inscribed.

765. The **delegation of Senegal** also supported the proposal to inscribe this element following the information provided by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and it believed that this element deserved to be included on the Representative List.

766. The **Chairperson** noted the many speakers, Hungary, Zambia, Congo, Ethiopia, Palestine, Colombia, Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Lebanon and the Philippines, surmising that all the Members would offer supportive statements.

767. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for its presentation in defense of its case, which had provided the partial information that was missing. It therefore supported the inscription of the element on the Representative List.

768. The **delegation of Afghanistan** joined the previous speakers in remarking that the information provided in writing by the submitting delegation and the clarifications presented were sufficient. It therefore strongly supported the inscription of this element.

769. As was customary, the **Chairperson** noted that the remaining speakers would join those supporting the inscription. He then turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 and criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted. Based on the interventions, it seemed that the Committee was now satisfied with the information provided. Criterion R.5 was thus duly adopted. Paragraphs 3–5 were also adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.33 adopted to inscribe 'Spring celebration, Hıdrellez' on the Representative List**.

770. The **delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Macedonia and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Turkey, as partners who had participated in preparing the nomination file of the element, to cordially thank the Committee for its understanding and for accepting its explanation. In this regard, the delegation thanked once again the colleagues and experts from Turkey for their excellent cooperation and high professionalism during the long process of preparing and submitting the joint nomination file. The inscription of the element on the Representative List was a great honour and acknowledegment, but also an obligation to promote and safeguard this element, as well as to stimulate the bearers to educate the new generation to practise and share this element in their community and more widely.

771. The **President of the NGO Hidirellez-Bahar Senlikleri Festivali**, Mr Shenol Tahir, took the opportunity to thank the Committee for its decision to inscribe Spring celebration, Hıdrellez to the Representative List. This decision confirmed the universal value of this element. Macedonia and the NGO would have the opportunity to celebrate this important event, not only at the national level but also at the international level under the umbrella of UNESCO. He invited everyone to celebrate Hıdrellez together on 6 May 2018 in Macedonia.

772. The **delegation of Turkey** wholeheartedly thanked the Committee Members for their support with the inscription of this element on behalf of the two submitting States. Hıdrellez is a

celebration of spring carried out every year on 6 May by many communities over a wide geographical area. It is celebrated on the waterfronts, in wooded areas, high hills or green spaces, which the communities define as cultural spaces and believe to be sacred. Hıdrellez is believed to be the first day of the transition from winter to spring, according to the traditional calendar used in the region, and is acknowledged as the day of abundance, renewal and hope. On this day, the communities, groups and individuals have a strong connection with nature. They come together and have fun. In this sense, it is important that Hıdrellez – a symbol of peace and dialogue with people and harmony with nature – is inscribed on the Representative List. The people of the region give different names to this day. Members of different religions and cultures celebrate this day every year on 6 May in peace and dialogue. The delegation thanked the Committee once again for its positive consideration of Hıdrellez for inscription. It remarked that the Spring celebration would be celebrated more enthusiastically in the wide geographic area from the the Middle East to the Balkans, and in many places where the communities of this culture had emigrated. This inscription would thus make a strong contribution to the visibility of the Convention. With this understanding, as a State Party that supports multinational files, it was open to the extension of this multinational file with the participation of States Parties that share Hıdrellez as a common cultural heritage. The delegation thanked the partner institutions, particularly the Ministry of Culture and the National Commission, for their involvement in the preparation of the file.

773. The **Chairperson** congratulated the submitting States and turned to the next nomination.

774. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'The Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.34], submitted by Turkmenistan. The Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing is a performing art involving creative poeticizing focused on good feelings and wishes. It is performed during ceremonies and national celebrations and involves singing with vocal improvization and dancing with movements of the hands, gestures and footsteps. The bearers and practitioners are actively involved in safeguarding the practice through performances and the compilation of introductory teaching resources. The knowledge and skills are traditionally transmitted from master singers to amateurs through informal training. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: The element forms part of family ceremonies (such as births and weddings) and national celebrations. The rite serves to promote happiness, fertility and welfare for the communities, and promotes peace and solidarity, social cohesion and unity among community members. R.2: The inscription of the element would contribute to a better understanding of the performing arts as a tool for dialogue between generations and for social cohesion both in the country and abroad. As a platform for exchange and cultural cooperation that could strengthen ties between people of different ages and categories, and foster tolerance and respect between genders, the element contributes to intercultural and intergenerational communication. R.3: The viability of the element has been ensured by coordinated efforts by the communities and institutions concerned in both the past and present. Such measures include: publishing activities; identification, documentation; educational, awareness-raising and capacity-building measures at the national level; and performances during wedding ceremonies, social events and national celebrations, among other measures. R.4: The preparation of the nomination file involved the wide, active participation of the communities concerned. They were also intensely involved in collecting documentation during the nomination process. R.5: The element was included in the National Inventory of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. This inventory is maintained by the Department of the Intangible Cultural Heritage at the Ministry of Culture. Drawn up with the active participation of bearers, practitioners, community members and members of folklore groups and other stakeholders, it is updated annually. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to remind the State Party that measures aimed at safeguarding the element should not attempt to 'freeze' the element and underline the inherently living and evolving nature of intangible cultural heritage.

775. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for

adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.34 adopted to inscribe 'The Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing' on the Representative List**.

776. The **delegation of Turkmenistan** thanked the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their kind support of the nomination file of Kushtdepdi rite of singing and dancing. In this context, it was important to note that this was the third element from Turkmenistan inscribed on the Representative List. The element was one of the richest examples of the intangible heritage of Turkmenistan and it contributed to intercultural and intergenerational communication to better understand the cultural diversity of the Turkmen community. Furthermore, the inscription would facilitate the safeguarding of all other domains of intangible cultural heritage in Turkmenistan, as well as their transmission to the next generation.

777. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **'The art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.b.35], submitted by Viet Nam. The art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam is a diverse art combining music, poetry, acting, painting and literature. Bài Chòi is an important form of culture and recreation, whose bearers and practitioners include artists, performers, card-making and hut-making artists. Performers and their families play a major role in safeguarding the practice, and numerous dedicated groups exist. Most performers learn their skills within the family, but specialist artists also transmit their knowledge in clubs, schools and associations. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription. R.1: The art of Bài Chòi is an important cultural practice within the village communities, providing entertainment as well as a context for socializing and enjoying the arts. Bài Chòi stories include lessons on morality, compassion, as well as love for the village and for the communities concerned. The element provides an aesthetic platform to express their feelings, knowledge and life experiences. R.2: The inscription of the art of Bài Chòi would encourage dialogue among communities, groups and individuals. It would also create opportunities for exchange and the sharing of experience between performers, thereby enriching knowledge and skills related to the practice of the art form. It would also raise awareness of the diversity of intangible cultural heritage, as the element combines multiple domains of cultural expressions. R.3: The file provides a clear, sufficiently detailed description of the past and current efforts to safeguard the element and ensure its viability by communities, groups and clubs, with the support of the government. Such efforts include the organization of Bài Chòi festivals and performances, and teaching the related song repertories, singing skills, performance techniques, hut- and card-making methods, and playing techniques. R.4: The community actively contributed ideas for cataloguing the element, filled in inventory forms and participated in all stages of the preparation of the nomination file. Individuals and representatives of Bài Chòi groups and clubs signed to demonstrate their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination, which is also expressed in the audio and video recordings of interviews conducted in regions that practise Bài Chòi. R.5: The element was included on the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism in 2013 and 2014. The inventory is held in the intangible cultural heritage management information system archive of the Department of Cultural Heritage of Viet Nam. The Departments of Culture, Sports and Tourism in the nine provinces are responsible for cooperating with communities to update information about the element every year. The Vietnamese Institute for Musicology manages the database on the art of Bài Chòi and updates it every year. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe the art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam on the Representative List.

778. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.35 adopted to inscribe 'The art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam' on the Representative List**.

779. The **delegation of Viet Nam** spoke on behalf of the Viet Nam National Commission for UNESCO to express gratitude for the inscription.

780. The **Vice-Minister for Culture, Sports and Tourism**, Ms Dang Thi Bich Lien [speaking in Vietnamese] sincerely thanked the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for

inscribing the art of Bài Chòi in provinces of the central region of Viet Nam on the Representative List. The inscription was very meaningful as it reflected the unique culture of the Vietnamese people, the cohesion of the community and respect for cultural diversity, while encouraging dialogue between the different individuals, communities and peoples in the spirit of tolerance, peace and humanity; the respected principles of UNESCO. The art of Bài Chòi also satisfied the need for entertainment and enjoying arts, expressing love for the homeland and life experiences of the Vietnamese people. On behalf of Viet Nam and the bearers of the heritage, the country was committed to carrying out the necessary measures to safeguard and promote the values of the art of Bài Chòi in Central Viet Nam.

[A short film on the element was projected]

781. The **Chairperson** congratulated Viet Nam and was thankful for the presence of the very high-level delegation led by the Vice-Minister at this session meeting. The Chairperson then returned to the examination of the earlier nomination file, '**Khaen music of the Lao people'** [draft decision 11.b.20], submitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

782. The **delegation of the Philippines** began by expressing thanks to Laos for submitting this nomination, adding that it recognized the importance of the element for the communities and the State Party; a friendly neighbour of the Philippines in the region. However, it asked the Chair of the Evaluation Body, regarding the information provided by the State Party, whether in his view the file was now in conformity with R.3 and R.5.

783. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Philippines for this question, adding that the Evaluation Body had not received any written information that would confirm the completeness of the information requested under R.3 and R.5. For the moment, the information it had was contained in the file submitted, as examined by the Evaluation Body. For criterion R.3, a description of the safeguarding measures that had already been implemented had been noted, but there were no planned safeguarding measures in the future, as had been requested. For criterion R.5, the information regarding the updating of the inventory and the body responsible for maintaining it were still missing. It was therefore up to the Committee to decide whether the information given orally by the State Party satisfied these two criteria.

784. The **Secretary** explained that the practice in the past was that no *additional* information could be included during the Committee's deliberations. In 2016, the Committee had recognized clarifications in the interventions by States Parties, but additional information could not be introduced. The dual option was a new mechanism whereby the Evaluation Body invited the Committee to examine the information in question. Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee stated specifically, 'Representatives of a State Party, whether or not a Member of the Committee, shall not speak to advocate the inclusion in the List mentioned in Articles 16 and 17 of the Convention of an item of the intangible cultural heritage nominated by that State or to endorse a request submitted by that State, but only to provide information in reply to questions raised. This provision applies to all observers mentioned in Rule 8.'

785. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and the Secretary for the information provided. It had asked the Evaluation Body for its views precisely to get to this point, and to show clearly the need to be consistent as a Committee despite the importance of the files before it. The delegation would thus reserve its remarks for the time being but would engage should other Committee Members wish to present amendments regardless of the rules outlined by the Secretariat and despite the experts' views presented by the Chair of the Evaluation Body.

786. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, especially the Evaluation Body because the answer was very clear. The submitting State Party had not submitted written information to the Evaluation Body to clearly clarify the missing elements in the file. As for R.5, it was not clearly stipulated how the inventory was regularly updated and which body was responsible for maintaining it. Although the answer had been provided orally by the delegation of Laos in the morning session, the answer also

had to be provided to the Committee in writing. As for R.3, the Evaluation Body recognized that there were several actions implemented in relation to the safeguarding of the element, but that a future safeguarding plan was missing. The delegation thus proposed returning to the draft decision, as this aspect had been taken into consideration in the amendments submitted to the Secretariat, which Members were free to support or oppose.

787. The **delegation of Ethiopia** concurred with the comments made by Palestine and welcomed and congratulated the submitting State for bringing this file to the Committee. Having listened to the explanations regarding the concerns of the Evaluation Body, it shared the remarks expressed by the Body on the satisfactory efforts relating to safeguarding measures in place, while noting the absence of future efforts. Thus, it strongly supported the inscription of the element and encouraged the submitting State to work on its future safeguarding plans, which would satisfy the concerns of the Evaluation Body.

788. Outlining the status of the draft decision, the **Secretary** recalled that the item had been opened with some paragraphs already adopted, with one paragraph partially adopted. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted as a whole. In paragraph 3, criteria R.3 and R.5 were adopted but not paragraph 3 as a whole. The draft amendment asked to reopen paragraph 2 and delete paragraph 3. The Committee had been informed by Legal Affairs that it had the authority to reopen the paragraph by consensus, provided that the decision was not yet adopted as a whole.

789. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that certain paragraphs had indeed been adopted, but not the decision as a whole. The Committee, as a sovereign body, could therefore reopen the paragraphs already adopted in order to amend and adopt the final decision.

790. The **delegation of Armenia** also wished to reopen and look at the paragraph concerned.

791. The **delegation of Austria** stated that based on the explanation given by the Evaluation Body and the Secretary, it wished to align with the Philippines.

792. The **delegation of Afghanistan** reminded the Committee that the reason for suspending the debate on this item was to allow for the discussion and preparation of an amendment.

793. The **Secretary** noted that the Committee wished to reopen the paragraph. Paragraph 1 had already been adopted, so the Committee could agree and move to reopening paragraph 2.

794. The **Chairperson** wished to recommence the adoption of the draft decision from the beginning. With no objections, paragraph 1 was adopted. In paragraph 2, criteria R.1 and R.2 were duly adopted. In R.3, there was a new proposed amendment by Palestine, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Cuba, Senegal, Armenia, Mauritius, Côte d'Ivoire, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Ethiopia and the Congo.

795. The **delegation of Hungary** fully respected the respective positions of all Members of this Committee, adding that it would like to go along with the consensus, while supporting the position expressed by Austria and the Philippines. But in the spirit of consensus, and going along with the majority decision, it wished to bring a small amendment to this paragraph based on the report and the evaluations of the Evaluation Body. In the original proposal by the Evaluation Body, it wished to delete 'adequate' from the sentence, 'The Government has created a national action plan and adequate policies for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage', because the Evaluation Body had at the same time pointed out that the measures undertaken appeared to have certain deficiencies. Thus, it did not wish to approve and confirm something that the Evaluation Body judged to be not fully in line with the Convention. With that in mind, the delegation had an additional amendment to follow the paragraph that would decide on the inscription, which it would present later.

796. The **delegation of Palestine** understood Hungary's concern, adding that this word had not been added by Palestine and the co-sponsors of the amendment but was proposed by the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body. Moreover, the word 'adequate' was already in the original text. Thus, the delegation preferred to retain it, but would be flexible should this help Hungary join the consensus.

797. The **delegation of Hungary** found the situation to be delicate. The amendment as it stood picked up part of the Evaluation Body's text that actually spelled out the positive elements, while deleting the negative ones. The delegation was of the opinion that turning a blind eye to problems did not help to solve them, and that it was is better to help solve them constructively. The Committee had been created to safeguard intangible cultural heritage and, particularly, the participation of communities. This was why – in a spirit of consensus – it could join the amendment that brought forward the positive aspects, but not in contradiction to the other parts of the original text proposed by the Evaluation Body.

798. The **delegation of Ethiopia** remarked that if Hungary had read the paragraph after the inscription, it would have understood the rationale in remaining silent with regard to the wording of 'adequate'. The delegation explained that the Evaluation Body had reported that the existing measure was adequate enough, which was positively reflected [in the amendment], but that its concern lay in the future safeguarding plan. Thus, if the Committee agreed with the recommendations for the future plan and to keep the positive tone of the text, then by default the Committee perceived the effort of the submitting State as adequate. Moreover, 'adequate' did not imply absolute, which Ethiopia would object to. The use of 'adequate' thus maintained the positive and encouraging note for the submitting State to further its safeguarding efforts, which had been appreciated by the Evaluation Body. Following the inscription, a paragraph would encourage the submitting State to make further efforts. The delegation could agree to delete 'adequate' but preferred to retain it as it stood.

799. The **delegation of Algeria** could go with the paragraph as amended by Palestine, Bulgaria, Cyprus and other Members. However, regarding the concern by Hungary and others, it could propose an amendment after the 'inscription' paragraph to encourage the submitting State to bear in mind the two points cited by the Evaluation Body in the original R.3.

800. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Ethiopia and Algeria for their clear explanations. For the sake of time and consensus, the delegation was ready to delete 'adequate' so that Hungary could join the consensus as well as other Members.

801. The **delegation of the Philippines** appreciated the flexibility, adding that it also preferred to retain the original text after the explanation by the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat. However, in the spirit of flexibility and with the deletion of 'adequate' it could go along with the consensus. It thanked Palestine for accepting the deletion of 'adequate'.

802. The **Chairperson** noted the near consensus on R.3 on the deletion of 'adequate'. With no further comments or objections, R.3 was duly adopted. R.4 was also adopted. He then turned to criterion R.5.

803. The **delegation of Hungary** wished to join the consensus and co-sponsor the amendment.

804. The **Chairperson** duly adopted criterion R.5 and paragraph 2 was adopted as a whole. He then turned to paragraph 3.

805. The **delegation of Hungary** wished to co-sponsor paragraph 3.

806. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted. It was noted that paragraph 4 thanked the submitting State.

807. The **delegation of Zambia** wished to join the Committee Members who supported the nomination. However, it wished to add, possibly as paragraph 5, the following text, 'Advises the submitting State to ensure all safeguarding measures that have been initiated for Khaen music of the Lao People are maintained and where necessary strengthened'. The delegation explained that it wished the Committee to advise and ensure that the measures were indeed initiated and maintained, and, where necessary, strengthened.

808. The **delegation of Algeria** supported the proposal by Zambia, adding that it made sense to consolidate and even add to the Evaluation Body's recommendation regarding the specific safeguarding plans. Moreover, along the lines of R.5, it encouraged the State Party to continue its efforts to establish safeguarding plans 'with the participation of the communities'. The delegation thus proposed, after the citation of criteria R.3 and R.5, the following:

'encourages the State Party to continue its efforts to establish safeguarding plans specific to each element with the active participation of the communities', as recommended by the Evaluation Body in R.3.

809. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Algeria for the enhanced language, adding that it fully adhered to the amendment and proposed going ahead with the adoption before the end of the language interpretation.

810. The **delegation of Turkey** echoed Palestine's remark, as it noted a request by Viet Nam to treat agenda item 11.c, as the delegation of Viet Nam would be leaving this evening.

811. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the proposal by Turkey.

812. The **delegation of Hungary** wished to suggest a minor modification in the text, to replace 'encourages' with 'invites'. The delegation explained that one problem identified in R.5 by the Evaluation Body was the updating of the inventory, adding that in other inscriptions where R.5 criterion had been clarified, e.g. in the case of Ireland, there had been an encouragement to the State Party to ensure community participation in the inventorying process and the regular updating of the inventory. Thus, there was a specific point about regular updating that should be maintained in the standard paragraph in this decision, as well as in a separate paragraph. The delegation would then go in the sense of the rest of the paragraph that addressed the issue in R.3, i.e. in pursuing its efforts to establish safeguarding plans with the active participation of the communities and practitioners concerned. The delegation therefore proposed keeping those specific items apart as they addressed two different criteria.

813. The **delegation of Austria** noted a language issue in the use of 'safeguarding plans', which referred to the language used in the Urgent Safeguarding List, whereas 'safeguarding measures' was specific to the Representative List, as in this case.

814. The **Secretary** noted Algeria's proposal was 'measures specific to each element', and sought clarification as to whether this referred to measures in general or each element.

815. The **delegation of Algeria** explained that this recommendation would refer to the future, adding that this referred not only to this element but to future elements of the Lao Republic. In this way, it would take into account the recommendation of the Evaluation Body.

816. The **Secretary** reiterated that the whole sentence was unclear in that it was making a recommendation beyond the specific element examined under this nomination file.

817. The **delegation of Algeria** confirmed that the recommendation was for this element as well as future nominations. This was the understanding of the Evaluation Body's recommendation in this specific case, which referred to general safeguarding measures for all elements.

818. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Hungary for its proposal, adding that there was no need to continue [with another paragraph] after R.3 and R.5 because it was already mentioned in new paragraphs 5 and 6. However, this would negate Algeria's concern.

819. Thanking Algeria, the **Chairperson** turned to paragraph 4, and the new paragraphs 5 and 6. With no further comments or objections, paragraphs 4–6 were duly adopted.

820. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that before adopting the decision as a whole, it wished to register its serious concern about accepting and interpreting additional information only received this morning that was not originally part of the file submitted, and thus altering the substantiated recommendation of the Evaluation Body based on the original submission and recognized rules and practices of this Convention. This touched upon the nature of the Representative List and the integrity and credibility of the Committee. It was imperative for the Committee and States Parties to maintain certain standards of consistency and abide by the Operational Directives and agreed timelines. Having said this, it also believed that establishing a procedure for dialogue between the submitting States Parties and the Evaluation Body before the publication of their recommendations would help the Committee and the Secretariat in dealing with such situations on criteria other than R.5 ahead

of the Committee sessions, and thus avoid such lengthy discussions. Having said this, it did not wish to block the consensus and congratulated the State Party.

821. The **Chairperson** thanked the Philippines for its spirit of consensus and cooperation. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.b.20 adopted to inscribe 'Khaen music of the Lao people' on the Representative List**.

822. The **delegation of Lao People's Democratic Republic** thanked the Government of the Republic of Korea for its exceptional welcome. On behalf of the people of the Lao People's Republic and the Government, the delegation warmly thanked UNESCO and all the Member States for having imagined this Convention that allowed countries to build bridges between peoples and cultures. It was also the meaning and vocation of Khaen music, which had just been inscribed on the Representative List. This would enable practitioners in the country to live a historic moment for its first element of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation expressed an immense feeling of joy and pride.

823. Congratulating the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the **Chairperson** adjourned the day's session.

[Friday, 8 December, morning session]

824. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that the Chairperson would be unable to chair the session that day. Thus, in accordance with Rule 4.2 of the Rules of Procedure, he had asked the Vice-Chair of Turkey to chair the morning session, and the Vice-Chair of Colombia to chair the afternoon session.

[The Vice-Chairperson of Turkey chaired the following session]

825. The **Vice-Chairperson** remarked on the advances made in yesterday's session, which had completed the examination of nominations to the Representative List, noting however that the Committee had yet to finalize the examination of the 12.COM 11 series. The Bureau had met to discuss the revised timetable, which was explained to the Committee. Before starting the work, the Vice-Chair took the opportunity to express appreciation to the fund of the project of Prince Sultan bin Abdul Aziz for its support for Arabic interpretation.

ITEM 11.c OF THE AGENDA

REMOVAL OF AN ELEMENT FROM THE LIST OF INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING AND ITS TRANSFER TO THE REPRESENTATIVE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE OF HUMANITY

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11.c*
File: *1 request*

826. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to agenda item 11.c on the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and its transfer to the Representative List. It was noted that this was the first case of a transfer of an element from one List to another. This item had been included on the agenda following Decision 10.COM 19 in 2015. At its tenth session, the Committee decided – on an exceptional basis and pending the adoption of relevant procedures by the General Assembly – to examine the request submitted by Viet Nam for the transfer of one element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. The element concerned Xoan singing of Phú Thọ province, Viet Nam, which had been inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2011. The Vice-Chair explained that the Committee was requested only to examine the request submitted by Viet Nam. Later, the Committee would have the opportunity under agenda item 14 to discuss the removal and transfer mechanisms in broader terms. The Vice-Chair noted that over forty nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding and the Representative List had been examined, and thus the criteria for both of those Lists were clear.

827. However, as this was the first time that the Committee would examine a transfer request, the **Vice-Chairperson** deemed it important to recall the orientations given by the Operational Directives concerning the removal of an element from a List and the transfer of an element from one List to another. The relevant paragraphs of the Operational Directives came from Chapter 1.11 – Transfer of an element from one list to the other or removal of an element from a list. Paragraph 38 read, 'An element may not simultaneously be inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. A State Party may request that an element be transferred from one list to the other. Such a request must demonstrate that the element satisfies all the criteria for the list to which transfer is requested and shall be submitted according to the established procedures and deadlines for nominations'. Paragraph 39 read, 'An element shall be removed from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding by the Committee when it determines after assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan that the element no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription on that list'. It was recalled that the Committee had decided in 2015 that the possible examination of the nomination of the element to the Representative List in the 2017 cycle would only take place should it first decide on the removal of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. As this was the first time the Evaluation Body had been asked to evaluate a request for transfer, the Vice-Chair invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to outline the working methods concerning this request.

828. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that Xoan singing of Phú Thọ province in Viet Nam is a performing art that includes singing, dancing, drumming and clapper beating, which is closely linked to the worship of the Hùng kings. Bearers and practitioners form guilds and the element fosters cultural understanding and community cohesion. The practice is safeguarded through seminars, the collection of Xoan songs, and – thanks to the efforts of the guilds – by national institutes and thirty-three dedicated clubs of Xoan singing, which is mainly transmitted orally. Experienced artists also teach this art to members of clubs and music teachers. As this was the first case of a transfer of an element from one List to the other, the Committee might wish to recall its Decision 10.COM 19 to concurrently examine the report on the status of the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the new nomination of the same element to the Representative List on an exceptional basis and pending the adoption of relevant procedures by the General Assembly. The Committee might further recall that it had decided in Decision 10.COM 19 that voluntary supplementary contributions to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund be received in due course to convene an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group to discuss draft Operational Directives on the procedure for the removal of an element from a List and the transfer of an element from one List to the other. The Committee might wish to take note that the Operational Directives still needed to be revised to establish clear procedures in this regard and based on the experience during the Committee's examination of the present checklist submitted by Viet Nam. The Committee might also wish to recall that the nomination of the element to the Representative List in the 2017 cycle would only be examined if the Committee first decided to remove the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. From the information included in the report on the status of the inscribed element, which had been submitted by the State Party in 2016, and after assessing the implementation of the safeguarding plan, the nomination did not satisfy one or more criteria for the Urgent Safeguarding List.

829. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** further explained that the report and the status of the element demonstrated that Xoan singing was no longer in need of urgent safeguarding since recent efforts by the local communities and the government had considerably restored its viability since its inscription on the Urgent Safeguard List in 2011. The project for the safeguarding and promotion of Xoan singing implemented since 2013, and to be continued until 2020, had played an essential role in safeguarding and reviving the element with the full support of the community. The Xoan guilds and the communities, practitioners and institutions concerned had actively participated in the preparation of the report and approved it enthusiastically, taking part in interviews, discussions and seminars. Furthermore, the element had been extensively inventoried with the participation of the communities from 2012

to 2015 with the information being updated every year. Xoan singing was included in various inventories such as Duvan at the Vietnamese Institute for Musicology within the Viet Nam National Academy of Music. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee remove Xoan singing of Phú Thọ province in Viet Nam from the Urgent Safeguarding List.

830. Regarding the Representative List, the **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied the following criteria for inscription on the Representative List. R.1: Xoan performances involve music and singing as a way of worshipping and expresses gratitude to the Hun kings. The performances invoke good health and fortune and include songs of courtship. The tradition also reflects the central message behind the common Vietnamese proverb 'when drinking water remember the source', which it seeks to transmit to young practitioners. R.2: The element experienced a critical decline during the 20th century and has been successfully revitalized thanks to the considerable efforts of the local communities and other stakeholders. Its inclusion on the Representative List could serve as an example of a good practice and inspire dialogue with communities worldwide on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. R.3: The efforts described should be considered within the context of the long-term project for the safeguarding and promotion of Xoan singing spanning from 2013 to 2020. The availability of the element is being ensured by the communities, groups and individuals concerned. The measures proposed include: establishing a safeguarding fund for Xoan singing; providing support for each Xoan guild restoring Xoan singing spaces; organizing regular festivals; publishing books; producing documentaries on Xoan singing and carrying out research; and regular media programmes and training sessions. R.4: The process of developing a nomination file to inscribe the element on the Representative List was carried out with the active participation of the communities of the four Xoan guilds. An ongoing consultation process was pursued between the practitioners and the public institutions concerned. Written letters of free, prior and informed consent from community members and local officials were provided. R.5: The element was included in the National List of Viet Nam's Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2012. Together with the communities concerned, the Phú Thọ Department of Culture, Sports and Tourism had updated the inventory of Xoan singing from 2012 to 2015. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee inscribe Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province in Viet Nam on the Representative List. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to ensure the community consents to the removal of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and its transfer to the Representative List, and that the consenting community includes at least the same community members that consented to the inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Committee might encourage the State Party to complete the implementation of the Safeguarding Plan as foreseen in the report on the status of the element.

831. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson for the explanation on the different issues of the file, opening the floor to the Committee Members for comments.

832. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** shared a concern regarding paragraph 11[5], adding that the consent from the community should have been sought and in place prior to Viet Nam's request for the transfer of the element.

833. Congratulating the Vice-Chairperson, the **delegation of Cuba** fully agreed with the observation made by Saint Lucia, adding that at this stage in the decision these kinds of remarks were best avoided. In addition, paragraph 11 did not add anything to the decision. The delegation congratulated Viet Nam and the community for its progress with the element.

834. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** also congratulated the Vice-Chairperson on her presidency. Côte d'Ivoire shared the same concerns as Saint Lucia and Cuba. Indeed, if the communities

---

5 Invites the State Party to ensure the community consents to the removal of the element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and to its transfer to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, and that the community consenting to the removal and transfer includes at least the same community members that consented to the inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.

were not consulted, on what did the Evaluation Body base its review? The delegation was sure that this issue would be returned to in the discussion in the agenda item on this subject. Moreover, it wondered whether there might be a legal vacuum because it was unclear on what basis the Evaluation Body had formed its argument.

835. The **Vice-Chairperson** asked whether Côte d'Ivoire sought the opinion of the Legal Advisor now, or later under agenda item 14.

836. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** agreed that it was a good solution to address these issues under item 14 as a whole. Nevertheless, the Committee should already consider that there was potentially a legal vacuum in this area.

837. The **Vice-Chairperson** would thus ask the Legal Advisor to provide clarifications in this regard under agenda item 14, and after the adoption of this draft decision.

838. The **delegation of Cuba** asked the Secretariat to record the proposal made by Saint Lucia and supported by Cuba.

839. Congratulating the Vice-Chairperson, the **delegation of Palestine** also supported the logic behind the deletion of paragraph 11.

840. The **delegation of Algeria** was pleased to note the Vice-Chairperson on the podium. Echoing the previous remarks, it also wondered about the consent sought from the communities concerned *after* the decision. The delegation suggested that instead of removing the whole paragraph, the beginning of the paragraph could be retained, which read, 'Invites the State Party to inform the community concerned of the removal of the element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage'. However, in this case the community's consent would not be sought given the element's integration onto the other List. Nevertheless, informing the community of the decision might be necessary.

841. The **delegation of Turkey** had the same understanding as Saint Lucia, Cuba and Palestine in that this issue should already have been addressed. The delegation sought to hear from the Evaluation Body as to why it had included this paragraph after the element's inscription.

842. The **delegation of Zambia** shared the same observation in that the sentencing was out of place. In this regard, it could agree with Algeria to replace 'consent' with 'information' so that the Committee should be informed. Alternatively, the Committee could delete paragraph 11.

843. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that this was indeed the first time this had occurred. The Evaluation Body had based its examination on the two paragraphs 38 and 39. First, it considered the removal, if conditions permit, before then proposing the element for inscription. The delegation was of the view that given the report on these two aspects, i.e. what first motivated the removal and then motivated the request for inscription, the Body carried out its work in good conscience in relation to these two paragraphs. From this point of view, there was no issue with the understanding; however, paragraph 11 was indeed problematic, as mentioned by Saint Lucia. The delegation felt that the Committee could go in the direction proposed by Algeria, which was to inform the communities. However, would this now become a prerequisite to ask for consent? In that case, 'inform' would also be problematic. Alternatively, the Committee could delete this paragraph. However, in order not to create a precedent, the delegation suggested waiting until agenda item 14 so as to gain a clear understanding of the removal and transfer steps with clear procedures in the Operational Directives for future requests. Otherwise, all the elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List would make similar requests in future sessions. Thus, clear and specific procedures should be in place. For the moment, however, the delegation could accept the proposal to delete paragraph 11, as proposed by Saint Lucia and others.

