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1. This document contains the summary records of the thirteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Port Louis, Republic of Mauritius, from 26 November to 1 December 2018.
2. Some 821 participants registered to attend the session, among which delegations from 24 States Members of the Committee, 102 States Parties not Members of the Committee, 2 States not party to the Convention, 2 intergovernmental organizations, 6 category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, 73 accredited non-governmental organizations accredited to provide advisory services to the Committee and 25 press/media entities.
3. The full list of participants is available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/preliminary-list-of-participants-01011).
4. The session was conducted in four languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee), Spanish, and Arabic for item 10 and its sub-items.
5. The Living Heritage Entity of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.
6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the thirteenth session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: Mr Prithvirajsing Roopun (Republic of Mauritius)

Vice-Chairpersons: Cyprus, Armenia, Guatemala, the Philippines and Lebanon

Rapporteur: Ms Gabriele Detschmann (Austria)

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

**DRAFT DECISION 14.COM 4**

The Committee,

1. Having examined document LHE/19/14.COM/4,
2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee’s thirteenth session contained in this document.

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

*[Monday, 26 November 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OPENING**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.1 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.1_Rev.-EN.docx)

1. The **Chairperson**, **Mr Prithvirajsing Roopun,** welcomed the delegates to the thirteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. He began by announcing that language interpretation was available in English and French, the working languages of the Committee, as well as Spanish for the entire duration of the session, and Arabic interpretation for Item 10 and its sub-items. The Chairperson gratefully acknowledged the financial support offered by Spain and the Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud Foundation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for Spanish and Arabic interpretation, respectively. He was honoured to welcome the delegates, the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Audrey Azoulay, as well as the Ministers and dignitaries of the States Parties and non-States Parties to the Convention, experts and representatives of non-governmental organizations and civil society. The Committee would deliberate on important issues and make decisions for the effective safeguarding of living heritage. With a heavy agenda, the Chairperson counted on the cooperation of speakers in making their interventions short and concise. He would also occasionally call on the Vice-Chairpersons of Armenia, Cyprus, Guatemala, Lebanon and the Philippines to assist in the smooth progress of the session. The Rapporteur, Ms Gabriele Detschmann of Austria, would sit with her delegation. Together with the Republic of Mauritius, these countries formed the Bureau of the Committee.
2. The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO**, Mr Ernesto Ottone, thanked the Government of the Republic of Mauritius for hosting this session of the Committee, with special thanks to the Minister of Arts and Culture and his team. As always, the Committee had a full agenda with important points for the future of the Convention, and he wished the delegates every success in their work.
3. Thanking the Assistant Director-General, the **Chairperson** officially declared the thirteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage open. He then invited the Secretary to present some practical information.
4. The **Secretary of the Convention**, Mr Tim Curtis, began by thanking the Republic of Mauritius for hosting this thirteenth session of the Committee, and for the dedication and enthusiasm of the Mauritian team who had worked in close cooperation with the Secretariat in preparing the session. He also thanked Spain and the Foundation of Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for their generous contributions to the Spanish and Arabic interpretation. It was noted that the live webcast was available on the Committee [webpage](https://ich.unesco.org/en/13com). Wi-Fi was also available and the session was paperless; documents were printed in limited quantities and were available only to Members of the Committee upon request. All participants were invited to download the documents from the Committee website and USB keys were also generously provided by the host State. A copy of the 2018 edition of the Basic Texts[[1]](#footnote-1) was distributed in English or French, which contained the latest resolutions and decisions of the General Assembly and the Committee, as well as the overall results framework for the Convention adopted by the seventh session of the General Assembly. Copies were also available in Arabic, Chinese, Spanish or Russian upon request. Regarding registration, badges provided access to the conference venue to the almost 800 people registered to attend this session from more than 125 different countries[[2]](#footnote-2). Transport from designated hotels to the venue was generously provided to all participants.
5. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** moved to the next agenda item.

**ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**Documents:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/2 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-2_Rev.-EN.docx)

[*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.2.1 Rev.5*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.2.2_Rev.5-EN.docx)

[*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.2.2 Rev.5*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.5-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 2*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/2)

1. The **Secretary** introduced the provisional agenda that included twenty-two items, with some containing sub-items. The agenda had been prepared according to Rule 9 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, with the documents published in English and French online by the statutory deadline of 29 October, i.e. four weeks before the opening of this session according to Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. All working documents could be identified by the code ITH/18/13.COM followed by the number corresponding to the item of the provisional agenda. Information documents were preceded by ‘INF’. Documents with corrigenda, addenda or revisions were suffixed with ‘REV’ (revised). Regarding the timetable,thethirteenth session of the Committee was a six-day session the timetable of which had been adopted by the Bureau at its meeting on 2 October in Paris. The Bureau had met the previous day and the revised timetable was now document INF.2.1 Rev. The Committee would meet every day from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2.30 p.m. to 5.30 p.m. It was noted that the meeting was scheduled over six days instead of five on the condition that the Committee would not hold night sessions. Items would be examined in the order indicated in the timetable, as approved by the Bureau. The Committee was asked to adopt the agenda and not the timetable, as the Bureau would adjust the provisional timetable as required. Observers were welcome to attend the Bureau meeting. Side events would take place during the session. The Secretariat had prepared two side events: i) a demonstration of the tool ‘Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage’ developed by the Secretariat, and ii) a roundtable discussion aiming to raise awareness about the global network of facilitators. A press conference would also take place immediately after the morning session. States Parties, accredited NGOs and category 2 centres had also organized a number of side events[[3]](#footnote-3).
2. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee of how he wished to conduct the debates. Committee Members were invited to limit their remarks to two minutes and to refrain 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 were invited to complete the relevant form available from the Secretariat and the Committee’s webpage and to submit written amendments electronically. Following a general debate by the Committee Members, the floor would be given to Observers, time permitting, but they could not intervene during discussions on draft decisions. Concerning the Report of the Evaluation Body to the Committee, and in particular items 10.a, 10.b, 10.c and 10.d, the Committee had fifty files to examine for which fifteen hours was allotted. This meant that the Committee would have about eighteen minutes to examine each file on average. Due to the tight schedule and in order to discuss every agenda item, recent sessions of the Committee had adopted a working method to deal with this high number of nominations. At its session on 2 October 2018, the Bureau discussed the need to continue to ensure that debates on nominations proceeded efficiently. Hence, the Bureau proposed continuing with the working method adopted three years ago, as per the email communication sent on 15 November 2018 by the Secretariat. As a general principle, 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 specific issues were raised by a Committee Member. Proposed amendments to draft decisions should be made known in advance of the Bureau meeting so that the Bureau could establish the list of files for debate and thus better organize the time available. Nevertheless, Members of the Committee were always entitled to ask for the floor. Following the examination of each file—regardless of the outcome—the Chairperson would give the floor to the submitting State(s) for two minutes to deliver a short speech, show a video clip or perform a demonstration, which had become a tradition within the Committee. The Chairperson also suggested adopting the same working method for item 7.b, Examination of the reports of States Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. That is to say, if no Committee Member wished to discuss or amend specific draft decisions, the individual decisions under this item would be adopted without debate. It was noted that there were sixteen reports, which would take a long time if they were examined individually. The Secretariat should thus be informed in advance in the event of proposed amendments to a draft decision. The Chairperson would also invite requests for debate on the opening of the items, and would consequently take it for granted that draft decisions on Urgent Safeguarding List reports and nominations with no requests for amendment or debate could be proposed for adoption as a whole instead of on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. This would save time and allow the Committee to spend more time debating other nominations that deserved the Committee’s attention. With no comments on the agreed methodology, he invited UNESCO’s Deputy Chief of Security for UN coordination, Ms Mary Moné, to say a few words.
3. The **Security Adviser to the Director-General**, Ms Mary Moné, reassured the delegates that their security and safety were assured by the host country, thanking them for their efforts.
4. The **Chairperson** then turned to the draft decision. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 2 adopted**.

**ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OBSERVERS**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/3*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-3-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 3*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/3)

1. The **Chairperson** thenturned to the next agenda item, item 3.
2. The **Secretary** introduced agenda item 3 on Observers, explaining thatthis item was required every year by the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, according to Articles 8.1 to 8.3. Articles 8.1 and 8.2, which stipulate that States Parties, not Members of the Committee, and States not Parties to the Convention (but members of UNESCO or the United Nations), Associate Members of UNESCO, permanent observer missions 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](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/3), the Committee had 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](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/3), the Committee had authorized the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) to participate as an Observer in its twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions. By its Decision [12.COM 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/3), the Committee had authorized the African Trade Center to participate as an Observer in its thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth sessions. The Secretary also noted a written request for Observer status for the Centre for Black Culture and International Understanding (CBCIU) to participate in the fourteenth session of the Committee. It was also noted that the working document did not mention the participation of accredited NGOs because they were automatically admitted as Observers to Committee sessions, in accordance with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure.
3. The **Chairperson** reminded delegates that Observers would only be recognized to speak during a general debate or after a decision had been taken, and not during the discussions on draft decisions. It was clarified that Observers included States Parties not members of the Committee and accredited NGOs, and that there were a number of participants attending the session as an ‘audience’, in the sense of Rule 8.5 of the Rules of Procedure; as such, they could not address the meeting, and were thus requested to refrain from asking for the floor.
4. **The** **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 3 adopted**.

**ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA**

**ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/4*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-4-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 4*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/4)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 4 on the adoption of the summary records of the twelfth session of the Committee.
2. The **Secretary** presented the summary report of the twelfth session of the Committee in application of Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. Although it was a very lengthy document, the report was 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 had faithfully summarized the interventions of all Members of the Committee and Observers who had spoken at the twelfth session of the Committee. The Secretary reminded the delegates that recordings of the debates were available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/12com).
3. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 4 adopted**.
4. Before moving to the next agenda item, item 5, the **Chairperson** turned to the two scheduled oral reports: the report of the Chairperson of the Committee on Bureau activities and the report of the ICHNGO Forum. The Chairperson began with the report of the Chairperson of the Committee on Bureau activities and outcomes since its election in Jeju in 2017. According to the Rules of Procedure of the Committee and the Operational Directives of the Convention, the Committee entrusts its Bureau with significant tasks and responsibilities. Although the Committee meets only once per year, the Bureau can meet as many times as necessary either through face-to-face meetings or electronic consultation, the flexibility of which allows for the adoption of operational decisions between two Committee sessions. With regard to its tasks, the Bureau is asked to coordinate the dates, times and order of business of Committee meetings. It is also responsible for examining and approving International Assistance requests up to US$100,000. The Bureau also decides any other task the Committee assigns to it. The Chairperson took the opportunity to thank the Bureau members for their active participation and spirit of cooperation, and for their trust. During its mandate, three face-to-face meetings had been held, and a diversity of issues relating both to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at the national level and to the implementation of the Convention at the international level had been examined. It was noted that once again, the Bureau had dedicated the majority of its work to the record number of International Assistance requests: twenty-four financial assistance requests, twenty-two International Assistance requests up to US$100,000, one preparatory assistance request and one emergency assistance request. This high number confirmed the effectiveness of the measures taken by the sixth session of the General Assembly in 2016 to increase the ceiling of requests from US$25,000 to US$100,000. Of the twenty-four requests examined, sixteen had been approved, submitted by Colombia, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Haiti, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Senegal, Togo, Tonga and Ukraine. Two requests had also been received from Mongolia and Zimbabwe. The Bureau had also approved a preparatory assistance request from Albania, as well as an emergency assistance request from Colombia. The projects were aimed at developing community-based inventories, building national or local capacities for implementing the Convention, safeguarding specific living heritage practices, and fostering the transmission of living heritage for education. Furthermore, for the first time, the Bureau had examined and approved three International Assistance requests in which States Parties requested International Assistance that partly took the form of services from the Secretariat to the State. In addition to the provision of a grant, the States concerned by this new modality were the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Senegal. For those projects, the UNESCO field officers in Beijing, Dakar and Kingston would be partly implementing the projects with expert services, training, equipment and so on, with only part of the funds directly transmitted to the State.
5. The **Chairperson** congratulated the beneficiary States, but he also spoke of the reality that many States encounter difficulties in preparing International Assistance requests to meet the criteria laid out in chapter 1.4 of the Operational Directives. Regrettably, seven requests were returned to the submitting States and one request was not approved. The Bureau also initiated a discussion regarding the increasing number of International Assistance requests up to US$100,000 submitted by the same State Party either at the same time or in quick succession. Consequently, the Bureau requested that a specific item on multiple submissions of International Assistance requests be examined under agenda item 12. Other than financial assistance requests, the Bureau was also called upon to study important budgetary questions. By its Decision 12.COM 7, the Committee delegated to its Bureau the authority to decide upon the utilization of the funds allocated under ‘other functions of the Committee’. In 2018, the Bureau approved a plan for the utilization of the Funds for other functions of the Committee for the period 1 January 2018 to 31 December 2019 based on a proposal prepared by the Secretariat and corresponding to US$1,718,184. Finally, the Bureau approved the timetable of the current session, which was presented on 2 October 2018 during the information and exchange sessions. With regard to transparency in the organization of the meeting of this Bureau, the Chairperson explained that in accordance with Recommendation 69 of the Open-ended Working Group on Governance, when a Bureau meeting is convened, the Secretariat asks Bureau members to communicate the date and venue of the Bureau meeting within their respective Electoral Group. Furthermore, the agenda, documents and decisions of each meeting of the Committee are published online for consultation. In addition, the Secretariat shares the decisions of the Bureau with all Committee Members through an email communication. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.
6. The **delegation of Senegal** began by thanking the host country for its warm hospitality, and the Secretariat for its availability and support over the past two years in the implementation of its pre-inventory project, which would be reinforced by the assistance newly granted by the Bureau for which it was grateful. This assistance would not only help in establishing an inventory, it would also strengthen national capacities in preparing safeguarding plans, and in the development of education modules in the testing phase at the school level. This important work would continue to be carried out alongside the UNESCO Dakar office, with which the country had enjoyed a long-standing partnership. In this regard, the delegation would later present a video of the concrete work being carried out, and concluded its remarks by once again thanking the Bureau for approving its assistance request.
7. The **delegation of Djibouti** expressed its thanks to the Government of Mauritius and the Minister of Arts and Culture for their kind and warm hospitality, congratulating the Secretariat for its excellent work and organization. It also thanked all the States that had supported its election to the Committee in June 2018. In this regard, with the help of UNESCO, Djibouti had conducted an awareness-raising workshop on the implementation of the Convention in June 2018. At the end of this workshop, another project was formulated to request International Assistance of less than US$100,000 with a view to strengthening the Convention at the national level. Djibouti had ratified the Convention in 2017 and it took note of the reform of the periodic reports mechanism, adding that States should be informed of the frequency of Bureau meetings so as to anticipate the response time for a request.
8. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked Mauritius for its warm welcome and for hosting the thirteenth session of the Committee. It also thanked Spain for making interpretation in Spanish possible. The delegation noted the two agenda items that addressed International Assistance, particularly the work on the new mechanism with regard to monitoring and the commendable initiative to work with field offices with co-funding for projects. The delegation remarked that some countries encounter problems in implementing projects, particularly on certain subjects, and that a pilot project in this regard could be adjusted to the reality of each country, which could prove productive. It took the opportunity to congratulate the Bureau on its efforts in drafting the recommendations on governance, and for the report presenting its work. This was particularly pertinent on the subject of the capacity building of States Parties owing to the complex nature of the mechanism, whose national capacities could be improved so that they might be better able to use the Fund to further implement the Convention.
9. The **Secretary** responded to the question by Djibouti regarding the time required for processing International Assistance requests through the Bureau by explaining that there was no fixed statutory time. The Bureau did its best to process requests as quickly as possible, and indeed the Bureau had worked particularly hard in 2018 because of the greater number of requests examined. The issue of International Assistance had been discussed at the General Assembly, including the reinforcement of the Secretariat, but the Bureau was scheduled to meet about four times a year, or once every three months. Thus, the general process time was on average four months, i.e. from the reception of a request to its approval by the Bureau. However, the timing would likely improve with the reinforcement of the Secretariat in 2019, which would be further discussed under agenda item 8.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification and then proceeded to the report on the ICHNGO Forum, recalling that at its eighth session in 2013 the Committee had decided to systematically include the outcomes of the Forum during its sessions. The Chairperson then invited the representative of the ICHNGO Forum, Ms Reme Sakr from Syria Trust for Development (Syrian Arab Republic) and Ms Ananya Bhattacharya from Contact Base (India) to present their report.
11. The **Representative of the ICHNGO Forum,** Ms Ananya Bhattacharya, began by thanking the host country of Mauritius and the Secretariat for their kind hospitality and facilitation of the meeting. As an international platform for accredited NGOs, the Forum is committed to contributing to the implementation of the Convention and the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Over the past six years, the Forum had achieved many concrete results. Six regional ICHNGO Forum networks had been established for exchange and cooperation at the regional level, which included six working groups on specific issues, such as capacity building, research, ethics, the overall results framework, lighter ways of sharing safeguarding experiences, information and communications technology (ICT) and intangible cultural heritage. The online journal [#HeritageAlive](http://www.ichngoforum.org/category/heritage-alive/) had received 40+ contributions thus far, with 11 articles received in 2018, and a publication on traditional food was planned in 2019. The Forum had newly launched [ichngo.net](http://ichngo.net/) to facilitate the sharing of intangible cultural heritage practices and events to complement the Forum [website](http://www.ichngoforum.org/). The Forum also introduced an ethics programme in response to the Ethical Principles of the Convention and took initiatives for consultations on the role of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention. The 2018 ICHNGO Forum Symposium held the previous day had focused on the roles of NGOs in implementing the Convention. Three NGO meetings had been held in 2018, which were devoted, *inter alia*, to the process of further developing a number of suggestions, from the mapping of possible contributions of NGOs in line with the functions of the Committee and the overall results framework, to strengthening the capacities of accredited NGOs in relation to their possible roles. Moreover, NGOs could play a crucial role in mediation, facilitation and cultural brokerage with respect to cultivating local to global safeguarding processes in intangible cultural heritage. This mediation role was already highlighted in the debates of the Committee and the General Assembly, as well as in the new chapter on sustainable development in the 2016 Operational Directives.
12. The **Representative of the ICHNGO Forum,** Ms Reme Sakr, spoke of the Forum’s satisfaction with the transparent nature and dialogue concerning the reflection process on the ways in which NGOs could participate and further contribute to the development of the current accreditation system. The Forum thus looked forward to the learnings and results of the online consultation along with the Secretariat and the ad hoc working group, as well as recommendations and decisions to be taken at the present session and into the fourteenth session of the Committee. Moreover, during this session, the ICHNGO Forum would have its first fully elected steering committee with each of the six regions represented, along with a seat reserved for international NGOs so as to maximize the exchange of experiences and develop its governance structure and guarantee good participation. This steering committee would play an integral role in the training of regional NGOs on regional network building and reporting, as well as on outreach programmes. The Forum consistently called on and made great efforts to better communicate and connect with States Parties, and it reiterated this call to deepen communication and strengthen collaboration to further develop regional networks and the capacities of NGOs working under the 2003 Convention.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the representatives for the interesting presentation, remarking that the Committee was fully cognizant of the Forum’s implementation of the Convention and the safeguarding of living heritage, and that most of its members were voluntarily contributing their own time to support this cause. It was indeed an inspiring example for all. The Chairperson noted that a discussion under agenda item 13 would further reflect on the participation of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention, and he took the opportunity to personally thank the Forum for its continuous efforts and to acknowledge the vital role NGOs play in the implementation of the Convention at the national and international levels in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Before giving the floor to the Secretary, the Chairperson invited the Committee to take a moment to pay homage to two experts, **Ms Yelena Khorosh** from Kazakhstan and **Mr Edward Jubara** from South Sudan, who had recently passed away as they prepared to attend this session. The delegation of Kazakhstan was invited to say a few words.
14. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** began by congratulating the host country and the Secretariat for the excellent arrangements, and then spoke of their sadness in informing the Committee of the untimely passing of a leading expert of Kazakhstan’s national committee for intangible cultural heritage, Dr Yelena Khorosh, on 17 October 2018. Born in 1957 in Almaty, Kazakhstan, Dr Khorosh graduated in 1981 as an architect from the Almaty Institute of Architecture and Construction. She had long been involved in the protection of cultural heritage of Kazakhstan, particularly following Kazakhstan’s accession to UNESCO in 1992 having participated in a number of international training initiatives in the field of safeguarding heritage sites. Dr Khorosh was the first Kazakh to report on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, and her knowledge and professionalism were instrumental in the country’s earliest successful nominations to the World Heritage List: the Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi in 2003 and the Petroglyphs within the Archaeological Landscape of Tamgaly in 2004. As an expert associated with ICOMOS, she always played a significant role in helping prepare the nomination of sites, including those along the historic Silk Roads with the neighbouring countries of Central Asia. Following Kazakhstan’s ratification of the 2003 Convention in December 2011, the National Commission of the Republic of Kazakhstan for UNESCO and ISESCO had relied on her experience and expertise to support the work of the country’s newly created National Committee for ICH. As the committee’s expert, she dedicated the last few years of her life to preparing a draft nomination of the traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders, which would be considered at the present session. An accomplished scholar, Dr Khorosh was passionate about safeguarding cultural heritage not only of her country but of all humankind. In this respect, the delegation kindly asked the Chairperson to consider proposing a moment of silence.
15. In the absence of the delegation of South Sudan, the **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to say a few words about Mr Edward Jubara.
16. The **Secretary** spoke of Mr Edward Jubara, Director-General of Archives and Antiquities for the Government of South Sudan, as being instrumental in liaising between UNESCO and the Government to promote South Sudan’s ratification of the UNESCO culture Conventions, including the ratification of the 2003 Convention in 2016. Mr Jubara had worked alongside the Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports to support safeguarding activities on the ground, which concretely led to the training of a team of experts in May 2018 to inventory South Sudan’s rich intangible heritage. He had represented his country at several Committee meetings where he had brought the needs and aspirations of South Sudan to the global agenda and expressed his confidence that safeguarding living heritage would help lay a solid foundation for the future development of the country. His commitment and passion would not be forgotten and heartfelt condolences went to his family.

