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| **Summary**  This document presents the recommendations made by the Open-ended intergovernmental working group in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention. These recommendations are presented in the form of draft amendments to the Operational Directives that the present session of the Committee may recommend for the General Assembly’s approval at its ninth session.  **Decision required:** paragraph 14 |

**Background**

1. In 2018, the Committee launched a global reflection, financially supported by Japan, on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention[[1]](#footnote-1) to address a series of broad issues identified over a decade of implementation concerning the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereafter ‘The Representative List’), the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereafter ‘the Urgent Safeguarding List’) and the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (hereafter ‘the Register’) (Decision [13.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/6) and Decision [13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10)).
2. The issues and challenges encountered were presented in detail to the Committee at its fourteenth session in 2019 (document [LHE/19/14.COM/14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-14-EN.docx) and Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)), which identified the following main reflection points: (a) overall approach to the listing mechanisms; (b) issues related to the criteria of inscription; (c) issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements; and (d) methodology for the evaluation of nominations. Further discussion took place at the eighth session of the General Assembly in September 2020.[[2]](#footnote-2)
3. In addition, at different sessions the Committee and the General Assembly requested that certain specific issues be addressed during the global reflection. Requests to consider topics such as the revision of criterion R.2 (Decision [13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10), Decision [14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) and Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)), the procedure for the removal and transfer of elements (Decision [10.COM 19](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/19), Decision [12.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/14), Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14) and Resolution [8.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/11)), the follow-up of inscribed elements (Decision [13.COM 9](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/9) and Decision [15.COM 7](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/7)) were followed later by requests to deal with issues related to the annual nomination ceilings (Resolution [8.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/11)), the preparation of multinational nominations (Decision [15.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/8)) as well as the procedure for their extension (Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)), and how living heritage safeguarding contributes to sustainable development through the listing mechanisms (Decision [15.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/8)).

**Consultations with experts**

1. The reflection continued in 2021 with increased momentum, characterized by efforts to design the process as inclusively as possible. While the timeline of the reflection as well as the meeting modalities had to be adjusted due to the COVID-19 pandemic[[3]](#footnote-3), a two-step consultation with experts could take place:

a. Online survey: As a first step of the expert consultation, the Secretariat invited 201 experts to participate in an online survey[[4]](#footnote-4) between 26 March and 11 April 2021 to share their views on the main challenges identified so far regarding the listing mechanisms and on possible approaches for finding solutions. The participation included those experts proposed by States Parties in response to a call, present and past members of the Evaluation Body (157 in total, including past Subsidiary Body and Consultative Body members), and experts identified by the Secretariat, including representatives of the NGO Forum.

b. Category VI meeting of experts: As the second step of the expert consultation, an online Category VI meeting of experts was convened over six non-consecutive days in May 2021.[[5]](#footnote-5) Thirty-four experts were invited to work in plenary sessions and in three breakout groups, taking into account the results of the above-mentioned survey and two papers commissioned to support the meeting. The final report ([LHE/21/16.COM/EXP/7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-EXP-7-EN.docx)), and particularly the breakout group reports contained therein, reflects a series of suggestions or options considered by experts which do not form conclusive solutions; the purpose of the expert consultation was not for the experts to agree on every point of the reflection. Nevertheless, the vast majority of their positions seemed to fall equally into one or more of the following four approaches: (a) fine-tuning; (b) repositioning; (c) stricter-control; and (d) maximum inclusivity.

**Open-ended intergovernmental working group**

1. Based on the advice gained through expert consultations, the Open-ended intergovernmental working group (hereafter ‘working group’) was convened as an online meeting in two parts (Part I: 8 and 9 July 2021 and Part II: 9 and 10 September 2021), as adjustments in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Bureau of the meeting was composed of H.E. Mr Atsuyuki Oike (Japan) as Chairperson and of five Vice-Chairpersons, who also acted as Rapporteurs: Germany, Poland, Peru, Côte d’Ivoire and Kuwait.
2. The working documents presented to the working group are summarized in the table below. Moreover, the deliberations made during the meeting are kept in the summary records ([LHE/21/16.COM/INF.14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-INF.14-EN)).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Part I** | |
| Agenda and Timetable (Part I) | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/1](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-1-EN.docx) |
| Progress to date and meeting objectives | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/2](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-2-EN.docx) |
| Towards a reformed listing system | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/3](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-3-EN.docx) |
| **Part II** | |
| Agenda and Timetable (Part II) | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/4](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-4-EN.docx) |
| Summary of Part I and meeting objectives for Part II | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-5-EN.docx) |
| Towards a reformed listing system (Part II): Transfer, removal and extension of elements inscribed on the Lists | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-6-EN.docx) |
| Other issues requiring further reflection | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-7-EN.docx) |
| Report to the Intergovernmental Committee | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/8](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-8-EN.docx) |
| Ways forward | [LHE/21/16.COM WG/8 -ways forward](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-8-Ways_forward-EN-FR.docx) |