844. The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to explain.

845. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Committee Members who had raised the question behind this paragraph, adding that the Evaluation Body had discussed this at length. The Chairperson explained that the reason for using the word 'ensure', as mentioned by Côte d'Ivoire, was that there was indeed a vacuum, which was acknowledged by the

Committee in its decision 10.COM 19, hence the reason why it wished to have some clarity on the issue. So, the use of this verb, deemed most appropriate, was to send a message to the State Party inviting them to make sure that it was done. The Chairperson conceded that there was no procedure for the consent of the communities on the removal and transfer, and thus it was up to the Committee to decide whether it wished to adopt a new wording that was more appropriate.

846. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** wished to congratulate the Vice-Chair on her stewardship of the session, adding that it supported the use of the word 'inform'.

847. The **delegation of Turkey** also congratulated the Vice-Chair, adding that it supported Saint Lucia, Cuba, Palestine and Senegal.

848. The **delegation of Cuba** agreed that the Committee should have a clear procedure. Nevertheless, it wished to express a moment of happiness and congratulations on the good practice to follow: how an element of intangible cultural heritage that required safeguarding had evolved to the point that it could now move on to the Representative List. It was thus a moment for rejoicing and congratulations, before considering the adoption of this decision.

849. Following the explanation, the **delegation of Zambia** felt that maybe 'document' could be used instead of 'ensure', in this way, the Committee would have some evidence that the community had indeed given its consent. So, the State Party could be asked to document the community's consent to the removal.

850. The **Secretary** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his explanation of the processes, adding that during the examinations by the Evaluation Body the issue of community consent had been debated extensively, i.e. whether this should be an important measure. Community consent was not requested through the submitting State, and in this case this information had not been requested, as it was not currently part of the procedure. So, the Evaluation Body was in a position to have to decide on this issue when perhaps it should have already been done, but the submitting State had not been requested to provide it.

851. The **delegation of Hungary** congratulated the Vice-Chair on assuming her duties as Chair. It agreed that this was a very important issue, which was somewhat problematic in that the nomination was being judged on an exceptional basis at a time when there was still no established procedures for the transfer of an element from one List to the other. In such a situation this touched upon one of the fundamental principles of the Convention, i.e. Article 15 on the participation of communities, groups and individuals, which states, 'within the framework of its safeguarding activities of the intangible cultural heritage each State Party shall endeavour to ensure the widest possible participation of communities, groups, and where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage and to involve them actively in its management'. Clearly transferring an element from one List to another implied such management, and the community should certainly be taking an active part in this decision. The delegation felt that it was not appropriate for the Committee to be informed only after the transfer of the element from one List to the other. The delegation understood that this issue had come to the Committee for the first time and that the Committee would like to act upon it as quickly as possible. But this was indeed a very important issue, and for the sake of the Convention, the Committee should not act on such an important issue without the involvement of the community. Hungary was therefore uncomfortable with this situation. The delegation understood that the procedure had not been established and that the State Party was not required to demonstrate the participation of communities and their consent. Nevertheless, the lack of established procedure should not lead the Committee to violate one of the fundamental principles of this Convention.

852. Replying to Hungary's remarks, the **Secretary** clarified that Decision 10.COM 10 had in reality established a procedure on an experimental basis, which had been applied. The more fitting question might be whether the procedure was good and appropriate, one with which to move forward.

853. Following the explanations, the **delegation of Cyprus** remarked that there was still no procedure for the removal of an element. In this case, it could agree to include the sentence proposed by Algeria, while establishing a procedure for the removal of an element.

854. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that it did not agree with Zambia's proposal, and noted that many of the Member States wished to delete this paragraph. It fully agreed that the State Party should inform the community, but not that it should be documented, as this was unclear. The best proposal appeared to have reached consensus in the room, which was not reflected on the screen, and that was the deletion of paragraph 11 and that the State Party inform the community.

855. The **delegation of Afghanistan** agreed with Hungary that Article 15 on community participation was indeed a fundamental issue, but it also wished to recall the purpose of the two Lists. The first List [the Urgent Safeguarding List] seeks to keep an element alive, while ensuring the participation of the communities is a condition *sine qua non*. The second List [the Representative List] seeks to demonstrate the diversity of intangible cultural heritage and to raise awareness about its importance. Thus, it could be said in the case of the Representative List that the consent and participation of communities is somehow presumed so far as the survival of an element could demonstrate the diversity of heritage and raise awareness about its importance. Hence, the participation of the communities at this stage was not a condition *sine qua non* that could hinder the transfer of the element.

856. The **delegation of Palestine** felt that keeping this paragraph would be contradictory as the Evaluation Body had stated in R.4, 'the process of developing a nomination file to inscribe the element on the Representative List was carried out with the active participation of the communities'. This meant that the communities concerned had been actively involved and informed. It was further noted at the end of the paragraph that this was demonstrated through the provision of written letters of free, prior and informed consent from community members and local officials. Thus, if the communities had given their consent for the inscription of the element on the Representative List, then it could be assumed that they must have also given their consent to its removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List. Thus, paragraph 11 should be deleted as paragraph 4 was proof that the communities had been involved and informed.

857. The **delegation of the Philippines** also remarked on the importance of this item, and congratulated the efforts undertaken by the State Party. This item pointed to the need to address questions unforeseen by the framers of the Convention in that the system was constantly evolving. This item was indeed a reflection of a success story for the State Party, and like others it agreed that this was an exceptional case that required further reflection with regard to future procedures in other cases brought to the Committee. The delegation aligned with the remarks, particularly by Hungary, that the participation of communities was fundamental for the Representative List. However, like Palestine, the delegation noted from the draft decision that there had been efforts to inform the communities. In this regard, it wished to hear directly from the State Party and have the information on how it had reached out to the communities concerned regarding the removal and transfer of the element.

858. The **Vice-Chairperson** agreed that it would be good to hear from the State Party, asking the Philippines to specifically address a question.

859. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to ask the State Party whether the consent of the communities had been secured regarding the transfer and removal of the element.

860. The **delegation of Viet Nam** thanked the Evaluation Body for the careful examination of the file and for the recommendation to remove the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and transfer it to the Representative List. Concerning the question, the delegation clarified that it had already informed all the communities in the province of Phú Thọ and had received consent from all four guilds, which was clearly attached to the nomination file in 2017, as already noted by the Evaluation Body in which all the criteria were satisfied, including the consent of the communities. The delegation reaffirmed that the communities in the 2011 file were the same as the communities in the 2017 file. It was ready to provide the Committee with any further records of interviews carried out with the communities concerned, if required.

861. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked Viet Nam for the helpful explanations provided, adding that it was normal to take a little more time on this decision as it was putting into place a reflection that would influence how these cases were handled in the future. It also wished to see at the end of the sentence, 'invites the State Party to inform the community concerned of the removal of the element from the List of Urgent Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage and its transfer to the Representative List'. The community must therefore be informed of the entire process, not only the removal but also the transfer. In addition, the delegation had listened to the concern expressed by Hungary, Zambia and even some Members of the Evaluation Body regarding consent, but it had also heard that Viet Nam had already collected the consent of the communities. The State Party was also ready to present this consent to the Committee, which could also be reflected in the text, which would read, 'and also invites the submitting State to present to the Committee at its next session any response or demonstration from the communities concerned'. In this way, if the submitting State – after informing the communities – had received an answer or any complaint, it could bring it to the attention of the Committee at its next session, covering the Committee in either case.

862. The **delegation of Austria** remarked on the importance of community consent and community participation, as raised by Hungary and the Philippines. Moreover, it was also going to ask the State Party to seek consent from the communities, so it was happy to note that this had already been done. The Committee had heard how the communities had indeed been involved in the whole process, so it could therefore include its standard paragraph that thanked the State Party for providing this information and the documentation on the involvement of the communities.

863. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** thanked Hungary for emphasizing the importance of consent and community involvement, which is at the heart of all the processes of intangible cultural heritage. It supported Palestine's intervention proposing to delete the paragraph, as it was hoped that this was something that would happen with every file for which inscription was consented, i.e. that the submitting State had already informed, monitored and achieved community consent. Thus, it did not understand what the paragraph would achieve if community consent had already been obtained.

864. The **delegation of India** noted that the current procedure for a transfer, as it existed in its raw form, had already been followed and that the Committee was in fact trying to assess the State Party based on information that the Secretariat had already clarified was not requested, as per the current procedure. In addition, the State Party had already provided the information, and the consent letters of the communities involved had been attached to both nomination files submitted in 2011 and 2017. Thus, the nomination file should be considered in its exceptional circumstances, adding that it would like the Committee to reflect on this further and clarify the procedures, but that there was not enough time in this session to reach a conclusion on all the procedures that would be required. Thus, the two should be separated and considered in isolation, i.e. the nomination as a separate entity on the one hand, and how this issue should be treated in the future on the other.

865. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the Members who had pointed out the importance of community participation, noting the broad agreement on this important point. The delegation had been very much reassured by the intervention of Viet Nam concerning the participation of communities in the re-nomination process in that it had fully abided by the procedure and it thanked the State Party in this regard. It believed that the procedure had been followed and that the consent of the communities had been obtained to satisfy inscription of the element to the Representative List. However, the delegation wanted to flag this issue for discussion under agenda item 14, adding that more clarification was required in terms of the requested consent, i.e. what was required from the State Party in the case of a transfer of an element from one List to the other. The delegation explained that there was a difference in the kind of consent required in that the community concerned should understand the impact of the decision of a removal and transfer. Each list had different objectives, as pointed out by Afghanistan, which had implications for the management of the given element. In that sense,

Hungary joined the delegations in going along with this paragraph, as it saw a lot of merit in the original proposal by the Evaluation Body. Nevertheless, it also understood the concerns of many States Parties that wished to use different language, and it was also ready to join consensus on this but on the condition that this issue would be further discussed under agenda item 14. The delegation thanked all the Members of the Committee for paying attention to the involvement of communities.

866. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that the Committee was creating procedures from this nomination, adding that it did not agree with Algeria's proposal that sought to create a monitoring mechanism. It did not feel that the Committee had reached a point where it would have to request a Member State to submit information at the next session. The delegation agreed that it was important to create a clear mechanism, but that perhaps this was not the right time to do so. Thus, it proposed deleting the part that read, 'also invites the submitting State to present to the Committee at its next session any response from the communities concerned', as this monitoring mechanism was a dangerous direction to take. The delegation also asked the Vice-Chair to remove 'delete' from the draft decision, which had come about following multilateral negotiations.

867. The **Secretary** clarified that it had inserted 'delete' in the draft decision as it was unsure about the change proposed by Zambia. The Secretariat was ready to delete the whole paragraph, which would mean deleting Zambia's request to replace 'document', should Zambia allow.

868. The **delegation of Cuba** explained that in a multilateral negotiation, when a Member State makes a request, it deletes the previous request, and afterwards, if the other Member State wants to maintain it, it must say so.

869. The **Secretary** remarked that 'suppress' or 'delete' had been highlighted.

870. The **delegation of Hungary** called a point of order, noting that Hungary had been listed as a co-sponsor of the deletion when, in its intervention, it was still undecided.

871. The **Vice-Chairperson** would delete Hungary from the list of co-sponsors, remarking that there were indeed two different perspectives. Leaving the philosophical debate of how the Committee was going to establish this mechanism under agenda item 14, the Vice-Chairperson wondered whether the Committee could agree to delete paragraph 11 following the explanation by the State Party.

872. The **delegation of Algeria** wished to retain the part of the paragraph that would inform the community, though it could live with the deletion of the second part: 'inviting the submitting State'. The delegation noted that there was consensus on that; none of the Members were opposed to the State Party informing the community concerned.

873. Addressing Algeria's concerns, the **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** remarked that from the information provided by the State Party and in view of the information contained in the file, as noted by Palestine, it believed that the community had been informed and involved in the decision. Thus, for the sake of moving forward, that part of the paragraph should be deleted, with the possible addition proposed by Austria.

874. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the Committee had listened to the response of the State Party and welcomed what they had brought to the floor, which was noted by Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Palestine and Austria that proposed deleting paragraph 11. The delegation reiterated that the consent of the communities had been secured for the removal and transfer, and thus the Committee could move to the proposal by Austria to thank the delegation of Viet Nam. The procedure would then be discussed under agenda item 14.

875. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that it was not alone; Cyprus had also expressed an opinion. It asked that the Committee be flexible in requesting that the communities be informed of the decision. The delegation added that the proposal by Austria thanking the submitting State for the clarification could be a paragraph 11 bis. But informing the communities was a minimum to inform them that the item had moved from one List to another.

876. Following the clarifications provided by Viet Nam on the community's participation, the **delegation of Cyprus** spoke in favour of deleting the entire paragraph 11, including the proposal by Algeria. It also agreed with Austria to thank Viet Nam for its clarification.

877. The **delegation of Colombia** also supported the deletion of the entire paragraph 11 and then continuing with the next item on the agenda on the procedure on how the submitting State should inform the communities. In this case, Viet Nam had already provided an explanation.

878. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that it was in favour of the consensus if everyone agreed to delete the paragraph. However, it wished to record in the summary report that Algeria wished to inform the communities.

879. The delegation of **Palestine** responded to Algeria by explaining that the information had been provided by the submitting State, and the consent of the communities had been obtained. It supported Austria's amendment.

880. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the consensus towards deleting paragraph 11 and thanked Algeria for its flexibility, as well as Viet Nam for the clarifications provided to the Committee. The Vice-Chairperson noted that the new paragraph 11 proposed by Austria was supported by Côte d'Ivoire, the Philippines, Algeria, Cyprus, Palestine, India, Cuba, the Republic of Korea, Ethiopia, Turkey, Saint Lucia, Mongolia, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Lebanon, Senegal and Congo. Thus, consensus had been reached on the new paragraph 11. With no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.c. adopted to transfer 'Xoan singing of Phú Thọ province in Viet Nam' from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List**.

881. The **delegation of Viet Nam** spoke on behalf of the UNESCO National Commission of Viet Nam to express gratitude for the removal and subsequent inscription on the Representative List, inviting the Chairman of the People's Council of Phú Thọ Province to deliver his remarks.

882. **Mr Hoang Dan Mac** [interpretation from Vietnamese] remarked that over the past six years the communities of the four Vietnamese Xoan singing guilds, together with the authorities and the people of Phú Thọ Province in Viet Nam, had made tremendous efforts to ensure the urgent safeguarding of Phú Thọ's distinctive musical genre of Xoan singing. He expressed sincere thanks to the Committee and to all the States Parties to the Convention for their recognition of these efforts and for their acceptance of the community's proposal to remove Xoan singing from the Urgent Safeguarding List and inscribe it on the Representative List in 2017. In this moment, the Xoan singing communities of Phú Thọ Province and their counterparts in every other community of Viet Nam would be watching and delighted because this inscription had been made on the basis of a fair and objective assessment of the safeguarding measures undertaken by the communities over the last six years, satisfying their wish. On this occasion, he extended the communities' deep gratitude to the Vietnamese Government, the National Commission for UNESCO, the institutions and organizations concerned, and the experts in Viet Nam and the wider world for their support in sharing their invaluable experience and expertise in the safeguarding of cultural heritage. Every effort would be made to employ all the appropriate means to promote the essential role of the communities concerned in the future to continue to implement the safeguarding measures. In doing so, it would faithfully implement this decision.

ITEM 11.d OF THE AGENDA

EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11.d+Add.*
Files: *3 requests*

883. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 11.d and the Examination of requests for International Assistance, informing the Committee that Colombia had withdrawn its request. Thus, there were two requests to be examined. The Vice-Chair recalled the criteria to be met for International Assistance, which were projected onto the screen, adding that not all the

criteria needed to be satisfied for International Assistance to be granted. The Vice-Chair invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the requests.

884. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the request **'Community-self documentation and revitalization of ceremonies and practices associated with Empaako naming system in Uganda'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.d.2], submitted by Uganda. Inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in December 2013, Empaako is a traditional naming system. It is faced with serious threats to its viability. The proposed safeguarding plan aims to revitalize the practice and the observance of associated ceremonies and enhance the capacities of the communities concerned to transmit knowledge and skills and revive the practice. The communities concerned will be the main drivers of the project and ten selected community professionals will facilitate throughout the capacity-building workshops. The assistance concerns support for a project carried out at the national level aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention that takes the form of the granting of a donation in line with Article 21, paragraph g, of the Convention. Uganda requested an allocation of US$232,120 from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the implementation of this project. From the information included in the file, the request responded as follows to the criteria for granting International Assistance as set out in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Operational Directives. Criterion A.1: The request concerns the development of a practical guide regarding community-based self-documentation of intangible cultural heritage related to the local naming tradition. The request places communities in a central position and is based on a thorough study of community needs. Active community participation is ensured throughout the various stages of the project. Criterion A.2: In light of the diversity and density of the activities planned within the project, the amount of assistance requested is appropriate. The budgetary items are clear and the sources of funding are well-defined. Criterion A.3: The budget is well-conceived, reasonably structured and consistent with the planned activities. There is a clear overview and precise timetable of the project, and the objectives are clearly specified and matched to the identified threats. Criterion A.4: The mechanisms established by the project will continue to function beyond the lifespan of the project. The documentation gained will feed into educational materials with its multimedia formats being adapted for distribution through the mass media and for dissemination within and by cultural institutions and various cultural events. Criterion A.5: Eighty per cent of the total project budget is requested from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund while the State Party is committed to providing 13 per cent, with other partners contributing 7 per cent. Criterion A.6: Practitioners of Empaako traditions, folk clans, community associations and cultural institutions will acquire documentation skills, as well as the specific skills needed to carry out research, fieldwork and training that will be introduced and developed through the project. Public awareness of the implications of the 2003 Convention will be also raised. Criterion A.7: The State Party has so far benefited from International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund five times for the following projects, inventoried in the intangible cultural heritage of four communities in Uganda (2013–2015), with an amount of US$216,000: Preparatory assistance for the male child cleansing ceremony of the Lango people of North Central Uganda (2012–2013), with an amount of US$8,570; Preparatory assistance for Madi Bo Lair Music Ode (2013–2015), with an amount of US$10,000; Safeguarding and promotion of Bigwala goat trumpet music and dance of Busogo Kingdom of Uganda (2015–2017), with an amount of US$24,990; and Promoting intangible cultural heritage education in institutions of higher learning in Uganda (2017–2020), with an amount of US$97,582. Paragraph 10(a): The project is local in scope and would involve partners at the district and national levels. The NGO responsible for the implementation of the project is funded by international partners. Paragraph 10(b): A network of trainers and promoters of community self-documentation will be produced, thereby allowing for the extension of the programmes related to intangible cultural heritage. The project is likely to stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources and stakeholders. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee approve the International Assistance request from Uganda for the project entitled 'Community self-documentation and revitalization of ceremonies and practices associated with Empaako naming system in Uganda' and grant the amount of US$232,120 to the State Party. The

Committee might wish to invite the State Party to pay particular attention to the existing religious sensitivities in the region concerned, both during and beyond the planning and implementation of the project. The Committee might recommend that the State Party strive to ensure the long-term viability of the ceremonies and practices associated with the element given that the final assistance requested is limited to twenty-one months. The Committee might further invite the State Party to use form ICH-04-Report to report on the use of the assistance granted.

885. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.d.2 adopted to grant the request for the amount of US$232,120 to Uganda for the project 'Community-self documentation and revitalization of ceremonies and practices associated with Empaako naming system in Uganda'**.

886. The **delegation of Uganda** thanked the Committee for approving the financial assistance for the implementation of the project. It thanked the Secretariat for the invaluable guidance on technical inputs in the preparation of this request, and the Evaluation Body for the due diligence in the evaluation of the request. The Empaako tradition of Batooro, Banyoro, Batuku, Batagwenda and Banyabindi of Western Uganda was inscribed on UNESCO's Urgent Safeguarding List in 2013. Empaako is a naming tradition whereby, in addition to family and given names, a child is given a pet name Empaako from a list of twelve shared by the entire community. The practice is associated with rituals and ceremonies of which meanings formed each identity, as well as the belief systems of the communities concerned. The Empaako practice is faced with threats from religious groups, the diminished use of its language, and the abandonment of its ceremonies coupled with drastic drops in the knowledge of these ceremonies. The project is community-led, and places the communities concerned at the centre of its implementation. This project is aimed at the revitalization of performances and ceremonies, the enhancement of the capacities of bearers to transmit the practice, and building the capacities of communities to document safeguarding, while increasing the availability of and accessibility to their associated knowledge, raising awareness and mobilizing practitioners to revive their practice. A practical guide to community self-documentation of intangible cultural heritage would be developed and the capacities of eighty-seven stakeholders would be built to document their own intangible heritage, thereby creating a network of promoters of community-based documenters. The knowledge of the ceremonies and practices would be documented by the practitioners themselves and disseminated through multimedia channels, thereby raising awareness of their communities. The Uganda Government would do everything possible to assist the communities concerned to ensure the effective implementation and realization of the project goals. Uganda had developed capacities over the years through similar heritage safeguarding projects. The Ministry responsible for culture, the Ugandan National Commission for UNESCO, and the local governments in the communities concerned, as well as other national experts in intangible cultural heritage would be on hand to support the communities in the successful implementation of the project.

887. The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Uganda and turned to the next request.

888. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next request, **'Strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.d.3], submitted by Zambia. Participants in capacity-building activities carried out since 2010 in Zambia appreciated these workshops and were calling for the introduction of a more advanced and comprehensive version of the training. The proposed project is intended to develop the capacities of administrators and experts working with local communities. It will use the UNESCO capacity-building programme and its materials to develop a local syllabus and a training manual. It is intended to inspire many people and have far-reaching benefits for people interested in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. They requested assistance concerns support for a project carried out at the national level aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in accordance with Article 20

of the Convention, which takes the form of the granting of a donation in line with Article 21, paragraph g, of the Convention. Zambia requested an allocation of US$334,820 from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for the implementation of this project. From the information included in the file, the request responds as follows to the criteria for granting International Assistance. Criterion A.1: The project is a formal qualification in the field of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, namely a degree programme at the University of Zambia. During the preparation of the proposal, the views of the different communities were represented by the Chief Cultural Officer of the Ministry responsible for intangible cultural heritage, as well as a team of provincial and district cultural officers who were actively involved in the capacity-building programme. Criterion A.2: The file provides a detailed budget grouping with costs by activity. The timetable is planned according to the progress of each stage of the programme and provides reasonable timeframes. Criterion A.3: The budget is well-conceived, consistent with the planned activities and reasonably structured with a clear overview and precise timetable of the project. The NSR Institute at the University of Zambia will be responsible for implementing the project in collaboration with the National Commission for UNESCO. Criterion A.4: In terms of lasting results, the project would lead to the development of a national curriculum to strengthen capacities to implement the 2003 Convention. After UNESCO's support for twenty experts and practitioners during the initial three years, their subsequent fees and the costs associated with new enrolments for the degree programme would be supported by the Zambian Government or corporate sponsors. Criterion A.5: The Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund would cover 90 per cent of the total project budget with the State Party providing the remaining 10 per cent. Criterion A.6: It is mandatory for every student to carry out a practical project together with the communities for their benefit. With the knowledge and skills acquired through the degree programme, beneficiary students would be able to produce inventories and develop safeguarding projects. The capacities of the communities are also expected to be reinforced. Criterion A.7: The State Party has so far benefited from International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund twice, for the following two inventorying projects: Inventorying of proverbs of Lala community in Luano district of Zambia, contract under preparation (2016–2017), for an amount of US$24,999.90; Inventorying of the music and dance of the Lozi and Nkoya people of Kaoma District, contract under preparation (2016–2017), for an amount of US$24,928.30. These are implemented in accordance with UNESCO regulations. Paragraph 10(a): The proposed bachelors programme, the degree programme in intangible cultural heritage, is national in scope and involves participants from all ten provinces in Zambia. However, experts from other Southern African countries would also be invited to teach the subject in the future. Paragraph 10(b): The project is nationwide in scope with the potential to expand beyond Zambia's borders. The University of Zambia is one of the first universities in the wider region to offer degree programmes of this kind and may attract students from different countries, as well as sponsors to contribute to the sustainability of the programme in the long term. The Evaluation Board thus recommended that the Committee approve the International Assistance request from Zambia for the project entitled 'Strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia' and grant the amount of US$334,820 to the State Party. The Committee might wish to invite the State Party to seek the involvement of other collaborating institutions and organizations, including partners outside of the University of Zambia in the implementation of the project as a means of ensuring transparency and greater impact. The Committee might highlight the need for the State Party to ensure that the outcomes of the project are sustainable beyond the completion of the first cycle of the degree programme funded with this assistance. The Committee might further invite the State Party to use form ICH-04-Report to report on the use of the assistance granted.

889. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received for this request.

890. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** reflected on the information that Uganda had received assistance five times and Zambia twice. When the Evaluation Body considered a new request, did the Body have any information on the implementation status of some of the other

assistance that had been granted regarding their impacts and outcomes? Did it receive that kind of information to judge whether they should go ahead?

891. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked Saint Lucia for the question, explaining that the Evaluation Body only receives requests for International Assistance as submitted by the State Party concerned, their amount and the timeframe for their execution.

892. The **Secretary** understood from Saint Lucia's question that it concerned the assessment following the granting of International Assistance.

893. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** did not wish to refer to Uganda specifically or block assistance to a State Party. However, the delegation was of the opinion that the record of a State Party in the management of the Funds granted should be an important consideration when deciding whether to grant further assistance.

894. The **Secretary** explained that this information is provided to the Secretariat, meaning that once the Committee has approved an International Assistance request over US$100,000, the Secretariat follows up on the project implementation. Indeed, there is a criterion that depends on the performance of past projects that have been implemented. This was precisely the subject of discussions that took place under agenda item 7 on International Assistance budgets that outlined the work involved in its follow-up and implementation. Thus, this role is taken up by the Secretariat, which may inform the Evaluation Body should it prove problematic.

895. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that Saint Lucia was satisfied with the answer, and proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. **The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.d.3 adopted to grant the request for the amount of US$334,820 to Zambia for the project 'Strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia'**.

896. The **delegation of Zambia** congratulated the Vice-Chairperson for her chairing of this session. It thanked the Committee for approving its request for International Assistance, a project to strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia. The approval of the request would go a long way in building capacities in the area of intangible cultural heritage and in complementing government and private sector efforts at the national, district and community levels. The project would be fully supported by the Ministry of Tourism and Arts, the body responsible, the University of Zambia, where the training will be held, the Institute of Economic and Social Research, which is also heavily involved in the programme for intangible cultural heritage, and the National Commission for UNESCO in Zambia.

ITEM 11.e OF THE AGENDA

EXAMINATION OF PROPOSALS TO THE REGISTER OF GOOD SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/11.e+Add.2*
Files: *4 proposals*

897. The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Zambia and turned to the examination of agenda item 11(e): The examination of proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Before returning to the examination of draft decision 12.COM 11, the Vice-Chair informed the Committee that Belgium and Egypt had withdrawn their respective proposals. Thus, the Committee only had two proposals to examine. It was recalled that the Committee would evaluate the extent to which the proposals best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. The purpose of this register is to select effective safeguarding practices to be selected, disseminated and potentially replicated elsewhere. At its last session, the Committee recommended using the shortened title of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices instead of the Register of Best Safeguarding Practices. The revised title takes into consideration the impossibility of determining which practices are indeed the best. It also reflects the intent of the Register, which is to promote and share effective safeguarding

programmes and projects that other States and communities could learn from and that could serve to inspire them. The Vice-Chair recalled the selection criteria required, which were projected onto the screen. She then invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the proposals.

898. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the proposal **'Bulgarian Chitalishte, (Community Cultural Centre): practical experiences in safeguarding the vitality of the Intangible Cultural Heritage'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.e.2], submitted by Bulgaria. Established since 1856 in accordance with the Chitalishte Act of 1996, Chitalishte are non-governmental self-regulatory organizations. They perform cultural and educational activities aimed at safeguarding the customs and traditions of the Bulgarian people, ensuring access to information, distributing knowledge, and familiarizing citizens with the values and achievements of science, arts and culture. Chitalishte are central to the process of transmitting intangible cultural heritage with elderly members playing a key role in encouraging young people to get involved. From the information included in the file, the programme responded as follows to the criteria for selection as a good safeguarding practice set out in paragraph 7 of the Operational Directives. P.1: Although they were established as far back as in the 19th century as a way of cherishing traditional culture and local customs, the Chitalishte have adapted their actual operations to the purpose of applying safeguarding methods pertinent to intangible cultural heritage. Community members share common values between generations while implementing social and educational activities, festivals and exhibitions, documentation and archiving and raising awareness about specific elements of intangible cultural heritage. P.2: While Chitalishte centres operate as NGO structures, essentially at the local and national levels, they are also capable of operating at the regional and international levels. Cooperation with partner institutions from neighbouring countries is indicated in the form, as well as with the category 2 centre under the auspices of UNESCO based in Sofia, the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in south-eastern Europe with its regional reach. P.3: Chitalishte are inclusive and self-regulatory structures. They are established by communities and work primarily at the local level. Their objectives and activities relate to the safeguarding of local traditions and they address cultural needs through awareness-raising and educational activities, the dissemination of related cultural values, encouraging respect for cultural diversity and engaging increasingly in international cooperation. Activities for children also contribute to transmission processes. P.4: The centres are widely supported across the country by public authorities, institutions and various audiences. Over the years, Chitalishte have contributed to the safeguarding and transmission of intangible cultural heritage through various educational programmes, and the documentation and promotion of local traditions. The specific responsibilities of Chitalishte include offering support to bearers of traditions and updating the national living human treasure system. P.5: Wide public consultations preceded the proposal and attestations of consent from twenty-nine Chitalishte and supporting organizations are provided. Community involvement is integral to the planning and operations of these local community centres, with community members participating voluntarily as organizers, participants and audiences, often from an early age. However, more specific descriptions of how community members are involved in their activities are missing in the file. P.6: The Chitalishte model could be applied in different local circumstances. The system and organizational structure are inherently adaptable, as the many centres have proven through programmes and activities that are shaped by the aspirations and involvement of the various local communities that run them. As such, the centres can readily respond to community-based needs while still being guided by common national regulations and the broad support of the authorities. P.7: The file demonstrates the commitment of the various stakeholders involved with the Chitalishte in contributing to the dissemination of its practices and the learning accumulated. The partnership and collaboration include the Regional Centre for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-eastern Europe in Sofia, the Ethnographic Museum, the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Studies, and the National Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage. P.8: The Control Commission, a self-regulatory body internal to each Chitalishte, carries out an assessment of the activities. As required by national law under the Chitalishte Act, the General Assembly of each centre submits an adopted

programme to the municipal authorities. There are continuous cycles of self and external control and each Chitalishte is required to fill in a questionnaire from the Ministry of Culture for that purpose. P.9: Chitalishte not only serve as centres of intangible cultural heritage; they also address a much broader spectrum of local issues and problems. They successfully contribute to the coordination of local and national policies and resources with regard to cultural heritage and also work in continuous collaboration with schools, which significantly expands the possibility of combining formal and non-formal educational methods. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee select 'Bulgarian Chitalishte Community Cultural Centre Practical experience in safeguarding the vitality of the intangible cultural heritage' as a programme best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention. The Committee might encourage the State Party to share their experiences relating to the Chitalishte programmes and activities via regional and international platforms, not only in relation to community participation but also by providing examples of specific safeguarding methodologies and measures.

899. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.e.2 adopted to select 'Bulgarian Chitalishte, (Community Cultural Centre): practical experiences in safeguarding the vitality of the Intangible Cultural Heritage' to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices**.

900. The **delegation of Bulgaria** was moved, proud, happy and deeply grateful. It also expressed its appreciation to the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the positive decision on the selection of the proposal 'Bulgarian Chitalishte, (Community Cultural Centre): practical experiences in safeguarding the vitality of the Intangible Cultural Heritage', which demonstrates the importance of community cultural centres. The Chitalishta is a key element in the process of transmitting intangible cultural heritage in Bulgaria. In practice, the need to safeguard traditions and to exchange knowledge and skills is expressed through Chitalishte activities. This would allow communities to share and exchange common values and traditions informally from generation to generation.

901. The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Bulgaria and turned to the next proposal.

902. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next proposal, **'Margilan Crafts Development Centre, safeguarding of the atlas and adras making traditional technologies'** [draft decision 12.COM 11.e.4], submitted by Uzbekistan. Historically, Margilan was the centre for making atlas and adras fine traditional fabrics. Traditional crafts went through turbulent times during the Soviet period. The Crafts Development Centre was launched in 2007 to safeguard, develop and promote the method of Uzbek traditional atlas and adras making mainly through the transmission and promotion of skills. The success of the programme stems from its focus on a spirit of partnership with local communities playing a key role in its initiatives. From the information included in the file, the programme responded as follows to the criteria for selection as a good safeguarding practice. P.1: The programme arose from the urgent need to revitalize the craft techniques and practices. It involves awareness-raising activities and transmission at various levels, adopting an inclusive approach for different social groups; in particular, it supports intergenerational non-formal transmission with a focus on involving young people and promoting sustainable production through the use of natural fabrics and dyes. P.2: While the Margilan Crafts Development Centre mainly operates at the national level, ikat craftsmanship is also promoted at the international level through such activities as exhibitions, craft fairs and international festivals. Moreover, the Centre also connects craftspeople with art connoisseurs, fashion designers and markets in general. P.3: The Centre's mission includes safeguarding traditional atlas and adras making as a practice of intangible cultural heritage, ensuring respect for this element of cultural heritage and its bearers, raising awareness about its importance, and promoting respect for diversity and human creativity. It also encourages sustainable development based on heritage values that boost self-employment and the generation of income, as well as the inclusion of youth. P.4: The Centre has made a significant contribution to various

safeguarding measures, all of which have an important social impact. Its activities also include the revitalization of the traditional processes of silk production, dyeing and other aspects of the atlas and adras production process, along with the development of non-formal master apprentice training, master classes, and the production of educational materials. P.5: The local community first launched the campaign for the foundation of the Crafts Development Centre, supported by the government and civil society organizations. The process of preparing this proposal also involved the communities concerned at all stages. A large number of documents are enclosed as evidence of free, prior and informed consent. P.6: The file shows how an efficient public/private partnership scheme can be established for the safeguarding of cultural heritage. The project is a community-based initiative, supported by the State and other partners; in particular, the activities aimed at income-generation and sustainability could provide a model beyond Uzbekistan. However, there is a concern over the hierarchical nature of the working relationships between the different stakeholders within the Crafts Development Centre. P.7: The Crafts Development Centre has established professional relations with crafts workshops across the country. Moreover, the masters of the Crafts Development Centre visit foreign countries and eagerly transmit their knowledge and organize master classes and training activities. The practice is also disseminated through festivals, exhibitions and crafts fairs. P.8: Regular assessments carried out comprise both qualitative and quantitative data, which include monitoring and overall reporting to public agencies and specialized associations, and evaluations by partnering agencies. Continual quality control standards are also applied to the Crafts Development Centre's products. P.9: The Crafts Development Centre has developed within a context of social transition and has addressed many issues that are often pertinent to developing countries. The project could be considered as a model for social entrepreneurship in light of the inclusion of youth assistance for vulnerable groups and the revitalization of cultural heritage and sustainable development. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee select 'Margilan Crafts Development Centre, safeguarding of the atlas and adras making traditional technologies' as a programme best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention. The Committee might invite the State Party to ensure that the working relationships and conditions in the Margilan Crafts Development Centre are fully in line with the ethical principles of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.

903. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for his presentation. It was noted that no amendments had been received, and the draft decision was proposed for adoption as a whole. **The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11.e.4 adopted to select 'Margilan Crafts Development Centre, safeguarding of the atlas and adras making traditional technologies' to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices**.

904. The **delegation of Uzbekistan** expressed its warm thanks to the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat. This was the first nomination by Uzbekistan selected to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The delegation was sure that the selection of Margilan Crafts Development Centre would allow the community to take greater ownership of the practice, and would greatly inspire and encourage the knowledge bearers, as well as the government and its institutions, to become more involved in safeguarding this invaluable craftsmanship. Its inscription is a recognition of the identity of thousands of crafts people in Uzbekistan and would reinforce national identity, pride and dignity.

905. The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Uzbekistan, informing the Committee that it had completed the examination of the forty-five nomination files under agenda items 11 (a), 11 (b), 11 (c), 11 (d) and 11 (e).

ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2017

906. The **Vice-Chairperson** returned to the general debate concerning the Report of the Evaluation Body under agenda item 11, opening the floor to the Committee Members.

907. The **delegation of Senegal** expressed warm congratulations to the Evaluation Body on its work and the results achieved over these last two days. The challenging issues related to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage had been mentioned by the Rapporteur during his opening remarks, which had certainly helped in informing the Committee's decisions. Among those issues, of course, was the issue related to the removal and transfer of an element from one List to another. Another issue raised concerned the involvement of universities in development issues. All in all, the methodological approaches used, including the choice of the dual option, had enabled the Committee to work efficiently. The delegation believed that all the States Parties concerned by this dual option had welcomed it and were grateful to the Evaluation Body for its introduction. The delegation further believed that the Committee should continue in this thinking with regard to opening up communication with the submitting States. Indeed, communication mechanisms needed to be strengthened. This double option was fine, but the Committee needed to go further to improve the communication mechanisms with submitting States, so as not to repeat instances seen in other Conventions. However, in the case of the 1972 Convention – with interim reports between the evaluations and the possibility of meeting with the States Parties – these initiatives could perhaps be adapted to the 2003 Convention.

908. The **delegation of Zambia** joined Senegal in congratulating the Evaluation Body for its wonderful job, adding that it had a comment on paragraph 10.

909. The **delegation of Hungary** recalled its intervention concerning the opening of agenda item 11 on how it very much appreciated the oral report by the Evaluation Body. It reminded the Committee that the members of the Evaluation Body were elected by this Committee, which had established the rules and criteria on which this consultative body worked and made recommendations. In this regard, it should demonstrate respect towards the expertise and diligent work of the Evaluation Body, as had been the case during the present Committee session. The delegation noted that during deliberations on the nominations, this Committee had slightly changed its attitude compared to 2016, and it welcomed this change of abiding more closely by the Evaluation Body's recommendations. Another point at the beginning of this debate concerned shared heritage and it wished to make some amendments in this regard, which had been drafted with other delegations over the past few days.

910. The **delegation of Austria** had already made some comments on the overall report of the Body when the item had been opened, but it congratulated the Evaluation Body again on its work. Regarding the working methods, the delegation remarked on the recurrent mention of the visibility of intangible cultural heritage, creating awareness of its importance and encouraging dialogue, adding that the [Representative] List was not a competition as the World Heritage List might sometimes appear, and should have an inclusive approach. The delegation felt that in the present situation, the Members were occasionally forced into the roles of judges and defendants in the evaluation of files, which created discomfort and was not the aim of the Convention. For this reason, the delegation believed that the future role of the Evaluation Body might be more in the direction of assisting States Parties in submitting files rather than judging them. In this way, examinations would become a celebration of intangible cultural heritage, which would better encapsulate the spirit of the Convention. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Body with its expert experience should be involved in future discussions.

911. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that this Convention was above all a Convention for safeguarding, which should be reflected in future discussions. It was clear that the Evaluation Body was mandated to evaluate the files submitted to the Convention mechanisms; however, as pointed out by many delegations, it was also necessary to build capacity and skills. There were some submitting States that were unable to share their experiences and they should therefore be helped in the preparation of the files, as well as the safeguarding of their intangible cultural heritage. Certainly, the Representative List received the most focus, but the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices also deserved attention, although it was becoming a list of best practices for countries that could afford it. Other countries also had very good practices, but they could not develop them for lack of resources. Thus, the

Convention should not become a two-tier Convention with the Representative List split between rich and poor nations, with those that could invest a lot of resources and others that could not.

912. The **delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the Vice-Chair on the efficient way she had managed the discussions. Regarding the issue of synergies, the delegation referred to the discussion under Mongolia's file in which it wished to present an amendment to the draft decision. Regarding the discussion on the element inscribed from the United Arab Emirates, it wished to note that there was no clear definition in the Operational Directives of the scope of an element when talking about a different file or a similar practice in a different region, adding that perhaps the Committee could reflect on this in the future to have greater precision in this regard and thus avoid the lengthy discussions that might ensue.

913. The **delegation of Turkey** had already shared its comments with the Evaluation Body, but it would present some amendments to paragraph 8 regarding the Evaluation Body's observations on some of the elements shared by different communities and the importance of multinational files.

914. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** congratulated the Evaluation Body on the quality of its work. It also welcomed the initiative of the dual option, which facilitated the work of the Committee. It also called on submitting States Parties to provide the necessary information, which could be reflected in the establishment of a dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States, and thus prevent huge contradictions or difficulties in some nominations that come before the Committee, and to avoid any discomfort in the treatment of certain files.

915. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** congratulated the Evaluation Body for a job well done, noting the positive development in the Committee's attitude towards the work of the Evaluation Body, which should be encouraged. It remarked that in 2016 the Committee had faced some issues in relation to the place of politics, and again this year an issue had flared up. The delegation was convinced and confident that the field of intangible cultural heritage had a lot to teach other areas of work in the United Nations in terms of how the leadership approaches the subject. The Convention as a tool could contribute greatly towards healing, cooperation and peace among nations, especially among regional States that share elements. Strategies could be put in place that foster healing and cooperation, and peace among nations.

916. The **delegation of Finland** thanked the host country, the Secretariat and the Committee for the good work. It also supported the idea presented by Austria of discussing the future role of the Evaluation Body in assisting inscriptions. The Evaluation Body could give observations and recommendations to the States Parties, which could perhaps enhance the development of the Convention.

917. The **delegation of Egypt** congratulated the Vice-Chair on her stewardship of the meeting and thanked the Republic of Korea for its hospitality. The delegation wished to raise two points. Firstly, the dual option mechanism had worked very well and had indeed facilitated discussions in streamlining much of the process. The second point concerned developing countries. As Algeria had pointed out, it was important to prevent two-tier Lists: one for rich nations and one for poor nations.

918. The **delegation of Indonesia** appreciated the excellent work by the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat, as well as the Committee in processing the nomination files. It believed that the current system was now much improved, and it was satisfying for the States Parties that had presented nominations, which continued to guarantee credibility.

919. A **Representative of the ICHNGO Forum** acknowledged the hard work of the experts and the NGOs in the Evaluation Body and welcomed the newly implemented measures, such as the dual option and the changes and layout of the Forum. However, regarding inscriptions to the Lists, the Forum had observed at this session that the recommendations made by the Evaluation Body were once again almost systematically overruled by the Committee. While respecting the Committee's decisions, the ICHNGO Forum expressed a clear concern for any development that might weaken the credibility of the Convention, as well as the relevance

of the Evaluation Body. This affected, among other things, the potential value of advisory contributions that NGOs could offer to the Convention. In line with the current debates and decisions reflected in 11.COM and 12.COM, the advisory process of the Evaluation Body could eventually evolve from a judging role towards a more assistance-oriented one. Indeed, this Convention was not a competition, and its objectives should reflect an inclusive approach.

920. With no further speakers, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the examination of the draft decision. It was noted that the proposed draft decision was the result of the observations of the Evaluation Body. It addressed a number of issues that had been discussed over the past three days when the Committee debated each case individually, as well as the general debate on all the mechanisms. It also included a number of important reminders, in particular, for submitting States. It also raised important issues that the Evaluation Body and the Committee had encountered in the examination of files in the 2017 cycle and that it might wish to highlight. The Vice-Chair opened the floor for comments on the draft decision, noting that the Secretariat had three amendments.

921. The **delegation of Palestine** asked the Vice-Chair to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

922. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that paragraph 1 recalled the Operational Directives. Paragraph 2 cited the documents examined. Paragraph 3 expressed satisfaction with the work of the Evaluation Body. Paragraph 4 took note of the observations made during the course of the 2017 cycle. Paragraph 5 recalled the previous decisions of the Committee. Paragraph 6 appreciated the benefits of the referral option. Paragraph 7 took note of the dual system that had been proposed by the Evaluation Body. Paragraphs 1–7 were duly adopted. Paragraph 8 reminded States Parties that the Convention did not seek to establish a system of ownership.

923. The **delegation of Algeria** noted that some Members had made additional amendments to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11, which cover paragraph 8 in its entirety. Moreover, paragraph 8, as currently worded, appeared to go a little beyond the Committee's prerogatives, as it referred to the Convention, with the impression of negative connotations for the Convention, i.e. when a paragraph says that the 'Convention is not', the Committee is actually defining what it is, which is beyond the mandate of the Committee. Thus, the delegation sought the deletion of the paragraph as a whole.

924. The **Secretary** explained that the paragraph had come about in relation to discussions among the Evaluation Body in terms of claims made in the nomination files rather than to the Operational Directives or statutory decisions.

925. The **delegation of Cyprus** wished to add to the new paragraph 9, with which it totally agreed, which would read, 'and further encourages States Parties to submit multinational nominations', with perhaps 'and multinational inscriptions'.

926. The **Vice-Chairperson** suggested introducing the proposals when considering paragraph 9.

927. The **delegation of Colombia** would also wait for paragraph 9.

928. The **Chairperson** noted Algeria's proposal to delete paragraph 8 because the amendments in paragraphs 9 and 10 encompassed the spirit of paragraph 8.

929. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to introduce a new paragraph 8, which was co-sponsored by other Members.

930. The **delegation of Hungary** listened attentively to Algeria's intervention on paragraph 8, and understood that its amendment to paragraphs 9 and 10 took into account paragraph 8. However, the delegation proposed retaining paragraph 8, as it did not understand the linguistic reason behind the stated objectives of the Convention. Why would something that was not the purpose of the Convention preclude the purpose of the Convention? It nevertheless sought some common ground.

931. Given the explanations, the **delegation of Austria** was in favour of retaining paragraph 8, as this concerned ownership while the other paragraph was based on the geographical issue.

932. The **delegation of the Philippines** noted that Hungary and Austria saw value in this formulation, adding that the paragraph could perhaps be adjusted to address the concerns of Algeria. Moreover, it was important that these issues of geographical indication and intellectual property be stated as the Convention did not support exclusivity and exclusive rights. Thus, based on the files, and given that it was a recommendation from the Evaluation Body, the Committee should give it due credence.

933. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that it was not the working practice to put examples in a paragraph of a draft decision. It appreciated the rationale behind the paragraph, but everyone clearly understood the spirit of the Convention and it did not see the added value of including examples in the paragraph. The delegation supported its deletion.

934. The **delegation of Turkey** also wished to retain this important paragraph, adding that it complemented the paragraphs that followed. Also, it had made proposals on the understanding that the paragraph would be kept. Moreover, there were two different issues within paragraph 8, adding that the second paragraph, which read, 'that the inscription of an element on one of the Lists does not imply exclusive ownership of a cultural expression', was particularly important. The delegation explained that for some time, the Committee had remarked on this misunderstanding in interpreting elements and this paragraph therefore clarified that there was no exclusive ownership implied. In that sense, it valued the paragraph.

935. The **delegation of Zambia** wished to co-sponsor the retention of the paragraph, adding that it was very important, especially in view of some elements inscribed that had multi-ethnic elements or multinational ethnic groups such that a country or ethnic group might not wish others to have access to the element once inscribed in their name.

936. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** echoed the remarks by Turkey and Hungary that paragraph 8 complemented paragraph 9.

937. The **delegation of Colombia** also supported paragraph 8 as it was an important point of misunderstanding during this Committee, and all the more reason to have it clarified.

938. The **delegation of Cyprus** also sought to retain paragraph 8 but suggested looking at paragraphs 9 and 10 before deciding whether to keep or delete it.

939. The **delegation of Algeria** was not against the spirit of this paragraph; on the contrary, the following paragraphs developed this spirit. However, it supported a parallel view, adding that the Committee was not the General Assembly nor the drafting Committee of the Convention. The delegation then read Article 1 of the Convention, which states the four goals of the Convention, 'The purposes of this Convention are: (a) to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage; (b) to ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups and individuals concerned; (c) to raise awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage, and of ensuring mutual appreciation thereof; (d) to provide for international cooperation and assistance.' The paragraph gave the impression of defining a fifth by stating what the Convention was not. Thus, any reference to the Convention in this paragraph would be very awkward, not least because it was repeated in paragraphs 9 and 10. The delegation would be flexible for the sake of the consensus, but it did not wish to redefine the Convention.

940. The **delegation of Hungary** appreciated Algeria's flexibility, noting that the problem was perhaps with the French translation. While the English version stated, 'Reminds States Parties that the Convention does not seek to establish […]', the French version included the word 'objective'. The delegation proposed aligning the French with the English on this occasion, 'Rappelle aux Etats parties que la Convention pas cherche pas d'établir [ou ne vise pas à établir] un système', proposing that 'ne vise pas' might be the more eloquent solution..

941. The **Secretary** concurred that the text had originally been drafted in English, but despite concordance checks by the Secretariat, occasionally misinterpretations did arise. The original text did not refer to the objectives of the Convention, and the Convention did not 'seek to'.

942. The **delegation of Algeria** agreed that the understanding was even more obvious in the French than in the English, but the explanation remained the same. The paragraph was still defining the Convention through the use of the negative. The delegation wished to see paragraphs 9 and 10 to compare the elements that had been drawn from paragraph 8. Nevertheless, as the text stood, it referred to the Convention in a way that was beyond the Committee's mandate. It reiterated that it was in favour of the new paragraphs 9 and 10 and the spirit of paragraph 8, but not for redefining the Convention. In this regard, the Legal Advisor could provide clarification.

943. The **delegation of Hungary** returned to the earlier remarks by Saint Lucia, explaining that the spirit of this paragraph intended the Convention, its implementation and the listing mechanism to contribute to peace, cooperation and, where possible, healing regional wounds, even among nations, and that intangible cultural heritage was indeed where cooperation and the sharing of experience could prevail. The case of shared intangible cultural heritage had been observed in many nominations; in multinational nominations and in welcoming further extensions of already inscribed elements by certain States Parties. Thus, this procedure and approach to the Convention of nominating shared intangible cultural heritage in the form of multinational nominations should be encouraged as much as possible.

944. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to co-sponsor paragraph 9.

945. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** thanked Hungary for its eloquent explanation on paragraph 8, adding that it was not seeking to add an objective to the Convention. In fact, the Committee had been stating this over and over again in its interpretation of the spirit of the Convention, which was not explicitly spelled out. Paragraph 8 was therefore evoking the cooperation, shared wisdom and interpretation of the spirit that it tried to define. In this regard, paragraph 8 worked in conjunction with all the amendments, and it wished to co-sponsor paragraphs 8, 9 and 10.

946. The **delegation of Cyprus** remarked that it had provided the Secretariat with a minor amendment to paragraph 9, which would read 'and to submit nominations for inscription to elements already inscribed'. It explained that a State Party could inscribe its element on an already inscribed multinational file.

947. The **Secretary** clarified that the mechanism for joining multinational files did exist and cases had already occurred.

948. The **delegation of Cyprus** understood that the mechanism existed, but it sought to encourage other States to integrate their inscription to an already existing multinational file. The Mediterranean diet, with seven countries inscribed, was such an example.

949. The **delegation of Afghanistan** co-sponsored the proposals for paragraphs 9 and 10.

950. The **delegation of Austria** also supported the proposal for paragraph 9 by Hungary and others, adding that it complemented paragraph 8 very well, as discussed.

951. The **delegation of Senegal** also supported paragraph 9, firmly adding that African states only had artificial boundaries in that cultures were completely cross-border. Indeed, Africa had the most artificial borders in the world drawn up in Berlin at the time. Today, Africans recognized themselves in a cross-border culture and not in small confined states. Senegal also wished to co-sponsor paragraph 9.

952. The **delegation of Algeria** noted that paragraph 8 was suspended, and it would co-sponsor the amendments on paragraphs 9 and 10, which took account of all the concerns.

953. The **Vice-Chairperson** duly pronounced paragraphs 9 and 10 adopted, before returning to paragraph 8.

954. The **delegation of Algeria** could live with the paragraph as it stood, but without the reference to the Convention.

955. The **Secretary** drew the Committee's attention to Article 3 of the Convention, which referred to its relationship with other international instruments, particularly (b), which states, 'nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as affecting the rights and obligations of States Parties deriving from any international instrument relating to intellectual property rights or to the use of biological and ecological resources to which they are Parties'.

956. The **delegation of Guatemala** supported the spirit of the proposal and, noting that Algeria did not wish to make a reference to the Convention, suggested that the paragraph refer to the Committee, i.e. that the work of the Committee did not seek to establish a system.

957. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked Guatemala, adding that it could go along with the proposal. It sought, however, to reinforce the language, which would read 'Remind States Parties that inscriptions on the lists do not seek to establish a system of ownership […]', with no mention of the Convention.

958. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** supported paragraphs 9 and 10, as well as paragraph 8, as just explained by Algeria.

959. The **delegation of Senegal** could go along with the new proposal and it fully understood the concern raised by Algeria in that the Committee could not tell the Convention what it did not state. However, the Convention guided the Committee in its reflections and actions, and if the Committee wanted to strengthen the Convention in a decision, it had to refer to the Convention.

960. The **delegation of the Philippines** believed that the Committee was close with the new proposal by Algeria, which it could go along with as it was the intent of the original paragraph 8.

961. The **Vice-Chairperson** proposed returning to Algeria's amendment after lunch and adjourned the morning session.

[Friday, 8 December, afternoon session]

ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2017

962. The **Vice-Chairperson** began with the excellent news that the Committee had received an official invitation from Mauritius to host the thirteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee in Port Louis, which would be further discussed under item 19. The Vice-Chairperson thanked Mauritius on behalf of the Committee. She then turned to paragraph 8 on draft decision 12.COM 11, noting that Algeria had made an amendment to paragraph 8 that replaced 'the Convention' with 'the inscriptions on the list do not seek […]', for which there appeared to be a consensus.

963. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked all the Members that had joined the amendment with 'the Convention' clearly crossed out, which would now read, 'the inscriptions on the list do not seek to establish a system of ownership […]'. The delegation also wished to hear from the Legal Advisor in terms of the legal interpretation of the amendment and also to remind the Committee of the mandates of those that can and cannot interpret the Convention.

964. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the interpretation of the Convention belonged to the States Parties of the Convention because they are both the drafters and adopters of the rule, meaning the Convention. The Committee could certainly recommend to the States Parties how they wish to interpret the Convention. Regarding the new amendments proposed by Algeria, the changes appeared to address the concerns raised by Algeria.

965. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that Algeria was satisfied with the explanation, and paragraph 8 was duly adopted.

966. The **delegation of Palestine** recalled that it had sent a small amendment sponsored by Palestine, Cyprus, Algeria, Armenia, Afghanistan and Côte d'Ivoire, which could be placed as a 5.bis [later, a new paragraph 6].

967. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to add its name to the amendment.

968. The **delegation of Armenia** had discussed this paragraph earlier with the list of co-sponsors of this paragraph and suggested adding the word 'all' before the 'norms and principles' to read, 'are not in line with the objectives of the Convention and all norms and principles of international law'.

969. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that Senegal, Mongolia and Congo sought to co-sponsor the amendment.

970. The **delegation of Hungary** requested that the sponsor of the amendment explain the rationale behind the proposal as was standard procedure with new amendments, especially when brought up during the examination of a decision. It particularly sought clarification on the part 'not in line with […]'.

971. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that the purpose of the amendment had been raised several times, and that the Committee encouraged submitting States Parties to avoid any controversial titles, appellations or expressions, and to abide by international law. The paragraph essentially states that the Committee does not deal with politics but with the protection of intangible cultural heritage. That was why it encouraged States Parties to avoid any expressions or vocabulary that might create confusion, while the wording should be in line with the objectives of the Convention. Furthermore, respecting the norms and principles of international law is binding to all UN agencies and all intergovernmental Committees.

972. The **Secretary** sought clarification as to whether the paragraph referred to the objectives of the Convention or the spirit of the Convention.

973. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred that 'spirit of the Convention' was more appropriate.

974. The **delegation of Algeria** wished to provide a practical example of the application of this paragraph. A few years ago, Algeria had submitted a file for inscription on the Representative List, which was subsequently inscribed. However, the title contained a word that could be misinterpreted, and following discussions with a few Member States, including the Member State that had expressed reservations about the use of this word, Algeria had taken steps to change the title of its file in keeping with the friendly and bilateral spirit of the Convention.

975. The **Vice-Chairperson** remarked that all Members understood the importance of this paragraph, and with no objections, it was duly adopted [as a new paragraph 6] with the minor amendment from Armenia.

976. The **delegation of Hungary** remarked that the definite article was not needed in 'the norms and principles of the international law'. It also sought clarification regarding Armenia's proposal, as well as the example highlighted by Algeria. The delegation was also dubitative about changing 'objectives' of the Convention, which was clear, to the 'spirit' of the Convention, which was less tangible. Thus, although it understood the rationale, it expressed reservations on the change of the wording. The delegation sought the advice of the Legal Advisor in this regard, and also on the last part of the paragraph referring to the norms and principles of international law.

977. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to propose another amendment, which would read, 'in line with the letter and spirit of the Convention', which also encompassed the objectives and the spirit of the Convention in general. It also explained that the addition of 'all' indicated every norm and principle of international law and was thus more inclusive.

978. The **Legal Advisor** explained that the difference between the spirit and the objectives of the Convention was more a question of scope. The 'spirit' of the Convention was broader in scope and did not refer to the Convention per se nor what it stood for. Nevertheless, it did *imply* the objectives and the context. However, 'objective' referred to a more specific context,

as specifically set forth in the text of the Convention. It was therefore the sovereign body to decide whether it wished to use the broader term in this regard, or the more specific term of the objectives of the Convention. Regarding the norms and principles of international law, it was also a matter for the Committee to decide. Concerning the expression 'all', it was the Legal Advisor's view that it could be difficult to define 'all' because generally, in practice, the norms and principles of international laws would simply refer to the expression 'in accordance with the principles of international law', which would englobe and be interpreted as pertaining to all the principles of international laws and norms.

979. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the Legal Advisor for the clear explanation, adding that the principles of international law would suffice. As for the other question concerning objectives, spirit or letter, the delegation suggested 'the provisions of the Convention', which implied all the clauses and objectives of the Convention, whereas 'spirit' was open to interpretation.

980. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that the Legal Advisor had mentioned that 'spirit' was broader than 'provisions' or 'objectives', which are more limited in scope. It could however go along with Hungary's suggestion but it preferred to retain 'spirit' if not 'letter, as this was broader and also covered the provisions. Moreover, spirit was intangible and encapsulated the context around the Convention.

981. The **delegation of Armenia** asked the Legal Advisor whether 'Charter' could be used in place of 'norms and principles' as well as 'purposes and principles,' as stipulated in the UN Charter.

982. Returning to the point of 'spirit' versus 'provisions', the **Legal Advisor** suggested simply reverting to 'Convention', i.e. 'in line with the Convention', as this would include everything. Regarding Armenia's question, the Legal Advisor explained that it was a decision for the Committee should it wish to refer to the wording in the UN Charter.

983. The **delegation of Armenia** thus proposed replacing 'the norms' with 'purposes and principles of the UN Charter'.

984. After hearing the Legal Advisor, the **delegation of the Philippines** preferred to keep just 'Convention'. Regarding the final part of the paragraph, it preferred the general formulation 'principles of international law' to keep it simple. However, as a member of the UN, it would not have a problem should the Committee choose to cite the UN Charter. Nevertheless, a simple formulation of 'principles of international law' would suffice, as it included norms and other customary practices and international law within the principles.

985. The **delegation of Palestine** asked the Secretariat to tidy up the draft decision to reflect the amendment by the Philippines, as it was unclear.

986. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the remark to clean up the draft decision so that it was clearer and more precise.

987. The **delegation of Armenia** could go along with the Philippines' proposal to leave the text as it was, but it still insisted on adding the word 'all', as this implied inclusivity in all norms and principles of international law.

988. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that everyone was in agreement that 'in line with the Convention' should be retained, and proposed Armenia's minor amendment to insert 'all' in 'all norms and principles of international law', which was duly adopted. The Vice-Chair then turned to the new wording in paragraph 11.

989. The **delegation of Senegal** asked that the sponsors of the paragraph provide their rationale.

990. The **delegation of Hungary** reiterated an earlier explanation that the objective of these paragraphs was to further facilitate cooperation in the preparation of nomination files in order to enhance multinational nomination and, in particular, paragraphs 10 and 11 would prevent potential misunderstandings among communities concerning the ownership of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation further explained that this would help the work of the

Committee if in paragraph 1 the shared nature of the element was clearly spelled out on the basis of information provided in the nomination file. In fact, its amendment had been drawn up after consultations with several delegations in which it agreed that it was better to spell out the reference in the text itself.

991. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted Afghanistan, Armenia, Cyprus, Ethiopia and Saint Lucia as co-sponsors.

992. The **delegation of Zambia** found that paragraph 8, as presented, already encapsulated this concern and was thus unnecessary.

993. The **delegation of Hungary** understood the rationale behind paragraphs 8 and 9 as being the principles, whereas paragraphs 10 and 11 were operative in nature. Thus, should the Committee wish to see its principles followed, as proposed in paragraphs 8 and 9, then it should put into practice paragraphs 10 and 11. That was why they were connected.

994. The **Secretary** clarified that paragraph 8 'Reminds State Parties', whereas paragraph 11 is addressed to the Evaluation Body. Thus, the two paragraphs were addressed to two different entities.

995. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that Zambia was satisfied with the explanation, and with no objections, paragraph 11 was duly adopted. Paragraph 12 was also adopted. There was a minor amendment in paragraph 13 from Zambia.

996. The **delegation of Zambia** explained that it was a grammatical edit for clarity.

997. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted no objections and paragraph 13 was duly adopted. Paragraphs 14 and 15 were also adopted. Paragraph 16 was a new paragraph proposed by the Philippines, Palestine and Mongolia.

998. The **delegation of the Philippines** recalled an earlier discussion when reference had been made to the inscription of an associated site on the Tentative List under the World Heritage Convention and it was agreed to move the reference to synergies between culture Conventions, in particular the 1972 Convention, to this general resolution. So, in consultation with some Committee Members, it proposed this language. The delegation also gave the example of Jeju, which is a World Heritage site, but which had also inscribed elements on the Representative List. These were thus the kinds of synergies that showed how these connections could further benefit States Parties and communities.

999. The **delegation of Algeria** wished to join this paragraph with a minor amendment, explaining that it was indeed important to talk about synergies, but programmes should not be excluded. The delegation made specific mention of the MAB[6] programme, which could work in synergy with the Convention, but would be excluded by the current wording in the paragraph. For this reason, it wished to complete the text with 'as well as other Conventions and programmes'.