*[A minute of silence was respected]*

**ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

**Documents:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/5 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-5_Rev.-EN.docx)

[*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.5.1*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.1-EN.docx)

[*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.5.2*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.2-EN.docx)

[*ITH/18/13.COM/INF.5.3*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.3-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 5*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/5)

1. The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretary to present agenda item 5.
2. The **Secretary** presented the report of the Secretariat, which covered the six-month period from January to June 2018, recalling that he had presented a report at the seventh session of the General Assembly in June 2018, which was why this reporting period was short. It was noted that the Secretariat had made efforts to report succinctly, while demonstrating the broad undertakings of the Secretariat. So as not to repeat everything that was detailed in working document [13.COM/5 Rev](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-5_Rev.-EN.docx), the Secretary wished to present the major achievements of the Secretariat and, in some cases, to also provide updates on activities that had taken place since the publication of the document. The Secretary remarked that in the past, the Committee had found it useful for the Secretariat’s report to be organized along the C/5 structure, and therefore this report was once again based on the 39 C/5 results framework and, more specifically, the performance indicators of Expected Result 6 under MLA4. The document was also accompanied by three information documents. The first information document, [INF 5.1](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.1-EN.docx), was related to ‘Outreach and communication’ following the discussions of the twelfth session of the Committee in Jeju in 2017 (Decision [12.COM 5.b](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/12.COM/5.b)). This document outlined the communication activities undertaken during the reporting period, as well as activities expected to take place until the end of 2019, as budgeted under Expected Result 4 of the ‘other functions of committee’ approved by the Bureau in June 2018. The second information document, [INF 5.2](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.2-EN.docx), was the Financial Report of the Fund of the Convention, as had been the case for the last five sessions. The third and final information document, [INF 5.3](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.3-EN.docx), was the ‘Overview of the current use of the International Assistance mechanism and the global capacity-building programme in relation to elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List’, as requested by the Committee in 2017. The results of this analysis would also be helpful in the ongoing discussions foreseen around the listing mechanisms, as would be touched upon in agenda items 6, 8 and 9 of the present session.
3. Regarding the overall results framework, the **Secretary** was pleased to present what was undoubtedly *the* main achievement under the reporting period, namely, the adoption of the Overall Results Framework. As a global monitoring and evaluation tool to assess the overall impact of the implementation of the Convention, it had wide implications for all stakeholders at various levels. It was recalled that the framework had been developed through an extensive approach with a meeting of experts, an open-ended intergovernmental working group, and discussions at three sessions of the Committee (9.COM, 11.COM and 12.COM). The adoption of the framework at the seventh session of the General Assembly marked a notable achievement in the life of the Convention. As requested, the Secretariat was currently working on the development of the guidance notes for the indicators, and the revision of the periodic report forms that would help nourish the framework. In 2019, the Secretariat would also be preparing for the capacity-building activities to be undertaken in 2020 as the new periodic reporting cycles were rolled out, as would later be discussed under agenda item 8. This overall results framework could be seen as a way of opening ‘windows’ on the many aspects of the Convention and, in particular, on the multitude of policies and programmes initiated and implemented at the country level, representing perhaps the greatest achievements of the Convention in terms of impact. It was hoped that this would allow new and exciting narratives about the Convention to flow through these windows. The framework should provide different insights and stories related to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at community, national and international levels, such as its contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals, or the many ways by which communities were adapting to the cultural and other challenges faced in an ever-increasing and interconnected world.
4. Regarding the operationalization of the International Assistance mechanism, the **Secretary** was pleased to report on its significant progress. As the Committee was aware, over the years, the International Assistance budget line of the Fund had accumulated more resources than requests for it use. At the sixth session of the General Assembly in 2016, a decision was taken to increase the ceiling that could be examined by the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000. Consequently, the numbers clearly showed that the effects of that decision on the implementation of the fund were working. Concretely, the total amount of International Assistance approved by the governing bodies from January 2016 to June 2018 (US$2,741,987) was higher than the cumulative amount approved between 2009 and 2015 (US$2,293,735). The Secretariat had consequently intensified efforts to improve access to the ICH Fund to States for safeguarding their living heritage. In this regard, the seventh session of the General Assembly made an important decision that responded to a specific request by the Secretariat to authorize the recruitment of three fixed-term extrabudgetary posts at P3, P2 and G5 levels, financed by the Fund. These posts would be dedicated to the operationalization of the International Assistance portfolio of the ICH Fund. A ‘Safeguarding and Implementation Team’ would be formed to set up the implementation and monitoring mechanisms, including risk management, to determine the impact and sustainability of individual projects on the ground, as well as to improve the efficiency of the overall mechanism. The team would support and monitor the implementation of individual projects, while analyzing overall trends and good practices. The lessons learned would then be used to further improve the management of the Fund as a key tool of the Convention. The Secretary was pleased to report that the recruitment process was underway, with the vacancy notices having been published on 14 November.
5. Regarding ICH and education, the **Secretary** recalled that ‘Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education’ had been adopted as a new funding priority at the twelfth session of the Intergovernmental Committee in December 2017. A roundtable had also been organized at the seventh session of the General Assembly to raise awareness about this new funding priority. Specific activities under this new priority were subsequently included in the 39 C/5 work plans for ten Field Offices, namely, Almaty, Amman, Beijing, Harare, Havana, Dakar, Lebanon, Nairobi, Santiago and Tashkent. A number of offices were involved in resource mobilization efforts for integrating intangible cultural heritage into education, notably, UNESCO Bangkok was awaiting approval from a donor to cover activities in three countries. It was thus very encouraging that many of these plans involved colleagues from both the culture and education sectors, who were collaborating closely to ensure effective outcomes. Nevertheless, the core funding resources of the organization were extremely limited and the Secretary took the opportunity to once again call for additional funding for this important area of the Convention’s work. The Secretariat had also undertaken a few other intersectoral activities at the global level. For example, in October 2018, a webinar introducing intangible cultural heritage and its relationship with education for sustainable development (ESD) had been organized for key partners working on this subject. In early November 2018, the Secretariat had also co-organized a virtual conference with UNEVOC (the International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training) on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through technical and vocational education and training (TVET).
6. Regarding thematic initiatives, several cycles ago, the **Secretary** further explained that the Secretariat had begun working on some thematic issues such as intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency. At its two previous sessions, the Committee had reflected on the role of communities both in safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency and in mobilizing such heritage for preparedness, resilience and recovery. More details on this issue would be provided under agenda item 11. Another thematic issue concerned cities, which had become an important focus of work of the UN following the Habitat III conference[[4]](#footnote-4) in Quito [in 2016]. Consequently, the [UNESCO] General Conference asked the Culture Sector to support Member States in achieving SDG 11 on ‘inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlement’, building on existing mechanisms under the Conventions. Today, 54 per cent of the world’s population live in cities, which is expected to each 70 per cent by 2050. Thanks to support from Yong Xin Hua Yun Cultural Industry Investment Co. LTD in China, a multi-year sector wide project had been initiated on ‘Intangible Heritage and Creativity for Sustainable Cities’. In that framework, three pilot cities had been identified for the first year of the project where community-based inventorying would take place in urban centres, namely, Kingston in Jamaica, George Town in Malaysia and Harare in Zimbabwe. Six other cities would follow suit for the second and third years.
7. Regarding Statutory support and capacity building, the **Secretary** reported that a significant portion of the Secretariat’s resources had been dedicated to servicing States through the Convention’s statutory mechanisms and the intense statutory schedule of up to twenty meetings planned for the biennium. Throughout the reporting period, the Secretariat juggled with managing nominations, International Assistance requests, periodic reporting, NGO accreditations, to name just a few of the main lines of activities. Had it been ‘business as usual’? Not at all. The Secretariat continued to seek improvements in all areas of statutory operations to better serve States. The significant increase in International Assistance requests presented to the Bureau was an example of the Secretariat’s efforts to streamline operations. The number of States Parties to the Convention had steadily increased, reaching 178, and Kiribati, Singapore and the Solomon Islands were newly welcomed. In addition, there had been a territorial extension of Denmark to include the Faroe Islands. The national efforts of these States Parties were supported through the Regional Offices. Regarding the Global Capacity-building Programme, forty countries continued to benefit from multi-year projects through various sources of funding, including Funds-in-Trust agreements, the European Union, Japan, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates, as well as earmarked contributions to the ICH Fund, thanks to Azerbaijan, the Netherlands and Spain, and self-benefitting projects such as in Morocco and Thailand. One of the main strengths of the programme is the dynamic global [network of facilitators](https://ich.unesco.org/en/facilitator). The Secretary spoke of the recent expansion in July of the facilitators’ network in Asia and the Pacific with support from CRIHAP (the International Training Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region), as well as the recently strengthened European chapter through a training workshop for facilitators supported and hosted by the category 2 centre in Bulgaria (the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage in South-Eastern Europe). The Secretary was pleased to inform delegates of the side event on the facilitators’ network that was scheduled the following day, while noting that demand for the global capacity-building programme continued to grow. In this regard, he reminded the Committee that the future of the programme was still precarious as supplementary funding continued to experience a significant decline. Consequently, the Secretariat was undertaking a feasibility study on potential future partnership options to explore new ways to sustain and expand the programme.
8. Regarding outreach, the **Secretary** considered communication and outreach to be important safeguarding actions in line with Article 2 of the Convention. For this reason, the Secretariat had presented its plan at the last session of the Committee, the details of which could be found in document [INF.5.1](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-INF.5.1-EN.docx). Some of the actions were witnessed during the seventh session of the General Assembly, as well as some social media campaigns that had been initiated. The Secretariat was finalizing visual guidelines that would be presented in the present session. While communication was important, it of course needed to be based on sound information and knowledge. In this regard, the Secretariat continued its work on improving the knowledge management system of the Convention, particularly its dedicated [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en), which was an important working tool for many stakeholders. The Secretary was excited to announce the launch of a new and highly innovative knowledge management tool based on the lists that went beyond classic knowledge management that would also serve as a tool for communication. This session marked the launch of this new tool called ‘Dive into intangible Cultural Heritage’[[5]](#footnote-5), a new form of visualization of all the elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention, which was experienced as a constellation of the many interconnections of the elements. The Assistant Director-General for Culture would launch the tool following the morning session.