1. Amongst the specific issues highlighted by the Committee (see paragraph 3), the working group decided to give a focus on three core issues of the reflection as had been specifically requested by the Committee: criterion R.2, specific procedures for removing or transferring elements from and between Lists, as well as the extension of multinational nominations.
2. The recommendations of the working group, covering both Part I and Part II (document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/Recommendations](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-Recommandations_EN.docx)), are provided in [Annex I](#Annex_1). Following the request of the working group, the Secretariat prepared a set of draft amendments to the Operational Directives based on these recommendations, as provided in [Annex II](#Annex_2), for the examination of the present session of the Committee. The Committee may wish to propose that the General Assembly revise the Operational Directives accordingly.
3. These revisions pertain issues related to:

* The inscription criteria (only the deletion of criterion P.9 figures in the proposed amendments; changes under other criteria will be reflected through the revision of the relevant forms used for submitting nominations);
* The follow-up of inscribed elements, notably on the revised procedure for transferring elements between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List and the inclusion of successful safeguarding practices in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices;
* Methodology for evaluating nominations, notably on the revised procedure for inscribing elements on the Lists and the Register on an extended or reduced basis.

1. The working group also recommended the issues listed below for the attention of the Committee. They are not proposed to be reflected in the Operational Directives since they relate to practices to be encouraged rather than to procedures to be formalized. As such, these issues shall be taken into consideration, upon validation by the Committee, when revising relevant forms used for submitting nominations or in the context of statutory operations under the 2003 Convention:
   1. The use of the community’s language (or a language(s) that is accessible to them) in the preparation and submission of nominations;
   2. The use of technology, such as audio-visual tools, where possible, for providing information requested in the nomination forms as well as for communicating any concerns;
   3. The use of gender-neutral and inclusive language within all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, for example avoiding such terms as ‘gentleman’s agreement’.
2. Through the reflection and taking into account the advice given by experts, the working group considered it important to initiate a reflection on broader implications of Article 18 of the Convention. In order to support this initiative, Sweden already made a contribution in September 2021 in the form of an additional appropriation to the Regular Programme of UNESCO (document [LHE/21/16.COM/12](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM-12-EN.docx)). Furthermore, the working group suggested that this new initiative include the continuation of the discussion on how to enhance dialogue and communications amongst stakeholders of the Convention, with a particular focus on communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals.

**Ways forward**

1. The priority tasks identified (i.e. criterion R.2, specific procedures for removing or transferring elements from and between Lists, as well as the extension or reduction of multinational nominations) were successfully addressed by the working group through its Part I and Part II meeting. At the same time, the working group expressed its desire to conclude its discussion on additional issues (see paragraph 14 of the recommendations of the working group). To this purpose, the working group requested that the present session of the Committee extend the mandate of the working group.
2. In this regard, an additional meeting (Part III) of the extended Open-ended working group may be convened in early 2022. The results of that meeting could be examined by an extraordinary session of the Committee in the first half of 2022 so that it may present any outcomes for examination by the ninth session of the General Assembly in mid–2022.
3. The Committee may wish to adopt the following decision:

DRAFT DECISION 16.COM 14

The Committee,

1. Having examined document LHE/21/16.COM/14 and its annexes,
2. Recalling Decision [10.COM 19](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/19), [Decision [12.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/14)](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/14), Decision [13.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/fr/D%C3%A9cisions/13.COM/6), Decision [13.COM 9](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/9), Decision [13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10), Decision [14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10), Decision [[14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14), Decision [15.COM 7](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/7), Decision [15.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/15.COM/8) as well as Resolution [8.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/11),
3. Renews its gratitude to Japan for supporting the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention;
4. Takes note of the outcomes of the expert consultations and thanks the experts for their contributions;
5. Expresses its appreciation for the work of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group for having completed the complex tasks related to priority issues under the reflection that have important implications for the further development of the Convention and further thanks its members for their significant engagement and cooperation;
6. Affirms that the reformed listing system should continue to place communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals at the centre of safeguarding efforts and strive to further enhance their active participation in all steps of the listing mechanisms;
7. Recommends that the General Assembly revise the Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention (as contained in [Annex II](#Annex_2) to this document), on the basis of and reflecting the spirit of the recommendations of the working group (as contained in [Annex I](#Annex_1) to this document);
8. Encourages the following in order to ensure inclusivity and a broader involvement of communities, groups and where appropriate, individuals in the listing system:

a. The use of the community’s language (or a language(s) that is accessible to them) in the preparation and submission of nominations;

b. The use of technology, such as audio-visual tools, where possible, for providing information requested in the nomination forms as well as for communicating any concerns;

c. The use of gender-neutral and inclusive language within all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, including, for example, avoiding such terms as ‘gentleman’s agreement’;

1. Decides to initiate a reflection for a broader implementation of Article 18 of the Convention, which includes the continuation of the discussion on how to enhance dialogue and communications amongst stakeholders of the Convention, with a particular focus on communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals, and also thanks the Kingdom of Sweden for its contribution to support this process;
2. Further decides to extend the mandate of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group in order to discuss and conclude on the other issues raised by the working group, as indicated in [Annex I](#Annex_1) to this document, by convening a meeting (Part III) in early 2022;
3. Also decides to convene an extraordinary session of the Committee to be held after the extended working group meeting to examine any further proposals of the extended working group for potential presentation to the ninth session of the General Assembly in mid-2022.