1000. The **delegation of Hungary** strongly supported the amendment brought forward by the Philippines, as well as the amendment by Algeria. Jeju Island is also a Biosphere Reserve and part of the MAB Programme, so indeed, synergies should be extended to UNESCO Conventions and programmes. The delegation understood that the World Heritage Convention was often the first association that people thought of when talking about the 2003 Convention, but it was not the only relevant one. In this regard, the delegation sought to hear from the Secretariat on the formulation 'as well as other UNESCO Conventions' as well as the deletion of 'cultural', and whether using all the Conventions was feasible. It surmised that 'relevant' could perhaps be added, as 'relevant Conventions and programmes'.

1001. The **Secretary** remarked that this paragraph came within other broader discussions in UNESCO. In this regard, he informed the Committee that the Secretariat had set up cross-referencing of the 1972 and 2003 Conventions on the intangible cultural heritage website, such that a site in the 1972 Convention was linked with an element in the 2003 Convention. The Secretary recalled that the Culture Sector had two cross-cutting main lines of action

6. The Man and the Biosphere Programme of UNESCO.

which are precisely intended to cover synergies and collaboration across all the culture Conventions, as those involved in the discussions on programming under the C/5 would know. Regarding the mention of other sectors, the Secretary saw no impediment in terms of the spirit, even though there might be practical implications. Nevertheless, the language in the paragraph was encouraging synergies, which was acceptable.

1002. The **Director of the Division of Creativity**, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, clarified that at the level of the Culture Sector, with regard to the 39 C/5 and its the plan for the next biennium, the Division had two cross-cutting expected results across all the six culture Conventions. One of the themes concerned conflicts and emergencies, and the other was the SDGs and the 2030 Agenda. These cross-cutting expected results look at possible synergies across all the Conventions and see where connections between the implementation of the activities among these Conventions exist. For example, the natural heritage part of the 1972 Convention is already in synergy with the MAB Programme. So, they are linked through their common activities. Even at the level beyond UNESCO, the biodiversity Conventions and the 1972 Convention are working together. Thus, there were linkages at different levels, which were being explored for linkages and synergies in specific cross-cutting areas.

1003. The **delegation of Ethiopia** remarked that it had previously expressed concerns but was thankful for those Members who had drafted this paragraph, adding that it was very comfortable with the spirit of the paragraph. Nevertheless, it wondered why the 1972 Convention should be specifically highlighted given that it is a subset of the UNESCO Conventions. The delegation otherwise supported this paragraph, as amended by Algeria, as it helped to frame all the programmes that could potentially help the Convention's cause.

1004. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** remarked that it was important to consider what the bearers had in value that would contribute to the protection of intangible cultural heritage, and therefore it also agreed with this paragraph.

1005. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Algeria for the relevant amendment, which it supported, and noted that there was another amendment mentioned by Hungary that had not been reflected, which was the addition of 'relevant'. The delegation found it acceptable, making the paragraph clearer. Regarding Ethiopia's question, it asked that the Philippines respond. Finally, after listening to the Director of the Division, felt that 'Encourages further efforts' was better, as 'efforts' had already been cited in the draft decision.

1006. The **delegation of Turkey** noted that the Secretary had explained that the synergy process had already been established by the Secretariat, and that this issue had also been discussed within the context of the Ad-hoc Working Group on governance, which also called for further synergies. Thus, the Committee was very much in line with the Ad-hoc Working Group, so this was highly relevant and the delegation thus preferred Hungary's suggestion, adding that in addition to geoparks and the MAB Programme there were also links to UNESCO's MOST Programme and the IHP Programme[7]. For sure, coherence within all of UNESCO was needed, but the Convention was trying to do something different and it did not necessarily cover all of UNESCO's programmes. The delegation was therefore supportive of the paragraph in line with the amendment by Hungary of 'relevant'.

1007. The **delegation of Afghanistan** also supported the amendment, and with 'relevant'.

1008. The **delegation of Cyprus** also agreed with the amendment as proposed with 'relevant' in the French text as well.

1009. The **delegation of Senegal** could agree with the paragraph but wished to add that in the implementation of the 2003 Convention it was apparent that it had strong synergies with the 1972 Convention in that the links between the intangible and the tangible were so compelling in some sites, which was the reality. Nevertheless, it fully agreed with Hungary on the use of 'relevant', as it was relevant to the implementation of the Convention. The delegation wished

7. MOST Programme: Management of Social Transformations.
IHP Programme: International Hydrological Programme.

to add a small amendment that referred to the relevance in relation to the implementation of the Convention, as this made reference to the Convention's objectives.

1010. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** supported the proposal just made, adding that it shared the same concern as Ethiopia: why specifically mention the 1972 Convention and not include the synergy between the 2003 Convention and other UNESCO Conventions and programmes?

1011. The **delegation of Zambia** supported the paragraph, adding that it had no problem with the specific mention of the 1972 Convention, but wished to add 'as well as other relevant international Conventions' as the Committee should not restrict itself solely to UNESCO Conventions.

1012. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Committee Members for the interest generated, and welcomed 'relevant'. Responding to the question from Ethiopia and Côte d'Ivoire, the delegation explained that the 1972 Convention was mentioned explicitly because that was how it was raised in the context of the discussions during the present session in which a specific file had an associated site that was inscribed on the State Party's Tentative List. Senegal had mentioned that the links between 2003 and 1972 were indeed more tangible, which was why it was explicitly mentioned. Regarding the last suggestion by Zambia, the delegation wondered whether it might be broadening the scope too much, although it was flexible. Nevertheless, it preferred to maintain 'relevant UNESCO Conventions and programmes'.

1013. The **delegation of Cuba** did not think it was in the Committee's mandate to open this paragraph with respect to other Conventions even though States were Members of those other international instruments. It was ready to adopt this paragraph in view of the link between the 1972 and 2003 Conventions in that there were no other instruments in UNESCO that had a Representative List as such and they shared similarities. The delegation believed that the proposal to other 'UNESCO Conventions and programmes' covered the concerns of Member States, but it did not agree to include 'other international Conventions'.

1014. The **delegation of Austria** supported 'UNESCO Conventions' and 'recommendations', which would read 'UNESCO Conventions, recommendations and programmes'.

1015. The **delegation of Hungary** also had the intention to propose 'recommendations'. For example, in 2015 the General Conference had adopted the recommendation on the protection and promotion of museums and collections. In 2011, under historical landscapes, specifically mentioning intangible cultural heritage, were contexts in which intangible cultural heritage was relevant. Citing UNESCO programmes and traditional water management techniques, such as the ones inscribed earlier from Peru, may also be relevant in the IHP Programme. Thus, it found 'UNESCO Conventions, recommendations and programmes' to be a good formulation. It was also happy to go along with the consensus on 'relevant'. Moreover, 'UNESCO Conventions, recommendations and programmes' covered the spectrum. Furthermore, it was not against going beyond normative instruments adopted outside the context of UNESCO, but at this stage felt that it would be too much to ask.

1016. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with some of the Members that the use of 'international' in Zambia's amendment was perhaps going too far. It also supported 'relevant', as it was totally appropriate. However, it had some concerns about 'recommendations', adding that 'other relevant UNESCO Conventions and programmes' was clear enough and amply relevant to the Committee's purpose in that these Conventions and programmes had structures and Secretariats, which was not the case for recommendations. In this regard, it was not at all appropriate to keep recommendations.

1017. The **delegation of Turkey** agreed that synergies was in fact a very sensitive issue, adding that there was currently a process launched by UNESCO on synergies, which could not be said for all other international Conventions. Thus, as the Convention is housed under UNESCO, the Committee should limit itself to the relevant UNESCO Conventions in the first instance. Regarding Austria's 'recommendations', the delegation had difficulty in understanding what it specifically implied, as 'Conventions and programmes' referred to

statutory processes, while 'recommendations' was something different. The delegation asked that the Legal Advisor provide some clarity on the implications of its inclusion.

1018. The **delegation of Cyprus** concurred with the remarks, adding that the paragraph referred to synergies between Conventions and not between recommendations. It therefore supported the deletion of 'recommendations', and keeping 'UNESCO conventions' but not 'international'.

1019. The **delegation of Colombia** believed that this question was becoming very complex when in fact the Committee was seeking synergies with the 1972 Convention and all the Conventions connected to its work. The delegation also felt that not everything that UNESCO had related to culture needed be listed. Indeed, intangible cultural heritage was related to everything within culture, education, gender, armed conflict and so on, and thus did not require a list. The delegation thus preferred to maintain synergies with UNESCO Conventions, while leaving an opportunity in the future for an enlargement when other relevant programmes were debated.

1020. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** could not see how it was possible to have synergies between recommendations, as synergies occurred within a structured programme in a Convention. It also supported the removal of 'recommendations'.

1021. The **delegation of Algeria** concurred that it was getting rather complicated, even if it made sense. In addition, Conventions and programmes had a Secretariat, while recommendations did not. Secretariats could discuss with each other to create a synergy, while this was not necessarily the case with recommendations. It thus sought to stay with 'Conventions and programmes'. It was also clear that the Committee sought to work with relevant Conventions and programmes.

1022. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** agreed with the other Members regarding 'recommendations' in that Conventions and programmes did not have the same legal form as recommendations. It requested that Austria agree to delete 'recommendations'.

1023. The **delegation of Austria** agreed to move forward.

1024. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the consensus, and with no objections paragraph 16 was duly adopted. Paragraphs 17–19 were also adopted. **The Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 11 adopted**.

1025. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** wished to say a few words. Since it was his final year on the Evaluation Body, he wished to thank the Members of the Committee who had elected him for a three-year term from 2015 to 2017, as well as the members of the Evaluation Body for electing him as Chairperson in 2015 and 2017. He hoped that he had lived up to their trust. The Chairperson also thanked the Secretariat for its unwavering support and professionalism, and the States Parties for their indulgence when the recommendations made to the Committee were not the ones they might have expected. The Chairperson thanked all the other stakeholders, colleagues, researchers, and the members of the NGOs. He was delighted to have served the Convention in recent years, especially on the Evaluation Body, and he wished all the remaining members every success, as well as the newly elected members. The Chairperson hoped that the Convention would move forward to safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage that was so dear to all.

1026. The **Vice-Chairperson** spoke on behalf of all the Committee Members to thank the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for all his efforts, wishing him all the best and success in his future endeavours. The Vice-Chair thanked the Committee for its work and handed the chair to the Vice-Chair from Colombia.

[The Vice-Chairperson from Colombia chaired the following session]

1027. The **Vice-Chairperson** informed the Committee of a proposed change in the agenda to first discuss agenda item 14 on the reflection on the removal of an element from one List to another, followed by agenda items 13 and 12.

1028. The **Secretary** explained that the proposed change made sense because the Committee had just discussed this issue of the transfer of an element, but also, more importantly, the Secretariat had received a draft amendment on item 13 that first required the discussion and adoption of item 14.

1029. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that there were no objections.

ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA

REFLECTION ON THE REMOVAL OF AN ELEMENT FROM A LIST AND THE TRANSFER OF AN ELEMENT FROM ONE LIST TO THE OTHER

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/14*
Decision: *12.COM 14*

1030. The **Secretary** recalled that the reflection on the transfer of an element from one List to the other and the removal of an element from a List originated from the debates of the Committee at its tenth session in 2015. During that session, the Committee had decided to treat the request submitted by Viet Nam to transfer 'Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province, Viet Nam' from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List on an exceptional basis. At the same time, the Committee had also decided to begin a reflection to establish clear procedures for the removal of an element from one List and the transfer from one List to another, and to revise the Operational Directives (in its Decision 10.COM 19). The Secretary began his presentation by first recalling the current text of the Operational Directives, i.e. the starting point for the reflection. Three paragraphs currently addressed the removal or transfer of an element (under subchapter I.11): i) paragraph 38 on transfer establishes that an element may not be simultaneously inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, that a State Party may request that an element be transferred from one List to the other, and that such a request must demonstrate that the element satisfies all of the criteria for the List to which transfer is requested; ii) paragraph 39 on removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List is determined by the Committee after an assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan, and that the element no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription on that List; iii) paragraph 40 on the removal from the Representative List is determined by the Committee when the element no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription on that List. In their current state, the Operational Directives were somewhat ambiguous about the relationship between the transfer and removal of an element, and could indeed be interpreted in two different ways with different implications: i) either a removal is required before a transfer can take place (the removal and transfer are then considered as an interlinked procedure); or ii) a transfer has its own separate procedure (the removal and transfer are then considered as two separate procedures).

1031. The **Secretary** explained the differences between interlinked and separate procedures. In an interlinked procedure, the Committee had decided in Decision 10.COM 19 that pending the adoption of the relevant procedures by the General Assembly, it would examine at the same time both the report on the status of 'Xoan singing of Phú Thọ Province, Viet Nam', as well as the new nomination for the same element to the Representative List. The Committee considered that this transfer could not happen without the prior removal of the element from the other List, corresponding to a literal application of the Operational Directives on an interlinked procedure. For the transfer of elements from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List or to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, it could be deemed more adequate to consider an interlinked procedure. It would indeed be logical to first evaluate whether the element was still in need of urgent safeguarding, and hence examine its possible removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List before considering its transfer. Notwithstanding the procedure applied in the case of Viet Nam, the Operational Directives could be interpreted in a different way, with the two processes of the transfer and removal being considered separately, as per a separate procedure. Following this approach, a transfer could take place *after* the Committee had examined the nomination of an element that was already listed. If the nomination was found to satisfy all the criteria of the 'other List',

the Committee could decide to transfer the element from the original to the other List without first removing the element from the original List, i.e. the transfer itself would implicitly include the removal of the element from the original List. In this scenario, an element would be transferred to a new List irrespective of its status in relation to the criteria of the original List. In the same vein, paragraphs 39 (removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List) and 40 (removal from the Representative List) would then also be stand-alone procedures. For the transfer of elements from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List, i.e. in the opposite sense than was examined in the case of Viet Nam, it would indeed seem logical to consider the transfer and removal as two separate processes. Indeed, the transfer of an element from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List might not require the evaluation of the file against the criteria of the Representative List but instead against the criteria of the Urgent Safeguarding List. Another consideration is how the transfer and removal procedure might be initiated, as the current Operational Directives presented asymmetrical situations. According to paragraph 38, a State Party may request that an element be transferred from one List to the other. However, in the case of a removal, it is the Committee that decides, while paragraphs 39 and 40 remain silent about the role of the State Party or Parties concerned.

1032. The **Secretary** then evoked the lessons learned from the evaluation submitted by Viet Nam, recalling that this was the first experience by the Evaluation Body of evaluating a transfer request, which was based on a procedure identified by the Committee in its Decision 10.COM 19. This led to a number of observations. A criterion-by-criterion evaluation of the *status* of the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List against the *criteria* for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List was deemed inadequate. More specifically, the five criteria were not necessarily considered suitable as they had been formulated with a view to the possible inscription of an element and not for the purpose of examining whether an element could be removed from the List. This first experience showed that a new set of criteria would have to be devised for the specific purpose of examining a request for the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. The core of the evaluation should focus on: i) the assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan included in the initial nomination file; ii) the consent of the communities to the removal of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List; iii) confirmation that the nature of the element had not been distorted as a result of the implementation of the safeguarding plan; and iv) proof that the inventory had been (or was planned to be) updated to reflect the evolving status of the element. The sequence of the criteria was also deemed inadequate. The Body therefore suggested that, in the future, it should: i) first evaluate the implementation of the safeguarding plan and ensure that the nature of the element had not been distorted; (ii) ensure that the communities who had consented to the inscription also consented to the removal; and (iii) evaluate whether the threats identified still jeopardized the viability of the element so as to ascertain whether the element was still in need of urgent safeguarding. In this first evaluation of a transfer request, the status of the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List was based on the quadrennial report prepared and submitted by the State Party. However, this tool was considered inadequate as the quadrennial report did not provide sufficient information to assess whether an element still needed urgent safeguarding. Based on this observation, a new form would be required to allow submitting States to demonstrate the effectiveness of the implementation of the safeguarding plan described in the nomination file submitted at the time of inscription. This new form would also require submitting States to provide evidence of the consent of the same community that had supported the initial inscription of the element to have the element removed from the Urgent Safeguarding List, as well as a new assessment of the status of the element after the implementation of the safeguarding plan, including an evaluation of the threats to its viability identified at the time of inscription.

1033. Beyond these procedural and technical aspects, the **Secretary** believed that the issue of removal and transfer raised some broader questions. Firstly, the transfer request submitted by Viet Nam raised the need for a deeper reflection on the nature of listing and the purposes of the Lists of the Convention. It would thus seem pertinent for the Committee to consider the

broad context of the Convention and the full range of its mechanisms in order to address both 'transfer' and 'removal' in a way that was consistent and in line with its intent and purpose. Under the Convention, the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List each have distinct and specific objectives (as set out under Articles 16 and 17 of the Convention). The premature transfer or removal of an element might jeopardize the very purpose of the Urgent Safeguarding List and reinforce the already prominent tendency by States Parties to favour the Representative List. In this regard, the Committee might wish to reflect on the prominence of the Representative List and whether it fulfils its intended purpose to raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage in general. While the experience of the 2017 cycle provided some insights into the difficulties experienced in examining a transfer request within the framework of the current Operational Directives, the Committee might also consider the possibility of the transfer of an element from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List, i.e. in the opposite sense. In this regard, the Committee might wish to reflect on the appropriateness of the criteria of the Representative List should it ever receive such a transfer request, and consider whether such a transfer would follow the same procedures as a transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. In addition, the discussions on the transfer of elements from one List to another raises concern regarding the risk of turning the listing mechanisms of the Convention into a sister model of the listing system established under the 1972 World Heritage Convention. If a transfer to the Representative List constitutes an indicator of achievement for elements previously inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, this could lead to a major change in the dynamic of both Lists. This trend should therefore be carefully considered in light of the different purposes of the two Conventions.

1034. The **Secretary** then turned to the second consideration that the Committee might wish to keep in mind, which was to make better use of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (under Article 18 of the Convention). In a case in which successful safeguarding efforts led to a situation wherein an element no longer required urgent safeguarding, the removal of this element from the Urgent Safeguarding List, followed by the selection of its successful safeguarding process for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, could also be considered as a logical outcome. A third consideration was the link between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the International Assistance mechanism. The examination of the transfer submitted by Viet Nam highlighted the importance of the effective implementation of the safeguarding plan for elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. This should help reinforce the existing combined mechanism that allowed States Parties to nominate elements to the Urgent Safeguarding List while simultaneously requesting International Assistance to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan (Form ICH-01bis). Fourthly, periodic reporting also seemed to play an important role in the procedure relating to the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, the evaluation of the transfer request submitted by Viet Nam had shown that the periodic report – in its current form – was not an adequate tool for examining a removal request. This issue should be considered in light of the recommendation from the Evaluation Body to create a new form specifically dedicated to transfer and removal procedures. In addition, paragraph 39 of the Operational Directives on the prior assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan might also be taken into account in a different way, for instance through a monitoring mission or a separate reporting exercise. For the removal of an element inscribed on the Representative List, paragraph 40 of the Operational Directives did not prescribe how the Committee should proceed. The question concerned how the Committee would determine that an element no longer satisfied one or more criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The periodic reports might be a source of information in this regard. However, the national reports on elements inscribed on the Representative List followed a six-year periodicity and might therefore not be available or fully updated at the time of a request for removal or transfer. Finally, community consent should also be a key consideration in the evaluation of requests for the transfer of an element from one mechanism to another, as communities are in the best position to evaluate the status of the elements. However, uncertainty remained as to how communities could participate in this process beyond the provision of consent letters. Possibilities for the active and more direct involvement of communities in the process should therefore be further explored.

1035. The **Secretary** remarked that the examination of the transfer request submitted by Viet Nam had highlighted a number of procedural and technical issues, as well as raising more fundamental issues linked to the core of the Convention that could instigate an in-depth reflection on the future of the listing system. Suggesting ways forward, the Secretary explained that while the creation of clear and more established procedures, new criteria and forms, and the revision of the Operational Directives could indeed allow for the transfer of elements and hence solve the issue of transfer requests in the short term, the Committee might also keep in mind that the transfer of elements from one List to another was more than a technical issue and that it could have far-ranging ramifications for the Convention and the core purposes of its mechanisms in the future. In light of this, it might be premature for the Committee to examine other removal and transfer requests before clear procedures and methodologies had been established and included in the Operational Directives, and before operational tools for the implementation of these procedures had been created. The Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group, which the Committee had initially hoped would be held before the present session to discuss the draft Operational Directives on the transfer and removal procedures, could not be convened as no voluntary supplementary contributions had yet been made to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund for this purpose. Thus, draft decision 12.COM 14 proposed convening an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group, pending a voluntary supplementary contribution to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, to reflect on: i) the procedures for the removal of an element from a List and the transfer from one List to the other; and ii) larger fundamental issues for the future of the 2003 Convention such as the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register, and the relevance of the various criteria for each of these mechanisms.

1036. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked Viet Nam as its nomination had given the Committee the opportunity to discuss the possibilities of the removal of an element from one List and to draw lessons and question how to address this issue in the future. In fact, it would have been very useful if the Committee had been able to organize the working group before the present session of the Committee to properly reflect on the matter. Nevertheless, it considered Viet Nam's case as an exception and thus it should not set a precedent for any such cases in the future until a framework had been defined. The delegation strongly believed that States Parties should refrain from submitting such files until clear procedures had been developed and the Operational Directives had been revised accordingly. It fully agreed with the recommendation of the Evaluation Body that the Committee should not rush into this issue before setting clear and specific rules. The Convention was quite new and comparisons between this Convention and the 1972 Convention in terms of removals and transfers from one List to another were best avoided. Firstly, the Committee should be able to answer the fundamental questions of the intent and purpose of the Convention and listing mechanisms. This issue should thus be fully discussed at the technical level by experts in the first instance, and sufficient time should also be given for its consideration at the intergovernmental level before coming to the Committee. The delegation wished to hear from the Evaluation Body regarding the challenges they had faced during the examination of Viet Nam's file. It also had some amendments under this agenda item.

1037. The **delegation of the Philippines** viewed this item as relevant for the future directions of the Convention and its mechanisms. In the bigger picture, it viewed listing as only a small part of the intangible cultural heritage story and not an end but only a means for greater safeguarding and transmission of elements. From this perspective, the Representative and Urgent Safeguarding Lists were living and dynamic entities. Reporting and monitoring elements hence became key. When considering such transfers in the future, a paradigm shift was perhaps needed in how the Committee should conduct its work and decide on the status of elements. Would there be a need to move away from a methodology that only examines the contents of files to one that goes *in situ* to observe the elements and communities themselves? Also, hypothetically, what if in the case of a multinational file the element in one or more submitting States Parties required a possible transfer from one List to another, but not in the other States Parties that had submitted the original dossier? In this case, the Committee might have to look at paragraph 38 of the Operational Directives and decide

whether in fact the same element could indeed be on two separate Lists at the same time. Hence its earlier intervention under item 11, in which it had called for a clear definition of what an element and its scope actually meant. These were of course far-reaching questions that had serious implications for the Convention's future. The delegation supported points regarding the Register of Good Practices and, again, this dynamic should be multidirectional, but the Convention and its Operational Directives did not accommodate for this multidirectional dynamic for the time being. It was felt that further work on this should be as open as possible and should not be restricted to an expert's working group but rather be a more inclusive and constant conversation involving as many States Parties as possible. The delegation believed that eventually, when more procedures had been outlined and ironed out, this could in fact hold the reins of a new and more compelling vision for the Convention and could actually help position the system into dealing with the complex challenges faced under such items as intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and intangible cultural heritage in sustainable development. This work needed to be taken up and the delegation commended the work that had been already done in this regard, even though there was still quite a long road ahead.

1038. The **delegation of Senegal** recalled that the case of Viet Nam was indeed an exception and its removal and transfer to another List was an exceptional case. Currently, the Committee did not have specific rules or procedures, which it needed to work on. Unfortunately, the budget for a planned working group had not been found, but the Committee should continue to work in this direction. Indeed, as pointed out by the Secretariat and the Philippines, it was clear that there was no need to rush into this issue. The purpose of the Convention was the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, which was the most important aspect, and not inscription necessarily. Regarding the relationship to the 1972 Convention, the delegation agreed that synergies were desirable, but on this particular issue, the Committee should tread carefully because the 1972 Convention had very specific criteria and procedures that determine whether a site is inscribed or endangered, which was not at all the case with the 2003 Convention. The Convention sought to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. From this point of view, the Committee should deepen its reflection on the removal and transfer of an element, and only a working group could help the Committee arrive at convincing results. For the time being, the Committee should evoke these procedures and the perspectives of deepening this reflection, but not insist on finding a solution in the present session.

1039. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive information that provided an insight into the situation, which concerned all Member States. Indeed, it was a young Convention and in a decade [if left unresolved], it would have a bigger problem in this regard. That was why it was important to take note of all these issues and to evaluate and reflect as fully as possible so that the situation would not remain the same in the future. It was true that the 2003 Convention was not the same as the 1972 Convention, but the Committee should take into account the incident that had occurred in this session, which was also perilous as it could lead to a politicization of this Convention. The delegation spoke of the terrible situation of certain World Heritage sites in Danger in the 1972 Convention, adding that this was also a problem for the smooth running of the 2003 Convention. Moreover, this debate not only concerned the Committee; the General Assembly should also be part of this debate. For this reason, the delegation advocated that in all the issues, the working groups should directly link with the General Assembly so as to reach a solution through consensus in which all States Parties could participate, and thus prevent the same situation occurring in the next five years as was currently experienced in the 1972 Convention.

1040. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that it was most important to reflect on the spirit of the Lists and their impact on the Convention and the safeguarding of elements. It was important in this present session to see how the Lists in the 2003 Convention had evolved, and to be very careful not to have Lists functioning at different speeds. As previously mentioned, the delegation did not wish to see Lists transformed into an 'infamous' List comprising poor nations where urgent safeguarding was needed on the one hand, and on the other, States with ample resources that presented best practices; this was a problem that needed to be addressed. The transfer of an element from one List to another was linked to these issues.

Thus, an in-depth reflection on why and how the impact of these Lists occurred needed to be carried out by a body of experts on this subject, which would be followed up at the intergovernmental level.

1041. The **delegation of Austria** believed that this was indeed a highly complex issue, but also a very interesting development, noting that there was still no procedure in place regarding the removal of an element from a List. An important point raised was the reconsideration of the purposes of the List and also the danger of creating hierarchies between them. The delegation agreed that a transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List should not be considered as an indicator of achievement, and it also supported the link made between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices because of course it made sense to promote and share a successful safeguarding plan. It also deemed it absolutely necessary that the communities, groups and individuals concerned provide their informed consent, as they were in the best position to evaluate the status of the element. Finally, it agreed that the introduction of new forms, criteria and requests should be given careful consideration, and therefore it fully supported the creation of an open-ended and inclusive working group in that regard.

1042. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked Turkey for its question on the difficulties encountered in the first evaluation of Viet Nam's nomination, adding that he would only refer to the report as it contained most of what the Body had encountered in terms of difficulties. First, on the question of format: the format of the report did not follow the usual format of nomination forms, which made it difficult to confirm whether or not the information contained in the report could confirm that the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List were still valid. Regarding the question of the need for a clear procedure, this also caused some difficulty in that the Body had relied on the procedure outlined in the Committee's Decision 10.COM 19, which was followed to the letter, but it lacked a clear procedure for the removal of an element from one List and its transfer to another List. The third difficulty concerned community consent, which was a dual consent: consent for the removal from the Urgent Safeguarding List, and consent for the possible inscription on the Representative List. Regarding the transfer mechanism, the Body solely relied on the trust and confidence in the data provided by the State Party. Nevertheless, the Body agreed that the quantitative and qualitative data justified the removal, because – on the basis of the report – the situation of the element had improved significantly. Another difficulty concerned the safeguarding plan, as the safeguarding plan continued until 2020. Thus, the question was whether the results of the plan had been achieved even if the safeguarding plan had not yet been completed. The Body considered that it had been met even though it could be further improved, and the Committee further recommended that the State Party continue to implement its safeguarding plan. Finally, regarding the purpose of the Urgent Safeguarding List, the Chairperson agreed that this question was indeed worth exploring, i.e. do elements stay indefinitely on this List? Is the goal to focus attention on the viability of the element to ensure that its viability is restored so that it could leave the List one day? This question had been reflected upon to a great extent by the Evaluation Body.

1043. The **delegation of Hungary** congratulated the Vice-Chairperson for taking up the role of Chair. It fully agreed that this issue of transfers between Lists raised some fundamental questions for the Convention, as well as for its implementation, with far-reaching consequences. The delegation also agreed with the assessment presented by the Secretariat, as well as the main findings of the Evaluation Body in its report. It had in fact highlighted the issue of community consent in the discussion of Viet Nam's file, which had also been mentioned by Austria and the Evaluation Body. As the two Lists had specific and distinct objectives, the delegation believed that it was particularly important that communities be made aware of the implications of this transfer, and hence its amendment to the draft decision in this regard. Regarding the Urgent Safeguarding List, if an element required urgent safeguarding because its viability was endangered, then action had to be taken with some form of expected result. Now, situations might differ greatly between countries and different contexts so a blanket rule could not be applied to all cases. However, in the main, the delegation believed that getting an element off the Urgent Safeguarding List should be its

objective. So, if the main objective was to safeguard intangible cultural heritage then the Committee should do its best with the instruments of the Convention to remedy the situation and help the element restore its condition. Regarding this issue, the delegation wished to hear from the Secretariat – possibly for a future study – about the links between Urgent Safeguarding listing, the International Assistance mechanism and the capacity-building programme, i.e. to what extent had elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List benefited from the International Assistance mechanism and specific capacity-building programmes in place? Finally, regarding the periodicity of the different reports, the delegation remarked that the periodic report of six years might not be adequate to assess the request for transfer, i.e. States Parties should not have to wait six years to be able to file requests for transfers. So there certainly needed to be a mechanism for specific reporting in the case of transfers from one List to another. It also agreed with Algeria's suggestion that further reflection should perhaps start with an expert group work first, which could later grow into an intergovernmental expert meeting.

1044. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** congratulated the Vice-Chair on her chairing of the session. Côte d'Ivoire endorsed all the comments made by the previous speakers. When looking at the element of Viet Nam, it noted a real procedural problem, i.e. under whose initiative could an element be removed from a List and transferred to another, and in what lapse of time? These questions had not been addressed by the Operational Directives. As mentioned by another Committee Member, the key to the Convention was the safeguarding measures that needed to be taken. In this case, were the safeguarding measures that made it possible to inscribe the element still relevant? What did the Committee need to do to verify whether or not these measures no longer corresponded to the List on which the element was inscribed so as to undertake a transfer or a removal? The delegation believed, as stated by Algeria, that these questions required an in-depth reflection vis-à-vis the Operational Guidelines. Comparing it with the 1972 Convention, it was noted that the advisory bodies venture into the field to formulate recommendations to the States concerned when a property is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As a result, the States must respond to those observations so that the property can either be removed from the List or not. In the case of the 2003 Convention: to whom did the initiative belong? Was it to the State Party concerned, the Secretariat or the Evaluation Body? All these questions required answers at the Committee level so as to ensure the safeguarding of the elements inscribed on the Lists. As Hungary had so eloquently explained, what mattered were the safeguarding measures, and the question needed to be put to the experts. The delegation recalled how the referral option had been entrusted to two experts, after which their work was brought to the States Parties' attention, which led to changes in the Operational Directives. It believed that these issues on the transfer of an element submitted by Viet Nam should first be examined by experts, while the Committee could reflect on how to make its contribution so that together the Committee could take the appropriate measures to safeguard this heritage.

1045. The **delegation of Republic of Korea** believed that the Committee should take the necessary time to ponder this issue to decide whether the urgent safeguarding measures had indeed been effective before it could consider the transfer of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List. Fortunately for the Committee, it had the regular reporting system. The same would also apply in the case of an element being transferred from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List. Thus, the Committee should take the time it needed to come to a decision.