*[A short video presentation of the tool ‘Dive into Intangible cultural heritage’]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his presentation and congratulated the Secretariat for this new tool, opening the floor for comments.
2. The **delegation of Colombia** expressed thanks for the invitation to attend the session, and to the Republic of Mauritius, the Members of the Bureau and the Secretariat for having prepared the Committee and all its documents. It was also very grateful to Spain for facilitating Spanish interpretation, extending further thanks to the Secretary for the very detailed report. The delegation began by outlining its position with regard to some of the issues of debate during this session. Firstly, it asked that the Committee continue to foster intangible cultural heritage as a basic factor for promoting welfare and for working towards a rich, diverse future at the global, national and local levels. In other words, it was important to continue its work within the framework of the Convention and to understand the importance of safeguarding living heritage for communities in strengthening their resilience, particularly under the current context. Moreover, taking into account the importance of education in intangible cultural heritage, as one of the priorities of the Secretariat, the delegation called for greater reflection on this issue as a way of protecting goods and services that would allow communities to better generate an economic income, while preserving their ancestral traditions. It also emphasized the importance of coordinating intangible cultural heritage activities with the aims of sustainable development and the 2030 Agenda. In this regard, Colombia was working on ways to better increase the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in certain urban and peri-urban contexts. The delegation thanked the Secretary for having attended its first international forum in 2018, adding that it was an issue of great interest to Colombia and on which it had been working over the last two years. In this regard, it invited all the delegations to attend its side event during this session on Wednesday. It also wished to share Colombia’s aspiration to be considered as the host of the fourteenth session of the Committee, adding that it was very grateful for the initial support received by many.
3. The **delegation of Japan** expressed its thanks and appreciation to Mauritius for its great hospitality and the arrangements made for the session. With regard to the Secretariat’s report on the implementation of intangible cultural heritage, Japan expressed appreciation for its efforts—despite the limited human resources and budget—in the activities implemented to enhance the awareness and visibility of intangible cultural heritage, to promote the protection and preservation of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, and to make the International Assistance mechanism more effective and efficient. In appreciation of those efforts, Japan reiterated its commitment to assisting activities through its budgetary contribution.
4. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Republic of Mauritius for its generous hosting of this Committee session and for the impressive opening ceremony. It remarked on the shared history between the Netherlands and Mauritius; when the Dutch East India Company landed on the island, they named Mauritius after Prince Maurits of the House of Nassau. Names of places and regions in Mauritius still recalled the presence of the Dutch, even though colonial history had its dark sides, for instance in the case of slavery. The Dutch had also played a role in the extinction of the dodo that had become an important symbol of animal extinction the world over. The delegation congratulated the Secretariat and its staff for the excellent reports, adding that it appreciated all its achievements and commitment, given the high workload and limited resources. It remarked on how the Convention had evolved since its adoption in 2003, which was reflected in the results and necessary new developments. Consequently, there were major topics and challenges that required further work, for example on issues such as urban development in relation to sustainable development and education. The delegation thus welcomed the focus on formal and non-formal education, as well as the new budget line, and the focus on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts and intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. These issues needed to be considered both in terms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and ensuring that communities, groups and young people were made aware of the values of intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, it could contribute to the resilience of communities. The delegation also supported the focus on capacity building in the activities undertaken by the Secretariat, noting that the global capacity-building programme was more focused on regional cooperation, and it looked forward to working on those topics and sharing experiences. It was also noted that the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies was an important topic of discussion during the General Assembly, as well as in this Committee session. The contribution of the Convention to this important topic was thus increasingly concrete, and the delegation welcomed this direction, adding that it would contribute towards supporting pilots and new methods of preparedness, resilience and reconciliation.
5. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** conveyed its sincere gratitude to the Government of Mauritius for its warm hospitality and excellent organization of the session. As an elected Member of the Committee, it wished to thank the Member States that had voted for Azerbaijan, underlining its commitment to the letter and spirit of the Convention. Azerbaijan had been a Member of the Committee in 2010 and 2014. Five years ago, in 2013, Azerbaijan had successfully hosted the eighth session of the Committee, always striving for the protection of universal cultural heritage. The country attached great importance to the effective implementation of the Convention and reaffirmed its willingness and determination to continue working in an open, transparent and inclusive manner. The delegation highly appreciated the invaluable work and contributions made so far by Member States, the expert community and the Secretariat in implementing the principles and aims of the Convention. It believed that UNESCO as a laboratory of ideas should be a multilateral environment where all Member States can stand together for the preservation of common heritage, respecting diversity and the promotion of a culture of peace. In the context of the relationship between UNESCO and Azerbaijan, the delegation underlined the valuable contribution of her Excellency, Ms Mehriban Aliyeva, first Vice-President of Azerbaijan and a UNESCO Goodwill Ambassador in bringing this cooperation to an even more dynamic level. Thanks to her tireless efforts, elements of tangible and intangible cultural heritage of Azerbaijan had been inscribed. The delegation assured the Committee that—as a Member of the Committee—Azerbaijan would spare no efforts to protect intangible cultural heritage and share its rich experience through constructive engagement with Member States in the spirit of partnership and cooperation for the better implementation of the objectives of the Convention.
6. The **delegation of Austria** thanked Mauritius for its warm hospitality and for facilitating this meeting, and the Chairperson for his experience and leadership. It was a great pleasure to note that 178 States Parties were now committed to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, while broad, geographically balanced participation was crucial for the sake of sustainability and long-term progress. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat for its dedicated efforts, congratulating the Secretariat for the excellent preparation of the documents despite the high workload. Indeed, the large amount of activities and achievements during the reporting period were impressive and it was hoped that the work on communication and outreach presented at the General Assembly would also be presented and available to Member States at the present meeting. Many important projects and initiatives were being implemented that would contribute to several of the goals of the 2030 Agenda, and the delegation noted with great interest the growing demand of the global capacity-building programme, welcoming its broad scope of actions through its inspiring projects in a wide range of safeguarding areas. The delegation noted that the report made reference to the Secretariat’s exploration of potential partnerships and partnership modalities, and it appreciated any information on the partners and modalities if such information was available. It concluded by thanking all the countries that had supported the Convention and the Secretariat through voluntary supplementary contributions and other forms of support.
7. The **delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and warmly thanked the people and the Government of Mauritius for graciously hosting the meeting. It thanked the Secretariat for its report and the additional documents related to this item. It was noted that the Convention was evolving with more and more States Parties and elements on its Lists, especially the Representative List, with new issues and challenges constantly emerging and thus the expectations and responsibilities of the Committee and the Secretariat continued to expand. Therefore, a robust, efficient, transparent and credible system was needed to support States Parties, the Committee and the Secretariat in its collective efforts to safeguard intangible cultural heritage, the overarching goal. The Lists are visible tools for safeguarding and raising awareness, but was this focus doing more harm than good? A reflection on the nature of the listing mechanisms was thus timely, as well as a closer examination of the spirit and procedures by which nominations were evaluated. The delegation also wished to hear about the outcome of the sixth annual coordination meeting on category 2 centres held in June in 2018, adding that it welcomed the work on outreach and communications, especially in the production of documentaries that could help the public and relevant authorities attain a better appreciation of intangible cultural heritage in relation to the recurrent challenges of criterion R.2. Finally, it sought to hear more about the impact of the restructuring of the Culture Sector on the Convention’s Secretariat.
8. The **delegation of Cuba** wishedto address the issue of higher education, particularly tertiary education as priorities in the Convention, adding that Cuba was making great efforts to consolidate higher education and tertiary education in the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, a new discipline was being created in Cuba in the field of cultural heritage safeguarding with three different higher education courses to train the relevant professionals. The authorities were working alongside the European Union to create a regional centre in the Caribbean for the preservation and restoration of heritage, not solely on the basis of culture but also to include cultural diversity involving the three relevant UNESCO Conventions. The delegation remarked on the importance for States to have support and assistance from UNESCO in these efforts in order to better implement the Convention and to create synergies with other countries that have good [safeguarding] practices.
9. The **delegation of China** thanked the Government of Mauritius for hosting the thirteenth session of the Committee and for its warm hospitality. It was noted that it was China’s first session since it became an elected Member of the Committee in June 2018, and it joined the other Members of the Committee in congratulating the Chairperson on his strong and smooth chairing of the session. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat for its very informative report on its work during the reporting period. It understood that the Secretariat worked under a very heavy workload in addition to its statutory work in support of the Convention, whose extraordinary efforts to undertake more initiatives to extend its efforts on knowledge management, communication and outreach with NGOs and other stakeholders, on capacity-building programmes and also intangible cultural heritage and education were highly appreciated. The delegation also spoke about the capacity-building programmes involving the oldest category 2 centre, the International Training Center for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region (CRIHAP) in China, noting its efforts and that one facilitator from China had been approved on the list of global facilitators in 2018, adding that it hoped that the network of facilitators would be continuously renewed and broadened. The Secretariat’s efforts to cover more thematic initiatives, including intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts, were also noted in the report. These were pressing issues faced by many of the States Parties in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. China attached great importance to these issues and always tried to involve all stakeholders, both in public and private sectors, in addressing these kinds of challenges in the implementation of the Convention. Moreover, these challenges would persist as the Convention continued to enjoy steady growth, and the delegation agreed with the Secretariat that such programmes depended on and should be built upon sustainable finances and human resources. In this regard, China has a strong sense of mission and it wished to see greater responsibility in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which had never been an easy task and the reason why the Convention joined all States Parties in this common purpose to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage of humanity, reiterating its commitment.
10. The **delegation of Armenia** expressed its appreciation to the government and the people of Mauritius for hosting the thirteenth session of the Committee, remarking that the adoption of the Convention had been a landmark event that strongly contributed to promoting cultural diversity in its various forms. The Convention emphasizes the importance of intangible heritage as a springboard for cultural diversity and sustainable development. It also stresses the invaluable role of intangible cultural heritage in bringing people together to ensure greater understanding and exchange, while safeguarding heritage in a spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance. In turn, it aims to ensure greater visibility of intangible cultural heritage to encourage dialogue that respects cultural diversity and results in appropriate safeguarding measures. The delegation was happy to see the Secretariat’s activities covering all aspects, and was especially happy to note intangible cultural heritage in education and intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, which showed that the Secretariat was trying to reach all stakeholders. It also thanked Ms Audrey Azoulay for pursuing this important mission as Director-General of UNESCO. As Vice-Chair of the Bureau, the delegation congratulated the Chairperson, expressing its readiness to support him in all his endeavours.
11. Thanking Armenia, the **Chairperson** noted a few other speakers, but wished to interrupt the discussion for an extraordinary situation. The Bureau had met the previous afternoon at the request of the Director-General and agreed to examine a nomination for inscription on the Representative List in an exceptional case. He understood that specific travel plans had been made with in relation to agenda item 10.b, but that the schedule would resume immediately afterwards to maintain the provisional timetable as initially planned. The Chairperson invited the Director-General to introduce this specific case.
12. The **Director-General of UNESCO**, Ms Audrey Azoulay, thanked the Bureau for its consideration of this point, and she was honoured to present an unprecedented situation to the Committee concerning two Member States in a historic first proposal that demonstrated great faith in UNESCO in general, but also in the Committee’s work in particular. The two States in question were the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, which had decided to submit the element ssirum or ssireum for inscription on the Representative List. The element is a traditional form of wrestling practised in both countries dating back thousands of years. As the Korean nations work towards a rapprochement, the present session served as an opportunity to demonstrate the importance of cultural heritage for peace and reconciliation. These initially separate nominations highlighted the similarities on both sides of the Korean peninsula. Ms Azoulay wished to thank the highest authorities in both countries and their delegations for taking this common step towards a United Nations organization, which had been unimaginable not so long ago, in a joint approach demonstrating how culture can to be at the forefront of peace. These two countries had responded with courage and commitment in the submission of the joint nomination that sent a powerful message to all Koreans and to the world. This was an important symbolic step, rooted in the long history of these countries, as they unite in this joint inscription, which reveals the extraordinary strength of cultural heritage as a vector of peace and dialogue at the heart of UNESCO’s mandate. This exceptional situation was an example that should inspire us all around the world. Ms Azoulay invited the Secretary to introduce the procedure for the examination of this particular case.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the Director-General, inviting the Secretary to present the case.
14. The **Secretary** explained thatunder normal circumstances item 10 would start with a presentation by the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body on the working methods and cross-cutting issues. The Secretariat, however, proposed introducing the scheduled presentation later in the agenda and go directly to the examination of this joint inscription. The Secretary understood that submitting States were eagerly awaiting this item, with many countries sending high-level delegates and the domestic press corps to attend these sessions. As published in working document 10.b, the nominations from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea were planned for examination under the draft decisions 13.COM 10.b.13 and 13.COM 10.b.30, respectively. These two separate decisions would now be merged into a new draft decision attributed as 10.b.41, which was structured firstly to take note of the nomination from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. From the information included in the file, it was decided that the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5 for inscription. The decision then further takes note of the nomination from the Republic of Korea and decided that, from the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5 for inscription. The final part of the draft decision includes a paragraph to acknowledge that the two submitting States had expressed their wish to have the two files examined by the Committee as a joint inscription. It refers to the recommendation of the Evaluation Body to inscribe both elements, and proposed deciding on an exceptional basis to jointly examine the two files and to jointly inscribe the element on the Representative List under a common title, Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum). The Secretary invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the two nomination files, which had been evaluated separately.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked the Director-General and the Secretary for the explanations and guidance, adding that he personally felt very privileged that the present Committee session provided a platform to discuss such an important case, bearing in mind the implications for future relations between the two Parties and their respective communities.
16. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body,** Mr John Omare of Kenya, spoke of his pleasure in presenting the recommendation by the Evaluation Body on the two files. These are **Ssirum (wrestling) in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**, submitted by the **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea**, and **Ssireum, traditional wrestling in the Republic of Korea**, submitted by the **Republic of Korea**. The two files clearly demonstrated the shared nature of the practices related to wrestling. In fact, during their examination, the Evaluation Body had discussed and regretted that these two files had not been presented as a joint nomination. Both files present ssirum and ssireum as a physical game practised popularly in all regions of their territories where two opponents try to push each other to the ground by grabbing their opponents’ belt and using a fabric strap connected to their waist and leg. In both files, the winner of the game is awarded a bull or an ox symbolizing agricultural abundance on which they parade after the game. Letters of consent provided by both submitting States emphasized the importance of the practice in Korea and for Korean communities. The safeguarding measures presented in both files paid particular attention to the integration of the practice in education systems. Efforts in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea included mobilizing institutions outside of the field of culture, targeted actions encouraging the participation of women in the safeguarding of the practice, and the documentation of the regional diversity within the country. In the Republic of Korea, a legal framework was adopted in 2012 to support the transmission, dissemination, training and research of the practice. From the information included in the file, both nominations satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the clear presentation, adding that he strongly recommended that the Committee recognize the efforts of the Director-General and inscribe the two files as a joint inscription in the spirit of understanding and cooperation. **The** **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM** [**10.b.41**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.41) **adopted**.