**Annex I**

**Recommendations of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group**

1. The reformed listing system should strive to place communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals at the centre of safeguarding efforts and seek their broader and more active participation in all steps of the listing mechanisms.

Issues related to the inscription criteria

1. All criteria for the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereafter the ‘Representative List’) and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereafter the ‘Urgent Safeguarding List’) are to be maintained, while taking the following specific proposals into account:
2. *Criterion R.1/U.1 or the nomination form should include a reference to the compatibility of the nominated element with international human rights instruments;*
3. *Criterion R.2 or the nomination form should be reformulated and simplified to focus on the contribution of nominated elements to encouraging mutual respect and dialogue among communities, groups and individuals, and to indicate how the element contributes to sustainable development;*
4. *Criterion R.4/U.4 or the nomination form could be revised to ensure that communities understand that inscription on the Lists of the Convention does not place their element above others nor imply exclusivity or ‘ownership’ of the element;*
5. *Criterion R.5/U.5 or the nomination form could be simplified by referring to the inventorying systems already identified in the periodic report;*
6. *Simplification of the forms for all criteria.*
7. The criteria for the Register of Good Safeguarding practices are to be amended as follows:
8. *Criterion P.9 should be deleted.*

Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements

1. The reformed system shall be guided by the following considerations:
2. *Encourage safeguarding efforts towards elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List by fast tracking and facilitating access to financial assistance and technical support;*
3. *Reinforce the monitoring system through the periodic reporting mechanism to ensure that the safeguarding plans are implemented;*
4. *Facilitate the transfer of elements between the Lists, including the inclusion of successful safeguarding plans implemented under the Urgent Safeguarding List into the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.*
5. The proposed procedure for transfers between the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List and the inclusion of successful safeguarding practices in the Register is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 0** | **Pre-submission actions (optional)**   * If considered necessary by the State(s) Party(ies) and the community(ies), groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, possibility to call upon technical assistance through the Secretariat at any time prior to the possible submission of a transfer request. Requests for expert advice could also be made in the context of the periodic reporting mechanism. * If communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned submit letters or audio-visual materials to the Secretariat – directly or via the ICH NGO Forum – to express their wish to transfer an element from one List to the other the Secretariat will transmit such expressions to the State Party concerned and inform the Committee accordingly. |
| **Step 1** | **Preparation and submission** |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (normal cycle)*   * The process is initiated by the State(s) Party(ies) with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals. * Given the importance of the safeguarding plan and its regular assessment through the periodic reporting mechanism, the periodic report of the Urgent Safeguarding List becomes the mechanism by which State(s) Party(ies) can initiate a transfer to the Representative List. * The State(s) Party(ies) will submit the transfer request form with its periodic report on the concerned element. * Upon submission, the transfer file is included in the next normal nomination cycle currently in application and is evaluated by the Evaluation Body and examined by the Committee. * A light transfer form is created, focusing on: (a) an updated description of the element explaining any changes the element has undergone since its inscription; (b) the current level of viability and a description of threats; (c) the outcomes of the implementation of the safeguarding plan; and (d) community consent through written documents or audio-visual materials. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (shortened cycle)*   * The State(s) Party(ies) initiate(s) the process with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals. * The State(s) Party(ies) submit the transfer request by a new 31 January statutory deadline. The Secretariat registers the request. * The transfer file is transmitted to the Evaluation Body on the same year of its submission, without a completeness check. * A light transfer form is created, focusing on: (a) an updated description of the element, including justification for the need for urgent safeguarding; (b) a safeguarding plan, including possible expression of the need for International Assistance to support its implementation; and (c) community consent through written documents or audio-visual materials. |
| **Step 2** | **Evaluation**   * The transfer request is evaluated by three members of the Evaluation Body to be identified by the Evaluation Body itself (among the three, there will be at least one member from the region of the element concerned, at least one from an accredited NGO and at least one individual expert) who carry out an initial assessment which would then be collectively discussed by all members of the Evaluation Body. * For each type of transfer, the evaluation of the conformity of the transfer request is based on a reduced number of criteria, as follows: |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (normal cycle)*   * Criterion R.1: Updated description of the element addressing the changes in the viability of the element in relation to the original criterion U.2. * Criterion R.2: Demonstration of the contribution of nominated elements to encouraging mutual respect and dialogue among communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals, and indicate how the element contributes to sustainable development. * Criterion R.3: Assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan described under the original criterion U.3 and safeguarding measures planned for the future. * Criterion R.4: Consent from the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that had agreed to the inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (shortened cycle)*   * Criterion U.1: Updated description of the element, including justification for the need for urgent safeguarding. * Criterion U.3: Adequate safeguarding plan and conformity with criteria for International Assistance (if requested). International Assistance could include the revision of the safeguarding plan, if it is not considered fully adequate to respond to the threats identified. * Criterion U.4: Consent from the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that had agreed to the inscription on the Representative List. |
| *Inclusion in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices*   * Following its evaluation of the request for transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, the Evaluation Body may recommend including in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices the successful safeguarding experience described in the transfer request. In this case, a member of the Evaluation Body drafts the criteria-based justification to be confirmed by the State Party and by the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals. |
| **Step 3** | **Examination**   1. The Committee examines the request based on the Evaluation Body’s recommendation. |
| *Transfer from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (normal cycle)*   * The transfer request is examined by the Committee in the next cycle. |
| *Transfer from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List (shortened cycle)*   * The transfer request is examined by the Committee in the same year as it is submitted by the State Party and the concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals. |
| *Inclusion in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices*   * The criteria-based justification drafted by a member of the Evaluation Body and approved by the State Party concerned is examined by the Committee in the year following the submission of the transfer request by the State Party. |