1046. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** congratulated the Vice-Chair and agreed with the many remarks made by Committee Members. Indeed, this was a very important and complex issue that needed time to resolve as it had far-reaching implications. One of its primary concerns was that the process should not minimize or devalue either of the Lists. Returning to the important point made by Hungary, the whole objective should be to remove elements from the Urgent Safeguarding List once the urgent need to safeguard the element had been removed. Thus, although the inscription process placed the element on the List, the ultimate objective would be to remove it from that List as much as possible.

1047. The **Secretary** thanked the delegations for their useful, interesting and encouraging feedback. Hungary had raised some questions related to 'urgency' and whether the Secretariat was undertaking capacity building and supporting issues on the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Secretary conceded that these were indeed complex issues that implied, among other things, intergenerational questions, i.e. how long did it take for an element to be transferred intergenerationally? Were we talking in terms of generations? These were the kinds of questions where perhaps some reflection was needed. If the transmission was intergenerational then one might consider that one generation was needed to know whether an element is no longer in need of urgent safeguarding. The Secretariat had indeed been carrying out capacity building on developing safeguarding plans. Regarding the combined mechanism of an International Assistance request and a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List, it was noted that only one submitting State had so far used this mechanism. The Secretary believed that a lot could be achieved in this regard, and hence it was a potential area where the International Assistance mechanism could be better utilized and perhaps further encouraged. The periodicity of the periodic reporting was another issue. For the Representative List, they were included in the overall implementation of the Convention, as well as in the overall results framework going forward. In the case of the Urgent Safeguarding List, the reports were submitted every four years, though it was not clear how long the safeguarding plans needed to be under criterion U.3. In the case of Viet Nam in fact, it was currently into its second plan; the first plan had been fully implemented and the country was in fact implementing a new plan. Thus, there were indeed many complex issues, but the Secretariat strongly agreed with many of the comments made. There needed to be both expert consultation and broad intergovernmental consultation, and while the intention was to remove an element from its state of urgent safeguarding, the Committee could not ignore the potential parallels that many understood in relation to the endangered status of the World Heritage system, which unfortunately brought with it some negative connotations with regard to the Urgent Safeguarding List, leading to some States shying away from making use of this mechanism.

1048. The **delegation of Japan** thanked the Secretariat for the agenda item, adding that it considered the transfer of an element from one List to the other to be more than a mere technical issue and the Committee should be given an opportunity to reflect on the core purpose or meaning of the Convention in this regard. This examination might raise difficult issues, but at the same time it was a necessary step for the development of the Convention. Japan therefore welcomed the creation of an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group to contribute to this debate.

1049. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–3 were duly adopted. Paragraph 4 had an amendment by Turkey, the Philippines and India.

1050. The **delegation of Turkey** found the paragraph self-explanatory as it took note that the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group was unable to discuss this removal issue.

1051. The **Vice-Chairperson** thus pronounced paragraph 4 adopted. Paragraph 5 reiterated the need to revise the Operational Directives.

1052. The **delegation of Turkey** explained that the paragraph placed the emphasis on the fact that the examination of the case of Viet Nam was on an exceptional basis.

1053. The **Vice-Chairperson** thus pronounced paragraph 5 adopted. Paragraph 6 acknowledged that the transfer of an element raised issues linked to the overall purpose of the Convention, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 7 invited States Parties to refrain from submitting requests for transfer until clear procedures had been established, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 8 once again called upon the generosity of the States to finance an Open-ended Working Group that would hopefully be held in 2018 or 2019, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 9 had received an amendment.

1054. The **delegation of Algeria** asked to return to the paragraphs that referred to the Open-ended Working Group to propose that instead of an open-ended group the Committee reflect on

creating a smaller group that would be less open-ended, and thus less costly. The delegation explained that the Committee had waited for more than two years to receive funding for an open-ended meeting, and that perhaps a group comprising two representatives from each Electoral Group could be formed instead.

1055. The **delegation of Turkey** noted that Algeria proposed creating a restricted group to discuss the issue of transfer, adding that it could not agree to the proposal because this issue affected all States Parties and should be discussed in a very inclusive manner so as to accommodate the concerns among all States Parties.

1056. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked on the importance of the issue [on community consent] but did not understand the position of the paragraph in the draft decision, adding that this issue would surely be discussed in the working group or during the General Assembly. The delegation sought clarification from the drafter of paragraph 9.

1057. The **delegation of Austria** supported the remarks by Turkey on the importance of this issue with wide implications for its future development and thus a very inclusive working group, which included all the positions, should be open to as many States Parties as possible.

1058. The **delegation of Hungary** made a point of order, as the amendment by Algeria was not projected on the screen and the subject of the debate was therefore unclear.

1059. The **delegation of Algeria** clarified that it had proposed an amendment to paragraph 8 to convene a restricted group instead of an open-ended group in the first instance, given the scarcity of funding for a larger group. It reiterated that it was simply suggesting that the Committee consider the option of a smaller group before discussing the issue on a broader scale in an open-ended group at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris where all the delegations could meet. The delegation sought inclusivity, but should the proposal not meet with the Committee's approval, then it would not have an amendment to propose.

1060. The **Secretary** understood that the question was partly addressed to the Secretariat as well, and having listened to the concerns agreed that the open-ended process was indeed necessary. This issue had profound ramifications in very different contexts in many States and the Secretariat strongly recommended a fully open-ended group in this regard. The Secretary explained that an open-ended group had been held in 2016 and it was not unreasonable to envisage that some States might be interested in supporting such an open-ended process. Moreover, a two-stage process might actually use more resources because ultimately a fully open-ended discussion could not be avoided given that the issue was so intimately linked to States' engagement with the Convention. Thus, despite the good intention, the Secretariat would prefer to approach donors for the fully open-ended inclusive process that was, in any case, necessary for such issues before going to the General Assembly.

1061. The **delegation of Cyprus** asked for clarity regarding the paragraph under discussion.

1062. The **Secretary** explained that paragraph 8 of the original document dealt with the open-ended group, while paragraph 8 of the amended document was now paragraph 11.

1063. The **delegation of Hungary** explained that the amendment stemmed from the lesson learned in the case of the transfer of the Viet Nam element. It was of the understanding that this Committee identified [community consent] as an important issue, and it fully agreed with Cuba that the Open-ended Working Group would deal with such issues and many more issues that were identified in the report. Nevertheless, this point had arisen from the earlier discussion on the Viet Nam case and was thus already identified as an important point of discussion for the working group. In this sense of procedure, the Committee was sovereign to point out certain issues that should be included for consideration in the working group.

1064. The **delegation of Cuba** understood the issue raised by Hungary, but in this case, it was important to first discuss the mandate of the open-ended group, as well as the other important subjects for discussion in its agenda, along with the period of time it would cover. The fact of

selectively placing this issue in the draft decision afforded it priority over other issues of importance, which was not the correct way or working.

1065. The **delegation of Cyprus** asked to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis before discussing the working group.

1066. The **delegation of Austria** supported paragraph 9 because the issue of community consent had been discussed in the morning session and was of the utmost importance.

1067. The **delegation of Turkey** fully acknowledged the importance of informing the communities concerned. However, it aligned with the remarks by Cuba that this issue should be discussed at the Open-ended Working Group and not by the Committee at this session in a piecemeal approach. This was indeed one of many important issues and it was for the Open-ended Working Group to adopt this outcome. The delegation would not block the consensus, but it had concerns concerning this paragraph.

1068. The **delegation of Cyprus** explained that this issue arose from the examination of the transfer of the element in the Viet Nam file, and the reason why it was in this paragraph. However, if there was no consensus, it would be ready to withdraw the amendment.

1069. The **delegation of Cuba** understood the purpose of this paragraph and fully agreed with the importance of informing the communities, but in this case, there was a contradiction with paragraph 10 which invited States Parties to refrain from submitting requests to transfer an element to another List because it would be part of the debate to be held, even though an exception had been made for Viet Nam. Nevertheless, there was a contradiction in placing paragraph 9, as proposed, followed by paragraph 10. The delegation reiterated that it had no problem with the principle of paragraph 9, but that it was not well-placed, as this was an issue for discussion within the mandate of the working group. It agreed with Cyprus that the Committee should not confuse issues of principle with issues that correspond to the mandate of the working group.

1070. The **delegation of Turkey** supported the remarks by Cuba and endorsed the importance of the principle reflected in the paragraph, but it should be the outcome of the working group.

1071. The **Vice-Chairperson** proposed suspending the discussion on paragraph 9 and returning to the order of the document on the screen. The Committee could then later return to paragraph 9 to consider whether it should remain in the document, and if so, where it should be placed.

1072. The **delegation of Afghanistan** fully agreed with the Vice-Chair's suggestion.

1073. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 10, which was duly adopted.

1074. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that its proposal did not meet with the Committee's approval and therefore it would not insist. However, it requested that the proposal be reported in the summary records, i.e. that it had wished to consider a smaller group for an initial first draft, followed by a more inclusive working group. That being said, the delegation had a small amendment to paragraph 11, which would change the name from an 'intergovernmental working group' to 'an expert working group'. The delegation explained that the initial work should first be carried out by experts and that the term 'intergovernmental' presupposed the permanent delegations to UNESCO. Certainly, as a delegation, it would continue to take up and discuss this issue, but the first input must come from the experts.

1075. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked Algeria for the clarification, adding that the meeting held in Chengdu was an intergovernmental working group composed of experts. It sought to specify in the paragraph that the intergovernmental meeting would invite experts, as there was a problem in restricting the meeting to experts alone as the issue involved decision-making for which States Parties were implicated.

1076. The **delegation of Turkey** agreed with Senegal's position in that the meeting should be an expert intergovernmental working group in which States Parties would send their experts, but some would be attended by permanent delegations. Thus, the meeting should not be limited

to specific experts. It should be up to the Member States to decide. It was noted that the last part of Algeria's proposal limited the meeting to experts in intangible cultural heritage, which the delegation wished to delete.

1077. The **delegation of Cuba** clarified that normally, in an open working group, each State Party is free to nominate the person to represent the delegation. Moreover, in UNESCO, there are six categories of meetings. Meetings of experts follow a process that requires funding, and they are appointed by the Director-General as part of the rules of the organization. Thus, it was important not to confuse the two things. In the case of an open working group, each State Party in an intergovernmental committee would decide on its representative, which could be an expert or a representative of a permanent delegation, or both.

1078. The **Secretary** wished to explain that the meeting would follow the Operational Directives in that, whether for the General Assembly or for the Committee, the use of the Fund is for the participation of experts, even though the meeting is intergovernmental. However, this did not imply that it would be an experts' meeting. By way of an example, the Open-ended Working Group in Chengdu in 2016 was an expert meeting that found other financing to develop the first phase of the proposal, which then went on to the open-ended group. It was noted that the language in the paragraph was the exact same language as found under Part III, Rule 5.4 of the Rules of Procedure for the Committee. The Secretary reiterated that an open-ended intergovernmental meeting was indeed required, but funding was only available to participating experts. It was thus for the State Party to decide whether it wished to have a representative and an expert, or both, to attend the meeting. An experts' meeting, as correctly mentioned by Cuba, was a different category of meeting, as seen in the case of Chengdu in which an experts' meeting was first held, followed by an intergovernmental meeting where the Committee offered to finance the participation of experts.

1079. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked the Secretary for the explanation, adding that unfortunately when a working group meeting takes place in UNESCO it is usually attended by members of the delegations. The delegation surmised that the funds for the participation of experts would not cover all the experts who would attend.

1080. The **delegation of Guatemala** asked whether the Fund would finance participation in this meeting. If not, it fully supported Cuba's remarks.

1081. The **delegation of Cuba** wondered whether the meeting could be held one or two days before the meeting of the General Assembly to encourage the participation of experts. It shared the concern of Cyprus that open-ended working groups at UNESCO were often attended by the permanent delegations in Paris, and it was true that it was very important for the experts to be included as well. Moreover, it would not be first time that UNESCO organized working groups ahead of the General Assembly.

1082. The **delegation of Algeria** explained that it had introduced this amendment to distinguish between a meeting composed of experts and an intergovernmental meeting. It now understood that the paragraph had been based on the Rules of Procedure. Nevertheless, the meeting called for the participation of experts, without whom the process could not move forward. The delegation withdrew its amendment but nevertheless wished to hear from the Secretariat on whether a meeting of a smaller group of experts could take place prior to the open-ended meeting.

1083. The **Secretary** wished to give some context as to why the paragraph was here based on past experience. He explained that the potential donor would thus be bound to the rules whereby experts from developing countries would be given a chance to receive funding to participate in these sessions, i.e. the funding must also include the cost of the participation of experts from developing countries. In the case of the last Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group, funding had been received from the National Commission of the People's Republic of China a year earlier to organize an expert group, which was not an intergovernmental expert group, which took place in order to prepare the preliminary proposals to the intergovernmental group. Should Algeria request this, it would also be subject to

extrabudgetary funding. However, it would cost less than an intergovernmental working group.

1084. The delegation of **Hungary** found the debate complicated in that the terminology seemed to be changing. It recalled that this Convention had been drafted in 2002 by independent experts working in their private capacity, as requested by the Director-General of UNESCO. Three meetings were held in 2001, 2002, and then in September 2002. The First Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts was held in UNESCO in September 2002 to develop the preliminary draft text of the Convention. The second session of the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts took place in February 2003, and then an Intersessional Working Group of government experts was held on the preliminary draft of the Convention in April 2003. Hence, the terminology at that time and those participating in the intergovernmental meetings were experts. It was noted that the issue of removal and transfer was of prime importance to the Convention. Thus, the delegation wished to employ language to ensure that this reflection be carried out by experts, and if not possible, then to have the process occur in two stages, as suggested by Algeria, but experts should conduct this work. In any case, it would go to the Committee and the General Assembly.

1085. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that the Secretary and Hungary were clear in that the Chengdu meeting was an intergovernmental meeting, which Senegal had attended, essentially made up of experts. There were perhaps some government representatives at the state level, but those in charge were experts. Thus, the expert meeting might also be an intergovernmental meeting of experts. It was noted that Hungary had recalled the history of the Convention meetings, but the Committee was calling for an intergovernmental meeting dedicated to experts to reflect on the issue. Moreover, the intergovernmental meeting would have clear terms of reference. The donor would thus understand that this was a meeting of experts at the intergovernmental level.

1086. The **delegation of Cuba** wished to make it clear that the meeting of experts in the creation of a Convention is a completely different process, convened at the prerogative of the Director-General. It sought clarification from the Legal Advisor in this regard. When UNESCO sets out to create a Convention, a new standard-setting instrument, a group of experts is formed to work on elaborating and preparing the normative instrument. However, owing to a lack of funding over the last two years, and the fact that there was no available funding from the Regular Programme, the Committee had been unable to establish working groups to address these various issues. Hungary had reminded the Committee of the Convention's history, but that was a completely different process from the one under discussion, which was to reflect on an issue concerning an Operational Directive of the Convention.

1087. **The Legal Advisor** remarked that there were two groups of meetings generally held under UNESCO Conventions, Committees, and so on. The first group of meetings of a representative character was convened with States, i.e. intergovernmental and non-governmental meetings are composed of delegations or representatives of States. The second group of meetings of a non-representative character comprised different types of meetings, such as expert meetings, international congresses, advisory committees, and so on. The first group contained three categories, while the second group had another eight categories. In total, there were eight categories of meetings. In this case, what mattered was actually not the terminology but the nature of the meeting that the Committee wished to convene. Thus, the question was whether the Committee wished to convene a representative or a non-representative meeting. The Legal Advisor was of the understanding that the intention was to create a representative meeting. Although the terminology was not a problem, it had to be called 'intergovernmental'. It was also up to the Committee to decide whether or not the representative meeting would be composed of experts of the government, or to leave it open to Member States to decide whether they wished to bring experts or not.

1088. The **Secretary** explained that the proposal was to convene an Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group. However, in stipulation of the Rules of Procedure, intergovernmental meetings of this Convention should provide the fees for the participation of experts from developing countries, even if the meeting was financed through

extrabudgetary funds by a donor. Moreover, the Committee could, should it wish, (in this case of an open-ended intergovernmental meeting, as with the creation of a Convention) ask the Director-General to convene, if possible, an expert group to help prepare the documentation for presentation to the intergovernmental meeting, as had occurred in the case of the Chengdu intergovernmental meeting. The two meetings were indeed different, but the funding of experts followed the practice of this Convention whereby developing States were given the possibility to have their experts funded to attend such intergovernmental meetings.

1089. The **delegation of Algeria** asked the Secretariat whether it would be possible to see the example of the Chengdu meeting reflected in the paragraph, i.e. to first convene an expert meeting prior to the one mentioned.

1090. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the Committee had spent way too much time on this paragraph and that the explanations had made it clear that the meeting would be open-ended but also open to expert participation. The delegation understood Algeria's initial proposal and it shared some of its sentiments because, for instance, the last meeting in Chengdu, even though it was open-ended, was not necessarily accessible to all States Parties. The original proposal was that the technical aspect could be fully prepared and then opened for inputs to the wider spectrum of States Parties. However, following all the explanations, the delegation believed that the Committee could follow the same procedure for the overall results framework. Moreover, the meeting should not clash with other important meetings and all countries should be informed in advance so that if they so wish, they could also send experts to really engage in this important discussion.

1091. Responding to Algeria's question, the **Secretary** explained that it was not necessary to have a recommendation in that, should the Committee request that the Secretariat first organize an expert meeting, then it could not organize the intergovernmental meeting until the expert meeting had taken place as the expert meeting would prepare the documentation that would be submitted to the intergovernmental group. However, if this was put in the paragraph, then it would become a requirement, leaving little flexibility. It was noted that this had not been a requirement for the Chengdu meeting, but the Committee also had the opportunity of extrabudgetary funds to convene the meeting.

1092. The **Secretary** explained that Algeria was suggesting to first convene an expert meeting, which was not restricted to an intergovernmental meeting, prior to an open-ended intergovernmental meeting. It would be an expert meeting in the sense explained by the Legal Advisor. In this case, the Secretary feared that if funding was not forthcoming, then the Committee could not go straight to the intergovernmental meeting. Nevertheless, he concurred that it was wise to have an expert meeting.

1093. The **delegation of Algeria** remarked that, as the Secretary explained, it was not necessary to have the language to hold such a preliminary meeting; it would not insist on it and fully trusted him to try to find the necessary funding to organize such a meeting.

1094. The **delegation of Turkey** came to the conclusion that all the Members wanted the same thing. It therefore proposed leaving the paragraph as it was, adding that the paragraph could read, 'encourages States Parties to provide extrabudgetary funding' so that the decision would 'encourage' States Parties.

1095. The **Secretary** suggested adding a new paragraph that 'encourages States Parties to provide funding to convene an expert meeting in preparation of the open-ended intergovernmental working group'. In this way, if funding was not found, the Committee could still go ahead.

1096. The **delegation of Cyprus** fully agreed with the addition of this new paragraph, but it also wished to add in paragraph 11 that the meeting should be held two days before the General Assembly, as suggested by Cuba.

1097. The **delegation of Cuba** clarified that normally the language used when requesting funds for a meeting was to 'encourage the Secretariat to find the necessary funding to […]'.

1098. The **Secretary** concurred, adding that this was not a problem. However, he had concerns regarding the insistence that the meeting be held two days before the General Assembly, as this posed a problem in terms of the Secretariat's work, as well as imposing more conditions on the donor; they were already being asked to pay for the participation of experts from developing countries. The Secretary remarked that too many conditions would reduce the chances of finding a donor.

1099. The **delegation of Cyprus** did not agree in that this would not be too demanding.

1100. The **Secretary** explained that part of the concern about the previous open-ended working group [in Chengdu], which was fully open-ended in that all States Parties were invited, was that it was held outside Paris and delegations based in Paris thus found it difficult to attend. Again, it was more difficult to raise funds and find a donor to pay for a meeting of this type, which was not helped by imposing a number of conditions on the content and timing.

1101. The **delegation of Cyprus** explained that the date would be subject to the meeting being held in Paris at UNESCO.

1102. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** believed that the finer points of the meeting should be left to the Secretariat to organize and determine with regard to the venue and date so as to remain consistent given that the Committee was looking for funds.

1103. The **delegation of Algeria** clarified that the meeting could not in any case be held with UNESCO funds because the Committee had already decided that it would be held with extrabudgetary funds. In that case, the donor would organize the meeting as it saw fit, i.e. by utilizing the country's infrastructure and using local means to minimize costs and setting a time that was convenient, Thus, to impose that the meeting be held in Paris on specific dates seemed rather restrictive, as explained by the Secretary.

1104. The **delegation of Hungary** noted a minor linguistic issue in the French version. It also remarked that the there was no paragraph calling for extrabudgetary funding for the open-ended working group itself. It wondered whether there had been previous decisions that might already have called for it, which should then be recalled here. It would thus be good to be explicit that extrabudgetary funds were sought to hold the open-ended intergovernmental meeting, in the same way as was mentioned for raising funding for the expert meeting.

1105. The **Secretary** emphasized that the paragraph used exactly the same wording as in other past Committees for open-ended working groups. He reiterated that it would be difficult to mobilize a donor, but the Secretariat would work to find the funds and the donor.

1106. Noting the long and broad debate, the **delegation of Senegal** proposed adopting the paragraph, adding that the Secretariat knew its work as did the Committee. The Secretariat would act on the decision to seek out the donors to find the necessary funds, acting in a flexible way that was less binding with no fixed dates or place.

1107. The **Vice-Chairperson** proposed that the Committee agree with Senegal's proposal and adopt the paragraph, which was duly adopted. There was an amendment on paragraph 6, [the new paragraph 9], which would be tackled tomorrow.

1108. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that decisions still needed to be made that were vital for the Committee to continue its work in 2019, which included the election of the Evaluation Body, the place and date of the next Committee session, as well as the item on the NGOs. The Secretary suggested that once the Committee had finalized this item, it should first tackle the essential statutory items that were required.

1109. The **delegation of the Philippines** recognized that the Committee was behind schedule and thus proposed adopting this item as a whole with the two additional amendments as there were no further discussion points and the draft decision had already been debated at length. In this way, the Committee could concentrate on the statutory items for the next session.

1110. The **Secretary** noted that paragraphs 9 and 12 had additional amendments, but that the Philippines proposed adopting the decision as a whole.

1111. The **delegation of Zambia** supported the suggestion by the Philippines to move forward.

1112. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted Cuba's agreement, and with no further comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 14 adopted**.

1113. The **Vice-Chairperson** adjourned the day's session.

[Saturday, 9 December, morning session]

[The Chairperson reprised his role]

1114. The **Chairperson** welcomed the delegations and thanked the Vice-Chairs of Turkey and Colombia once again for chairing the session on his behalf. He began by informing the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning for the last time and had taken note that the meeting was behind schedule with a total of twelve elements left to examine. However, the crucial items that the Committee must examine in order to function in 2018 included: item 18, Establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2018 cycle; item 19, Date and venue of the thirteenth session of the Committee; item 20, Election of the Members of the Bureau of the thirteenth session of the Committee; item 17, Accreditation of new non-governmental organizations and review of accredited non-governmental organizations; item 5.a, Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities; and item 22, Adoption of the list of decisions. If the Committee ran out of time, the remaining agenda items 12, 13, 15, 16 and 21 would unfortunately not be examined at the present session.

1115. The **Secretary** hoped to finish the morning session with agenda items 18, 19, 20 and up to item 17, explaining that during the lunch break the Secretariat would prepare the revised version of the Report by the Committee to the General Assembly (item 5a), as well as the List of Decisions adopted up to that point. The afternoon session would thus start with the adoption of the Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities (January 2016 to December 2017) and the adoption of the List of Decisions (item 22). The Committee might allow the Rapporteur of the twelfth session of the Committee to validate any remaining decisions taken thereafter. The Committee would then try to examine the remaining items in the following order: item 13, Report of the informal ad hoc working group; item 12, Procedures to facilitate dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State(s); item 15, Intangible cultural heritage in emergencies; item 16, Follow-up to the recommendations of the External Auditor's 'Report on the governance of UNESCO and dependent funds, programmes and entities' (Document 38C/23); and finally item 21, Other business.

1116. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item 18.

ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2018 CYCLE

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/18 Rev.Add*
Decision: *12.COM 18*

1117. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** of the **Secretariat** invited the Committee to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body (Annex 1 of the working document 18) and to nominate two NGOs and one expert (in conformity with Decision 9.COM 11), with one NGO from Electoral Group III, one NGO from Electoral Group IV, and one Expert from Electoral Group V(b), as well as to re-elect the nine elected members of the preceding years. Ms Ohinata informed the Committee that: i) the candidates had been proposed by States Parties through the Chairperson of each Electoral Group; ii) according to Decision 9.COM 11, States were encouraged to ensure that at least two nominations were sent by the Chairperson of the Electoral Group; and iii) in accordance with paragraph 28 of the Operational Directives, a maximum of three candidates could be nominated. The candidatures received by Electoral Group included: i) one NGO in Group III (the candidate number corresponded to the number of seats to be filled, thus the NGO Erigaie Foundation would be declared elected without a

vote); ii) three NGOs from Group IV; and iii) two experts from Group V(b) (the Egyptian expert's candidature had been withdrawn at the request of Egypt). Annex 2 listed the candidates, associated websites, NGO accreditation requests, and the experts' CVs.

1118. The **Chairperson** proposed first looking at the terms of reference before proceeding to the appointment of the three new members of the Evaluation Body, reminding the Committee that in 2015 it had adopted amendments to the Rules of Procedure to include provisions governing voting by secret ballot, notably to Rule 39. With reference to Section B of Rule 39, the vote to choose the two of the three new members of the Evaluation Body would proceed by secret ballot. With no comments or objections, the terms of reference in Annex 1 were adopted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to present the procedure of the secret ballot.

1119. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that all Members of the Committee would receive two ballots, one for each vacant seat, and one envelope. Each Member was invited to select a choice for each of the two vacant seats, and not just for the vacant seat of his or her Electoral Group. The candidate with the highest number of votes would be elected. Each ballot contained the names of all the candidates for each seat. Members were invited to circle the names of the candidates for whom they wished to vote, sealing the envelope and placing it in the ballot box. The absence of a ballot in the envelope was considered an abstention. Ballots on which more names than vacant seats had been circled, and those with no indication of voter intent, would be considered invalid. A roll-call would be made after a five-minute break.

1120. The **Chairperson** sought two tellers among Members of the Committee. The delegations of Côte d'Ivoire and Austria presented themselves, taking their place at the podium. The Chairperson gave Members five minutes to cast their ballots.

[*five-minute break*]

1121. During this pause, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the delegation of India had kindly requested to screen the video in relation to its inscription of Kumbh Mela.

[A short film on the element was projected]

1122. The **Chairperson** congratulated India once again for its inscription. He then invited the Secretariat to present the roll-call of Members in alphabetical order in French.

1123. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** announced the following voting Members: Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Lebanon, Mauritius, Mongolia, Palestine, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Turkey and Zambia. Cuba was absent for the vote.

1124. The **Chairperson** noted that all the envelopes had been collected, and while the votes were being counted, he proceeded with agenda item 19.

ITEM 19 OF THE AGENDA

DATE AND VENUE OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/19*
Decision: *12.COM 19*

1125. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 19 on the date and venue of the thirteenth session of the Committee in 2018, informing the Committee that the Secretariat had received a proposal from Mauritius to host the next session, and he invited Mauritius to extend that invitation to the Committee.

1126. The **delegation of the Republic of Mauritius** spoke of the great honour and pleasure for Mauritius to formally invite all the delegations to the thirteenth session in Mauritius in 2019. It was a moment of gratitude and honour to be able to host this very important event in

Mauritius and to also give an opportunity to everyone around the world to share its culture and enlarge its horizons. The delegation believed that meeting outside Paris was very important to share, appreciate and participate in the cultural lives of people. It would be the first time that Mauritius would host this session, though it had experience of hosting conferences and other major activities. Mauritius is the second country after Algeria to have ratified the 2003 Convention and it was sure that all the delegations would find it an enriching and memorable experience. The delegation also explained that Mauritius is fully bilingual in French and English, and at times, even a third language, such as Hindi, German, Mandarin or Arabic, which meant that everyone would feel at ease. As a multicultural country, it had people of Indian, African, Chinese, Arabic and European origins. Like Jeju, it is a small island of 2,200 km^2 with a population of 1.3 million people and a high-end tourist destination. It is as green as Jeju and, according to WHO, the air quality is second after Estonia, and it is one of ten countries free from conflict. In addition, it would be summer with a temperature of 25°-30°C. The delegation explained that it had collaborated with UNESCO in 2017 with three expert conferences: one on slavery, one on indentured labour, and one on synergies in culture. Last week, it launched worldwide a handbook by UNESCO on the management of heritage sites. Mauritius has two World Heritage Sites, one for slavery, [Le Morne Cultural Landscape] and one for indentured labourers [Aapravasi Ghat]. The meeting would likely be held in Port Louis, five minutes from the capital city. The welcome was reiterated in French.

1127. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee accept this kind offer by acclamation, thanking Mauritius for its offer and inviting the Secretariat to provide additional information on the dates.

[Offer accepted by acclamation]

1128. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that the date and place was determined as stipulated under Rule 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure, and in consultation with the Director-General. The proposed dates were 26 November to 1st December 2018.

1129. The **delegation of the Mauritius** suggested adding 'Republic of' to complete its country title.

1130. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 19 adopted.**

[A video on Mauritius was projected]

ITEM 20 OF THE AGENDA

ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUREAU OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/20*
Decision: *12.COM 20*

1131. The **Chairperson** then turned to item 20 and the election of the next Bureau, recalling that, in accordance with Rules 12 and 13 of the Rules of Procedure, the Committee shall elect its Bureau, consisting of a Chairperson, one or more Vice-chairpersons and a Rapporteur who shall remain in office until the end of the next ordinary session. In accordance with Rule 13.4, the Committee, in electing the Bureau, shall have due regard to ensure equitable geographical representation and, inasmuch as possible, a balance among the various fields of intangible cultural heritage. The Members of the Bureau would also need to be Members of the Committee. The role of the Rapporteur would be to validate the decisions of the Committee and its Bureau after their preparation by the Secretariat. According to the Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs, the Rapporteur should not express his/her opinion nor vote in his/her capacity as Rapporteur during Bureau meetings if all Electoral Groups were already represented through the Chairperson and Vice-Chairs in order to respect the principle of equitable geographical representation within the Bureau, pursuant to Rule 12.1 of the Rules of Procedure. It was also customary for the Chairperson of the Bureau to come from the host country and therefore Mauritius would represent Group V(a). Mauritius

asked to suspend part of Rule 13.1 to give it time until January 2018 to choose a Chairperson, which would be communicated to all Committee Members electronically, who would be given fifteen days to respond. The Committee agreed to suspend part of Rule 13.1 to respond to Mauritius' request. The Chairperson invited nominations for the role of Rapporteur.

1132. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** proposed Ms Gabriele Detschmann (Austria) as Rapporteur.

1133. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Mauritius for the offer and warmly supported Austria.

1134. The **delegations of Colombia and Turkey** supported the nomination of Austria.

1135. The **Chairperson** noted support from Hungary, Zambia, Congo, Bulgaria, Senegal, Ethiopia, Côte d'Ivoire and Armenia with almost unanimous consensus. He then turned to the election of the Vice-Chairpersons.

1136. The **delegation of Austria** proposed **Cyprus** as Vice-Chair from Group I.

1137. The **Chairperson** thanked Austria and remarked that Group II had a clean slate and thus candidates were needed for Electoral Groups III, Group IV, and V(b). Electoral Group V(a) would be represented by the host country of the Republic of Mauritius.