*[Adopted by acclamation]*

1. Addressing the Director-General of UNESCO, the Chairperson of the Committee, the Committee Members and all the participants, the **delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** spoke of the great honour at this very significant and momentous occasion to represent a historical milestone for both North and South Korea in the joint inscription of Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum), a common asset of the entire Korean nation, on the Representative List. The inscription conformed to the common aspirations and longing of Koreans to become one, and to sustain and carry forward its homogeneity, calling on all compatriots to cherish and foster great national unity. It also highlighted the unstinting support and wish of the international community for peace and prosperity in the Korean peninsula. Thanks to the love for the nation and honest desire for peace shown by the Supreme Leaders of North and South of Korea, the historic Panmunjom Declaration[[6]](#footnote-6) and the Pyongyang Joint Declaration[[7]](#footnote-7) had recently been adopted, and a vigorous move for national reconciliation, peace and prosperity across the land of Korea had been widely made. The joint inscription of the element thus highlighted the unshakeable real and heartfelt desire of all Koreans to enter a new era of peace and prosperity. Comrade Kim Jung-un, Chairman of the State Affairs Commission of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, had stressed that national heritage conservation is a patriotic undertaking for safeguarding the history and traditions of the nation, through caring for and developing precious spiritual and material wealth created by their ancestors. He also stressed the need to care for and develop traditional music, dance and fine arts, which were conducive to the sense of national identity, and to promote national sports, including taekwondo and ssirum, and encourage people to play such folk games as Yut Nori and top-spinning. The joint inscription of ssirum, the first element borne from the joint efforts of both sides in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, was an important landmark on the road towards unity of the Korean peninsula. Conforming to the aspirations of the entire Korean nation and the principles of the Convention, the delegation would endeavour in the future to promote international exchange and cooperation in the field of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and fulfil its responsibility to ensure the cultural diversity of humanity and its sustainable development, peace and prosperity. The delegation expressed thanks to the Director-General, the Chairperson and the Members of the Committee, as well as participants in this session for their strong support for Korean national reconciliation and cooperation with this joint inscription.
2. The **delegation of the Republic of the Korea** recalled the time in Jeju Island in 2017 spent working hard with the Chairperson, and added that his able guidance and leadership would bring about a very successful and fruitful Committee session. The delegation extended its sincere gratitude to all the Members of the Committee for supporting the joint inscription of Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum). It thanked the Secretariat and the Director-General, whose support had been invaluable throughout the entire process of inscription and consultation between the two Korea nations. In particular, the delegation was grateful to the representatives of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea for their cooperation, which enabled the spirit of mutual cooperation and understanding. It was also deeply touched by the Committee’s decision to jointly inscribe Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum). In fact, all the intangible cultural heritage of the two Koreas was embedded in the same traditions and culture, belonging to a common heritage of all Koreans. Nevertheless, the shared heritage (such as Arirang lyrical folk song, and Kimjang, making and sharing kimchi) had been submitted as two separate nominations up until now, and thus this was the first joint inscription. This decision therefore carried a far more significant impact than the simple recognition of the inscribed element itself, marking the beginning of further cooperation between the two nations to promote and preserve a common intangible heritage. Furthermore, through UNESCO, the two Koreas would be able to expand cooperation beyond culture into other fields of competence to include education and science. It was thus an exemplary case that demonstrated how UNESCO—within its unique role and mandate—can facilitate the construction of peace through culture, education and science through the power of diplomacy. Ssireum does not incite competition or conflict. It is a sport that encourages teamwork and promotes unity and peace. It is a popular form of entertainment at the time of festivities when people gather together in their communities and wish for a good harvest. The ssireum tradition frees the minds of people from their hard living conditions, and brings joy to villages, creating unity and community that had bound Korean people for centuries. The delegation hoped that the same spirit of unity and harmony could be revived to achieve lasting peace on the Korean peninsula. It concluded by translating a Korean folk song, “Let’s get together on the day of the festival, uptown, downtown. Let’s come out and let’s play ssireum”.
3. A **Representative of the Cultural Heritage Administration (CHA) of the Republic of Korea** was very pleased with the Committee decision to inscribe Ssireum as a joint nomination on the Representative List. She expressed sincere gratitude to the Committee Members for their heartfelt support and interest in the nomination. As an administrator in charge of the preservation of cultural heritage in the Republic of Korea, the inscription of ssireum was a reminder of the great responsibility of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in the spirit of the Convention and international cooperation, and the CHA would continue its efforts to safeguard intangible cultural heritage at both the national and international levels. She also expressed her sincere appreciation to the delegation of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea for the utmost endeavours undertaken. Special thanks went to the Director-General and her staff for their support and for the great outcome, and to the Republic of Mauritius for hosting this wonderful Committee and for their hospitality.

*[Photo call with the Director-General with the Korean delegations]*

1. The **Chairperson** announced that a press conference would take place during the lunch break, as well as the launch of the ‘Dive into intangible Cultural Heritage’, a project presented by the Assistant Director-General for Culture. The afternoon session would resume with agenda item 5. The press conference was organized in two parts: the first part was dedicated to the joint inscription on the Representative List of Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum) in the presence of the Director-General and representatives from both Koreas, and the second part focused on other important issues on the agenda. A meeting of the Arab Group was also announced.

*[Monday, 26 November 2018, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 5 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

1. Following a morning session that had made history, the **Chairperson** opened the afternoon session and turned to agenda item 5, noting five Members that wished to speak.
2. The **Secretary** thanked the Committee Members for the earlier encouraging comments, particularly the new Committee Members who pledged support for the Secretariat’s work going forward. It was noted that there were three specific questions, one from Austria and two from the Philippines. Austria sought to hear more about the partnership approach to the capacity-building programme and how that would work. The Secretary explained that it was still too early to give an exact status of the situation even though a partner had recently been found to undertake a few feasibility studies. The idea was to see whether new reliable partnerships could undertake work to multiply the effects of the capacity-building programme beyond those already implemented by the Secretariat or the category 2 centres. Regarding the two questions from the Philippines, the first concerned the outcomes of the annual meeting of the category 2 centres, which in 2018 was its sixth annual meeting hosted in Paris immediately after the General Assembly (as was the practice) when they tended to be shorter meetings. Meetings held in alternate years (not in the years of the General Assembly) tended to be longer meetings when category 2 centres invited each other. The meeting in 2018 was therefore a short meeting with general discussions to share perspectives and provide an update on new developments in the Convention, including those just adopted, the results framework, and so on. Category 2 centres exchanged ideas for collaboration and in that sense there was no real outcome, except that the centre in Algeria offered to host the meeting of the category 2 centres in 2019. It is during those longer meetings, hosted by category 2 centres, that fuller discussions take place. On the question regarding the restructuring of the Culture Sector in relation to the Secretariat’s work, there was no direct impact on its work, and the team had remained unchanged. In fact, it had allowed for better access to the Assistant Director-General, so generally, it had helped the Secretariat in many ways.
3. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat, adding that the implementation of the Convention was not solely about inscriptions, but about a set of mechanisms and elements that States were called upon to actualize within their respective communities. It was in this sense that Senegal had emphasized very early on the importance of training, capacity-building and inventorying actions, which would enable elements to become credible inscriptions. In this regard, UNESCO had understood this approach, with Senegal following this process by working mainly on heritage education at the university level where a number of modules were being developed, which would be followed up at the elementary school level in 2019. The delegation congratulated the Secretariat on its activities, as well on the implementation of the recommendations by the General Assembly, particularly by the working group on the monitoring and evaluation tool, as well as work carried out to assist Member States, including Senegal. Concluding, the delegation congratulated the Secretariat for the launch of the innovative, digital tool that would help better communicate intangible cultural heritage to a younger, more technologically literate generation.
4. The **delegation of Djibouti** spoke of the unique and emotional moment experienced in the joint inscription of the two Korea nations, adding that it reinforced the role of UNESCO in bringing people together and peace to the world, which increased confidence in UNESCO’s ongoing efforts for the benefit of culture. The delegation also congratulated the Secretary for the rich, clear and transparent report that outlined the excellent work carried out by the Secretariat despite the limited staff. It wished to highlight three points. Firstly, one of the activities concerned the integration of intangible cultural heritage into formal education, which it considered to be an important factor in the development of intangible cultural heritage worldwide, as today’s children will become tomorrow’s leaders. If children are imbued with values and elements of intangible cultural heritage at an early age, then they will undoubtedly contribute to and fully engage in the development and implementation of safeguarding measures of the world’s intangible cultural heritage [in the future]. Secondly, new ICTs constitute an indispensable tool and an excellent disseminator of knowledge and know-how, whose use is crucial in safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of humanity. The importance of this was demonstrated by the [digital tool] presented [at lunchtime], which showed how the appropriation of new forms of knowledge and technology can contribute to safeguarding cultural heritage. The delegation also congratulated the Secretary on the real pragmatism that characterized the Secretariat’s report. Finally, it expressed confidence in the leadership of the Director-General who—with the appointment of various administrators in the various fields of UNESCO—augurs for a new era of knowledge-sharing and the general mobilization of intangible cultural heritage.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** added its voice to those thanking Mauritius, and congratulated the Secretariat for its work, not just for the report but also for all the work behind the scenes and its continuous efforts, for which it was grateful. The delegation joined in the comments made by the previous speakers, including the Philippines and the Netherlands, on the greater emphasis placed on inscriptions and very little post-inscription, notwithstanding the efforts made by the Secretariat, although the periodic reporting reform would likely play a role in this regard. Another important issue on the agenda concerned the protection of intangible cultural heritage in conflict areas, and the delegation hoped that the Secretariat would continue to address this important issue.
6. The **delegation of Poland** congratulated the host country of Mauritius for its chairmanship of the Committee and for its warm hospitality. It congratulated the Secretariat for its work and for the excellent report, and it looked forward to the next steps in developing the Convention, particularly as it wished to cooperate so as to better reflect on the revival of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The delegation also sought closer cooperation with the ICHNGO Forum. As a Committee Member for the first time, the delegation would do its utmost to maintain a good working spirit, adding that it was very proud to have witnessed the historic moment when the Committee adopted the joint nomination from the two Korean States. This decision proved that culture is definitely a tool for peace, and it hoped that this spirit of dialogue and reconciliation would prevail in the further work of the Convention.
7. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the delegations and the host country of Mauritius for its wonderful welcome. It wished to share with the Committee information about the ongoing activities taking place in Guatemala, as well as about the support received from UNESCO. The various decisions taken in the context of the Convention had strengthened the capacity of the different actors responsible for culture in Guatemala, which in turn had helped establish inventories of intangible cultural heritage together with the communities. The delegation expressed its gratitude to Azerbaijan for granting funds in 2017 that had enabled awareness-raising and capacity-building activities in certain municipalities in Guatemala, for example, in Esquipulas, known for its Catholic *feria*, and for the festivities of the Romería and the image of the *Christo Negro*, as well as in the towns of San Antonio Palopó and Chimaltinango that are also in the process of inventorying their intangible cultural heritage, notably in the ceramics of the area. The delegation took the opportunity to commend the excellent decision to inscribe the joint element of the two Korean nations, which had made history, adding that this Committee continued to be a forum for dialogue and peace. Moreover, many countries represented in this session and in the future would be making proposals and must be given the opportunity to contribute and inquire so that UNESCO could be a central base from which the world could learn how to strengthen intangible cultural heritage in general.
8. The **delegation of Lebanon** thanked the Chairperson and Mauritius for hosting the Committee and for their organization of this session, as well as the Secretary and the Secretariat for their report and for all their efforts. Lebanon is a very diverse country that places great importance on acknowledging and preserving intangible cultural heritage as a tool to broaden understanding and reconciliation for the promotion of peace and sustainable development. In Lebanon, it is believed that this should be part of everyday education and, as such, a pilot project had just been launched to introduce intangible cultural heritage into the education system, specifically in secondary schools. In the same vein, the delegation encouraged the Secretariat to pursue its efforts in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations for two reasons: i) Lebanon is a host country for over one million Syrian refugees; and ii) Lebanon is still trying to return the internally displaced Lebanese from the civil war back to their villages and cities.
9. The **delegation of Togo** thankedall the delegations and congratulated the Secretariat, adding that Togo was honoured to be have been elected a Member of the Committee in 2017. It spoke of its sense of great joy and satisfaction to be serving the Committee for the first time, adding that Togo—together with UNESCO’s work on intangible cultural heritage—can follow suit and defend the objectives of intangible cultural heritage. Togo had benefited from a project to valorize and safeguard the practice of traditional instruments, the pilot phase of which had been successful. It was delighted that UNESCO had continued [the project] at the national level so as to take stock of all the elements in the implementation of the Convention. The delegation reiterated its thanks to all the countries that had supported its candidacy, and thanked Mauritius for its warm welcome, adding that it would implement the learnings, build capacities and exchange with everyone so as to present intangible cultural heritage to the world to safeguard it.
10. The **delegation of Cuba** was particularly concerned about the participation of the field offices in this process, especially in the culture sector given the very limited amount of funds available given to the implementation of projects. Thus, what measures were foreseen to improve the ability of those regional field offices to implement these projects? Also, had any thought been given to changing or improving the entire process of cost recovery related to the implementation of projects? It was noted that this was currently not the case in the Regional Offices (as it went directly to Headquarters), which had a significant impact on the work carried out in the Regional Offices in implementing the Convention.
11. The **Secretary** thanked the delegations for their comments and took note of the issues presented, including on some of the priority areas already identified [by the Secretariat], such as intangible cultural heritage in education and intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, whose work in this direction would continue. The Secretary thanked the delegations for acknowledging the work of the Secretariat, which was highly appreciated, adding that it was encouraging to hear that the work was going in the right direction. Responding to the specific question from Cuba concerning the use of cost recovery, the Secretary concurred that the cost recovery policy was complex. Funds allocated to ‘intangible cultural heritage education’ were used in the Regular Programme budget, which is not subject to cost recovery, so that the budgets in the field offices implementing the ICH education programme were not subject to cost recovery, as was the case at Headquarters. However, there was indeed cost recovery in extrabudgetary projects, which was normally split among the various Regular Programme staff, as cost recovery can only be charged to Regular Programme staff implementing the project. The Secretary was unsure whether a specific project was being alluded to by Cuba, but it was wrong to think that cost recovery never went to a field office and indeed this was sometimes negotiated, particularly with extrabudgetary projects. When a project is fully implemented by the field, there is cost recovery to the field office. When a project is implemented partially by the field and partially by Headquarters, the cost recovery is shared at the moment of the design of the project. The Secretary wondered whether there was a specific project in mind, but as far as he was aware, cost recovery applied to both Headquarters and field offices.
12. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–10 were duly adopted. It was noted that China had an amendment in paragraph 11 on the initiative on intangible cultural heritage [in urban contexts].
13. The **delegation of China** proposed a slight amendment in paragraph 11 based on the draft document provided by the Secretariat, which would amend the wording to ‘thanks for the generous contribution from the private sector of the People’s Republic of China’ with the rest of the paragraph unchanged. This wording was in line with previous Committee decisions.
14. The **delegation of Zambia** presented a slight amendment for the sake of clarity in paragraph 11, which would replace ‘towards it’ with ‘towards this area’.
15. The **Chairperson** noted no objections to the amendments by China and Zambia, and paragraph 11 was duly adopted as amended. Paragraphs 12 and 13 were also adopted. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 5 adopted.**

**ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA**

**INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND: VOLUNTARY SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/6*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-6-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 6*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/6)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 6, reminding the Committee that, in accordance with Articles 25.5 and 27 of the Convention, it was responsible for approving the voluntary supplementary contributions made by State Parties in addition to their annual assessed contributions. The contributions are intended for the implementation of activities that cannot be supported with the limited resources of UNESCO’s regular budget and were therefore of the utmost importance for the implementation of the Convention. It was noted that one of the ‘other issues’ concerned the decision by the Executive Board at its 204th session to apply a new set of Management Costs Rates to Special Accounts.
2. The **Secretary** remarked that, in accordance with Decision [12.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/6), the Secretariat was requested to report on any voluntary supplementary contributions it may have received since its last session. A generous voluntary supplementary contribution by Japan was also presented for possible acceptance by the Committee. This item also brought to mind the decision of the 204th session of the Executive Board relating to the new set of Management Cost Rates for Special Accounts, which concerned the ICH Fund. In this regard, the Committee was expected to make a recommendation to the next session of the General Assembly. The Secretary began with a review of the current state of affairsin relation to the voluntary supplementary contributions received since the last session of the Committee. At its twelfth session, the Committee approved two new funding priorities for the period 2018–2021: i) ‘Strengthening capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage and contribute to sustainable development’ so as to continue efforts to extend the reach and effectiveness of the global capacity‑building strategy; and ii) ‘Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education’. It could be seen from Figure 1 in the report that the evolution of the voluntary supplementary contributions mobilized in support of the first funding priority, the global capacity-building programme, had showed a general decline since 2012, reaching its lowest point in the current biennium. This was attributed to the sharp reduction in earmarked contributions made to the Fund by State Parties. During the reporting period, i.e. the first six months of 2018, no contributions were received for earmarked activities related to the capacity-building programme. Nevertheless, the steady decline over past biennia seemed to show a small sign of turning around through the Funds-in-Trust arrangements. Since the beginning of the current biennium, two new projects had been initiated thanks to the generous contributions made by Belgium (Flanders) to continue the project aimed at strengthening subregional cooperation and national capacities in seven Southern African countries, and also by Japan to strengthen national capacities for the effective implementation of the 2003 Convention in Lebanon. Although some donors had expressed an informal interest, no contributions had been received to support the second funding priority on intangible cultural heritage in education. Given this worrying situation, it was suggested that the Committee encourage donors to support the two funding priorities through earmarked voluntary contributions to the ICH Fund.
3. Regarding support for the human resources of the Secretariat, the **Secretary** explained that during its last session, the General Assembly had approved the creation of three posts with the purpose of expanding and improving the reach of the International Assistance mechanisms. Notwithstanding this encouraging development, support for the human resources of the Secretariat through voluntary contributions was still essential in order to keep up with the volume of statutory obligations of the Convention. The team being recruited would alleviate only a small part of the increasing workload of the Secretariat as it would mainly focus on tasks that cannot be assumed by the current team of Secretariat, which include the implementation and monitoring systems for individual projects having received International Assistance. For this reason, it was suggested that the Committee further encourage donors to make new voluntary contributions to the sub-fund. Since the last session of the Committee, the sub-fund had received a total of US$64,917 thanks to the generous contributions made by the People’s Republic of China, Finland, Kazakhstan and Montenegro. The Secretary was happy to note the new voluntary supplementary contribution to the ICH Fund by Japanto further support the 2003 Convention. At its twelfth session, the Committee had acknowledged the need to convene an open-ended intergovernmental working group to reflect, *inter alia*, on: i) the procedures for the removal of an element from a List and the transfer from one List to the other: ii) the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register established under the Convention; and iii) the relevance of the various criteria for each of these mechanisms. At its seventh session, the General Assembly had further underlined this need. It was expected that the results of the reflection would lead to the amendments of the Operational Directives with an improved and well-thought-out renewed mechanism for listings under the Convention. The Secretary highlighted that the decision of the Committee was set broadly to discuss all relevant issues related to the listing mechanisms, as suggested by ‘inter alia’. In this regard, the Secretariat considered that other aspects of the listing mechanisms should also be included in the reflection, for example, concerning the follow-up of elements inscribed on the Lists, as considered under agenda item 9. Japan had expressed to the Secretariat its intention that the contribution be used to organize a preliminary meeting of experts in 2019 in preparation for an open-ended intergovernmental working group meeting to be held provisionally in 2021. In this regard, the Secretariat was confident that a meeting of experts could be organized in 2019. The remaining amount would be used to support the organization of the open-ended working group provisionally indicated for 2021; the Secretariat would seek the additional resources needed to convene that working group. The Committee was asked to approve the generous offer from Japan, as per Annex II in document 13.COM 6.
4. The **Secretary** then outlined the timeline of future meetings, beginning with the reflection and the meeting of experts in 2019, the outcome of which would be reported to the fourteenth session of the Committee. The eighth session of the General Assembly and the fifteenth session of the Committee would provide further occasions to discuss the reflection before convening a meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental working group. The results of the working group would then be brought to the sixteenth session so as to agree on the amendments to the Operational Directives to be recommended to the General Assembly. Finally, in 2022, the General Assembly at its ninth session may adopt the amendments of the Operational Directives. The combination of a meeting of experts and the open-ended intergovernmental working group is a method that had proved very useful when developing the overall results framework. The timeline is quite long because of the complex nature of the reflection, which covered multiple issues, and because of a number of other thematic or statutory meetings that had to take place. For example, the Secretariat would be organizing two additional meetings in 2019; one on the participation of accredited NGOs in the implementation of the Convention and the other on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies (as per Decisions [12.COM 17](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/17) and [13.COM 2 BUR 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions-bureau/13.COM%202.BUR/3), respectively). Moreover, it was difficult to foresee an open-ended working group in 2020 because of the eighth General Assembly in the same year. The Secretary once again stressed the complex and somewhat sensitive nature of the reflection, which was why it was important to include as many opportunities for discussions at the intergovernmental level as possible. The current plan allowed for the careful preparation of the open-ended intergovernmental working group.
5. Regarding Management Cost Rates, the **Secretary** recalled that, at its 204th session, the Executive Board decided to approve a new set of Management Costs Rates. The Secretary explained that there are different kinds of contributions that compose the ICH Fund. On the one hand, the Fund receives annual assessed contributions, as defined by Article 26 of the Convention, which so far benefit from a special Management Cost Rate derogation of 0 per cent, which was exceptionally granted by the Director-General, not only to the ICH Fund, but also to comparable special accounts, such as the World Heritage Fund. On the other hand, the Fund also receives voluntary contributions, such as those made by State Parties to support earmarked activities or the sub-fund, which, up to now, were subject to a standard Management Cost Rate of 10 per cent. With respect to the decision taken by the Executive Board, multi-donor special accounts would now be subject to a new rate of 7 per cent instead of 10 per cent. Given the different regimes of Management Cost Rates affecting the contributions received by the Fund, this decision would have two different impacts. Firstly, voluntary contributions made by State Parties will now benefit from a lower rate (from 10 per cent to 7 per cent). Secondly, the decision by the Executive Board would mean that the assessed contributions to the Fund would see an increase in the rate from 0 per cent to 7 per cent. Given the special derogation granted by the Director-General, the Executive Board recognized the need to undertake consultations with the Governing Bodies of the 2003 Convention prior to any potential implementation of this decision. This same exception was made with the 1972 Convention, whose Committee in 2018 recommended not to apply the new Management Cost Rate to assessed contributions. The Committee was thus asked to make a recommendation in this regard for the next session of the General Assembly in June 2020. It was noted that a 7 per cent rate applied on the current plan of expenditure (US$9,590,922), as approved by 7.GA, would see an allocation of Management Cost Rate at US$671,364.
6. Thanking the Secretary for the clear presentation, the **Chairperson** expressed sincere gratitude to Belgium (Flanders), the People’s Republic of China, Finland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Montenegro and Singapore for their generous support to the Convention and its Secretariat since the last session. From the presentation, it was clear that the situation of voluntary contributions continued to be extremely worrying, requiring the attention of all. The Committee was asked to take a decision to accept the generous offer for a new voluntary supplementary contribution made by Japan, and to discuss the potential modification of the current Management Cost Rate that applied to the ICH Fund.
7. The **delegation of Japan** reiterated its offer, as presented by the Secretariat and described in Annex II of the working document, in which Japan made a voluntary contribution to the ICH Fund for the organization of an expert meeting and for supporting a meeting of the open-ended intergovernmental working group with a view to reflecting on and exploring ways to improve the current mechanisms and procedures of the Convention. The delegation believed that the reflection was necessary as the Committee and the General Assembly had repeatedly discussed improving the mechanisms and procedures of the Convention. Certain results had been achieved, such as the revised nomination form, the decision to reform the periodic reporting mechanism, and so on. Nevertheless, the situation facing the Convention was changing dramatically. States Parties had increased from 30 to 178 over the past 15 years since the adoption of the Convention. The *raison d’etre* of the Convention was becoming wider, and it was recognized that expectations and demands from States Parties were also growing. Against this background, Japan proposed to begin the reflection on the mechanisms and procedures of the Convention that reflected the currents demand, while respecting and maintaining the original spirit and design of the Convention. Referring to Article 2 of the Convention, the delegation explained that the definition of intangible cultural heritage highlighted its unique character, which does not refer to outstanding universal value (OUV); an essential requirement for the inscription of World Heritage. The evaluation process of an element of intangible cultural heritage involves the examination and confirmation of criteria, which evaluates and determines the cultural values of the nominated element; a core part of the Convention that is still relevant and should be maintained. However, the evaluation process of intangible cultural heritage should be re-examined and updated to take into account the demands of the day. For example, the Evaluation Body maintains the practice of evaluating nominated elements solely based on the information and facts contained in the file, but it could be beneficial to refer to sources other than the files, such as those available on the internet like YouTube, especially when the submitting State requests that the Body do so. This would help the Evaluation Body better understand whether the nominated element met the criteria and would thus help decrease the number of unnecessary referrals. Based on these points, Japan suggested that the following points be examined in the expert meeting: i) the nature and purpose of the List; ii) the forthcoming evaluation process; iii) the procedures for the removal of an element from a List and the transfer from one List to the other; iv) issues concerning the follow-up of the inscribed element on the List of the Convention. Japan was thus ready to actively contribute to the reflection process together with all other Committee Members and States Parties to the Convention, and the Secretariat.
8. The **delegation of Palestine** warmly thanked Japan and the other donors for providing extrabudgetary funds to the Convention, adding that the report revealed a decline in the extrabudgetary funds allocated to the two priority areas identified, namely, capacity building and sustainable development, and intangible cultural heritage through education. The delegation thus wished to know if—in the case of a sustained decline in the ICH Fund—it would be possible to continue these activities under the Regular Programme fund. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for the clarity in the report, but had some concerns regarding the figures displayed in the timeline. It was of the understanding that the next step would be the reflection meeting in Japan in 2019, followed by the General Assembly, the fourteenth session of the Committee, and the ad hoc working group. However, there was no mention in the timeline of the expert working group between the two sessions.
9. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Netherlands, China, Finland, Kazakhstan and Montenegro for their contributions to the ICH Fund, as well as the Chairperson for having initiated and fostering this dialogue, which concerned structural issues affecting the Convention. It was also very grateful that this dialogue was to take place at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, which would make it easier for all Member States to participate. Regarding the Secretariat’s report, Colombia remarked on the importance of seeking funds to continue fostering these initiatives to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education. In this respect, Colombia was completely committed to this initiative and believed that the connection between intangible cultural heritage and education generated sustainable development, but also created social and economic dynamics within communities. In this regard, the delegation wished to offer the Committee its experience and methodology in tertiary education and in workshops, as well as its experiences in safeguarding traditional customs and knowledge in vulnerable communities throughout the different regions of Colombia.
10. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for its detailed report on the contributions to the ICH Fund, joining the other delegations in expressing its full appreciation to the countries that had provided support to the Convention since the Committee’s last session. It also thanked the Government of Japan for its contributions to the ICH Fund for launching this very important reflection process on the removal of an element from a List and its transfer to another List, as well as on the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register established under the Convention. The delegation was confident that this work would help clarify multiple questions linked to the status of the elements inscribed, as well as the purpose of the inscription, confirming its own active participation in this reflection process. The delegation also shared its concerns with the decline in extrabudgetary resources to the Secretariat’s capacity-building strategy, which was one of the instrumental ways to better implement the Convention. Azerbaijan is one of the supporters of the Secretariat for capacity-building projects, which provides States Parties with a better understanding of the Convention and serves to implement it more efficiently. With regard to management cost rates, it was recalled that the UNESCO Executive Board had decided to apply a rate of 7 per cent. Considering the 2004 Board decision to allow the governing bodies to undertake necessary consultations with the Committee, the delegation wondered whether any consultation was planned between the Committee sessions and, if so, what the timing and format of such a consultation would be.