\* Also takes note of the cost implications as indicated in Document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/6.](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-6-EN.docx)

1. The proposed procedure for removing elements from the Lists of the Convention is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Step 1** | **Removal request or other information received about developments affecting the situation of an inscribed element**  Correspondence from the submitting entity (i.e. State(s) Party(ies) concerned, communities, groups and/or where appropriate, individuals concerned or a third party) is registered by the Secretariat. | |
| **Step 2** | **Transmission of information**   * The Secretariat transmits information to the State Party, the nomination contact person and representatives of communities, groups and/or where appropriate, individuals (as identified in the nomination file), who may provide a response and complementary information. * If the submitting entity wishes to remain anonymous, the Secretariat transmits an edited version of the original correspondence. | |
| **Step 3** | **Preliminary check** | |
| If the removal request is submitted by the State Party concerned as identified in the nomination file:   * The Secretariat gathers information (possibly through the ICH NGO Forum) in particular in relation to Article 2 of the Convention. * The removal request is then directly transmitted to the Committee, together with the reply from the State Party and communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, as well as any information gathered through the ICH NGO Forum. | In other cases:   * The Secretariat may gather information (possibly through the ICH NGO Forum) in particular in relation to Article 2 of the Convention and share the results of that information with the concerned State Party and gather its response, if any. * The Bureau recommends or not to include the case on the agenda of the next Committee session. |
| Regardless of the option selected above, all cases received by the Secretariat are brought to the attention of the Committee in the sense of Decision [14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14) (paragraph 15). | |
| **Step 4** | **Examination by the Committee**  Information received and the reply from the State Party and concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals – as well as any information gathered through the ICH NGO Forum and the decision from the Bureau (if the request went through the Bureau) – are brought to the attention of the Committee, which may decide to:   * + - 1. If the removal request is submitted by the State Party concerned as identified in the nomination file: * Place the element under ‘follow-up’ status as an interim measure, if it considers that additional information is needed (continue to Step 5). * Remove the element from the List, if it considers that the information is complete and there is enough ground for removal (end of the procedure). * Remove the element from the List, if it considers that the information is complete and there is enough ground for removal with the possibility of placing it in an Intangible Cultural Heritage Repository (end of the procedure).   + - 1. In other cases: * Maintain the element on the List, if it considers that the information is complete and there is insufficient ground for removal (end of the procedure). * Place the element under ‘follow-up’ status as an interim measure, if it considers that additional information is needed (continue to Step 5). | |
| **Step 5** | **Enhanced follow-up (observation, exchange and dialogue)**   * The Evaluation Body will decide if the follow-up is carried out by the Evaluation Body as a whole, or by three members of the Evaluation Body (among the three, there will be at least one member from the region of the element concerned, at least one from an accredited NGO and at least one individual expert) who carry out an initial assessment which would then be collectively discussed by all members of the Evaluation Body. * On a case-by-case basis, follow-up can take the form of written correspondence and/or online consultation with the State Party, communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, and the ICH NGO Forum and/or a consultative mission. * A follow-up report, paying particular attention to Article 2 of the Convention, is transmitted to the Secretariat with a recommendation to the Committee. | |
| **Step 6** | **Follow-up report to the Committee and its decision**  On the basis of the follow-up report and the recommendation, and paying particular attention to criteria R.1/U.1 and/or R.4/U.4, the Committee may decide to:   * Continue to place the element under ‘follow-up’ for a period to be determined, if the issues persist. The Committee recommends the implementation of reconciliatory/mediatory measures and specifies a session of the Committee in which the issue will be reported back by the State Party for a final decision by the Committee. * Remove the element from the List, if there is enough ground for removal (end of procedure). * Remove the element from the List, if there is enough ground for removal, with the possibility of placing it in an Intangible Cultural Heritage Repository (end of the procedure). * Maintain the element on the List, if there is insufficient ground for removal (end of procedure). | |

\* Also takes note of the cost implications as indicated in Document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-6-EN.docx).

