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

1. The Open-ended intergovernmental working group (the working group) in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention met for its Part I meeting online on 8 and 9 July 2021.
2. The Bureau of the working group consisted of H.E. Ambassador Atsuyuki Oike (Japan) as Chairperson as well as of a group of Vice-Chairpersons, one for each from the remaining Electoral Group, who also acted as Rapporteurs: Germany, Poland, Peru, Côte d’Ivoire and Kuwait.
3. The working group thanks the experts who participated in the online survey and in the category VI expert meeting for their hard work and dedication as their proposals laid the ground for the present meeting of the working group.
4. Having discussed possible overall approaches identified through the expert consultation, the working group decides to recommend that the reform of the listing system be guided by a mixture of proposals made under both the ‘fine-tuning’ and ‘repositioning’ approaches.
5. The working group affirms that the reform should strive to place communities, groups and if applicable individuals at the centre of safeguarding efforts and seek their broader and more active participation in all steps of the listing mechanisms.
6. On the issues related to the inscription criteria, the working group recommends:

(1) to maintain all criteria for the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity (hereinafter the ‘Representative List’) and the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (hereinafter the ‘Urgent Safeguarding List’), while taking into account the following specific proposals:

* 1. *Criterion R.1/U.1 or the nomination form should include a reference to the compatibility of the element nominated with international human rights instruments;*
	2. *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;*
	3. *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;*
	4. *Criterion R.5/U.5 or the nomination form could be simplified by referring to the inventorying systems already identified in the periodic report;*
	5. *Simplification of the forms for all criteria.*

(2) to amend the criteria for the Register of Good Safeguarding practices as follows:

1. *Criterion P.9 should be deleted.*
2. On the issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements, the working group recommends to:
3. *Encourage safeguarding efforts towards elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List by fast tracking and facilitating access to financial assistance and technical support;*
4. *Reinforce the monitoring system through the periodic reporting mechanism to ensure that the safeguarding plans are implemented;*
5. *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.*
6. On the issues related to the methodology for the evaluation of nominations, the working group recommends:
7. *to simplify the procedure for the extension of multinational nominations, bearing in mind the importance of the consent of communities, groups and where applicable individuals.*
8. The working group recommends to use gender-neutral and inclusive language within all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, including for example avoiding such terms as ‘gentleman’s agreement.’
9. The working group recommends to initiate a reflection for a broader implementation of Article 18 of the Convention.
10. On the proposals to ensure a broader involvement of communities, groups, and where applicable individuals, in the listing system, the working group recommends:
11. *the use of the community’s language (or a language(s) that is accessible to them) in the preparation and submission of nominations;*
12. *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.*
13. The working group further considers that the following issues be discussed during Part II of the meeting:

*Inscription criteria*

1. *Deletion or reformulation of criteria, other than criterion P.9, under the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, pending a broader discussion on the implementation of Article 18 of the Convention;*
2. *Revising the priority for the examination of nomination files for States Parties which 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;*

*Follow-up of inscribed elements*

1. *Feasibility and functionality of creating the following platform/network/forum (which may be combined) and their roles:*
	1. *an ‘arm’s-length’ online platform with community participation allowing their engagement in the follow-up of inscribed elements;*
	2. *a network of inscribed elements for sharing safeguarding experiences; and*
	3. *a special forum that would allow the governing bodies of the Convention to consult community representatives in a systematic manner;*
2. *Consider the implications of an ‘arm’s-length’ online platform with clarifications on its role and status within the follow-up of the inscribed elements, including how it will be set up, who will maintain it, what will its status be within the Convention, how it will be funded and how it will interact with all stakeholders;*
3. *Specific procedures for removing elements from the Lists of the Convention, including the introduction of interim measures;*
4. *Propose simplified procedures for transferring elements between the Lists as well as including in the Register those safeguarding experiences that have successfully improved the viability of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List;*

*Methodology for the evaluation of nominations*

1. *Possibility to obtain additional information regarding nominations by using a dialogue process with accredited NGOs and communities, groups and where applicable individuals concerned;*
2. *Consider the possibility of simplifying the extension of national files to include more communities in a similar manner to that proposed for multinational files;*

*Number of files per cycle*

*The following proposals by States will be discussed in the process ahead:*

1. *[Consider the possibility of 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;]*
2. *[Consider the possibility of 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;]*
3. *[Consider the possibility of moving all International Assistance requests to the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.]*
4. The working group requests the Secretariat to provide further information taking into account the points agreed above, in time for Part II of the meeting (9 and 10 September 2021).