11. Inline with the statement made by Palestine, the **delegation of the Philippines** noted in regard to the timeline of the reflection on the listing mechanisms that the preparatory experts meeting supported by Japan was scheduled in 2019, but the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the matter was only proposed in 2021, i.e. in three years from now. Based on the proposed timeline, any suggested amendments to the Operational Directives would only be taken up by the General Assembly in 2022, i.e. four years from now, at a time when addressing these matters appeared urgent. In this regard, the delegation believed that the General Assembly in 2020 should be used to adopt amendments to the Operational Directives that could improve the system, especially if they were widely supported. It may thus be useful to hold an initial meeting of the intergovernmental working group in 2020, followed by another meeting in 2021 and 2022, as would be necessary to continue the process of reform. Recognizing some of the comments made by the Secretariat on the complexities and suggested timeline, while keeping in place the present system until 2022, the delegation urged that the dialogue procedure be adopted soon.
12. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked Japan for its generous contribution and expressed an interest in participating in the process of reform, where possible. It also shared the concerns expressed on the serious decline in earmarked voluntary contributions in the past years. The Netherlands is a strong supporter of the global capacity-building programme as it represented the essence of the Convention, contributing to safeguarding on all levels among communities, NGOs and States Parties. These earmarked voluntary contributions can be very effective when the Secretariat is able to match needs and resources. In this way, capacity-building programmes could cater to the specific needs of regions and communities. The Netherlands highlighted paragraph 8 in draft decision 6 in which contributors are encouraged to support the achievement of the goals set out in the two funding priorities through earmarked voluntary contributions to the Fund. In past years, the Netherlands had financed capacity building in Suriname in the Dutch Caribbean Islands. As the project came to an end, the Netherlands now intended to start contributing to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education. Education on all levels is of the utmost importance in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The intangible cultural heritage experts within the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science in the Netherlands were currently working on the implementation of intangible cultural heritage in a new curriculum. The delegation emphasized the importance of using bottom-up approaches that involve community members and NGOs. It also believed that young people could greatly contribute to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. For example, in several National Committees, young people were actively involving other young people in the values of safeguarding heritage through peer-to-peer education. The Netherlands wondered whether these initiatives could be connected through the UNESCO Associated School Network (ASPnet) to work more globally on awareness-raising and ways to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. In general, greater visibility could be given to the different initiatives in education and intangible cultural heritage, as many Member States were active on this subject and States could learn from these good examples.
13. The **Secretary** noted two questions concerning the timeline, a question concerning the use of the Regular Programme funds from Palestine, a question concerning ASPnet from the Netherlands, and a question on the management cost rate from Azerbaijan. The Secretary began with the timeline, explaining that there were two factors. Firstly, whether the issues surrounding the inscription process needed to be fully reformed, comprehensively and holistically, or whether it should take a staggered approach. The Secretary reminded the Committee that it had ongoing actions, including on the reform of the NGO accreditation system and the development of guidelines for intangible cultural heritage in emergencies scheduled for 2019. Thus, there were three expert meetings to be held in 2019. The Secretary further reminded the Committee that in General Assembly years, the Secretariat had to organize both a Committee meeting and a General Assembly, and thus part of the problem was the number of statutory meetings already required in a calendar year. Another consideration was the funding for this process. At the moment, the Secretariat had received a very generous offer, but it was hoped that there might be further sources of funding to undertake more consultations on this process. The plan was therefore to hold the first expert meeting [on the initiation of reflections] in September 2019 based on the schedule of the other two expert meetings, as mentioned earlier, and considering the time available to host it. Consequently, a progress report could only be presented in one year’s time at the fourteenth session of the Committee. The Secretary remarked that the Committees themselves were in fact intergovernmental consultation processes that provide feedback on particular issues among Committee Members. The question was whether the expert meeting had already been planned to provide amendments to the Operational Directives. However, the Secretary considered this to be unrealistic, as it would be rushed with insufficient consultations, unless other requirements were dropped, such as intangible cultural heritage in emergencies or the renewal of the NGO accreditation system and the reflection on their engagement. The Secretariat simply could not continue adding more items without being given any more time.
14. The **Secretary** continued to address the timeline through to June 2020 and the next General Assembly, adding that to envision an entire revision by then was, in his opinion, unrealistic. The issue of a transfer of an element, the follow-up to the elements, the dialogue process, and the length of a referral were all complex questions that could not be rushed. The idea was that the reform of the Convention would engage positively into the next fifteen years so that there would not be a constant need to fix the issues on a piecemeal basis, but instead work towards a more comprehensive and integral reform. The General Assembly would thus broaden the consultation process, as the General Assembly has the authority over these issues and provides the opportunity for all 178 States Parties to discuss and effectively re-initiate another two-period after that, which brought the process to three years and a few months. One quicker option would be to change the title of the intergovernmental working group to a ‘special session of the General Assembly’, but that would be one less intergovernmental reflection, as well as other complications. Thus, it was not really feasible to foresee the meeting before 2021 given the resources, not only of the Secretariat but in order to meet the other requests made by the Committee. There might, however, be a possibility should the Committee consider withdrawing or suspending other processes, which was also in addition to the issue of financing, as the open-ended intergovernmental working group was not yet fully funded, though it might well be by 2021.
15. The **Secretary** then turned to the question of Regular Programme funding for the two funding priorities, clarifying that it was not the case that both were in decline. One was a new funding priority that had yet to be started, while the other was indeed in serious decline. The Secretariat acknowledged that part of the issue may have been the accumulation of the Fund of the International Assistance mechanism, which had made it more difficult to attract funding. However, that trend seemed to be reversed and indeed there was an encouraging use of the Fund for capacity-building projects. However, the Secretariat expected the Fund to start decreasing quickly and there was a severe risk that if the Fund decreased through better access to the International Assistance mechanism, a gap could open up in which there might not be any funding; the next eighteen months were therefore critical in that sense. With regard to the Regular Programme, the Secretary explained that funds from the Regular Programme were being used, but this was barely adequate. The incompressible costs, which related to the organization of the statutory meetings of the Convention, took up most of the money available under the Regular Programme. The remainder was given to field offices, but the funds were highly limited. The Secretary recalled that the Regular Programme money for this biennium had already been allocated to these funding priorities, but only as seed money to try and mobilize more extrabudgetary resources. Turning to the question by Azerbaijan [on management cost rates], the Secretary concurred that the General Assembly would have to make a decision on this for referral back in the first consultation step. The Committee had between the present session and the next to may make a recommendation to the General Assembly. If there was a request for an electronic consultation or meeting, the Secretary urged the Committee to make it a low-cost consultation, which the Secretariat would be happy to initiate among all States, via email for example. The Secretary suggested returning to this issue in order to get an idea about whether to also apply the 7 per cent rate to the assessed contributions of the Fund. In response to the question from the Netherlands on the possibility of working with ASPnet, the Secretary was happy to inform the Committee that the Secretariat was about to start an EU-funded project specifically working on intangible cultural heritage with ASPnet in a first initiative, and the Secretariat was very open to looking at that possibility in other contexts.
16. The **delegation of Palestine** wonderedwhether the initiation reflection expert meeting could be held earlier than the proposed date of September 2019, which would save at least one year. It also wondered whether the open-ended working group should not be held immediately after the outcome of the expert meeting in order to continue its work on this item.
17. The **delegation of the Philippines** appreciated the responses by the Secretariat to the points raised, and to similar points raised by Palestine. It understood the constraints expressed by the Secretary regarding scheduling, conceding that it was not easy, but it did not seek to drop any items in its place. With regard to substance, the delegation felt that any possible reforms, particularly concerning dialogue, which had already taken place within the Committee for a number of years, as well as in the ad hoc working group and the last General Assembly, could already be discussed at the eighth General Assembly. The delegation recalled that the Committee had already decided to take a decision on dialogue at its fourteenth session. Hence, by the eighth General Assembly in June 2020, if there were any amendments ready, especially on dialogue, then they did not have to be included in the overall holistic reflection, which would take longer, and could perhaps already be tabled at the eighth General Assembly. The points raised by Palestine also deserved merit.
18. The **Secretary** noted that there were two different issues: one concerning dialogue and one concerning the reform, adding that it was not just complicated but simply impossible to carry out all the development issues at the same time. It was not just a question of funding, but also a question of time in that going immediately from the expert meeting to the open-ended working group would not allow for a level of consultation with the Committee, which was viewed as an important consultative process. This was the process followed in the work on the overall results framework, and even then, there were some concerns that the entire process was insufficiently inclusiveness. Nevertheless, in that process, this additional consultation brought together a consensus on the overall results framework by the time it was submitted to the General Assembly. The Secretary believed that it was important to follow such a process so as to include the two oversights of the Committee, the opinion of the General Assembly and the three intergovernmental contexts that would ensure a fully reflected approach and hence a comprehensive reform. This could thus be seen as a strategic approach, but it would also be impossible to foresee an opening in the schedule in 2019 given the planned meetings, the expert meeting and the intergovernmental meeting. Regarding the question raised by the Philippines on the issue of dialogue, the Secretary explained that it was already on the agenda for discussion in 2019 at the next Committee session, and that the calendar had been very extensively examined in this regard. Moreover, it might be more efficient to discuss the dialogue once the question of the criterion had been examined. The question of the criterion could also be a way to review the evaluation process. The Secretary asked the Committee whether it could consider an interim measure in 2019 for the dialogue process that did not necessarily imply an immediate change to the Operational Directives until a broader process could be followed. The Secretary suggested that one option might be to get the Committee to agree on the dialogue reform in a lighter, more tentative way that could be initiated by the Committee in 2019, with the informal working group again working on this issue. Alternatively, the work on the issue could already solicit the Evaluation Body in February 2019 rather than in September 2019. Nevertheless, there was still the problem of the schedule. Only once the overall process had been considered could the issue of dialogue be integrated into the timeplan. The Secretary was sympathetic to the questions of dialogue and the need to work on this issue, whether it took the form of direct amendments to the Operational Directives in 2022 or an interim measure to allow some kind of dialogue in 2019 that would carry the process through to the overall reform. The Secretary assured the Committee that the Secretariat did not seek to delay this issue, but rather that it could not juggle all the issues at the same time. Not only did it require funding, but the staggered approach would allow for a more comprehensive reform that would be sustainable into the next fifteen to twenty years, as had previously taken place in other Conventions, notably World Heritage.
19. The **delegation of Senegal** recalled the open-ended working group in Chengdu that had discussed the sensitive, structural issues affecting the global reform of the Convention, which were indeed complex issues. It agreed on the sense of urgency expressed by the Philippines, but these issues also merited a broad consultation process among Committee Members before any decisions were made, as these reforms were extremely important for the future of the Convention. The delegation was of the opinion that these reforms could not be made in a hurry, not least because the work engaged the future of the Convention and had to be done correctly to ensure the longevity of the mechanisms and Operational Directives. It concurred that the issue of dialogue was indeed urgent, but the Committee had the resources and intelligence to perhaps find a temporary alternative. In any case, reforms that affect the Convention were structural in nature and would therefore take time if errors were to be avoided.
20. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Algeria to speak as an Observer.
21. The **delegation of Algeria** took the opportunity to thank Mauritius for its warm welcome, congratulating the Chairperson on his election and thanking the Secretariat for its work and the quality of the documents. As an Observer, the delegation wished to intervene on the issue of dialogue, recalling that Algeria had been the first to raise this point already in Addis Ababa [in 2016], and there had since been two Committee sessions and an open-ended working group of the Committee on this subject. It was hoped that a form of dialogue, as indicated by the Secretariat, would be light and operational and that it would not add to the burden of the Secretariat nor complicate the work of the Evaluation Body. However, it was clear that the idea of dialogue was established and well underway. The delegation recalled that dialogue had already been the subject of two decisions: a decision by the Committee and a decision by the General Assembly, which had decided to defer the issue of dialogue until its next session. The delegation therefore wondered whether trying to move ahead quickly on the issue of dialogue did not in fact go against the decisions that had already been taken, especially by the General Assembly.
22. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria for its pertinent comments.
23. The **Secretary** returned to the issue raised by Azerbaijan on the management costs, recalling that a decision had been made in the World Heritage Committee under the World Heritage Fund not to apply the rate to the assessed contributions. The Committee was thus free to make a decision at the present session in a consultation process, but it could also be returned to the Committee at its next session in 2019 when it would have to be decided before the General Assembly. It was noted that the draft decision ‘took note of Executive Board Document […]’.
24. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted.
25. The **delegation of the Philippines** proposed in paragraph 5, at the end of the sentence, adding, ‘taking into account the debates at the thirteenth session of the Committee’, as this took note of the discussions that had just taken place, especially on dialogue, and which may find an interim measure even at the level of the Operational Directives, if ready.
26. The **delegations of Palestine** and **Senegal** supported the proposed amendment in paragraph 5, which was duly adopted as amended.
27. The **Chairperson** returned to the draft decision and paragraphs 6–10 were duly adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 6 adopted**.