Issues related to the methodology for evaluating nominations

1. The proposed revised procedure for inscribing elements on the Lists and the Register on an extended basis is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Step 0** | **Pre-submission actions (optional)**   * States Parties planning to extend existing multinational nominations are encouraged to announce their intentions, in the sense of Decision [7.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/14), ahead of time through the webpage of the 2003 Convention, using the dedicated online form. This would provide opportunities for other States Parties to be informed of and join in the initiative and thus reduce the number of times that the same nomination is extended. * If requested by the State(s) Party(ies) and the community(ies), groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, expert advice may be sought prior to the possible submission of a request for inscription on an extended basis. |
| **Step 1.a** | **Preparation: Extension of multinational files to communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned** **in other States**   * The original lead State Party initiates the process to the Secretariat. * Newly joining State(s) Party(ies) is/are required to demonstrate that its/their inclusion in the extension satisfies all of the required criteria for inscription. * The State(s) Party(ies) included in the original inscription and any subsequent extension(s) shall demonstrate that the community(ies), groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned that gave their consent for the submission of the original nomination and subsequent extensions agree with the proposed extension and that the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned are willing to participate in already approved, newly proposed or updated safeguarding measures with the newly joining communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned and authorities (in the sense of Decision [10.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/10), paragraph 15). |
| **Step 1.b** | **Preparation: Extension of national files** **to other communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned within the submitting State**   * The process is initiated by the State Party in consultation with the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, or otherwise by the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned in cooperation with the appropriate authorities of the State Party. * The State Party concerned is required to demonstrate that the addition of newly joining communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned in its territory, satisfies required criteria for inscription using simplified forms. * The State Party concerned shall also demonstrate that the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned that carried the original nomination give their consent to the extension of the element and that they agree to safeguard the element with the newly joining communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned. |
| **Step 2** | **Evaluation and Examination**  The nomination is evaluated by the Evaluation Body and examined by the Committee following the regular evaluation procedure and timetable described in paragraph 54 of the Operational Directives. |

\* Also takes note of the cost implications as indicated in Document [LHE/21/16.COM WG/6](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-16.COM_WG-6-EN.docx).

1. In addition to the procedure described above, the following recommendation could be made:
2. *The working group requests the Secretariat to propose to the sixteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee a procedure – and accordingly draft amendments to the Operational Directives – for inscriptions on a reduced basis in a similar manner to the recommendations made by the working group for inscriptions on an extended basis.*

Article 18 of the Convention

1. The working group recommends to initiate a reflection for a broader implementation of Article 18 of the Convention and appreciates the offer made by Sweden to support this initiative.

Other issues

1. On the proposals to ensure a broader involvement of communities, groups and where appropriate, individuals in the listing system, the working group further recommends:
2. *The use of the community’s language (or a language(s) that is accessible to them) in the preparation and submission of nominations;*
3. *The use of technology, such as audio-visual tools, where possible, for providing information requested in the nomination forms as well as for communicating any concerns.*
4. The working group recommends using gender-neutral and inclusive language within all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, including, for example, avoiding such terms as ‘gentleman’s agreement’.
5. The working group recommends that the initiative financially supported by Sweden on the broader implications of Article 18 of the Convention includes the continuation of the discussion on how to enhance dialogue and communications amongst stakeholders of the 2003 Convention, including concerned communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals.

Ways forward

1. The working group requests that the Secretariat prepares a set of draft amendments to the Operational Directives based on the recommendations of the working group for examination by the Committee at its sixteenth session.
2. The working group recommends that the Committee at its sixteenth session extend its mandate in order to complete the discussion of the following issues by convening an additional online meeting in early 2022, so that the results may be examined by an extraordinary session of the Committee in the form of revised Operational Directives for the examination by the ninth session of the General Assembly in mid-2022:
3. *Revising the priority for the examination of nomination files for States Parties that did not fulfil their reporting obligations concerning the implementation of the Convention and the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List or on the Urgent Safeguarding List;*
4. *Debating the possibility of obtaining additional information regarding nominations by using a dialogue process with accredited NGOs and communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned; and*
5. *Conclude the following issues linked to the number of files per cycle:*
   * *Reviewing the adaptability of the composition and the working methods of the Evaluation Body to allow for a higher number of files per cycle to be evaluated, keeping in mind geographical representation;*
   * *Examining two files per State every three years alternating between a nomination to the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List or the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices;*
   * *Moving all International Assistance requests to the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage;*
   * *Whether the transfer requests from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List be treated as part of the annual ceiling approved by the Committee;*
   * *Whether the requests for extension be treated as part of the annual ceiling of files for examination and the priorities as defined by paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives.*