1138. The **delegation of Mongolia** proposed **the Philippines** as Vice-Chair from Group IV.

1139. The **delegation of Colombia** proposed **Guatemala** as Vice-Chair from Group III.

1140. The **delegation of Palestine** proposed **Lebanon** as Vice-Chair from Group V(b).

1141. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 20 adopted.**

ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA

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

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/17*
NGOs: *50 NGOs requesting accreditation*
59 NGOs accredited in 2012
Decision: *12.COM 17*

1142. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

1143. This **Secretary** explained that the working document came in three parts related to: i) A: the accreditation of new NGOs; ii) B: the review of accredited NGOs; and C: observations on the participation of accredited NGOs. In the interest of time, only some observations concerning the participation of accredited NGOs under the Convention were highlighted. The Secretary further explained that there was a need to elaborate the *inter alia* advisory functions of NGOs, noting that a majority of NGOs had not been concretely involved in the work of the Committee as only six NGOs could be engaged in the Evaluation Body at any given time. To address this challenge, the Committee might wish to elaborate on what the *inter alia* functions would mean and require from NGOs in order to maximize the benefit of their partnership (paragraph 17). There were also some inconsistencies in the criteria for accreditation and its review, as accreditation requests were mostly evaluated against information related to their administrative and legal status, together with the description of their activities, while renewals were determined by the contribution of NGOs to the statutory activities of the Committee and their activities at the bilateral, subregional, regional or international levels. To ensure coherence in the process, the Committee might wish to revise the accreditation criteria in view of the *inter alia* functions it required from the NGOs (paragraph 19). The document also drew the Committee's attention to the ICHNGO Forum, which was developing considerably and could thus be encouraged to play a more active role should the Committee clarify the *inter alia* functions it wished to confer upon it (paragraph 20). The problem of geographical imbalance persisted and it was sometimes challenging to identify an adequate number of NGO candidates from certain Electoral Groups for the Evaluation Body. Thus, it was important to explore practical methods to redress the disparity in geographical distribution

(paragraph 21). Following these observations, it was becoming clear that the Committee needed first to reflect on the *inter alia* advisory functions it wished to receive from the accredited NGOs and how this could be achieved. In addition, the Committee might wish to deliberate on moving towards a system that was flexible enough to allow the Committee to benefit more from the diverse sets of expertise and services of NGOs.

1144. The **delegation of the Philippines** agreed that the network of accredited NGOs should be more balanced in terms of equitable geographic representation, while the possibilities of maximizing engagement with the NGO network should be explored. It hoped that the Committee could reflect on appropriate measures on this for future sessions.

1145. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its efforts, for the accreditation requests, and for the report reflecting the current service and function of NGOs. It was noted that that the majority of the accredited NGOs came from Group I. Likewise, the majority of the twenty-nine NGOs whose accreditation was maintained were also in Group I. It added that it hoped the geographic representation of NGOs would become more balanced in the future. By enhancing the visibility of the Convention, NGOs would be further promoted through capacity building and International Assistance. The delegation also noted that the majority of the accredited NGOs were not able to observe meetings of the Committee. The role of the Secretariat as the facilitator for NGOs could be highlighted in this regard. Following the decisions of the governing bodies, the number of accredited NGOs would be 179. The collaboration between NGOs and the work carried out by ICHNGO forums in parallel with the Committee's deliberations were also deemed important. On the other hand, as pertaining to Article 9 of the Convention and paragraphs 27 and 28, and 91 to 99 of the Operational Directives, the direct participation of NGOs as advisors was possible only if their representatives were elected for four years to the six seats allocated to the NGOs in the Evaluation Body. This rather limited mandate was, in its view, not enough to motivate the active contribution of NGOs. The delegation believed that new ways and methods should be developed for NGOs to participate more effectively in the Committee's work. For example, requests for International Assistance of more than US$100,000 and the review of the periodic reports by the Bureau could be assisted by the simultaneous review of advisory reports of the three NGOs, which would allow NGOs to participate in the Committee's work while also reducing the workload of the Bureau. For this reason, it believed that there was a need for new regulations on the accreditation of NGOs and their participation in the Committee's work. In this regard, it considered it to be useful to address this topic in an informal and open-ended working group within the scope of Article 8 of the Convention. The delegation supported the accreditation of the twenty-nine NGOs in line with the proposal by the Secretariat, and looked forward to their effective participation in the work of the Committee after approval by the General Assembly in 2018. It was also noted that two of the twenty-nine NGOs proposed came from Turkey, which demonstrated the increasing interest of NGOs in the country.

1146. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines and Turkey for their comments regarding the balance of accredited NGOs, which it fully supported, and it looked forward to greater balance for this Convention.

1147. The **delegation of Austria** also confirmed that it was unhappy with the geographical imbalance of NGOs and it welcomed all steps to find a solution. It remarked on the excellent contribution of the ICHNGO Forum and congratulated the NGOs that had organized the Forum so excellently, encouraging them to continue their work. The delegation welcomed a more active role for the NGOs, and also for the Committee to have a more specific role for the ICHNGO in its work.

1148. The **delegation of Senegal** wished to respond to the comment on how best to maximize the contribution of NGOs at the level of the Committee through the Forum but also through their supporting advice. However, beyond the Committee, the delegation was more interested in the effective participation of NGOs at the level of the State Party, adding that this was important because NGOs could and already did play an extremely important role on the ground, and thus it was a duty of States Parties to involve them in all activities to implement the Convention. However, it was also true that some of these NGOs were not at all known by

the States Parties. For example, in Senegal, the authorities worked with many NGOs, but others were totally unknown, and the delegation could not understand how they could be accredited when these NGOs did not work directly with the States Parties. Thus, it could be the duty of States to invite them, and it could also be an obligation of the NGOs to work closer [with state authorities] in the field so that they were visible and recognized by the States.

1149. The **delegation of Belgium** began by thanking and congratulating the Republic of Korea as the host, and for its excellent organization. It warmly welcomed the reflection on the *inter alia* functions of the NGOs, and in that regard, it recalled Decision 10.COM 15.a paragraphs 9 and 10 adopted in Windhoek that concerned ethics. In paragraph 9, the Secretariat was requested to develop an online platform with a toolkit based on the 12 ethical principles, and in paragraph 10, the Committee invited and reminded accredited NGOs to participate in enriching and sharing information, and following up and contributing to updating the online platform with tools for ethics in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Thus, paragraphs 9 and 10 in Decision 10.COM 15.a gave very concrete examples of *inter alia* functions that could still be activated.

1150. Mr Diego Gradis of **Traditions pour demain (NGO)** wished to make some concluding remarks on behalf of the NGO Forum, and once again he thanked the Republic of Korea for its welcome. He would not return to the questions posed to the Evaluation Body, as they had already been discussed under agenda item 12. The Forum welcomed the possibilities of clarifying the *inter alia* dimension of its advisory functions to the Committee beyond the Evaluation Body, as had been mentioned by some Members of the Committee. The creation of a working group for this purpose would be welcomed with the participation of NGOs, if desired by the Committee. Mr Gradis remarked that the NGOs had demonstrated their contribution to defining the overall results framework at the Chengdu Working Group in June. The Forum had made good progress in its work, both in the composition of its steering committee and in the construction of networks within the regions so as to catalyze NGOs and their efforts for intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, this regionalization could also be observed at the level of the different working groups, as previously mentioned in the earlier intervention made by the ICHNGO Forum. Finally, the ICHNGO Forum thanked Indonesia and the Korean Heritage Foundation for their support in the previous week's capacity-building workshop, as well as ICHCAP[8] for its continued support, and even more recently for the publication of *#Heritage Alive* on traditional medicine[9]. The Forum also thanked the Secretariat for expressing the challenge faced by the Forum to receive even greater support in fulfilling its mission to strengthen the Convention. The Forum also thanked Austria, Turkey, Palestine, Senegal and Belgium for their interventions. Finally, the Forum looked forward to participating in the General Assembly in June 2018 and to the next Committee session in Mauritius, and thus to continuing its collaboration with the governing bodies of the Convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, and the collaboration of NGOs with communities in the field.

1151. A **Representative of the NGO CFS,** an accredited NGO and incumbent member of the Evaluation Body, took the opportunity to thank the Republic of Korea for its excellent hospitality and wonderful organization of the Committee. The NGO expressed its deepest gratitude to the Committee for reviewing the periodic reports by the CFS, and sincere thanks also went to the Secretariat for its continuous support and efficient assistance. The NGO also thanked the other NGOs and expert members of the Evaluation Body for their help and inspiration during the working process. The CFS valued the opportunity to serve the Committee as one of the first members of the Evaluation Body during the past three years from which CFS had benefited greatly and had learned working about methodologies, the good practices of States Parties, and information-sharing experiences generated from the formal mechanisms of international cooperation. As a result, its overall understanding of the goals and principles [of the Convention] had been enhanced. Also, as an outgoing member,

8. International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region.
9. Read the publication here.

the NGO was confident of the work it had achieved during its term. Nevertheless, it shared the concern with all the actors involved that the independence of the Evaluation Body should be fully respected. It welcomed the new members of the Evaluation Body and looked forward to a more efficient Evaluation Body to better fulfil its duty to the Committee. The CFS would continue to devote itself to further promoting the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at the local, national, regional and international levels.

1152. Thanking the NGOs, and with no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–7 were duly adopted.

1153. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that since this was an issue that called upon the States Parties, as reflected in the discussion, it had an amendment to the paragraph, which would read, 'invites the informal Ad-hoc Working Group and the Secretariat to continue its reflections…'. The delegation explained that the Committee would discuss the report of the Ad-hoc Working Group under agenda item 13, so it did not wish to pre-empt the decision, but the consensus appeared to wish to extend the mandate of the informal Ad-hoc Working Group to invite NGOs, which would be open to Committee Members and States Parties to continue their reflections, as the discussion should not be limited to just the Secretariat. Inputs from all States Parties should be sought so as to promote the objectives and the spirit of the Convention through engagement with civil society and accredited NGOs, among others.

1154. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines for the appropriate suggestion, which it supported, as this reflection concerned not only the Secretariat but also the States Parties, and especially the Members of the Committee.

1155. The **delegation of Turkey** also supported the relevant proposal from the Philippines, but it was not quite sure if the informal Ad-hoc Working Group should be mentioned first because it read as though the Working Group would also consult with the accredited NGOs. The delegation explained that it would not be appropriate for States Parties to consult with the NGOs, as it would be more appropriate for the Secretariat to consult with them. Furthermore, in parallel, States Parties would reflect among themselves on the role of the NGOs. Thus, the paragraph could be reworded to read, 'invites the Secretariat […].

1156. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the Philippines for proposing this amendment, which it co-sponsored, adding that it liked the original wording in that it believed that consultation with the NGOs and the Ad-hoc Working Group could be useful. The delegation suggested however, 'invites the Secretariat and the informal Ad-hoc Working Group […]'.

1157. The **delegation of Turkey** was not against consulting with the NGOs, but in the context of the setting of the informal Ad-hoc Working Group, and from experience, it would not enable the Committee to do so in an efficient manner because of the many items that needed to be discussed and it was not sure that there would be time to consult with the NGOs, at least in this cycle. Should the Committee continue this work in 2019 then it might consider consulting the NGOs at that time, which the delegation was open to. In this way, the Secretariat could undertake this consultation work, which could feed into the Committee's work. However, the delegation would go along with the consensus, and would not oppose the original wording.

1158. The **delegation of the Philippines** preferred the original formulation but would be flexible, and it thanked Hungary if it could agree to place its amendment after 'the Secretariat'. Responding to the comments by Turkey, the delegation explained that this was a recommendation, an invitation; the Ad-hoc Working group would be free to determine its procedures and timeline. It was seen more as a continuing possibility, and that the Committee did not necessarily have to complete such work. But the issue itself was very important to be able to consult in an organized way. The delegation therefore wished to keep the original wording but would accept moving it to after 'the Secretariat'.

1159. The **Chairperson** noted the near consensus on the new paragraph 8 and the addition of the informal Ad-hoc Working Group after the mention of 'the Secretariat'. With no objections, paragraph 8 was duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 9 was also adopted.

1160. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** noted that paragraph 6 had already been adopted, but it had a small concern it wished to express for the record in relation to the NGOs whose accreditation the Committee had agreed to terminate. In light of the Committee's concerns about the large regional imbalance, the delegation noted the termination of at least three NGOs from Cuba, Viet Nam and Brazil; countries that already had scant representation. It wished to have had the opportunity to discuss their termination in view of the large imbalance.

1161. The **Chairperson** thanked Saint Lucia for sharing its concerns, adding that the Committee would take serious note. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 17 adopted.**

1162. The **Secretary** responded to the very valid concern raised by Saint Lucia, adding that indeed a number of NGOs had not been renewed because they simply had not responded or replied to the reporting. When the Secretariat did not receive any reporting, and all NGOs have to report on their activities, then there was simply no basis to justify the renewal of their accreditation.

ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2018 CYCLE

1163. The **Chairperson** returned to the results of the ballot count for the new members of the Evaluation Body. Twenty-three Committee Members were present and had voted. The following candidates had received the following votes:

I. **Electoral Group III** – the situation was a clean slate and the **NGO Erigaie Foundation** was elected.

II. **Electoral Group IV** – seat for one accredited NGO:
   i. The NGO Oral Tradition Association (OTA) received **4** votes.
   ii. The NGO Aigine Cultural Research Center - Aigine CRC received **6** votes.
   iii. The **NGO Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation (CHF)** received **13** votes and was elected.

III. **Electoral Group V(b)** – Seat for one expert:
   i. The expert Mr Abdelaziz Hwedy (Jordan) received **6** votes.
   ii. The expert **Mr Saeed Al Busaidi (Oman)** received **17** votes and was elected.

1164. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three new members of the Evaluation Body and thanked the other candidates before proceeding with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 18 adopted.**

1165. The Chairperson congratulated the newly elected members of the Evaluation Body, wishing them good luck with the tasks ahead.

ITEM 13 OF THE AGENDA

REPORT OF THE INFORMAL AD HOC WORKING GROUP

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/13*
Decision: *12.COM 13*

1166. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 13 and the Report of the informal Ad-hoc Working Group. The Chairperson noted that a very high number of decisions taken by the Committee in 2016 had reversed recommendations by the Evaluation Body. Seventeen out of twenty-four files (71 per cent) were inscribed even though the recommendations were not favourable. In a number of cases, negative recommendations were made owing to minor or technical information that was missing. The Committee also expressed concern that no mechanism currently existed to allow submitting States to respond to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body before their cases are brought to the Committee. This situation prompted the Committee to take two interrelated actions: i) to ask the Secretariat to propose a procedure that would allow States to respond to preliminary recommendations in the

evaluation cycle before files were presented to the Committee, i.e. to propose a 'dialogue' mechanism, which would be presented under agenda item 12; and ii) to establish an Ad-hoc Working Group to discuss issues related to the content of the dialogue mechanism. The Committee thus established the Ad-hoc Working Group to examine a number of points: i) the issues related to the consultation and dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States; ii) the decision-making process of the Committee on nominations, proposals and requests; and iii) any other issue that would strengthen the implementation of the Convention. The Chairperson took the opportunity to thank the participating States for sharing their points of view and for their spirit of cooperation. The Ad-hoc Working Group had met on several occasions with the first meeting having been held on 16 February 2017 to discuss the agenda and composition of the Working Group. To save time and for the sake of efficiency, the two initial meetings were only open to Committee Members before being held as an open-ended meeting. In this way, the restricted Group would present a concrete proposal to the wider group of States Parties. Accordingly, Committee Members had met on 27 February and 10 May, while the open-ended meeting had been held on 2 June 2027. As the discussion evolved, the Working Group had felt it was necessary to consult with the Evaluation Body, and consequently two members of the Evaluation Body had participated via Skype on 10 May 2017 in their individual capacities. Subsequently, the Committee Members had met all twelve members of the Evaluation Body on 27 September 2017. The Group was convened in an open-ended meeting for the last time on 23 October with the aim of validating the Group's report. A 'drafting group' was created and six meetings took place under the chairpersonship of Mr Mounir Anastas, Ambassador of Palestine. The drafting group complemented the Group's work by mediating the different opinions.

1167. The **Chairperson** reported that the deliberations of the Group raised many questions, such as: i) Should the dialogue be limited only to certain criteria? ii) How many questions could the Evaluation Body ask? iii) What type of questions could be asked, for example, only minor additional information and clarifications, or just clarifications? iv) Under which conditions could the dialogue be initiated? v) When a submitting State responds to questions by the Evaluation Body, should the answer be limited in terms of word count, and if so, by how much? While the Group was reaching consensus on many issues, the members of the Evaluation Body met on 27 September 2017 and shared the view that it was too premature to consider a new 'dialogue' procedure. The Body pointed out that a number of measures had been recently put in place to improve the nomination process, such as the revision of the nomination form on R.5 and the extension of the referral option to all listing mechanisms. The Evaluation Body felt that the Committee should give time – at least until the end of the 2019 cycle – for the recent measures to take effect before assessing their effectiveness, and before considering the establishment of a formal 'dialogue' process. The Ad-hoc Working Group also reflected on other issues, such as: i) the decision-making process of the Committee; ii) the introduction of a so-called 'deferral option'; iii) the nature of the Representative List; and iv) other matters to improve the work of the Committee. The conclusion and recommendations of the Working Group were reflected in draft decision 12.COM 13. One of the main conclusions was that the Working Group wished to continue its reflection and proposed extending the mandate of the Working Group, including on the dialogue mechanism, as well as other issues within its mandate. The Chairperson thanked the Working Group once again for having undertaken crucial and fruitful discussions that would contribute to the development and governance of the Convention.

1168. The **Secretary** wished to point out that the extension of the Working Group's mandate had been decided at a Committee session in accordance with Article 8.3 of the Convention and Rule 20 of the Rules of Procedure, but that limited human and financial resources meant that the Secretariat would be unable to provide secretariat services to the Group, if the mandate was to be extended.

1169. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Chairperson for chairing the Working Group and the Vice-Chairperson of Palestine, Ambassador Mounir Anastas, for the work carried out this year. Turkey contributed actively to the work of the informal Working Group and had been a member of the Working Group established under the World Heritage Committee and had

even chaired it in 2016. Regarding the 2003 Convention, its position had been clear from the outset. At the end of its discussions in the Group, the delegation had not reached a consensus on all items, but it tried its best to understand other States Parties. It understood from the discussions that some countries requested more dialogue between the Evaluation Body and States Parties based on the experience of the World Heritage Committee. However, it was important to underline that the World Heritage Committee and its logic of inscriptions was very different from the 2003 Convention. Although lessons could be learnt from the experience of implementing the World Heritage Convention, it was not possible to directly compare these two Conventions. Each Convention had its own dynamics, aims and modalities. The delegation was not against a dialogue. In fact, it promoted dialogue wherever possible, in the World Heritage Convention in particular. However, the delegation reiterated that dialogue in this Convention was different from that of the 1972 Convention. In this Convention, the Evaluation Body evaluated the file itself, not the outstanding universal value of an element. In order to increase the quality of the files, the delegation believed that technical assistance was required, which could be an area of focus, i.e. how to assist States Parties in their preparations to obtain a better nomination file. It also very much welcomed the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. However, this was the first time the Committee had worked throughout the year as a Working Group in the context of this Convention. It was therefore a learning experience for all under this Convention. In fact, it created a working culture among the Secretariat, the States Parties and the Evaluation Body. In that sense, it was a useful exercise. The work of the Group shed light on the Committee's future work. However, at this stage, it was time to allow for the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation Body. As a matter fact, the dual option recommended by the Evaluation Body had already had a positive impact on the nominations, and the positive changes in favour of submitting States had been observed. In this regard, the Committee should refrain from extending the mandate of the Working Group to a further analysis of the dialogue mechanisms. It first needed to see how the Evaluation Body's recommendations would positively affect the process itself. As mentioned earlier, the Working Group should consider the funding system of the Convention as a whole, and should also consider the decision of the last General Conference. The delegation requested that the Secretariat annex the notes submitted by the Evaluation Body dated 27 September 2017 to the Group's report as a future reference.

1170. Thanking Turkey, the **Chairperson** asked the delegates that had attended the informal Ad-hoc Working Group to limit their interventions, especially concerning philosophical approaches, for example, in the differences between the World Heritage Convention and the 2003 Convention, as these topics had been largely discussed and would continue to be discussed during the ongoing work of the Working Group. Moreover, certain topics had not reached consensus and therefore delegates should refrain from opening these discussions again.

1171. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Ad-hoc Working Group for its work and especially the Chairperson of the Working Group, Mr Byong-hyun Lee, and the delegation of the Republic of Korea, as well as the Chairperson of the drafting group, Mr Mounir Anastas, for the numerous meetings conducted in Paris. It hoped to see the decision-making steps recommended by the Ad-hoc Working Group implemented at future sessions. On the issue of dialogue, the delegation had emphasized throughout this session that promoting the Convention and enhancing the credibility of the Committee were shared responsibilities. While it recognized the views of the Evaluation Body, the Secretariat and some Committee Members, it strongly believed that procedural and administrative considerations should not trump the larger interests and will of States Parties to the Convention and the communities. Dialogue should not be seen as a burden but an added value. Dialogue was in fact enshrined in Article 16 of the Convention as the purpose of the Representative List. It also built trust and understanding between States Parties and the Evaluation Body, and it called for its integration into the evaluation system. If the Committee wished to ensure that Lists promote inclusivity, that they were distinct from the World Heritage system of a top-down OUV approach, that costs are reduced for States Parties and make the work of the Secretariat and

Evaluation Body more efficient, and that politicization is limited when files do not meet substantive criteria but are regularly inscribed by the Committee after last-minute additional information from submitting States, then the Committee needed to have a dialogue mechanism in place so that situations like the ones experienced in Addis Ababa and on the Laos file no longer occurred. The States Parties should be given advance information on the questions or clarifications requested, and ample time to supply these to the Evaluation Body before its final recommendations. This dialogue did not need to be costly or complicated. In fact, no one was against dialogue. The delegation noted the Secretary's comment [on secretariat services] but it hoped that if the Ad-hoc Working Group was extended then the Secretariat would attend the meetings as resource speakers. Concluding, the delegation was not convinced that a mere revision of the nomination forms could replace dialogue. Even with the revised forms, similar challenges would no doubt be encountered. Nevertheless, the delegation would be interested in hearing the views of other Members, particularly those not involved intensively in the Ad-hoc Working Group, and – depending on the discussions – it would propose amendments.

1172. Thanking the Philippines, the **Chairperson** recalled that the subject of a dialogue process between the submitting States, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat had been agreed in principle during the Working Group during which the Evaluation Body had spoken at length on the subject. The Chairperson clarified that there would not be a dialogue for the time being as the Evaluation Body had asked for its postponement to another cycle given that it had introduced the dual system and the new R.5 form.

1173. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the delegation of the Republic of Korea for facilitating and chairing the Ad-hoc Working Group established to discuss the dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States, as well as the decision-making process. It particularly appreciated that the Chair had also organized two open-ended meetings that allowed all States Parties to contribute to this important discussion. The delegation also welcomed and was thankful that the Evaluation Body had been consulted in the process. The Working Group had had extensive discussions about a vast number of ideas relating to the inscription process and had come up with a proposal to change the evaluation cycle in order to allow States Parties to revise their nomination files after a negative evaluation by the Evaluation Body. The delegation was 100 per cent in favour of dialogue and any measure that helped States Parties to submit files of a high quality. However, after having heard the opinion of the Evaluation Body on the proposal, and especially taking into account the view of the Secretariat, it was glad that the Working Group agreed to postpone any decision on changing the Operational Directives. It fully concurred with the opinion expressed by members of the Evaluation Body that the Committee should first evaluate the impact of the measures already undertaken to improve the examination process, such as the revised form for R.5. Ideally, the General Assembly would look into this issue again at its eighth session in 2020 when it would be in a position to make a qualified decision. More generally, the delegation was of the opinion that dialogue between States Parties, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body could take various forms and lighter options should be considered before any decisions were taken. It also felt that it would be useful to consider these questions from a broader angle in the context of a debate about the nature and purpose of the Lists. On a different note, since the members of the Evaluation Body were elected by the Committee, the Committee should in principle follow the Evaluation Body's recommendations, while of course preserving its decision-making prerogative. As a general principle, the delegation strongly believed that Member States of UNESCO should continue taking their decisions by consensus. To conclude, it welcomed the proposal to take a step back and allow the Working Group to continue its reflections on the governance of the Committee. However, as a first step, it should wait for the positions expressed by the General Assembly in June so as to have a better overview as to which questions were still open.

1174. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked and welcomed the work of the Chairperson of the Working Group on Governance, whose input had been decisive. It spoke in favour of dialogue and especially inclusiveness. UNESCO's work as a whole was based on dialogue, as this allowed for progress, which everyone sought. The delegation hoped that the Evaluation Body

and the Member States would engage in dialogue and be able to continue doing so in an inclusive way so as to facilitate the Committee's work. Indeed, the proposed dual option and the revision of the form had helped the Committee make quicker decisions. In the end, the Committee had the dialogue it sought, but it occurred during the Committee session, which it wished to avoid as it took up a lot of precious time. Ideally, the dialogue should take place prior to the Committee session. That said, the delegation associated itself with the statement made by the Philippines, which had so eloquently expressed its own position.

1175. The **delegation of Hungary** fully concurred with the remarks, especially those put forward by the Philippines, thanking them for this precise formulation concerning the necessity of dialogue. It also welcomed the point raised by Turkey that technical assistance may also be necessary in the preparation of nomination files, which it preferred to call upstream advice. Indeed, there was occasionally the feeling of concurrent mechanisms being at play, such as the capacity-building programme, the communication of the Convention, and dialogue. The delegation believed that these simultaneous mechanisms would eventually improve because the public, as well as States Parties and other stakeholders, would be more aware of both the objectives of the Convention and the different Lists. Moreover, regarding the capacity-building exercise, States would be better equipped to prepare nomination files as well. The delegation thus thought of this in a more holistic manner and it also agreed that the problem of the listing mechanism and the objective of listings should be further discussed in the Working Group with a broader mandate, which this Committee could also confer upon it under other agenda items.

1176. The **delegation of Senegal** joined the other Members in congratulating the Working Group for conducting its work in a participatory, inclusive and open way. It agreed that dialogue was essential, but so was upstream assistance to States Parties in the preparation of files. The question was how and with which procedure. Was the Committee ready to embrace the experiences of other Conventions without first seeing whether they were adapted to the reality of intangible cultural heritage? The delegation noted the references made to the 1972 Convention, and it was clear that there was common ground. However, the Advisory Bodies, IUCN and ICOMOS in the 1972 Convention did not work in exactly the same way or process as the Evaluation Body, so although the experiences may guide dialogue and communication, they could not be replicated in the same way, at least not for the time being. The delegation was thus in favour of continuing the reflection while evaluating the alternative measures that had been taken. Everyone agreed that the situation in Addis Ababa was different from Jeju in that there was clearly a positive shift in the decision-making in Jeju regarding the nominations, even if the dialogue could have taken place before instead of during the session. The delegation thus supported continuing the reflection and postponing the decisions to allow for more in-depth measures that would be better adapted to the Convention in the future.

1177. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Chairperson for his good work as Chair of the Working Group, and for entrusting it the role of Chairperson of the drafting group. It thanked all the Members of the Committee who had participated actively in the work of the Group, adding that it was indeed a process that would take time to reform. In some Conventions, it had taken thirty years to implement one reform, for example in the distribution of seats in the 1972 Convention. As for the points raised, the delegation did not agree with everything that had been said, but it fully agreed with the statement made by the Philippines. For the moment, the Committee should wait for the outcome proposed by the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body. Nevertheless, the dialogue process would definitely be needed in the future, which should be kept in mind when establishing the mandate of the next Working Group.

1178. The **delegation of Cyprus** was also part of the Working Group, and aligned with the Philippines and Algeria with regard to dialogue between the Evaluation Body and States Parties, and thus avoiding the situation in the examination of files that had occurred in Jeju. The delegation believed that dialogue prior to the Committee session would save time and facilitate the Committee.

1179. The **delegation of Japan** spoke on behalf of the intangible cultural heritage expert from Japan to comment on the criteria for evaluating the nomination files. It believed that out of the five criteria, criterion R.1/U.1 was crucial because it concerned the community, the practitioners of the nominated element. One could not have a traditional cultural practice transmitted without the community. It is like a car without its engine; it could exist by itself but would never run as it is the engine that keeps the car going. In the case of intangible cultural heritage, engines are the people, and communities were needed to ensure the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Criterion R.1/U.1 clearly sought to identify the community who transmitted and would continue to transmit the nominated element. Moreover, R.1/U.1 asks whether the nominated element constitutes intangible cultural heritage as defined in the Convention. In other words, if the nomination file did not provide enough information to determine that the element was intangible cultural heritage, then the file would obviously be insufficient and should be referred to the submitting State. Furthermore, the information in R.1 relates closely to the other criteria. If the element did not constitute intangible cultural heritage then it would not be able to increase the visibility of such heritage in general, as specified under R.2. Therefore, the discussion should be more comprehensive than just an evaluation of criteria R.2 and R.5.

1180. The **delegation of Switzerland** thanked the Chairperson for the excellent conduct of the Ad-hoc Working Group and especially for opening it up to all States Parties. It deemed it important that governance issues – in this case, the decision-making process and the status of recommendations of the Evaluation Body – be discussed in an inclusive way, involving all Member States. The delegation considered, as mentioned by Austria and many others, that it was necessary to continue the process of reflection and to take the necessary time to formulate the recommendations to the General Assembly.

1181. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 5 took note of the Evaluation Body's view on the establishment of a formal dialogue process.

1182. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to add a new paragraph 5 [before the original paragraph 5], which would read, 'Recognizes the importance of dialogue to enhance the evaluation process', which reflected the present debate and reaffirmed its importance.

1183. Thanking the Philippines, the **Chairperson** pronounced that Paragraph 5 was duly adopted, with no objections. Paragraph 6 was also adopted. Paragraph 7 had a proposed amendment by Turkey, Austria and Ethiopia, which decided to postpone the discussion on the establishment of a formal dialogue process.

1184. The **delegation of the Philippines**, having listened closely to the debate, and as an active member of the Ad-hoc Working Group in Paris, was prepared to give more time to refine the proposed dialogue mechanism with a view to making it a lighter procedure. However, it had some amendments to the amendment proposed by Turkey, Austria and Ethiopia that would reflect the discussion. The proposal suggested, 'Decides to consider the establishment of' instead of 'postpone the discussion on', which would read, 'Decides to consider the establishment of a dialogue process between the Evaluation Body and nominating States Parties at its fourteenth session in 2019'. The words 'formal' and 'dialogue' did not need to be in brackets. The delegation further explained that this 'consideration' provided some flexibility and did not preclude a decision either way. It also suggested deleting the last part, 'to give time for adjustments introduced by', as this was already alluded to in paragraph 6.

1185. The **Secretary** remarked that 'submitting' States was more correct than 'nominating' States.

1186. The **delegation of Turkey** wished to see the original proposal reflected on the screen, adding that it understood the statement and rationale behind the proposal by the Philippines, but that it was not giving enough time to consider the suggestions by the Evaluation Body. The proposal was to have time to reflect on how the dialogue process had evolved so as to further discuss and reflect in order to make an informed decision at the next Committee and then decide how best to proceed. The new proposal did not provide enough time to reflect on this issue so the delegation insisted on retaining the original proposal under paragraph 7.

1187. The **delegation of the Philippines** appreciated the response from Turkey but it had made this proposal in relation to the previous paragraph 6 just adopted, which encompassed all the points raised by Turkey, namely the need to see the effects of the revised form, as well as the other adjustments made by the Evaluation Body. Thus, the proposed new paragraph 7 should be seen in relation to paragraph 6 with a more precise reflection of the debate.