**ITEM 7.a 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/18/13.COM/7.a Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-7.a_Rev.-EN.docx)

**Reports:** [*32 reports*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/7a-periodic-reporting-00994)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 7.a*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.a)

1. The **Chairperson** then moved to the next agenda item, item 7.a*.*
2. The **Secretary** recalled the ongoing reform of the mechanism for submitting periodic reports on the implementation of the 2003 Convention, which started immediately after the seventh session of the General Assembly in June 2017 with the approval of the overall results framework and the revision of the Operational Directives on periodic reporting. Further details on the reform and related ongoing activities were presented and discussed under agenda item 8, ‘Reform of the Periodic Reporting Mechanism’. However, owing to the transitional period established by the Committee at its twelfth session, the statutory obligation of States Parties to submit their periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention and on the elements inscribed on the Representative List before the deadlines of 15 December 2018 and 2019 were suspended. This meant that the present session would, for the last time, consider periodic reports submitted according to the calendar based on the date of ratification, as decided by the Committee in 2017. This year, the Committee was mandated to consider thirty-two periodic reports and to provide an overview at the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. Working document 13.COM 7.a consisted of an introduction and an annex consisting of five parts. It was noted that that the Secretariat had published a revised version of the working document to include the report submitted by Mongolia (number 18). Part I of the Annex provided an overview of the 2018 periodic reports. The table in paragraph 4 of the Annex contained the list of the thirty-two States that had submitted their reports in the current cycle. The table in paragraph 5 gave details of the thirty-eight States that should have reported this year. The Secretary confirmed that the suspension of the reporting deadline in 2018 and 2019 was also valid for late reports that had not yet been submitted to date, meaning that the thirty-eight States in the table would submit their next report as part of the next first round of regional reporting. The 32 reports to be considered covered 148 elements inscribed on the Representative List, of which 16 were multinational elements. It was noted that three States Parties had not reported on four items inscribed on the Representative List, namely: Bhutan for ‘Mask dance of the drums from Drametse’, originally proclaimed in 2005 and then incorporated in 2008; China for ‘The Twenty-Four Solar Terms, knowledge in China of time and practices developed through observation of sun’s annual’, inscribed in 2016; and India for two elements, the ‘Nowruz’ inscribed as a multinational element in 2009 and expanded to other countries in 2016, and ‘Yoga’ inscribed in 2016.
3. The **Secretary** explained that Part II of the Annex provided an overview of the main topics covered in the thirty-two reports submitted, namely on the institutional framework, inventory-making, safeguarding measures taken at the national level, as well as bilateral, subregional, regional and international cooperation for the safeguarding of living heritage. Part III of the Annex contained an in-depth analysis of the reports submitted since 2011. For this cycle, the analysis focused on the measures taken by States Parties to raise awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage. Several measures adopted by the States were highlighted by the analysis, including the involvement of the various stakeholders to ensure greater impact, the recognition of the central role of inventories and their accessibility, as well as the proclamations of heritage days, years and weeks. One of the important measures [mentioned by almost all States] related to cultural festivals, whether existing or newly created ones. In addition, communication and media engagement were also highlighted as being important in raising public awareness. Part IV of the Annex provided a brief general analysis of the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List, which took into account several dimensions related to the elements, such as the consequences of inscriptions, the evolution of the scope of elements, and efforts made to promote or strengthen them, as well as community participation in the safeguarding activities and reporting exercises, and entities involved in the management and safeguarding of the inscribed elements. Part V of the Annex provided summaries of each of the thirty-two reports received, which this year corresponded to the information provided by States in Section A.6, ‘Summary’, of their respective reports. These reports would be published on the website of the Convention, as well as the summary of reports examined by the Committee between 2011 and 2017.
4. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the periodic reports of States Parties contained a wealth of information that revealed, among others, common challenges that stakeholders face in the safeguarding of elements, which was crucial for the future of the Convention as it delved into emerging issues, such as the monitoring of elements post-inscription. As the periodic reporting procedure is aligned with the overall results framework, the Committee might also ponder how the reporting process could be made more meaningful for all parties concerned and not just as an obligation, and beyond simply taking note and transmitting the report to the General Assembly. The Committee might consider giving more detailed and interactive feedback to States Parties. In addition to the synthesis provided by the Secretariat, there could be a better way to distil and discuss best practices and lessons learned from the various reports. The delegation wondered whether this could be an area for accredited NGOs. Also, taking inspiration from other international bodies, a peer review system could be applied in which the Committee would review the periodic reports and adopt observations, which may help move the paradigm from focusing on the Lists to zeroing in on outcomes and results on the ground.
5. The **delegation of Austria** joined the Philippines in commending all States Parties who had submitted their reports on time, and also the Secretariat for the in-depth overview of the reports. These reports were not only an essential tool for the Committee to fulfil one of its co-functions, as mentioned in Article 7, but could also be used as primary sources for scientific, technical and artistic studies. Looking at the 2018 reports, they were also a valuable source of information for current thematic priorities, such as intangible cultural heritage in education, experience-oriented approaches, or summer schools on intangible cultural heritage management. The reports further contained options for NGO participation in the implementation of the Convention at the national level. Another benefit of the reports is that they somehow mirror the impact of International Assistance, for example in the field of inventorying. Another point concerned the update on the current status of elements inscribed on the Representative List, in which Austria had repeatedly raised concerns about the missing updates, which should contain a reflection on any changing factors that might affect the status of an inscribed element. The delegation therefore greatly appreciated the generous contribution of Japan to the Fund, which would provide an excellent starting point for an inclusive reflection process on the listing mechanism.
6. The **delegation of Jamaica** expressed gratitude to UNESCO for facilitating its participation in this session and also to the hosts for the generosity of their welcome. The delegation had found the exercise of drafting the report interesting; it was the first time it had had to report on the element inscribed, Maroon heritage of Moore Town. In addition to its obligation in keeping with the requirements of the Convention, it had provided an opportunity to actually evaluate the status of the element. Going forward, the delegation appreciated and accepted the modifications made to the reporting cycle and trusted that this would improve Jamaica’s ability to monitor the status of elements inscribed in Jamaica on a constant basis even further.
7. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the detailed document prepared for the examination of the last periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention, and commended the thirty-two Member States for their reports submitted in the current cycle, while welcoming the efforts of the States Parties concerned to meet the reporting requirements. The delegation also welcomed the quality of the overview and the summaries of the periodic reports, which provided detailed and structured information that allowed the Committee to follow and monitor the implementation of the Convention at the country level. It particularly liked the fact that a large number of countries had advanced efforts to ensure the sustainable transmission of intangible cultural heritage, while involving to the extent possible the communities concerned, as well as enhancing inventorying and research efforts. The delegation noted with great appreciation the fact that multinational nominations continued to contribute to the international cooperation, even post-inscription, as countries increasingly continued to engage in joint safeguarding and promotion activities over common heritage. Finally, it also noted the large number of countries that had not submitted their reports yet but expected the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism to remedy this situation through regional reporting where guidance for the States Parties concerned would be provided. The delegation encouraged Member States to fulfil their reporting obligations and the Committee should monitor this issue closely.
8. The **delegation of Zambia** commended the Secretariat for its elaborate report and also the thirty-two countries that had submitted their reports. However, it was concerned about the high number of countries that had not submitted their reports, especially as many came from Group V(a). The delegation wondered whether the Secretariat could put in place a mechanism or survey to identify the reasons behind the default rate, i.e. was it due to a lack of capacity or interest? Once established, it would be interesting to go further and explore the pattern. Was it the same countries that were failing to report? Or different countries at different times? Which Electoral Groups seemed to be defaulting more? In this way, a mechanism would help establish why this was happening.
9. The **delegation of Djibouti** remarked thatDjibouti was among the thirty-two countries that had submitted their reports, albeit three years late; it should have submitted it in 2014 but it was submitted at the end of 2017. It was indeed important to question the reason for this delay, as mentioned by Zambia, and it believed there were many factors. The most important factor is the need for capacity building, followed by the mobilization of all the persons and parties involved in the drafting of the report and in the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, Djibouti, wished to thank the facilitator Mr Idriss Moussa Ahmed and also Ms Karalyn Monteil from the UNESCO Nairobi Office, while noting the importance of involving the facilitators and resource persons who could help in the process. Above all, the report constituted the memory of each country in terms of progress in the implementation of the Convention. In this regard, it was necessary and important for the Secretariat and the Committee to take into account the reporting status so as to target and be guided by the specific priorities and needs of the countries concerned when formulating the capacity-building programmes.
10. The **delegation of Poland** had submitted its first report and wished to share its positive experience with the reporting process, which was taken very seriously and indeed helped identify gaps and reflect on new safeguarding mechanisms. Poland was constantly developing its national inventory, which now contained thirty-two elements, and it encouraged other States to submit their reports, adding that it was ready to share its experience in this regard.
11. The **delegation of China** commended the Secretariat for preparing such a detailed summary of the thirty-two reports submitted by the States Parties in 2018. The periodic reports provided information and good practices of the different countries, and their adopted measures and policies on implementation and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. This information on good practices should be used to its advantage, even though some may be very similar to current actions. For instance, since 2015, China had been involved in training courses and forums in more than 118 colleges and higher education academies to assist the bearers and practitioners by helping them better understand the Convention, as well as better involving them in its implementation. It had already found many similar practices in other States Parties. Also, much had been said in terms of the integration of intangible cultural heritage into school curricula, as mentioned by previous speakers. Thus, various useful and effective pieces of information could be gleaned from these periodic reports. Moreover, the high number of delayed reports only reflected the greater need for capacity building, not just for States Parties who had not yet submitted their reports, but even for States Parties that had already submitted their reports. For instance, China has a large number of communities that need to enhance their capacities in terms of implementation, and specifically on the submission of the periodic report. Fortunately, at its seventh session, the General Assembly adopted the twenty-six indicators of the overall results framework, which the delegation believed would help improve the reporting mechanism. In addition, the Committee would discuss the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism in the current session, which would help improve the reporting system.
12. The **delegation of Lebanon** remarked that it had submitted its report in 2018, but conceded that it had been particularly late in doing so. Nevertheless, the report helped establish the status of implementation of the Convention in Lebanon, which had resulted in a rather negative assessment for a number of circumstantial and institutional reasons. The delegation therefore took the opportunity to thank Japan for supporting the reflection process that would strengthen the capacities of States Parties and ensure long-term and sustainable implementation.
13. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
14. The **delegation of Pakistan** thanked and congratulated the Chairperson, the Government of Mauritius and the Secretariat for organizing this important event. Pakistan, as custodian of a rich intangible cultural heritage, takes pride in its heritage and had ratified the Convention [in 2005]. This was Pakistan’s second report and it was still a learning experience. Highlighting some of the measures taken to implement the provisions of the Convention, the delegation noted the twenty-five elements on its national inventory, of which two elements had been inscribed in a multinational inscription, namely, falconry and the Nawrouz, with Pakistan presenting a third element, namely, Suri Jagek. Pakistan had also signed an MoU with ICHCAP[[8]](#footnote-8) under which it was organizing training courses at the federal and provincial levels; three such courses had already been conducted and a fourth course would take place in December 2018. At the provincial level and federal levels, members of intangible cultural heritage cells were informed at the working group level to monitor the implementation of the Convention in letter and spirit. Pakistan had also translated the Convention into Urdu to promote awareness on the importance of intangible cultural heritage, and also tried to ensure that intangible cultural heritage awareness reached the curriculum level at various educational levels. A separate book was also being published in this regard.
15. The **Chairperson** thanked Pakistan for sharing its views and also for the translation [of the Convention text] into Urdu.
16. The **delegation of Niger** thanked the Secretariat for its continual efforts every year for the successful safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. It also thanked the host country for the quality of its welcome, and congratulated the Chairperson for his dynamism during this session. Niger was one of the countries that was late in its reporting, but it had almost completed every phase of the report from an internal perspective, from the collection of data to the drafting of the text. However, the report required validation from all the stakeholders, as it could not be placed online without this internal validation. The delegation asked that the Secretariat designate facilitators in those States that were late so that it could help them progress in the reporting, making the reports more quickly available online.
17. The **delegation of Bangladesh** congratulated the Chairperson on his chairing of the meeting, conveying its appreciation for the warm welcome and commending the Secretariat for the summary report, which provided better insights into the process of preparing a report. This was Bangladesh’s first submission under the Convention on the status of the elements inscribed on the Representative List. Although it was a year late, the process of preparing the report had been very rewarding in terms of understanding the gaps in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The delegation firmly believed that the communities lay at the heart of safeguarding measures, and in this process it assured the Committee that the communities were involved in every stage of data collection in a robust consultation. Pakistan would continue its efforts to submit its report on time, reiterating its thanks to the Secretariat for its extensive report, which was a very useful guide for future reporting.
18. The **delegation of Morocco** thanked Mauritius for its warm welcome and the Secretariat for the documents, adding that it had some general reflections on the reports. Firstly [from personal experience as a facilitator], it was noted that there was an absence of a reporting mechanism within States. The delegation understood that the Committee was working to improve the reporting mechanism by States to the Committee, but there was also a lack of an upstream mechanism at the State level for preparing these reports that would include the objectives, stakeholders, procedures, and finally the results to which these reports must lead. Secondly, within the Committee itself, it may need to consider the key indicators that allow the content of the reports to improve the safeguarding of elements and, more generally, of the implementation of the Convention at the national level. What were the key indicators that could be used by the Committee to improve this reporting exercise? Finally, regarding the Urgent Safeguarding List, the delegation raised the point again: For how long should elements remain on the Urgent Safeguarding List? Are they expected to remain indefinitely? Or should the Committee assist States Parties to ensure their viability is improved so that they may join the Representative List? This example had recently been seen in the case of Viet Nam [Decision [12.COM 11.C](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/11.C)]. Thus, it was important to reflect on the question: How can the reports enable the Committee to concretely assess the viability of the elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List?
19. The **delegation of Uganda** thanked the Chairperson for chairing this session and for the warm welcome and hospitality of the Government of Mauritius, as well as the Secretariat for coordinating and financing some of the delegates’ participation in this meeting. Uganda commended all thirty-two States Parties that had submitted their reports on time, noting the improvement in the reporting, as shown in Table 2 of the report. Uganda was one of the thirty-two countries that had had a delay in its submission by one and a half years, and this was its first report since its ratification of the Convention [in 2009]. In addition, many institutions were responsible for intangible cultural heritage in the country, which arose from the awareness raised when the element was inscribed on the Representative List, thus making it more difficult to reach out to all the institutions. In preparing the report, the delegation advised States Parties to use the guidance dossier provided by the Secretariat when interpreting each section, which had helped Uganda submit a good report. It was also important to collate the documents in a timely way ahead of the reporting time, and to strengthen partnerships between the reporting agencies and other stakeholders, such as the NGOs accredited to the Convention, the communities, and the private sector. Uganda would now use this report to further raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage at the national level and to learn from the lessons used to improve the next reporting process. However, in view of the recommendation to suspend the deadline of submission of the reports for 2018 and 2019 (Uganda had two pending reports for 2018 and 2019), the delegation still wished to encourage States Parties to continue working on finalizing their reports to avoid any delays in submission in 2020.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Uganda and all the speakers for sharing their experiences and the initiatives taken, and for realizing how the preparation of the report was helpful. Some pertinent issues were also raised and the Chairperson invited the Secretary to respond.
21. The **Secretary** was encouraged to hear all the comments on the reports, and wished to address some specific points raised by the Committee Members, Zambia, the Philippines and Austria, which sought to improve and touched upon the very purpose of the reform that was currently underway. Regarding the indicators, the Secretary explained that the intention was to use the work on the results framework to obtain the kind of information that could be developed into indicators and used by States to track their own implementation at the national level. This would hopefully provide a tool that could be aggregated at the international level, but could also be used at the national level by States to help them make decisions on a results basis within that framework. This was the reason for the reform and the overall results framework that had been underway over the last few years. The peer review approach was said to be an interesting system that could be considered but had not yet been employed, and there was no reason why States Parties wishing to engage in such a system could not do so. The Secretariat had been working both on the content and the structure of the reports, but that would not necessarily address the questions raised by Austria for now on the elements themselves that are inscribed on the Lists, which lay outside the overall results framework. Nevertheless, this should come up in the overall review of the listing mechanism, including under agenda item 9[[9]](#footnote-9) of the present session. Responding to the question raised by Zambia as to why countries were not reporting, the Secretary explained that this was part of the reason behind the reform moving towards a regional cycle that would allow collegial exchanges and capacity building within the regions, which would hopefully achieve similar results as in World Heritage, particularly through UNESCO’s network of field offices and workshops, which would bring groups of countries together to work on training and the preparation of reports in the same year.
22. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. The Chairperson noted an amendment proposed by Djibouti in paragraph 6.
23. The **delegation of Djibouti** proposed an amendment in paragraph 6 that would take into consideration the debates and interventions that had taken place, including at the level of the implementation of the Convention on this subject.
24. The **Chairperson** asked for a concrete proposal.
25. The **delegation of Djibouti** proposed starting a new sentence that would read, ‘considering that the debates will be integrated into the new planning of the capacity-building programme proposed by the Secretariat’.
26. The **delegation of Armenia** asked Djibouti to elaborate on the rationale behind the integration aspect of the debates and what it implied.
27. The **delegation of Senegal** understood the concerns raised by Djibouti, but the phrase as expressed seemed inappropriate, particularly the use of ‘considering’, and suggested instead, ‘taking into account’.
28. The **delegation of Togo** agreed with Senegal and suggested, ‘taking into account the debates in the new planning of the capacity-building programme’.
29. The **Secretary** sought clarity as it was unclear whether the request sought to integrate the debates that had just taken place into the content of the capacity-building programme, in which case, it would be necessary to define the debates and how they would be integrated into the planning. The Secretary reminded the Committee that there was a specific agenda item 8 addressing the reform of the periodic reports in which it may be possible to discuss planning for capacity building.
30. The **delegation of Djibouti** wished to clarify that the debates concerned the various justifications for the delay in drafting and submitting the periodic reports, which more or less justified the crucial need for capacity building at the level of practitioners, communities, the different research institutions and representatives of the ministries and civil society who all participate as integral parts of the report. Thus, it was at this level that the alarm needed to be raised, as this delay required an urgent response, which could be to strengthen capacity building based on the needs of the different reporting countries and those lagging behind.
31. The **Secretary** understood the point more clearly and noted two things. Firstly, the issue of the low rate of submissions of reports had been an issue in the Committee sessions for years, and, secondly, the reform of the periodic reports was linked to the adoption of the results frameworks. One of the main reasons the General Assembly had decided in 2017 to reform the system was to be able to develop a system of capacity building around periodic reports. In this regard, agenda item 8 dealt directly with the question of the reform of periodic reporting. The Secretary therefore felt that it might be more appropriate to include a reference to these debates under agenda item 8, as item 8 would serve as the basis for the reform and hence the reason for the suspension of reporting in order to adapt the form, but also to develop the associated capacity-building programme, which had been requested over several Committee sessions. The Secretary thus suggested that it may be more appropriate for Djibouti to raise this matter under item 8, which would also allow some time to come up with suitable wording.
32. The **delegation of Djibouti** thanked the Secretary for his clarification and for identifying the appropriate place for this wording.
33. The **Chairperson** confirmed that there would be no amendment in paragraph 6, and thus returned to paragraphs 7 and 8, which were duly adopted. **The Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 7.a adopted**.

**ITEM 7.b 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/18/13.COM/7.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-7.b-EN.docx)