**Annex II**

**Proposed amendments to the Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Operational Directives (2020 edition)** | | | **Proposed amendments** | | |
| **I.3** | **Criteria for selection of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention** | | **I.3** | [No change.] | |
| 7. | […]  P.9 The programme, project or activity is primarily applicable to the particular needs of developing countries. | | 7. | […]  ~~P.9 The programme, project or activity is primarily applicable to the particular needs of developing countries.~~ [[6]](#footnote-6) | |
| **I.6** | **Inscription on an extended or reduced basis** | | **I.6** | [No change.] | |
| 16. | The inscription of an element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity can be extended to other communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals at the national and/or international level upon the request of the State(s) Party(ies) in whose territory(ies) the element is present, with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals. | | 16.1 | The inscription of an element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity can be extended to other communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals at the national and/or international level upon the request of the State(s) Party(ies) in whose territory(ies) the element is present~~, with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals~~.[[7]](#footnote-7) | |
| - | - | | 16.2 | State(s) Party(ies) are encouraged to announce their intentions to join in existing inscribed elements on an extended basis, in a timely manner, through the webpage of the Convention, using the dedicated online form.[[8]](#footnote-8) | |
| - | - | | 16.3 | At the international level, newly joining States(s) Party(ies) is/are required to demonstrate that its/their inclusion in the extension satisfies all of the required criteria for inscription. Concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals that gave their consent for the submission of the original nomination and subsequent extensions must agree with the proposed extension and their participation in ongoing, newly proposed or updated safeguarding measures with the newly joining communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned and authorities.[[9]](#footnote-9) | |
|  |  | | 16.4 | At the national level, the State Party is required to demonstrate that the extension satisfies the required criteria for inscription, taking into account the criteria already satisfied through the original nomination. Concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals that gave their consent for the submission of the original nomination and subsequent extensions must agree with the proposed extension and their participation in ongoing, newly proposed or updated safeguarding measures with the newly joining communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned and authorities.[[10]](#footnote-10) | |
| 17. | The inscription of an element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity can be reduced at the national and/or international level if the State(s) Party(ies) in whose territory(ies) the element is present so request(s), with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals. | | 17.1 | The inscription of an element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity can be reduced at the national and/or international level if the State~~(s)~~ Party~~(ies)~~ in whose territory~~(ies)~~ the element is present so requests~~, with the consent of the concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals~~.[[11]](#footnote-11) | |
|  |  | | 17.2. | States(s) Party(ies) is/are required to demonstrate that the communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals who are proposed to be removed from the inscribed element, give evidence of their free, prior and informed consent to the reduction of the element.[[12]](#footnote-12) | |
| **I.7** | **Submission of files** | | **I.7** | [No change.] | |
| 20. | Form ICH-01 is used for the nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, ICH-02 for the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, ICH-03 for the proposals of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. | | 20.1 | Form ICH-01 is used for the nominations to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and includes an option for simultaneously requesting International Assistance; this form is also used for the nominations to the same List on an extended or reduced basis at the national and/or international level.  Form ICH-02 is used for the nominations to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity; this form is also used for the nominations to the same list on an extended or reduced basis at the national and/or international level.  Form ICH-03 is used for the proposals of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. | |
| - | - | | 20.2 | Form ICH-01 RL to USL is used for the transfer of an element from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and includes an option for simultaneously requesting International Assistance.  Form ICH-02 USL to RL, attached to the periodic reporting Form ICH-11, is used for the transfer of an element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.[[13]](#footnote-13) | |
| 21. | States Parties may request preparatory assistance for the elaboration of nomination files to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and for the elaboration of proposals of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. | | 21. | States Parties may request preparatory assistance, in consultation with communities, groups and where appropriate, individuals concerned,[[14]](#footnote-14) for the elaboration of:   1. nomination files to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, 2. proposals of programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention, 3. requests for the transfer of an element from one List to another,[[15]](#footnote-15) and 4. nominations files on an extended or reduced basis of already inscribed elements.[[16]](#footnote-16) | |
| 22. | As far as preparatory assistance is concerned, Form ICH-05 is used for requests for preparatory assistance to elaborate a nomination for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and Form ICH-06 is used for requests for preparatory assistance to elaborate a proposal of a programme, project or activity for selection and promotion by the Committee. All other requests for International Assistance, whatever amount is requested, shall be submitted using Form ICH-04. | | 22. | ~~As far as preparatory assistance is concerned, Form ICH-05 is used for requests for preparatory assistance to elaborate a nomination for inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding, and Form ICH-06 is used for requests for preparatory assistance to elaborate a proposal of a programme, project or activity for selection and promotion by the Committee. All other requests for International Assistance, whatever amount is requested, shall be submitted using Form ICH-04.~~  Requests for all preparatory assistance shall be submitted by using Form ICH-05. Requests for International Assistance shall be submitted using Form ICH-04, irrespective of the amount requested. | |
| **I.8** | **Evaluation of files** | | **I.8** | [No change.] | |
| 30. | The Evaluation Body shall submit to the Committee an evaluation report that includes a recommendation:   * to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated element on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, or to refer the nomination to the submitting State(s) for additional information; * to select or not to select the proposed programme, project or activity, or to refer the proposal to the submitting State(s) for additional information; or * to approve or not to approve the International Assistance request, or to refer the request to the submitting State(s) for additional information. | | 30. | The Evaluation Body shall submit to the Committee an evaluation report that includes a recommendation:   * to inscribe or not to inscribe the nominated element (including the transfer from one list to another, the extension or the reduction of an already inscribed element) on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, or to refer the nomination to the submitting State(s) for additional information; * to select or not to select the proposed programme, project or activity, or to refer the proposal to the submitting State(s) for additional information; * to approve or not to approve the International Assistance request, or to refer the request to the submitting State(s) for additional information; or * to maintain or to remove the inscribed element from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, in case of ‘enhanced follow-up’. | |
| **I.11** | **Transfer of an element from one List to the other or removal of an element from a List** | | **I.11** | [No change.] | |