1188. The **delegation of Palestine** aligned with the remarks by the Philippines in that the previous paragraph did indeed propose allowing for such time, as explained.

1189. The **delegation of Turkey** felt that the problem lay in the use of 'establishment' as it implied that this would be established in the meeting, and suggested 'decides to reflect further on the establishment of a dialogue process'.

1190. The **delegation of Algeria** proposed an amendment to replace 'decides to consider' with 'decides to resume its discussion', with the rest of the paragraph unchanged. In this way, it did not presuppose or pre-empt the decisions of the Committee.

1191. The **delegation of the Philippines** could accept Algeria's compromise formulation on the understanding that the extended Ad-hoc Working Group would continue to refine the proposed dialogue mechanism.

1192. The **delegation of Turkey** could also go along with Algeria's proposal, adding that the Committee had extensively discussed the issue of dialogue at the Ad-hoc Working Group and it did not see how the dialogue mechanism could be refined without first seeing the actual outcome of the amendments made so far. Essentially, there was not enough evidence to discuss this further and thus it would be a repetition of the discussion that had already taken place this year. Nevertheless, it could agree with the proposal by Algeria on this understanding.

1193. The **delegation of Austria** believed that it was important to step back to allow the General Assembly to take its decisions. But it could also accept the proposal by Algeria to resume the discussion after the fourteenth session as it would also give the General Assembly the possibility to express its views, which was very important.

1194. The **delegation of the Philippines** suggested suspending the adoption of this paragraph until the Committee could complete the paragraph on the mandate of the extended Ad-hoc Working Group, as the Committee could only agree to further discussion if the appropriate dialogue mechanism was included. The delegation explained that – from the debate – it was known that the proposed dialogue mechanism formulated by the Ad-hoc Working Group was procedurally and administratively heavy and thus costly for the Secretariat, which was already under financial and human resource constraints. However, the discussion on these serious questions should continue. Thus, the proposal was to suspend the paragraph, and should it be included in the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group then the Committee could agree to resume the discussion, as proposed by Algeria, but not otherwise.

1195. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the appropriate proposal from the Philippines, i.e. to first discuss the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group.

1196. The **delegation of Hungary** also supported the suspension of the debate on this paragraph, as suggested by the Philippines, and moving to the subsequent paragraphs.

1197. The **Chairperson** suspended deliberations on this paragraph and turned to paragraph 8.

1198. The **delegation of Turkey** could go along with the adoption, but it wanted to request once again that the Secretariat annex the Evaluation Body's report to the report of the informal Ad-hoc Working group that would go to the General Assembly.

1199. The **Secretary** sought clarification on the Evaluation Body's report.

1200. The **delegation of Turkey** explained that it was a one-page report published on 27 September by the Evaluation Body that was a reflection on the dialogue process, which would thus complement the discussion of the Ad-hoc Working Group in this regard.

1201. The **Chairperson** noted that the Secretariat understood the request by Turkey. With no further comments, paragraph 8 was adopted. Paragraph 9 had a proposed amendment by several countries.

1202. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that it was good to annex the document to the report in paragraph 8, which would certainly be informative, but the General Assembly should also be able to discuss these issues and provide its opinion on this mechanism. The delegation did not wish to alter the paragraph, but simply to record this important point in the oral report.

1203. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that when it was presenting its amendment, it thought it would be able by that time to finish the technical reflection on the transfer, in which case part (iii) would be redundant and could thus be deleted.

1204. The **delegation of the Philippines** had a new small (i) based on the discussion of the previous paragraph 8, which would read, 'to further reflect on an appropriate dialogue mechanism, in consultation with the Evaluation Body', adding that it had had very good meetings with the Evaluation Body, first with the Chairperson as well as the previous Chairperson, and then in September with the entire Body that had proved to be very fruitful. Thus, this should be continued so as to come up with a good solution in partnership, which would be the priority given the many long debates. The delegation also suggested that the small (ii) could be subsumed into (iii) to lighten the text. Finally, as with the previous Ad-hoc Working Group, an item on 'other issues' could be included that might cover other issues related to the functions of the Committee.

1205. As mentioned in a previous statement, the **delegation of Turkey** believed that this was repeating the work already carried out in the last Working Group. It noted that the Philippines was very interested in this point, but it could not accept it as a priority because lengthy discussions had already taken place. The delegation suggested under point (iii), 'further reflect on a dialogue mechanism as appropriate in consultation with the Evaluation Body', which it could agree to.

1206. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to add, 'as well as any other issues to facilitate the work of the Committee'.

1207. As mentioned in its statement, the **delegation of Austria** believed that the Committee needed to take a step back and wait for the results of the measures that had already been implemented, while considering the consultation that had already taken place with the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat. It thus suggested adding to the Philippines proposal that the Committee reflect on the dialogue mechanism 'depending on the respective decisions by the next General Assembly', adding that 'as appropriate' would express a similar idea.

1208. The **delegation of Cuba** preferred the proposal by the Philippines because – from its point of view – [consultation with the Evaluation Body] needed to be a priority. It explained that the Committee had reflected for a year and that it should continue its work, which had been agreed within the Working Group, but it was also the general consensus of all the Committee Members. It thanked Palestine for its proposal, but it was very important that the decision make clear that the Committee would continue working on these issues, and that the question of the financial mechanism of the Convention was not the most important issue.

1209. The **delegation of Algeria** was satisfied with the wording as presented, but wished to explain its understanding behind paragraph 9 in that the Ad-hoc Working Group went from a restricted group reserved for Members of the Committee to an open-ended meeting. It recalled that this had been called for when the Committee had created this group in Addis Ababa. For the delegation, the issues that would be discussed in this Group were of paramount importance to the Convention, and the discussions should be open and inclusive. It also sought that the Committee consider the possibility of including in the mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group a discussion on the outcome of the intergovernmental meeting on the transfer of an element from one List to another, as mentioned by Austria.

1210. The **delegation of the Philippines** felt that its original proposal would suffice because that would be the priority, as mentioned by Cuba, adding that it believed it would ultimately benefit all submitting States Parties, so it insisted on point (i). The delegation was flexible as to the language, adding that this should appear before the funding mechanism, which would read, 'to further reflect on an appropriate dialogue mechanism in consultation with the Evaluation Body'. Also, it could agree with 'resume discussions' in the previous paragraph.

1211. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** had participated in the work of the Ad-hoc Working Group and was of the opinion that the Committee needed to continue the debate on the dialogue mechanism between the submitting States and the Evaluation Body, and continue to experiment with the new mechanisms proposed by the Evaluation Body, which was not contradictory. It supported the proposal by the Philippines.

1212. The **delegation of Hungary** supported the Philippines' proposal on the dialogue, and strongly supported Algeria on the open-ended nature of the working group, which had already been suggested in Addis Ababa in 2016. The delegation sought to complete the name of the group, which would read, 'an informal Ad-hoc Open-ended Working Group'.

1213. The **delegation of Palestine** shared the same concern as the Philippines and others, and still did not understand the need to place the question of the funding mechanism as a second priority. The 2003 Convention was the only Convention that had no problem with funding or financial problems and this could thus be a lesser priority. The delegation agreed with point (i) as it currently stood, but point (ii) could be placed a little later.

1214. The **delegation of Turkey** felt that the funding mechanism was undoubtedly an important issue in this Convention, as had been extensively discussed during agenda items 6 and 7. Regarding the proposal by the Philippines, it could only accept it being moved to the first priority if the suggestion by Austria was reflected in the proposal, meaning that the reflection could only be carried out after hearing from the General Assembly.

1215. The **delegation of the Philippines** could not accept Austria's proposal because that would mean that the Group could only work on this issue, which was supposedly a priority, after [the General Assembly] in June 2018. In turn, that would mean convening the meeting after the summer, i.e. in September, when the next Committee session would be in November.

1216. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that the discussion would only be resumed at the fourteenth session so there was no rush to discuss the issues in the next five or six months until the General Assembly had taken its decisions. In addition, there were also other important topics for the Working Group to discuss like the other points mentioned in the paragraph, so not all the work would get done in the first half of the year.

1217. The **delegation of Turkey** seconded Austria's remarks.

1218. The **delegation of the Philippines** proposed the formulation 'taking into account', adding that the discussion on the dialogue should not be suspended or take place only after the General Assembly. Thus, by adding 'taking into account', the Ad-hoc Working Group could continue to discuss the first priority issue before the General Assembly.

1219. The **delegation of Algeria** noted the near consensus with the proposal by the Philippines to take into account the relevant resolutions of [the General Assembly], which made sense. Moreover, it was not in the Committee's tradition to stop States Parties from discussing any issue they wished.

1220. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** associated with the comments made by Algeria in that the dialogue that had already begun should be expanded.

1221. The **delegation of Palestine** had agreed with the original proposal by the Philippines, but could agree with the last proposal 'taking into account', as this would settle all the concerns.

1222. The **delegation of Turkey** remarked that it had already shown flexibility so it could go along with 'taking into account', but it sought to change the order of the points so that the point on governance would precede the point on dialogue. The delegation explained that the Group

had held extensive discussions on dialogue for an entire year, and it was thus going back to square one without listening to the views of the General Assembly or the recommendation of the Evaluation Body, which was problematic.

1223. The **delegation of the Philippines** preferred the point on 'dialogue' to receive first priority, but it would take into account the views of Turkey and Austria and agreed to reposition the point. The question was whether the point on the funding mechanisms should be point (i) and the working group on governance point (ii), which it could also agree to. The delegation was of the understanding that these points, corresponding to the mandate of the Working Group, were not an indication of hierarchy and thus their order was irrelevant. All the points outlined were equal and would anyway be discussed in the order determined by the Ad-hoc Working Group, like the criteria in the Lists that had equal weighting.

1224. The **delegation of Hungary** recalled that, in its Decision 12.COM 17, the Committee had added to the mandate of the Working Group discussing possible ways in which the participation of NGOs under the Convention could be further enhanced. As this paragraph 9 appeared to enumerate the full mandate of the Ad-hoc Working Group, the delegation wished to see the previous decision reflected here as the fourth theme of the mandate. In addition, it did not like the formulation 'as well as any other issues' as this broadened the mandate to such an extent that it would render the smooth conduct of the Working Group difficult. The delegation thus preferred to spell out the precise mandate of the Working Group. It could not propose a language at the moment but surmised that the Secretariat could suggest something over lunch. Finally, on a technical note, the delegation recalled that the previous Working Group had elected a Chairperson and wondered whether that should also be reflected in the draft decision.

1225. The **delegation of Palestine** responded to Hungary's remark by explaining that the custom was for the next Chairperson of the Committee to become the Chairperson of the Working Group. As for the 'other issues to facilitate the work of the committee', it was recalled that this text was contained in the 2016 decision and it provided some flexibility should the Group need to discuss an issue that had not been previously stipulated. Moreover, these points [under paragraph 9] provided general guidelines for the Working Group and did not correspond to a specific mandate. The delegation thus insisted on keeping the text as this was indeed the purpose of the Working Group, to 'facilitate the work of the Committee'.

1226. The **Chairperson** noted that Hungary's concerns had been reflected, and a new sub-item (iv) had been added [on consultation with NGOs].

1227. The **delegation of the Philippines** supported Hungary's proposal, and also Palestine's proposal that would be a new (v).

1228. The **Chairperson** remarked on the addition of points (iv) and (v). With no further comments or objections, paragraph 9 was duly adopted. He then returned to paragraph 7, which was duly adopted. The Chairperson deleted the proposal by the Philippines.

1229. The **delegation of the Philippines** was of the understanding that paragraph 7 was its paragraph as amended by Algeria, and not the original amendment by Turkey, Austria and Ethiopia.

1230. The **Chairperson** concurred that this was the understanding of this Committee, and paragraph 7 was replaced by the proposal put forward by the Philippines in 'Decides to resume […]'. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 13 adopted.**

ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA

PROCEDURES TO FACILITATE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE EVALUATION BODY AND THE SUBMITTING STATE(S)

1231. The **Chairperson** proceeded to agenda item 12 and proposed suspending this item until the next session meeting.

1232. The **delegation of Palestine** had no problem suspending this item until the next session, as this was the understanding of the previous discussion.

1233. With no objections, the **Chairperson** decided to postpone item 12 until the next session.

1234. The **Secretary** wanted to briefly respond to the Philippines in its earlier comments to confirm that the Secretariat was not against a dialogue, but it did not want the broader concept of dialogue to be limited to one specific mechanism, as proposed. The Secretary also reminded the Committee that the Secretariat would be unable to provide secretariat services to the informal Working Group; however, it would be happy to attend if invited to do so.

1235. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that in conformity with Article 30 of the Convention, the Committee was to submit a report of its activities to the General Assembly at each of its sessions. Furthermore, according to Rule 43 of our Rules of Procedure, it shall adopt its report of this session in the form of a List of Decisions. The Committee would thus proceed with items 5.a and 22 concerning the report of the Committee and the approval of the List of Decisions in the afternoon session. The report of the Committee to the General Assembly would need to be updated to include the activities undertaken by the Committee between the time of writing of the report in October and the end of the year 2017. To facilitate this process, the Secretariat would update the report of the Committee to the General Assembly up until the present. Moreover, the Secretariat would compile the decisions adopted during the week i.e. decisions concerning items 2 to 11 including 11.a, 11.b, 11.c 11.d and 11.e. as well as 14, 17, 18, 19 and 20. A printed copy would be available after lunch, which would give Members half an hour to read the report and the decisions. The session would then start with item 5.a to adopt the report. The Rapporteur might validate any necessary updates to the report. The Committee would then move to item 22 to adopt the List of Decisions.

1236. The **Secretary** informed the Committee Members that the Secretariat would shortly send a satisfaction survey to their email addresses, and would greatly appreciate it if they could complete the form as this would help improve the organization of statutory meetings of the Convention.

1237. The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

[Saturday, 9 December, afternoon session]

ITEM 22 OF THE AGENDA
ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS

1238. The **Chairperson** hoped that the Members had had time to read the Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities from January 2016 to December 2017. With no forthcoming comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared the Committee's report adopted**. The final version would be published online by the statutory deadline for the General Assembly.

1239. The **delegation of Zambia** sought to have the acronym NIESR spelled out in the report as National Institute of Economic and Social Research.

1240. The **Chairperson** thanked Zambia for the clarification. With no further comments on the List of Decisions, and subject to linguistic revisions by the Secretariat, the **Chairperson declared the List of Decisions adopted.** The final version would be published online by the Secretariat by the end of 2017.

ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA
INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN EMERGENCIES

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/15*
Decision: *12.COM 15*

1241. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 15, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

1242. The **Secretary** began by presenting the item within the broader context and global framework of culture in emergencies, recalling that the General Conference of UNESCO had adopted the 'Strategy for reinforcing UNESCO's action for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in the event of armed conflict'[10] at its 38th session in 2015, followed by the Action Plan approved by UNESCO's Executive Board in May 2017. At its 39th session, the General Conference adopted an Addendum to the Strategy that concerned emergencies caused by natural and human-induced hazards, and made an Appeal on Protecting Culture and Promoting Cultural Pluralism: the Key to Lasting Peace.[11] Moreover, the General Conference also adopted a new cross-cutting Expected Result 5 in the 39 C/5 entitled 'Culture protected and cultural pluralism promoted in emergencies through better preparedness and response, in particular through the effective implementation of UNESCO's cultural standard setting instruments'. Hence, UNESCO now had a comprehensive framework for culture in emergencies for both conflict and natural disaster situations. The Operational Directives had been amended by the 6th General Assembly to include a specific chapter on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development with a section dedicated to peace and community-based resilience to natural disaster and climate change. The Secretary recalled the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 2347 on the destruction of cultural heritage in the event of armed conflict, which was a historic resolution as it was the first to focus exclusively on cultural heritage. It included specific references to UNESCO's Strategy and UNESCO's role. Safeguarding culture in emergencies also contributes to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, notably by strengthening resilience (particularly in relation to SDGs 11, 13, 14 and 15), and by promoting peaceful and inclusive societies (SDG 16).

1243. Regarding the specific work of the Convention on this issue, the **Secretary** further recalled that the Committee in 2016 had initiated a reflection on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and had felt that more case studies were necessary to fully grasp the complexity of the issue in defining operational modalities for the implementation of the Convention in such situations. The Secretariat had therefore conducted a number of activities in relation to different contexts such as conflict, displacement and natural disaster, the results of which were presented in the working document, including lessons learned and possible ways forward. Regarding conflicts, a small-scale survey had been carried out on safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of Syrian refugees (mainly in Lebanon and Jordan, as well as in Egypt, France, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Turkey). The objective was to understand more about the dual role of intangible cultural heritage and communities in a displacement context. Based on this experience and the promising results of the survey, it was thought interesting to pilot a fully-fledged needs identification. This approach was thus tested in the province of North Kivu in the Democratic Republic of Congo together with the UNESCO Office in Kinshasa, and had a twofold objective: i) to assess the needs with a view to defining context-based safeguarding actions for intangible cultural heritage in North Kivu in the framework of the Convention; and ii) to feed the Committee's reflection with a case study in the context of a longstanding conflict and a large-scale internal displacement of populations. Concerning natural disasters, and because of the unpredictability of such emergencies and the fact that there was research and literature available in this field, it was felt more appropriate to first conduct a desk study to identify and conceptualize the key issues at stake. The Secretariat therefore commissioned a desk study on the safeguarding and mobilization of intangible cultural heritage in the contexts of natural and human-induced hazards, backed up with case studies[12]. Finally, the Secretariat continued to provide dedicated support for the preparation and implementation of emergency International Assistance requests, as detailed in the working document and online.

---

10. Read the Strategy here.
11. Read the Appeal here.
12. Read the Desk Study here.

1244. The **Secretary** took the opportunity to highlight a few key points that had emerged. Firstly, the results of the activities confirmed, as was acknowledged by the Committee in 2016, that: i) intangible cultural heritage is indeed at risk in situations of emergencies; ii) intangible cultural heritage could play a fundamental role towards the preparedness, recovery and resilience of communities; and iii) the broad concept of intangible cultural heritage was not duly taken into account in emergency situations; for example, humanitarian agencies look at some aspects of cultural norms and behaviour, as well as local/indigenous knowledge, but the broader issues of practice and transmission were not addressed, and this is precisely where the 2003 Convention had added value. There is most probably a lack of knowledge and understanding of the concept of intangible cultural heritage by humanitarian, peace-building and disaster risk management actors. The studies mentioned in the working document also illustrate that communities do take action to enact their living heritage to the extent possible, which should be supported by national authorities in guaranteeing an enabling environment, or at least not undermining the communities' ability to practice their intangible cultural heritage. In terms of operational modalities, one lesson that could already be drawn at this stage is the usefulness of community-based needs identifications. This entailed background studies, stakeholder consultations, field surveys, and a careful analysis of the results collected. This approach required an important preparatory phase, expertise, and confidence-building with those affected by crises and disasters, which required at least three to six months of study, depending on the context. This approach was thus in line with the principles of the Convention as it gave communities a real voice in recognizing the primary role of communities in defining their intangible cultural heritage within a specific context. It is key for developing context-specific safeguarding actions that respond to the concrete needs on the ground. The Secretariat was of the view that community-based needs identifications could be considered by the Committee when designing primary interventions to respond to emergency situations in the framework of the Convention. Hence, the Secretariat wished to further roll-out this approach in different emergency contexts, both conflicts and natural disasters.

1245. The **Secretary** then turned to the lessons that could be drawn from the emergency International Assistance mechanism thus far. Although a low number of requests had been submitted, it appeared to be a useful mechanism for acting in emergencies while involving the community, which responded to the 2003 Convention in this regard. It was noted that it was not set up as a rapid-response mechanism deployable at short notice; nevertheless, the UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund provided a good complement to this end. The Secretary underlined that technical assistance was required in all cases, as this helped to finalize requests. Indeed, the involvement of the submitting State, an expert and the Secretariat proved to be a very effective way to support the submitting State in defining a specific response to the emergency in line with the Convention's provisions, as well as to share experiences of similar situations (a recent good example is the technical assistance provided to Niger by a Malian expert). Content-wise, this experience showed that a phase-to-phase approach is needed, i.e. starting with large-scale projects should be avoided and instead a community-based needs identification approach should be adopted to design appropriate safeguarding actions in a second phase. Based on the knowledge and experience gleaned since the last Committee session, the Secretariat proposed several possible ways forward: i) to continue developing more case studies whose results might point to emerging patterns in order to develop suitable interventions; ii) to continue piloting community-based needs identifications on the ground following an emergency; iii) to make improved use of the mechanisms and processes of the Convention, in particular in the framework of inventories in the field of preparedness and periodic reporting; and iv) to foster the strategic use of emergency International Assistance with a view to generating knowledge and experience on how to deal with intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency. In moving forward, it was important to remain cognizant of the sensitivity of the issue that involved dealing with people, their identity and cultural rights. Care should thus be exercised when talking about generic measures as each case was different. In some cases, it would certainly be inappropriate to intervene before other basic human needs (such as food, shelter, sanitation, etc.) had been properly met. Moreover, it was an absolute necessity to have the agreement

and consent of the stakeholders concerned prior to operational action on the ground. Intense preparatory work should therefore be carried out before intervening in a specific emergency context, as well as involving the right people. Hence, intervention in the field of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies was more likely to happen in the preparedness and recovery phases of the emergency, as reflected in the draft decision.

1246. The **delegation of Lebanon** wondered about the communities cited, as field studies had shown how disjointed communities could be. Obviously, if the communities being referred to were to be found in refugee camps, then they could be defined, but in urban neighbourhoods or communities scattered in the countryside, the delegation did not see how communities could be defined. In this case, the communities would be dispersed households that were far from their place of cultural renewal. Thus, a reworking of the concept of community, as found in the Convention, would be required in this context.

1247. The **delegation of Austria** had read working document 15 with great interest. The overview of key findings provided an insightful overview and reasons why – under given circumstances and its various contexts – the debate on the role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies such as armed conflict and disasters caused by natural and human hazards was essential for guiding the future work of the Convention, also with a view to achieving the goals of the 2030 Agenda. Regarding disasters caused by natural hazards and the effect of climate change, Austria spoke from its own experience in that the Convention was of seminal importance for the safeguarding and harnessing of local and traditional knowledge. This was also relevant in the context of a growing technologized nation state because up until today natural hazards such as avalanches could not be perfectly predicted or fully assessed by scientific means. For this reason, the transmission and safeguarding of traditional knowledge and practices was all the more important. Inventorying in Austria's case had proved to be a valuable mechanism in this regard, and it welcomed more examples of good practices regarding cooperation with educational institutions. The delegation also agreed that more case studies were needed to identify the needs of communities, but also to raise awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage in interventions by humanitarian actors. In this regard, it asked the Secretariat whether additional activities were planned that were aimed at raising awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in the work of humanitarian organizations. The delegation further noted the emphasis placed on community-based needs identification as a preliminary basis when defining safeguarding measures. In this regard, it drew the Committee's attention to its ethics and principles for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, especially in those cases where research and data collection were carried out by non-community members.

1248. The **delegation of the Philippines** found this subject to be very interesting and timely given the global challenges and increasing armed conflicts, climate change and natural disasters, and it thanked the Secretary for his presentation. Intangible cultural heritage is endangered by these threats, but at the same time intangible cultural heritage could also be a source of community-driven disaster risk reduction, resilience and recovery, as rightfully mentioned in the document. There is a wealth of potential in this field and the delegation welcomed the Secretariat's initial desk study. It also welcomed the focus on community-driven responses. For example, the Philippines was on the front lines of climate change and extreme weather events. In 2013, the country had been hit by the strongest typhoon ever in world history and 6,000 people had unfortunately lost their lives in the central Philippines together with their cultural heritage. Following that terrible event, the communities affected used arts and cultural heritage to help in the healing and recovery process, and also, recently, the Philippines had experienced a difficult armed conflict in the southern Philippines in the city of Marawi, which was also affecting communities and their intangible cultural heritage. Thus, it felt very strongly about this item and would like to see it further developed. The delegation therefore recommended institutional linkages between UNESCO and related United Nations agencies, such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and the Red Cross, which could be explored, possibly through a workshop that would bring together these various actors and of course the communities affected to explore synergies and cooperation. Lastly, the delegation

also believed that climate change should be a priority as intangible cultural heritage for climate change adaptation and mitigation was a very interesting topic for the future. The funding mechanism, such as the Green Climate Fund, could therefore be tapped in this regard. It had an amendment to the draft decision.

1249. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for the detailed report, which showed that the Secretariat had been working on integrating intangible cultural heritage into emergency situations with a comprehensive approach since the eleventh session of the Committee meeting in Addis Ababa. Though the item had been discussed for the first time only in 2016, since then a number of activities had been carried out by the Secretariat to cover emergencies from several fronts, ranging from situations of conflict and violent extremism to emergencies associated with disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards. The delegation believed that this comprehensive approach to intangible cultural heritage was exemplary for UNESCO when responding to emergencies. In fact, the delegation had been addressing this issue in Turkey since 2013, specifically in relation to Syrians living in Turkey. In Turkey, the number of Syrians had exceeded three million as of 2017. The majority of Syrians had already moved from camps and settled in various cities of Turkey, especially cities near the Syrian border. Over the past seven years, formal and non-formal education had been provided to the children, including those born in Turkey, in their native language so that they could learn their own culture. The Turkish National Commission for UNESCO had made several field visits to these camps to meet with all the relevant stakeholders. A number of recommendations had come out of these field visits and subsequent meetings, and they had been integrated into the work of Turkey's relevant institutions. The delegation believed that these important experiences could be reflected in the future work of UNESCO and could contribute to efforts to this end, and it would provide written information regarding its experience to the Secretariat. As a result of these studies, regarding emergencies in relation to displaced persons, the delegation had learned that the focus must be on promoting enabling spaces that encourage people to sustain their identity and belonging so as to enable them to educate themselves in their own language and to help them integrate into the society in which they live. This was just the beginning of a process in UNESCO on emergency issues in the context of the 2003 Convention. Further work was needed to further utilize the International Assistance mechanism for the integration of intangible cultural heritage into the humanitarian agenda to prevent violent extremism. Considering its experience in this field, the delegation was ready to support the work of UNESCO, especially with regard to emergencies associated with displaced persons.

1250. The **Secretary** thanked the Committee Members for their positive and encouraging remarks on the work carried out; this was far from complete but the Secretariat appreciated the sense of moving in a positive direction. Regarding the question from Lebanon, the Secretary agreed that there was a need to define communities in the context of this very complex issue. The Convention itself does not define communities, as could be seen in the nomination files submitted under various mechanisms in which there are multiple approaches to defining communities. Clearly in cases where communities are dispersed, it would become even more problematic. However, approaching the issue from a policy perspective was also not as simple, and the Secretary invited the Committee to reflect further on the subject, i.e. to acknowledge that the definition of a community in a situation of emergency might not be the same as when there was no emergency. Regarding the question on awareness raising among humanitarian actors from the Philippines, it was noted that UNESCO had recently signed an agreement with the Red Cross and would be keen to sign with other United Nations agencies. The idea of a workshop was interesting, and one that could be looked into moving forward. Regarding the comments from Turkey, the Secretary appreciated and welcomed feedback, information, research and collaboration with the NATCOM that seemed to intersect on the issues of displacement, intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education, as well as education for the prevention of violent extremism.

1251. The **delegation of Palestine** also joined the previous speakers in thanking the Secretariat for the efforts made in this domain, recognizing that it was very difficult but nevertheless noting the Secretariat's very positive work, which was on the right track. Regarding

cooperation with other United Nations agencies, as far as Palestine was concerned it would be good to keep in mind the cooperation with UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees).The delegation asked the Secretariat whether it was possible for the 2003 Convention to join United Nations missions so as to report on the effects on intangible cultural heritage in these situations. For example, UNESCO had sent several missions to different areas of armed conflict, one of which had taken place in January 2017 in Aleppo, resulting in a report on the destruction of cultural and natural heritage, and in the domain of education.

1252. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat on this very important document on a sensitive issue that concerned the entire United Nations system. It was true that UNESCO, through its authorities, had already made a number of declarations in this regard. The delegation remarked that it was often thought that conflicts or natural disasters had a much greater impact on equipment, buildings, cities and forests, but the impact on intangible cultural heritage was in fact much greater. In the case of Africa for example, behind every tangible element lay an extremely important intangible element that in itself gave meaning to the tangible element. So, when a forest or a village is destroyed, a whole set of intangible elements are also destroyed. For this reason, in Africa, intangible cultural heritage is more vulnerable with regard to safeguarding in relation to conflicts and natural disasters. In the case of Senegal, a call for independence in the south of the country in Casamance had resulted in a crisis situation in which the State and the protagonists were brought together through the expression of culture because it was essentially a cultural conflict, as well as of course a political conflict. It was found that the practices and expressions of joking relationships, which is a phenomenon of cultural expression found throughout West Africa, and inscribed on the Representative List by Niger, could be used for the rapprochement of the two opposing sides to facilitate their relationship and the peace negotiations, which worked to a certain extent, even though peace had not fully returned. Nevertheless, the use of social interactions within the understanding of intangible cultural heritage facilitated this exchange. Regarding nature, Africans are bound to nature through their belief systems, practices and rites, and therefore their values are very much integrated into intangible cultural heritage, and by extension, the safeguarding of nature and the natural environment. Thus, the protection of intangible cultural heritage was very important to Africa. The delegation welcomed the work initiated by the Secretariat and encouraged it to continue in this direction.

1253. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** joined the Members in congratulating and appreciating the work of the Secretariat in this very crucial area. Coming from the Caribbean, it could relate to the remarks made by the Philippines, as this year had been particularly devastating for the region in terms of hurricanes, which had virtually destroyed whole islands. Returning to the crucial points raised by the Secretary, the delegation cautioned the use of generic measures. Each case was different and intense preparatory work would be needed before every intervention. However, in a lot of these cases, there was no time for intense preparatory work when some form of intervention was urgently needed. In fact, urgency takes on a new meaning in many of these areas of action, and more guidance was needed in this regard. The delegation wondered whether the Urgent Safeguarding List might need to develop a kind of mechanism for fast tracking a number of the elements for urgent safeguarding. Regarding awareness-building activities, the delegation remarked that this was needed well ahead of an emergency; right now, the Caribbean was scrambling for information because many of the islands did not have any mechanisms in place, such as emergency International Assistance. Awareness-building activities thus needed to be very much present in advance. Despite the unpredictability of events, these areas under threat needed to be identified so as to provide these awareness-building activities ahead of the emergency.

1254. Regarding the concerns raised by Saint Lucia, the **Secretary** concurred that the study had found that because of the unpredictable nature of natural and human-induced hazards and disasters, greater emphasis should be placed on preparation and integrating intangible cultural heritage into disaster preparedness plans, as well as in inventories. Thus, one of the things that had come out of the desk study was the lack of safeguarding plans with regard to disaster preparedness in nomination files and inventorying systems. Moreover, in an instance

of rapid response, i.e. once disaster had hit, it was probably not appropriate to immediately come in and ask about intangible cultural heritage when people first needed to be secured. However, communities would indeed use intangible cultural heritage as best they could. Nevertheless, the point was valid as concerns intangible cultural heritage being integrated into a preparatory phase that was recognized in the inventory, safeguarding plans and policy measures. References to this could be found in the online desk study.