| 38. | 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 of the criteria for the List to which transfer is requested, and shall be submitted according to the established procedures and deadlines for nominations. | | 38.1 | 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~~ The request ~~must demonstrate that the element satisfies all of the criteria for the List to which transfer is requested,~~ shall be initiated by the State(s) Party(ies) with the free, prior and informed consent of the communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned,[[17]](#footnote-17) and shall be submitted according to the established procedures and deadlines ~~for nominations~~. | |
|  |  | | 38.2 | Communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned may express directly to the Secretariat their wish to transfer an element from one list to the other. Such a request is then transmitted to the State(s) Party(ies) concerned and the Committee is informed accordingly.[[18]](#footnote-18) | |
| 39. | 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. | | 39.1 | ~~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.~~[[19]](#footnote-19) An element shall be transferred from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding by the Committee when it determines, after assessment of the transfer request and taking into account the criteria already satisfied through the original nomination, that the element satisfies all criteria for inscription on that list. The request for such transfer, using Form ICH-01 RL to USL, shall include:   1. In relation to criterion U.1 - Updated description of the element, including justification for the need for urgent safeguarding; 2. In relation to criterion U.3 - Adequate safeguarding plan. 3. In relation to criterion U.4 - Consent from the concerned communities, groups and individuals that had agreed to the inscription on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.[[20]](#footnote-20) | |
|  |  | | 39.2 | An element shall be transferred from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity by the Committee when it determines, after assessment of the transfer request and taking into account the criteria already satisfied through the original nomination, that the element satisfies all criteria for inscription on that list. The request for such transfer, using Form ICH-02 USL to RL, shall include:   1. In relation to criterion R.1 - Updated description of the element addressing the changes in the viability of the element with reference to the original criterion U.2; 2. In relation to criterion R.2 - Demonstration of the contribution of nominated element to encouraging mutual respect and dialogue among communities, groups and individuals, and indicating how the element contributes to sustainable development; 3. In relation to criterion R.3 - Assessment of the implementation of the safeguarding plan described under the original criterion U.3 through the periodic reporting[[21]](#footnote-21) and safeguarding measures planned for the future; 4. In relation to criterion R.4 - Consent from the concerned communities, groups and individuals that had agreed to the inscription on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding.[[22]](#footnote-22) | |
|  |  | | 39.3 | The Evaluation Body may also recommend, following its evaluation of the request for transfer, that the Committee include the successful safeguarding experience in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices.[[23]](#footnote-23) | |
| 40. | An element shall be removed from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity by the Committee when it determines that it no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription on that list. | | 40.1 | An element shall be removed from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding or from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity by the Committee when it determines that it no longer satisfies ~~one or more criteria for inscription on that list~~ the required criteria, paying particular attention to criteria U.1/R.1 and U.4/R.4.[[24]](#footnote-24) The removal can be requested by the concerned State(s) Party(ies), communities, groups or individuals, or any other third party.[[25]](#footnote-25) | |
|  |  | | 40.2 | 1. A removal request from the submitting entity (i.e. State(s) Party(ies) concerned, communities, groups and/or where appropriate, individuals concerned or a third party) is registered by the Secretariat. 2. The Secretariat transmits the removal request, as the case may be, to the State Party, the nomination contact person and representatives of communities, groups and/or where appropriate, individuals (as identified in the nomination file), who may provide a response and complementary information. 3. If the submitting entity, other than States, wishes to remain anonymous, the Secretariat transmits an edited version of the original removal request. 4. (i) If the removal request is submitted by the State Party concerned as identified in the nomination file, the Secretariat gathers information in particular in relation to Article 2 of the Convention. The removal request is then directly transmitted to the Committee, together with a response, if any, from the State Party and/or communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals concerned, as well as any information gathered.   (ii) In other cases, the Secretariat may gather information in particular in relation to Article 2 of the Convention and share the results of that information with the concerned State Party and gather its response, if any. The removal request is then transmitted to the Bureau that may recommend or not to include the case on the agenda of the next Committee session. [[26]](#footnote-26) | |
|  |  | | 40.3 | The Committee may decide, in case additional information is needed, to place the element under ‘enhanced follow-up’ status as an interim measure for examination during a following cycle. Based on the additional information received, the Evaluation Body, paying particular attention to Article 2 of the Convention, will make a recommendation to the Committee for its decision.[[27]](#footnote-27) | |
|  |  | | 40.4 | The Committee may decide to place elements removed from the Lists of the Convention in an intangible cultural heritage repository.[[28]](#footnote-28) | |
| **I.15** | **Timetable – Overview of procedures** | | **I.15** | [No change.] | |
| 54. | Phase 1: Preparation and submission | | 54. |  | |
| 31 March  Year 0 | Deadline for preparatory assistance requests for the elaboration of nominations for the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and proposals for programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the objectives of the Convention (Article 18). |  | 31 March  Year 0 | Deadline for preparatory assistance requests. ~~for the elaboration of nominations for the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and proposals for programmes, projects and activities that best reflect the objectives of the Convention (Article 18).~~ |
| - | - |  | 15 December[[29]](#footnote-29) Year 0 | Deadline for submission of transfer requests from the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding to the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. |
| 31 March  Year 1 | Deadline by which nominations for the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding and the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity, proposals for programmes, projects and activities and International Assistance requests greater than US$100,000 must be received by the Secretariat. Files received after this date will be examined in the next cycle. The Secretariat posts on the website of the Convention, in their original language, files as received. |  | [No change.] | [No change.] |
| 30 June  Year 1 | Deadline by which the Secretariat will have processed the files, including registration and acknowledgement of receipt. If a file is found incomplete, the State Party is invited to complete the file. |  | [No change.] | [No change.] |
| 30 September  Year 1 | Deadline by which missing information required to complete the files, if any, shall be submitted by the State Party to the Secretariat. Files that remain incomplete are returned to the States Parties that may complete them for a subsequent cycle. As files revised by submitting States reach the Secretariat following its requests for additional information, they are posted online and replace the original files received. Their translations into English or French are also posted online as they become available. |  | [No change.] | [No change.] |
|  |  | -- |  | 31 January[[30]](#footnote-30)  Year 2 | Deadline by which transfer requests from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity to the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding must be received by the Secretariat. The Secretariat registers the requests. The requests are transmitted to the Evaluation Body on the same year of their submission, without checking whether a file is complete.[[31]](#footnote-31) |