1255. Responding to Palestine's question, the **Director of the Division of Creativity**, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, explained that the notion of 'disasters' encapsulated many different aspects that included preparedness, disaster risk reduction, loss, post-disaster recovery, reconciliation, displacement and displaced people. From the report, what one could see, and what the research told us, was that the most effective methodology used with intangible cultural heritage and community-based needs assessment for instance, as well as post-disaster recovery, were those methods that engaged with the community, for which people were required to work from within these communities. This worked very well for some of the different aspects mentioned earlier. Whereas the missions that had gone to Aleppo, for example, had had other specific objectives for which intangible cultural heritage-related work may or may not be most effective in an immediate, emergency situation. Thus, much more research was needed to understand exactly the many ways in which to engage, but it was nonetheless a complex process, one in which these aspects had to be accurately identified so as to see where intangible cultural heritage could be most effectively engaged in the long run, rather than assuming that it would be most effective at the time of emergency.

1256. The **delegation of Japan** wished to introduce two research projects in relation to intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations. The first one was conducted by the Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties, which examined the role of intangible cultural heritage as a tool of resilience and recovery after the Great East Japan Earthquake of March 2011. In the region devastated by the disaster, many lives had been lost and those who survived lost their homes and their possessions. As relocation progressed, some people moved out of their communities while some remained. But during the time of the festivals, they were able to gather as a whole once more. Evidently, intangible cultural heritage served as a spiritual pillar for these people in disaster-stricken communities and it also became the driving force behind their recovery efforts. Through this research, it was learned that there was a need to protect intangible cultural heritage from disasters by preparing customized measures adapted to the specificities of the different forms of intangible cultural heritage, such as oral traditions and traditional art and crafts. Hence the importance of creating inventories. The results of this research were compiled in a leaflet (which was made available at the session). The second research project was currently being contracted by the IRCI[13], a category 2 centre in Japan. The IRCI had been engaged in two research projects: one on the theme of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding and natural disaster risk management; and the other on post-conflict situations focusing on the Asia-Pacific region. With regards to the study on the emergency protection of intangible cultural heritage in conflict-affected countries, the IRCI was compiling research activities in Sri Lanka and other countries, and the results would be disseminated widely.

1257. The **delegation of Greece** began by congratulating the Chairperson, the Republic of Korea, and the Government for hosting this meeting. On the subject of intangible cultural heritage in cases of emergencies in general, it was impressed by the report and congratulated the Secretariat for further elaborating and providing an actual roadmap for underscoring the important value of intangible cultural heritage in cases of armed conflict, and in averting natural disasters and risk management. The delegation informed the Body that Greece had been engaged with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to try and formulate a programme to deal with the refugee situation in the country, which was a very difficult exercise for many reasons, as mentioned, but in this case the refugees did not stay for long. The representatives of the UNHCR in Greece believed that there was a lot of

13. International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Centre (based in Osaka, Japan).

potential in exploring intangible cultural heritage so as to enable the refugees – even those temporarily in camps – to recreate some sort of cohesiveness in their lives. On the other issue of using intangible cultural heritage in cases of averting or preventing natural disasters, Greece was working very closely with communities that practised dry stonemasonry and it had been proven that the continuation of this practice could save the environment and the land from many disasters such as floods or desertification.

1258. The **delegation of Belize** congratulated the Chairperson and the people and Government of the Republic of Korea for the excellent hosting of this meeting. With respect to the report by the Secretariat, it congratulated the Secretariat, commending it for the community-based needs identification approach. While the delegation supported the view that the mechanism for International Assistance in emergencies should not to be deployed as a rapid response mechanism, but rather only after an adequate needs-based assessment had been carried out and a plan developed in support of the communities, there were two things that came to mind. Firstly, that this was perhaps an opportunity for an integrated approach among United Nations agencies and Conventions in times of disaster, and secondly, it was also an opportunity – perhaps in the long run – to discuss how to deal with the immediate needs that arise in the aftermath of disaster with respect to intangible cultural heritage. In that regard, it requested that in addition to this approach, consideration be given to intangible cultural heritage that is directly connected to the livelihoods of persons affected by disaster and in the aftermath of disaster. The delegation also noted that in the spirit of the Convention – where communities and practitioners are knowledge bearers – the Convention also offered an opportunity for the adaptation of intangible cultural heritage from across the world, which may help restore livelihoods of communities affected by these disasters.

1259. The **delegation of South Sudan** congratulated the Chairperson for his coordination of the meeting, and for the report by the Secretary, which had touched upon so many aspects. The delegation appreciated the warm reception by the Government and people of the Republic of Korea. It also expressed appreciation to the UNESCO offices in Paris, Nairobi and in Juba that had provided such valuable support to the country at this critical time. South Sudan is considered one of the most diverse and culturally rich countries in the world. It has more than sixty-four indigenous languages spoken by the people, with many different traditions and cultural practices taking place. The country has recognized the importance of intangible cultural heritage, which led it to ratify three Conventions: 1972, 2005 and 2003, and it hoped that this would provide the good experience needed to develop the cultural sector of South Sudan. Unfortunately, however, South Sudan has descended into two senseless wars in 2016 and 2017, and its hope now was that intangible cultural heritage would develop. Finally, the delegation expressed appreciation to the UNESCO Office for its technical funding.

1260. The **Secretary** responded to Belize and Saint Lucia to assure them that the Secretariat was not referring to rapid a policy response, nor implying that the Secretariat could not be approached for assistance if needed in the context of recent activities; there were mechanisms in the Convention that could indeed assist. The issue was not to define strategic approaches in a rapid and generic way without first understanding the context. When referring to livelihoods, indeed this was an area in the United Nations system called the PDNA (Post-Disaster Needs Assessment), which seeks to identify losses and damage, with damages defined as physical damage and losses defined as income or livelihoods. In that context, the aspects are defined within a monetary term, and indeed identifying intangible cultural heritage within those terms was something the Secretariat should be working towards to address that concern. The Secretary also recognized the need to work with other United Nations agencies. However, these agencies were also working under difficult situations, so the benefit of common work should be seen within the context of both agencies reciprocating the need, i.e. the role that UNESCO could play should be clear and appropriate in the given situation.

1261. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, noting a number of proposed amendments. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 had an amendment by Austria, Palestine and Cyprus, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 had a

procedural amendment by Austria, Palestine and Cyprus, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted. Paragraph 6 had an amendment by the Philippines, Hungary and Palestine that included exploring linkages and cooperation with relevant United Nations and international bodies, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 7 had an amendment by Austria, Palestine, Cyprus and Colombia to explore and inform on further methodological approaches, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 8–10 were also adopted. A new paragraph 11 was proposed by Colombia that 'further encourages the Secretariat to pursue cooperation with other institutions with expertise in the field of risk management in the cultural sector such as ICOMOS'.

1262. The d**elegation of Algeria** was not against the spirit of the paragraph but did not see the value added by specifying one NGO, and with Colombia's permission, sought to delete ICOMOS.

1263. The **delegation of Turkey** supported Algeria in deleting the specific reference to ICOMOS.

1264. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed to delete ICOMOS, adding that the intention was that other institutions working in this field could help countries on this subject.

1265. The **Chairperson** declared that paragraph 11 was thus adopted. Paragraphs 12 and 13 were also adopted.

1266. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to make a slight clarification for the record, adding that the different emergency situations, which included armed conflict, human-induced hazards and so on, should also include military occupation.

1267. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine for its remark, which would be duly noted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 15 adopted.**

ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA

FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S 'REPORT ON THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDANT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES AND ENTITIES' (DOCUMENT 38C/23)

Document: *ITH/17/12.COM/16*
Decision: *12.COM 16*

1268. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 16, recalling that pursuant to Decision 11.COM 7 the Secretariat had been requested to include the report on the agenda in the current session, inviting the Secretary to present the item.

1269. The **Secretary** reiterated that this item had been requested by the Committee at its last session with a view to including it in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly in June 2018. It was recalled that a number of recommendations by the External Auditor in document 38 C/23 had already been discussed by the Committee at its eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh sessions, and by the General Assembly at its fifth and sixth sessions. As a detailed table had been presented in 2016, working document 16 was brief. It presented the recommendation of Sub-Group 2 that examined the 'Structure, composition and methods of work of UNESCO's international and intergovernmental bodies' of the 2003 Convention. In particular, the Sub-Group recommended that the governing bodies of the Convention strengthen the decision-making procedures and credibility of the Committee. It also took note of its initiative to develop an overall results framework for the Convention. It was noted that the document had been drafted prior to the 39th session of the General Conference of UNESCO. The draft decision suggested that the Committee take note of the recommendation and good practice regarding the Convention presented by Sub-Group 2, which was examined by the Executive Board and the General Conference of UNESCO.

1270. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to provide additional information. Last month, the UNESCO General Conference adopted 131 recommendations of the Open-ended Working Group on Governance. The Philippines had had the honour of co-chairing its two sub-groups

over the last biennium with Hungary. Sub-Group 2 took up the UNESCO International Intergovernmental bodies, including the 2003 Convention bodies. In accordance with the resolution of the General Conference, all UNESCO governing bodies, including the Committee, the General Assembly and their Secretariats were requested to follow up on the implementation of relevant general and specific recommendations of the Working Group on Governance. In its view, the following recommendations of the Working Group are among those that should be considered: Recommendation 60 on the need to reduce and manage the politicization of nominations and decisions; Recommendations 61 and 62 on effective information dissemination and documentation; Recommendation 64 on open-ended informal consultations on draft decisions; Recommendations 66 to 72 on clarifying and harmonizing the role of the Bureaus and the responsibilities of Bureau members, including the timely dissemination of reports of meetings and reinforcing their intergovernmental nature and transparency; Recommendation 73 on gender-neutral language; Recommendation 76 on orientation sessions for new members; Recommendation 94 on equitable resource allocation; Recommendation 96 on synergies with other culture Conventions; and Recommendation 97 on better utilizing the annual meeting of Chairpersons of the culture Conventions. Of special interest, mentioned by the Secretary, is Recommendation 107 addressed specifically to the 2003 Convention's governing bodies on 'the need to strengthen decision-making procedures and credibility of the Committee, taking due note of the Ad-hoc Working Group established to address these issues'. The delegation encouraged the active follow up of these recommendations and noted that this had already been given to the informal Ad-hoc Working Group's mandate. The delegation had submitted amendments to the draft decision in this regard, supported by other Committee Members.

1271. The **delegation of Turkey** also thanked the Secretariat for the report. However, the report and the draft decision did not fully reflect the decision of the last session of the General Conference regarding the recommendations of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Governance, but – as the Secretary explained – it had been prepared *before* the General Conference and was thus understandable. After two years of intense work among all UNESCO Member States, the delegation believed that it was now time for both the Secretariat and States Parties to implement the relevant recommendations, which had been eloquently put forward by the Philippines. However, it wished to draw the Committee's attention to some recommendations of importance. The first one concerned the role of the Bureau. Another concerned the synergies among culture Conventions. The delegation was glad that the informal Working Group had been given a mandate to implement the relevant recommendations of the Working Group on Governance under agenda item 13. It expected the Secretariat to also start implementing those recommendations under its responsibility. Together with the Philippines, Algeria and Hungary, it also had amendment proposals for the draft decision.

1272. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. The new paragraph 3 proposed by the Philippines, Algeria, Hungary and Turkey welcomed the adoption of the recommendations of the Open-ended Working Group on Governance and the methods of the work of the governing bodies of UNESCO by the General Conference at its 39th session, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 4 was also adopted. Paragraph 5 had an additional amendment at the end of the sentence by the Philippines, Algeria, Hungary and Turkey, which read, 'identified by the Open-ended Working Group on the Governance […]', which was duly adopted. A new paragraph 6 by the Philippines, Algeria, Hungary and Turkey, 'invites the Secretariat to implement the relevant recommendations of the Open-ended Working Group on Governance […]', was duly adopted. A new paragraph 7, 'invites the Bureau to conduct its work in accordance with the guiding principles and responsibilities of representatives of Electoral Groups in Bureaus, annexed as Appendix 2 in the recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group on Governance […] adopted at the 39th session of the General Conference', was duly adopted. Paragraph 7 was also adopted. A new paragraph 8 read, 'Invites also the informal ad hoc working group to take up relevant recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Governance […] that may

require further discussion before appropriate implementation, such as on the role of the Bureau'.

1273. The delegation of **Algeria** noted that Hungary had proposed 'Open-ended' to define the informal group from 'Ad-hoc', adding that the draft decision should use the right terminology.

1274. The **Chairperson** noted that Open-ended had been used in paragraph 7, which was the official working name.

1275. **Mr Gábor Soós, delegation of Hungary (Rapporteur)**, sought to clarify on the authoritative language, noting that the French should also follow.

1276. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Secretariat would automatically translate the text into French from the original English version, which the Rapporteur would later check.

1277. The **delegation of Turkey** further noted that paragraph 8 had used the formulation 'Working Group on the Governance' but paragraph 9 had labelled it 'Open-ended Working Group on the Governance'. For the sake of consistency, the exact name should be recalled in both paragraphs; it asked the Philippines whether it could explain.

1278. The **delegation of the Philippines** clarified that they both referred to the same group, but the official title was longer so 'Working Group on the Governance' was used to simplify the paragraph. However, for the sake of consistency, the title could be repeated in both paragraphs or left as it was on the understanding that it was referring to the same group.

1279. The **Chairperson** noting the clarification from the Philippines, and with the Committee agreeing on the new paragraphs 8 and 9, they were duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 16 adopted**.

ITEM 21 OF THE AGENDA

OTHER BUSINESS

Decision: *12.COM 21*

1280. The **Chairperson** turned to the next item 21, noting that Hungary wished to take the floor.

1281. The **delegation of Hungary** tabled a revised amendment under this agenda item, explaining that the reason for the amendment at this stage was because of its cross-cutting nature, which related to several agenda items discussed during the week, namely items 5.b, 8.a, 9, 11.c, 11.d, 14, as well as the recently discussed item 15. The text would read, 'Invites the Secretariat to prepare a report on the use of International Assistance mechanism and capacity-building programmes in relation to elements on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, as well as to explore further possibilities for utilizing these in order to safeguard elements on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, considering also the communication of the Convention'. The amendment thus touched upon the International Assistance mechanism, the capacity-building programme, and most importantly, the safeguarding of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It was proposing this cross-cutting issue as an overview of the current situation so that the Committee might have a better overview of the situation with a view to exploring further possibilities, and to provide further reflection on these interrelated issues.

1282. The **Secretary** noted that an additional text had been added to the original amendment submitted, which read, 'considering also the communication of the Convention'. The Secretary felt that it was confusing in that it was unclear what was expected from the Secretariat. The Secretary asked Hungary whether it would kindly go back to the original draft decision as discussed, and remove the additional text, which only caused confusion. In addition, he asked whether it would be possible to include this report in the Secretariat's report so as to avoid parallel reporting mechanisms.

1283. The **delegation of Hungary** could accept the deletion and thus avoid a lengthy debate.

1284. The **delegation of Turkey** found the adoption of this point under agenda item 21 very inconvenient and suggested that the paragraph be reflected instead under the appropriate agenda item, which would mean opening the already adopted item on an exceptional basis.

1285. The **delegation of Algeria** concurred that this amendment seemed a bit isolated, and agreed with Turkey that the paragraph could be integrated on an exceptional basis into a more appropriate decision.

1286. The **delegation of Palestine** had no issue with the idea behind the amendment. However, it sought clarification on whether Hungary was inviting the Secretariat to prepare another report or to include it in the report on the use of International Assistance for elements in need of urgent safeguarding.

1287. The **delegation of the Philippines** also wished to hear from Hungary, adding that it too had no issue with the idea. The delegation noted two basic options, however, as Turkey and Algeria had suggested, which were: i) to reopen the decision, or ii) the Committee could decide to leave it under this item but to include it in the report on the relevant item, as suggested by Palestine, which could perhaps be under agenda item 8.a [Reports of States Parties on the use of International Assistance from the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund].

1288. The **Secretary** remarked that agenda item 7, as suggested by Turkey, was mainly financial reporting whereas this was more substantive reporting. The Secretary suggested that this could perhaps be an annex to the Secretariat's report or part of its report, in which case it would come under item 5.b. This would also allow the Secretariat to cover any financial costs of the study and thus provide some flexibility, while avoiding extra reporting processes.

1289. Having listened to the Secretary, the **delegation of Turkey** felt that this should be reflected in the Secretariat's report under the relevant item, as decisions should not be reopened.

1290. The **delegation of Hungary** thanked the delegations that had asked about the timeframe of this report. It was of the understanding that this report should not be part of the year-and-a-half report by the Secretariat that only covered the period from January until the following Committee session, but should also cover the whole lifespan of the Urgent Safeguarding List. The delegation sought to have an overview of the situation of the Urgent Safeguarding List, i.e. to what extent elements on the List had been affected by International Assistance requests, and to what extent capacity building been used for their safeguarding, while exploring further possibilities in this regard. However, the delegation could agree with the Secretariat to include the report as an annex to its own report, as long as it took into account the longer timespan.

1291. The **Secretary** clarified that the Secretariat would produce a report on this issue as an annex to the Secretariat's report, which would not just cover the year's activities. The Secretary suggested adding 'as an annex to the Secretariat's report' so that it was clear.

1292. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision with a formal annex of the Secretariat's report. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 12.COM 21 adopted.**

1293. The **delegation of Senegal** wished to congratulate all the Members of the Committee for the atmosphere in which the work had been carried out, as well as the Secretariat, and especially the Chairperson and his assistants, including Turkey and Colombia who had assumed their roles as Vice-Chairs, all of which created a good atmosphere. It also congratulated the Government of the Republic of Korea for allowing the meeting to take place. Having read the Secretariat's report, the delegation had remarked on some possible suggestions concerning how to improve the participation of the States Members of the Committee, adding that it was occasionally difficult to be alone at one's desk when five or six Members could come together, which would really enhance the quality of participation, particularly among developing States.

ITEM 23 OF THE AGENDA
CLOSURE

1294. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for final comments before closing the meeting.

1295. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Senegal for his intervention and congratulated the Chairperson and all the Members of the Committee as all the items of the agenda had been covered without hindrance or problems. It thus reiterated its thanks to the Government of the Republic of Korea, and especially all the young volunteers for their professionalism, who had helped with the organization of this session. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for the work achieved. Finally, he spoke to the Chairperson of the great job done, inviting the delegations to give him a warm applause for this success.

1296. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked the Chairperson for his very able guidance and leadership throughout this session, as well as the Government of the Republic of Korea and the administration of Jeju Island for the facilities and the very warm hospitality. It also thanked the Secretary and his entire team who worked very hard and whose work was much appreciated, as well as the experts of the Evaluation Body whose efforts were also recognized. The delegation also thanked the interpreters and all the staff who had contributed to the successful completion of this meeting. This was the last Committee for Turkey as a Member and it had been a privilege for the country and a very rewarding experience. Turkey is a very committed State Party to this Convention and had tried to contribute to the discussion of this Committee actively, as well as being in line with the spirit of this Convention. It is for Turkey a platform where dialogue, mutual understanding and respect for each other prevail. It thanked its fellow Committee Members for the very good spirit, adding that the next Committee sessions would be more exciting with the new changes brought to this Convention, about which it was very optimistic, and it would continue to work to enhance the spirit of the Convention. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Chairperson, the Government of the Republic of Korea, the Secretariat, and everyone involved in this process.

1297. The **delegation of Côte d'Ivoire** reiterated its thanks to the host country for the quality of the welcome and for the excellent organization of the Committee's session. It also thanked the Secretariat, the interpreters, and the people and Government of the Republic of Korea, and the city of Jeju. Côte d'Ivoire, which had joined the Committee in 2014, would also leave the Body, and it wished to thank all the States Parties that had trusted it by supporting its election to the Committee, as well as all the Members of the Committee for honouring the delegation as one of the Vice-Chairs of the Bureau. It hoped to have lived up to this trust. Côte d'Ivoire renewed its thanks to UNESCO for having granted it International Assistance for the inventory of the cultural heritage present on its territory with a view to its urgent safeguarding. The delegation reaffirmed its country's commitment to the 2003 Convention, adding it would spare no effort to pursue its implementation, which it regarded as a place for dialogue between cultures and for mutual enrichment.

1298. Along the same lines as the previous speakers, the **delegation of Ethiopia** thanked the Korean authorities and people for their warm welcome, and the Chairperson for the fruitful deliberations, which had been successful in the way the meeting had been guided in the spirit of the Convention and its established principles. Many agenda items had been discussed, and the deliberations had not only helped make responsible decisions but also provided the delegations with lessons to contrast and benchmark practices and experiences with their realities at home with regard to safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of communities. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Chairperson for his excellent guidance, and the people and Government of the Republic of Korea. It also appreciated the excellent work by the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, as well as all the support staff and volunteers who had worked tirelessly to meet expectations.

1299. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia and Mr Yonas Desta Tsegaye, the former Chairperson.

1300. The **delegation of Afghanistan** thanked the host country, the people and the Government of the Republic of Korea and the authorities of Jeju Island, and congratulated the Chairperson

for his outstanding work and the smooth running and proper direction of the discussions. It also thanked the Secretariat for the unwavering and high-quality support that the Secretary and all his staff had provided to accompany the Committee's work that led to the success of the debates. As an out-going Member of the Committee, the delegation expressed appreciation for the work of the Committee, which had been a source of learning. Afghanistan had fully benefited from the experience and would remain as constructive as possible in the spirit of the Convention, wishing the in-coming and current Members much future success.

1301. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked the Republic of Korea, its Government and the people for the quality of the welcome. It also thanked the Chairperson for his conduct of the Committee's work, which had been managed with skill, wisdom, brio and responsibility. As Algeria ended its term on the Committee, it wished to warmly thank all the Members of the Committee. The delegation also thanked and congratulated the Evaluation Body for the quality of its work, as well as the Secretariat and the entire UNESCO team for its continuous efforts in the preparation of the nomination files. The delegation was proud to have been a witness and actor in the work of this Committee in some of its initiatives to continually improve the nominations so as to separate the cultural element from the human-constructed files. It was proud to have served this idea and to have had the privilege of participating in this process since the drafting of the Convention, as the first country in the world to ratify it, and having had the privilege of participating in the development of what is known as the heritage genome of humanity. The delegation concluded by adding that the Chairperson would be missed.

1302. The **delegation of Hungary** warmly thanked the authorities of the Republic of Korea and Jeju Island for a highly successful Committee meeting. It also wished to personally congratulate the Chairperson for his successful chairmanship, as well as the fellow delegates for their constructive work and sense of compromise. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its work and also the Secretariat for its professionalism, commitment and hard work. The membership of Hungary in this Committee would end in June 2018, but it would continue to follow the work of the Committee closely, adding that it had been a great honour and privilege to be part of it.

1303. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** thanked all the levels of organization for this very successful meeting, adding that it would take home many lessons with much to reflect on so that these could be fed back into the work back home. The delegation took the opportunity to wish much success to the people and the Government of Mauritius as the host of the thirteenth session. Saint Lucia would be departing from the Committee, but it would not be departing in terms of its pledge and commitment to the progress of this very important Convention. The delegation stated that it was an honour to have served on this Committee.

1304. The **delegation of Bulgaria** thanked the host country, the people and the Korean authorities for the excellent organization of the session and the warm welcome. The delegation congratulated the Chairperson on his chairmanship of this very successful and constructive session. It also appreciated the efforts and unwavering support of the Secretariat, which had ensured the success of the discussions. This was the last session for Bulgaria as a Member of the Committee and it was honoured to have been part of it. It expressed its sincere gratitude to all the Member States for the constructive dialogue and the exchange of ideas over the last four years.

1305. The **delegation of the Congo** expressed its gratitude to the people and the Republic of Korea for hosting this session. It also warmly congratulated the Chairperson, the Secretariat, the Members of the Bureau and the Evaluation Body for their excellent treatment of the nomination files. The delegation also thanked the entire team who had worked to ensure the success of this session.

1306. The **delegation of Mongolia** was also leaving the Committee in 2018, and it joined the previous speakers in thanking the Republic of Korea for hosting this session. It had been a great pleasure and honour for the delegation to work as a Member of the Committee since 2014. Mongolia would continue to support the 2003 Convention and to disseminate the spirit

of the Convention by safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. It thanked the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, the Chairperson and Members of the Committee for this session.

1307. The **delegation of the Philippines** expressed its deep appreciation to the Chairperson for his effective and dignified leadership. It also thanked the entire delegation, the organizers and staff from the Republic of Korea and the Island of Jeju for such gracious hospitality and excellent organization. The delegation thanked the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their dedication, hard work and commitment throughout the session. It had appreciated the opportunity in this session to engage with the accredited NGOs and experts, and all States Parties who had come to Jeju for important nominations. Finally, it congratulated all the Committee Members, especially the departing ones, for their great work, partnership and also friendship that would continue. Lastly, it looked forward to working very closely in supporting the next Chair of the Committee and to fruitful discussions in Mauritius.

1308. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson for his excellent mission and for the smooth meeting. It also thanked Turkey for its excellent chairing of its session as Vice-Chairperson. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, the Committee Members, and especially the backstage team who had made this meeting run smoothly and effortlessly.

1309. The **delegation of Armenia** expressed its deep appreciation of the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their long and hard work, especially the Secretary and the Chairperson for all their efforts, hard work and patience at such a high level. It thanked the Republic of Korea for its warm hospitality.

1310. The **delegation of the Republic of Korea** thanked the Chairperson for his great leadership, and everybody at the Secretariat. On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Korea, the CHA as host extended its sincere gratitude to all the Committee Members, delegations of the States Parties and experts for their invaluable contribution to this Committee meeting. Hosting the twelfth session of the Committee was indeed meaningful to the delegation to celebrate its cycle as a Committee Member, as well as a great opportunity to enhance the visibility of its intangible cultural heritage and international cooperation. For most participants, Jeju Island was a long way to come and it hoped that the delegations had achieved what they had set out to accomplish and enjoyed themselves in the meantime, and would have good news to take back home, especially for the communities concerned. The delegation informed all the delegations of the farewell dinner hosted by the Governor of Jeju Special Self-Governing Province that evening to celebrate this successful Committee. The delegation thanked all the participants, as well as those that had followed the session via the webcast, wishing everyone a safe journey home.

1311. The **delegation of Mauritius** congratulated and thanked the host country and Jeju Island for this well-organized and punctual event, thanking the Chairperson for the dignified manner in which he had conducted the meeting, with tact, calm and pertinence. The delegation added that it was still hesitating in its choice of the Chairperson for the future session, as he had set such a high standard. The delegation also expressed its gratitude to the Evaluation Body whose work had greatly facilitated the Committee, as well as the work of the Secretariat in organizing the session for months, making it trouble-free. A special word of thanks was expressed to all the Committee Members, the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairpersons. Thanks also went to all the Committee Members leaving the Committee; it added that it would seek their support and experience in some other forums, including NGOs and experts so as to benefit from their experience. The delegation also sought the support of the Government of the Republic of Korea as hosts of this session in organizing its own event in 2019, as well as the support of Ethiopia who had organized the Committee in 2016. It was also noted that it was the first time for a Small Island Developing State to organize a Committee meeting, which of course presented a big challenge but it was sure that it could rely on the help of all the Committee Members.

1312. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister of Mauritius, the next Chair and host country, joking that maybe this time next year he might be transferred to another assignment as Foreign

Minister or Prime Minister! The Chairperson remarked that the Committee had come to the end of its intense and highly productive week. He first wished to thank and congratulate the Committee, the delegations and their representatives for their positive and productive contributions throughout the session, which had enabled the Committee to achieve a tremendous amount thanks to their enthusiasm and willingness to work together in a spirit of mutual understanding. The Chairperson was thankful for the commitment shown by the Members of the Committee, Observer States Parties, NGOs and all other participants, adding that his work as Chairperson had proven thoroughly rewarding and smooth. Summarizing the achievements, the Chairperson explained that over the past six days, the Committee had examined forty-one files nominated for inscription and inscribed six of these on the Urgent Safeguarding List and thirty-three on the Representative List. It had also approved two International Assistance requests and included two programmes on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The Committee continued to recognize the invaluable support of NGOs on a diverse range of issues, and had agreed to recommend the accreditation of fifty NGOs, as well as renewing the accreditation status of fifty-nine others. It had examined periodic reports by eleven States Parties, a clear testament to the continuous commitment of many States Parties to the implementation of the Convention. For the first time, the Committee had also examined a request for the removal of an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List and its transfer to the Representative List, leading to highly fruitful reflections on the transfer and removal process. In addition, it had engaged in timely discussions on the role of intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency, the importance of the development of the overall results framework, and the proposed reforms to the periodic reporting system. These discussions would be essential for guiding the operational work under the Convention. Lastly, the Committee had also established a new Evaluation Body for the 2018 cycle, which the Chairperson welcomed, wishing them all the best in their work in the coming cycle. The Chairperson firmly believed that these issues would have an important, long-lasting impact, extending far beyond this session. The Committee would continue to reflect on these key issues as it moved towards attaining its common goals. The Chairperson paid tribute to the Members of the Bureau for their extraordinary support throughout this session, adding that it had been a privilege to work with them and he had been honoured at the confidence bestowed upon him. Sincerest thanks also went to the Rapporteur for his indispensable support throughout this session. Heartfelt gratitude also went to the interpreters, translators and technicians whose competence had been essential to ensuring the success and smooth running of this Committee. Concluding, the Chairperson thanked the Secretary of the Convention, Mr Tim Curtis, and his most able team for all their precious assistance and hard work. The results achieved during this session were largely their merit, and he extended warmest thanks and appreciation to them all.

1313. The **Director of the Division of Creativity**, Ms Jyoti Hosagrahar, echoed the remarks to express sincerest gratitude to the Chairperson for his effective leadership, and the smooth deliberation and productive outcomes of the past six days. Under his guidance, the Committee had been able to examine a broad range of issues relating to the implementation of the Convention. Her warmest thanks also went to the authorities of the Republic of Korea for their warm hospitality and flawless organization. Her thanks went, in particular, to the CHA of the Republic of Korea and also to Jeju Special Self-Governing Province. Gratitude was also extended to the Committee Members for their unfailing commitment to achieving consensus in the decisions adopted, as well as to all the States Parties for their reflections and shared contributions to the continued safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Ms Hosagrahar highlighted the special importance of this particular Committee session in light of the large number of important points reflected upon over the week, which promised to be a turning point in the life of the Convention and have a direct impact on the way intangible cultural heritage was safeguarded in an increasingly complex world. In recent years, an increasing number of conflicts and natural disasters had been witnessed, which had had a devastating effect on living heritage and communities. The world also faced increasing risks of climate change and climate-related disasters. The Committee had wisely recognized the key value of the Convention in preparing for and mitigating such challenges. By according a central role to communities and calling for the transmission of values through living heritage,

the Convention offered a vital means to achieve a better future, fostering unity and harmony among peoples. As was recognized at the very core of the Convention, the work carried out under the Convention was of immense relevance to UNESCO's broader commitment to furthering sustainable development, cultural diversity and peace. As many Members of the Committee had pointed out, this was particularly relevant in light of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and for sustainable cities. The important work of this Committee supported all the countries that worked hard to implement it in a variety of contexts. She also reaffirmed the incredible potential of this Convention to contribute not only to the specific communities, whose elements are listed, but also to a global transformative agenda where living heritage fosters diverse, inclusive, resilient and peaceful societies, as well as environmental sustainability. Ms Hosagrahar expressed sincerest thanks to the Evaluation Body members for their meticulous work, and to the Secretary, Mr Tim Curtis, and his team for their dedication and hard work, as well as to the field officers present. She thanked the interpreters, the technicians and all the staff in Jeju for their professionalism and competence. She concluded by thanking once again the Government of the Republic of Korea for the excellent work achieved, and she looked forward to seeing everyone in 2018.

1314. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Hosagrahar for her words of appreciation, as well as the delegation members and the participants from around the globe. He wished everyone a safe journey home and an enjoyable end to their stay in Jeju Island. The Chairperson looked forward to seeing many of the delegates in Paris at UNESCO, and declared the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage closed.

[Close of the twelfth session of the Committee]