1. Updated information and reference documents concerning the global reflection process are available on the webpage of the 2003 Convention: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/global-reflection-on-the-listing-mechanisms-01164>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The process has led to a concrete outcome, referred to as an ‘early harvest’, concerning the inclusion of a dialogue between the Evaluation Body and submitting States as part of the evaluation process. This additional step was formalized through the revision of the Operational Directives by the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020 ([Resolution 8.GA 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/10)). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The original timeline and meeting modalities of the reflection, as presented to the fourteenth session of the Committee ([document LHE/19/14.COM/14](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-14-EN.docx) and [Decision 14.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14)) had to be adjusted due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The revised plan was presented to the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020 ([Resolution 8.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.GA/11)). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The details of the survey, including how the experts were selected and its results, are provided in document [LHE/21/EXP/5](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-EXP-5-EN.docx) (see also the [compilation](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-21-EXP-INF.1.pdf) of the responses). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See <https://ich.unesco.org/en/online-meeting-of-experts-category-vi-01165> for the agenda and timetable, the list of participants and the background paper. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Recommendation 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See new 16.3 and 16.4 for community consent. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Recommendation 7, Step 0, bullet 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Recommendation 7, Step 1.a and b. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Recommendation 7, Step 1.a and b. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Recommendation 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Recommendation 7, Step 1.a and b. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Recommendation 5, step 1, bullet 5 and 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Recommendation 5, step 0, bullet 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Recommendation 5, step 0, bullet 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Recommendation 7, step 0, bullet 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Recommendation 5, step 1, bullet 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Recommendation 5, step 0, bullet 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. See new paragraph 40.1. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Recommendation 5, step 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Recommendation 5, step 1, bullet 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Recommendation 5, step 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Recommendation 5, step 2, last bullet. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Recommendation 6, step 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Recommendation 6, step 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Recommendation 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Recommendation 6, step 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Recommendation 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Deadline for reports on the status of an ICH element that has been inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, every four years after inscription of the element. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Recommendation 5, step 1, bullet 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Recommendation 5, step 3, bullet 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)