**Reports:** [*16 reports*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/7b-periodic-reporting-usl-00995)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 7.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to theexamination of agenda item 7.b, which would begin with a general debate followed by the adoption of the individual decisions concerning the reports on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Bureau had previously discussed the working method on this item, which would be presented by the Secretary. However, the Chairperson proposed not to immediately examine the decision on the report submitted by **Azerbaijan** on **Chovqan, a traditional Karabakh horse-riding game in the Republic of Azerbaijan** [Draft Decision 13.COM 7.b.1] due to ongoing discussions requiring more time. Subsequently, the adoption of the chapeau for this item 7.b. would be set aside for later. All the other reports would be examined as originally planned.
2. The **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of item 7.b and was pleased to see that so many reports had been submitted in the current cycle, i.e. sixteen out of nineteen, which clearly showed the attention paid by States Parties to the viability of endangered living heritage and to the safeguarding measures taken to improve the situation. The number of reports was higher than in past years and thus the Committee should be mindful of the need for good time management. The Chairperson recalled the specific working method that the Committee may take for the examination of this item in consultation with the Secretariat and the Bureau, as previously outlined under agenda item 2, inviting the Secretary to provide specific details.
3. The **Secretary** explained that the Committee was tasked with the examination of sixteen reports submitted by States Parties on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Secretary proposed that the item be presented as a whole, including an overview of the sixteen reports analyzed, along the three main themes, namely: i) the effectiveness of the safeguarding plan; ii) community participation in the implementation of the safeguarding plan; and iii) the preparation of the report and the viability and risks associated with the element. Following the overall presentation, the floor would be open for a general debate, and States having submitted a report could share their experiences in preparing their report or on the challenges and opportunities linked to the safeguarding of their elements. After the closure of the debate, the Committee would move towards adopting the respective individual decisions for each report as a whole and without debate, unless otherwise requested. Once all the individual decisions were adopted, the Committee would then proceed to adopt the chapeau decision, paragraph by paragraph, and then as a whole.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his proposition and methodology. With no objections, the Chairperson invited the Secretary to present the item.
5. The **Secretary** reiterated that the Committee had to examine sixteen reports and provide a summary of those reports to the General Assembly in 2020. The table in paragraph 6 listed all sixteen reports, which included four reports for elements inscribed in 2013, nine reports for elements inscribed in 2009, three overdue reports for elements inscribed in 2011, and one in 2012. The table in paragraph 5 highlighted three reports from China that were expected to be examined at this session. However, as the Committee had examined the first reports on these elements during its twelfth session in 2017, the second reports were expected by 15 December 2018 for examination at the fourteenth session in 2019. Thanks to the generous voluntary contribution from the Republic of Korea, approved in 2016 by the Committee, an online reporting tool had been developed for States to submit their reports on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Latvia and Viet Nam volunteered and successfully submitted their reports using this online tool for two inscribed elements. The majority of the reports for this cycle were either the second ordinary report or a third report submitted by the States after submitting an extraordinary report two years after inscription. Due to the increasing number of second and third ordinary reports, the document highlighted the importance of States addressing the concerns raised by the Committee based on the examination of the previous reports. This year, for instance, the reports submitted by Brazil on the element ‘**Yaokwa, the Enawene Nawe people's ritual for the maintenance of social and cosmic order**’ took into account the concerns raised by the Committee through its Decision [8.COM 6.b](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/8.COM/6.B) taken in 2013, whereby the updated safeguarding plan was adjusted to further align the activities to enhance the cultural aspects of the element.
6. The **Secretary** would go through the key points raised in the sixteen reports along the three thematic lines. The safeguarding plans implemented generally emphasized the partial or full achievement of the objectives initially set out in the safeguarding plans contained in the nomination files. Two thirds of the reports stressed the importance of strengthening the capacities of the existing practitioners, as well as increasing their number. The establishment of training centres, the transmission of traditional knowledge through its integration into educational curricula, and awareness-raising activities were the most common activities. Eight reports focused on the importance of youth for improving the viability of the element. For instance, the safeguarding activities of the element ‘**Rite of the Kalyady Tsars (Christmas Tsars)**’ from Belarus included designing and integrating training courses for school children and creating practical workshops linked to the making of equipment related to tsars. Another example came from the report from France on the element ‘**Cantu in paghjella**’, which demonstrated the success of integrating traditional knowledge into educational curricula, increasing the number of school children attending the paghjella workshops to more than 500. Of the reports, 60 per cent signal broader threats that go beyond the cultural dimension, such as environmental and natural resources associated with the living heritage, and socio-political and economic contexts. The safeguarding plans highlighted the broad cooperation put in place among different stakeholders to address these challenges. The report from Guatemala on the element ‘**Nan Pa’ch ceremony**’ talked about the safeguarding activities designed to take into consideration the socio-political, economic and cultural realities of the communities. The safeguarding plan for the ‘**Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas**’ in Kenya also aimed to conserve and enhance cultural and natural heritage, as well as empower the Mijikenda community and their livelihood opportunities.
7. The **Secretary** then spoke of the case of Mongolia, where safeguarding activities were mainly conducted at the national level, thus portraying the important role central agencies play in safeguarding efforts. The reports on all four inscribed elements included safeguarding activities identified in the framework of the national comprehensive programme for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage from 2018–2025. This seemed an important action to streamline the safeguarding efforts and to have a coherent approach at the national level. However, as safeguarding activities for each element require specific challenges and needs to be addressed, details about concrete measures for the safeguarding of each element would help better understand the safeguarding strategy. Therefore, Mongolia was invited in the respective draft decisions to update the safeguarding plans and provide further details in its next reports. The document highlighted the importance of the International Assistance that had been granted from the ICH Fund to safeguard some of the inscribed elements. Such was the case for Uganda, which received International Assistance in 2017 for the community-based self-documentation and revitalization of ceremonies and practices associated with the ‘**Empaako tradition**’. A description of how this assistance had helped safeguard the element would allow the Committee to better understand its impact. States were generally encouraged to coordinate these actions with the ongoing safeguarding measures as per the submitted file. Overall, the majority of States reported that communities play an important role in designing, implementing and monitoring the safeguarding plan. An increased involvement of NGOs, associations and local governments had been emphasized, such as in the report from Latvia on the element ‘**Suiti cultural space**’, where details on the opening community participation approach for the preparation and implementation of the safeguarding plan had further led to a multiannual cooperation with Liv communities in Latvia and the Seto and Kihnu Island communities in Estonia. A similar approach could be witnessed in Kyrgyzstan for the safeguarding of ‘**Kyrgyz traditional felt carpets**’, as well as in Mali for the element ‘**Sanké mon**’ whereby the communities, as well as local organizations and NGOs, were involved in policy development for improving the safeguarding measures.
8. The **Secretary** further noted that about half the reports mentioned gender roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the safeguarding plan. These reports mentioned the increasing participation of women in designing and implementing these plans. For instance, Viet Nam on ‘**Ca trù singing**’ reports that 80 per cent of their practitioners are now women, and in addition, Mauritania’s report on the ‘**Moorish epic T’heydinn**’ referred to the importance of the involvement of both men and women in the implementation of the safeguarding plan. Overall, the reports mentioned the involvement of communities in the design and implementation of the safeguarding plan. However, it seemed that their involvement in the preparation of the report was still rather limited. Eight reports submitted in the current cycle included positive signals about the improved viability of the inscribed elements, in particular, through increased community participation. However, States signalled some risks affecting the viability of the elements; the most common risks stated were changes in demographics, urbanization and changing migration trends. Lastly, the improved viability of the element was sometimes linked with the possible transfer of the element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List, as was the case for the two reports submitted by Mongolia. The generous contribution from Japan to finance an open-ended working group and a preliminary expert meeting on some broader themes concerning the listing mechanisms would also allow for a reflection on these transfer issues.
9. The **delegation of Mali** thanked Mauritius for the good organization of this thirteenth session and the warm welcome. It congratulated the Chairperson, recognizing his leadership qualities in guiding the work of the Committee. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat for all its work and for the preparation of the quality documents. The Committee’s multifaceted support and attentiveness had resulted in constructive exchanges during the preparation of the periodic reports. Mali had two elements inscribed on this Urgent Safeguarding List and every time it prepared its report, it wondered when these two elements would leave the Urgent Safeguarding List, which was a major concern. Morocco in particular had shared the same concern. Mali remained committed to the implementation of the Convention, and especially inventorying, inscription and the promotion of the Convention.
10. The **delegation of Algeria** concurred thatthe issue of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List and their transfer to another List really needed to be addressed, and it invited colleagues to think about this issue more thoroughly so as to begin the discussion with concrete proposals for establishing new rules on the passage from List to List. The delegation referred to other programmes and Conventions elsewhere within UNESCO, for example, the Man and the Biosphere programme (MAB). Although small, the programme was very relevant to the planet, and the International Co-ordinating Council (CIC) of MAB succeeded in adopting the ‘exit strategy’[[10]](#footnote-10) in which at a particular time, when an element on the MAB List no longer met the criteria or if the reports were several years late, or if the situation changed over time, the element in question was placed on a list. In turn, a reflection ensues on how to get the element out of the situation, either by removing it from the List or by placing it on another List. This equated to having a more relevant follow-up of the elements inscribed, as currently [in the 2003 Convention] there was ambiguity about the future of these various Lists. The delegation recalled that the objective of the Convention, i.e. safeguarding, should not be forgotten.
11. The **delegation of Belarus** remarked that it had submitted both reports, its second periodic report and the third report on the state of the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It was delighted that both reports had been approved by the Secretariat and the expert community and hopefully by the Committee, which was a great honour and responsibility. These reports were completed with the participation of many stakeholders, namely, the bearers and the representative communities, experts, and volunteers from different NGOs. Both reports were based on the annual monitoring of intangible cultural heritage elements and research work. The delegation was grateful to the Committee for its recommendation on improving the safeguarding policy for intangible cultural heritage in Belarus, adding that reporting was a good tool for learning and understanding its intangible cultural heritage.
12. The **Chairperson** adjourned the day’s session.

*[Tuesday, 27 November 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 7.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**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**

1. The **Chairperson** began the session by explaining that the Bureau had revised its timetable at its morning meeting, following the previous day’s concluded items 1–7.a, including item 10.b.41 on the joint Korean inscription. The day would thus begin with the examination of agenda item 7.b before moving to agenda items 7.c and 8. The Committee would examine agenda item 9 in the afternoon session, and possibly the report of the Evaluation Body. The Chairperson noted that Norway had wished to take the floor in the previous session and was now given the opportunity to speak.
2. The **delegation of Norway** beganby thanking Mauritius for the warm welcome and great hospitality, and the Secretariat for its excellent work, which was highlighted in the report. Norway was pleased to see that the Secretariat was planning actions to raise awareness on intangible cultural heritage among organizations and stakeholders working on issues related to indigenous peoples, especially communication activities to be held during the eighteenth session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in 2019, which was considered to be of particular importance. The delegation informed the Secretariat and all the delegations that a colleague from the Sami Parliament had joined the Norwegian delegation in Mauritius and looked forward to exchanging ideas and practices in the coming days.
3. The **Chairperson** resumed the examination of agenda item 7.b, recalling that the Secretary had presented an overview of the sixteen reports in the previous session followed by a few interventions from the floor. The Chairperson then turned to the individual decisions. The first was submitted by Azerbaijan on **Chovqan, a traditional Karabakh horse-riding game in the Republic of Azerbaijan**, which had received an amendment from Armenia.
4. Explaining its position, the **delegation of Armenia** explained that contrary to the purpose and spirit of UNESCO, the Convention and the latest efforts by the Director-General to de-politicize UNESCO, it acknowledged Azerbaijan’s continuous politicization of this framework with the aim of extending dividing lines in the sphere of culture. The report of Azerbaijan presented in draft Decision 13.COM 7.b.1 on the status of the element Chovqan was said to be full of ungrounded, false and inappropriate allegations targeting Armenia. Instead of focusing on the Chovqan game, Azerbaijan connected the game to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and thus introduced a conflict narrative in the report. The delegation resolutely rejected all the allegations contained therein, which contradicted the reality and the position of the international community, as reflected in the statements of the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairs that deals with the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The delegation further explained that when Azerbaijan inscribed Chovqan, a traditional Karabakh horse-riding game in the Republic of Azerbaijan in 2013, a decision undertaken in Baku, it had warned the Committee and the Secretariat that it was a politicized and sensitive nomination. It had been assured that this was not the case. However, the report on the status of the element presented by Azerbaijan illustrated that Armenia’s concerns were justified, as Azerbaijan was said to have speculated on the very name of Karabakh. Armenia did not accept the misuse of UNESCO to promote any perceptions of conflict, and strongly believed that issues of conflict resolution should be entrusted within their respective formats and should not include UNESCO and thus impede international cooperation. Taking this into account, Armenia requested that the Secretariat return the report to Azerbaijan for corrections and adjustments to the norms and principles of the Convention and its Operational Directives and the implementation of the Convention in accordance with Decision [9.COM 5.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/9.COM/5.A) and Decision [5.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/5.COM/6).
5. The **Chairperson** asked Armenia to explain if it wished to replace the draft decision with its amended text.
6. The **delegation of Armenia** explained that it wished to amend most, but not all, the paragraphs, eventually opening the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
7. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** responded that it had agreed to postpone this draft decision on the understanding that Armenia would refrain from inserting politically motivated amendments to the draft decision, which it had failed to do. It was said that Armenia had misused its membership of the Committee for almost three years by introducing politically motivated issues to the agenda. The delegation believed that the Committee should not be taken hostage on this political agenda, which was mainly used for domestic consumption. Responding to the allegations just voiced, the delegation clarified that the national report was presented in conformity with the obligation to report on the element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List every four years following its inscription. Azerbaijan had made a huge effort in the preparation of this report to involve all stakeholders and to include the concerns of the community. It collected data from the stakeholders, and conducted surveys and interviews with the community representatives, mainly persons practising this heritage who were forcibly displaced because of the military conflict and the occupation of the territories. The report thus presented factual information on the concerns expressed by the communities practising the Chovqan game. In these interviews and surveys, the communities explicitly raised their concerns regarding the scarcity of the Karabakh horse breed, which plays an important role in this game, and this was clearly outlined in the nomination file and the report. This scarcity of Karabakh horses is closely linked with the destruction of the horse-breeding factory in Agdam, which had played a role in sustaining the breed and the game in the past, and this factory was currently under occupation and thus beyond Azerbaijani control. Concerning the inconsistency with the United Nations Charter, the delegation drew attention to one of the fundamental principles of international law, i.e. territorial integrity, and recalled Article 2.4 of the UN Charter that states “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state”. In the case of safeguarding the Chovqan game, the element itself bore the direct consequences of occupation by another State against its integrity, which prevented the communities concerned from accessing the natural environment of the game; a point that was clearly made by the communities during the interview and survey process carried out by the Ministry of Culture of Azerbaijan during the preparation of the report.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** reminded the Committee that this Convention was community-based, and one of the fundamental principles of the Convention was to give a voice to the communities and respect their views on how their heritage was safeguarded. Azerbaijan had followed this principle closely, as duly reflected in the report. The nomination explicitly reflected the threats that had impacted the viability of the element, which were as follows: i) the decreased number of trainers and practitioners; ii) the devalued culture of Chovqan as a traditional practice in the past; iii) urbanization processes within the country; and, most importantly, iv) the shortage of horses of the Karabakh breed. Of these four threats, two were indirectly or directly impacted by the military conflict and subsequent occupation of the territories: i) as a result of the urbanization process, and as communities practising this element were forcibly displaced from their natural environment; and ii) the destruction of the horse-breeding stable. This explained why in the report, among other threats, the natural environment of the Karabakh bred horses was cited as being beyond Azeri control. The delegation advised Armenia to look at the item which was presented by the Secretariat on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, so as to find very clear information on how conflicts and the forcible displacement of communities negatively impact the viability of the element. Thus, the conflict in Karabakh and its subsequent occupation had negatively impacted the viability of the Chovqan Karabakh horse-riding game. The report therefore followed the feedback of the communities who explicitly mentioned these threats, and the delegation totally rejected the amendments proposed by Armenia, requesting that the Committee adhere to the technical decision proposed by the Secretariat, and adding that the Committee was not the right place to get embroiled in this political debate.
9. The **delegation of Armenia** believed that this was not a purely technical report because the name Karabakh, as previously explained, was only used for political reasons. The delegation wished to hear the Secretariat’s perspective on receiving this report, which contained almost ten paragraphs that referred to the conflict, but also language that was not accepted by the international community. How did the Secretariat accept this report? When talking about intangible cultural heritage, Armenia stood ready to support any kind of nomination, except political ones. With regard to the root causes of conflict, the delegation referred to Article 1 of the UN Charter that cites fundamental human rights, the freedom of people to self-determination, and their cultural and educational rights. In this case, it was not about military occupation. The conflict had different roots and the Committee should stick to the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chair format, as this was the only format under which this conflict should be addressed. The delegation thus believed that the Chovqan game, included in Azerbaijan’s national inventory as being possible only with Karabakh horses, was just a political misinterpretation of the element. Regarding the communities, the delegation asked that the Committee not forget the communities who had previously lived there and who had been forcibly removed. Armenia did not seek to bring the Committee or UNESCO into a political game, reiterating its position that the report was unacceptable. It accepted that this was a national report made on behalf of Azerbaijan, but it was nonetheless unacceptable. None of the paragraphs presented were accepted by Armenia, with the report containing one-sided allegations. In order not to set a precedent for the future, the delegation asked that the report be returned to the submitting State and adjusted to the norms.
10. The **delegation of Palestine** spoke of itsownexperience in this kind of situation; although unfortunate, it was unlikely that the situation could be resolved or that a consensus could be reached. Having heard the two delegations’ concerns, it understood the position of each. However, in order to advance the Committee’s work, the delegation asked to close the debate so that the Committee could adopt the decision as it currently stood, while taking note of the statements made by the two States Parties in the oral report.
11. Having listened to the debate, the **delegation of the Philippines** also took noteof the important statements made. It seconded Palestine’s motion to close the debate in accordance with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure.
12. The **delegation of Djibouti** agreed with the position voicedby Palestine and the Philippines.
13. The **Secretary** remarked that a reference was made to Rule 32 on the closure of a debate. Rule 32 states that “a State Member of the Committee may at any time move the closure of the debate whether or not any other speaker has signified his or her wish to take part in the discussion. If application is made for permission to speak against the closure it may be accorded to not more than two speakers. The Chairperson would then have to put the motion for closure.” The Chairperson could therefore ask whether there was an application against the closure of the debate.
14. The **Chairperson** remarked that, in line with Rule 32, as stated by the Secretary, he asked whether any Member was against the motion of closure, as presented by Palestine and seconded by the Philippines and Djibouti.
15. The **delegation of Armenia** reiterated its position and its wish to discuss the draft amendments as they had been presented, and not to only consider Azerbaijan’s report.
16. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no additional Committee Members opposing the closure of the debate, as required by Rule 32. The debate on this item was thus closed.
17. Despite the closure of the debate, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** explained that the Committee had to proceed with the adoption of draft decision 13.COM 7.b.1 as per established practice, with any amendments presented requiring the support of half the Committee Members.
18. The **Chairperson** concurred that despite the closure of the debate the Committee should return to the amendments presented to the draft decision paragraph by paragraph.
19. The **delegation of Palestine** cited another Rule of Procedure seeking an adjournment of the debate on this item until the next day.
20. The **Chairperson** noted Palestine’s motion for the adjournment of the debate on this item, noting that according to the Rules of Procedure there could be one Member speaking against and one Member in favour of the motion.
21. Before proceeding with the deliberations, the **delegation of Armenia** reiterated its request to hear the Secretariat’s opinion regarding the reception of Azerbaijan’s report and the paragraphs therein, as it wished to hear its position regarding the reporting system, i.e. how it is done and the kind of language considered to be irrelevant or relevant.
22. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Azerbaijan.
23. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** reminded the Committee that the debate was closed and thus there was no opportunity to ask questions or seek answers. It thus proposed that the amendments presented by Armenia be put to the Committee for its consideration without a debate, which would then be supported or not by the Committee Members.
24. The **Chairperson** confirmed the closure of the debate, but if there was any Member objecting to a clarification by the Secretariat then he could not go against the Rules. However, he noted the presence of another motion from Palestine to adjourn the debate on this issue.
25. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatit seemed unlikely that a discussion or mediation between the two parties would be resolved, even with additional time. Thus, for the sake of saving time, and to avoid proceeding with the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, the delegation requested a secret ballot on the adoption of the draft decision, for and against the amendments in their entirety.
26. The **Chairperson** noted a formal motion by Palestine, and a point of order from Azerbaijan.
27. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** appreciated the efforts of Palestine, but it did not see the point of having a secret ballot given that a clear procedure established by the Committee already existed regarding proposed amendments. If amendments received support from the Committee, then they were accepted and adopted, or if no support was received then they were rejected. Thus, there was no need to complicate matters by going to a secret ballot or voting.
28. The **delegation of Kuwait** noted the heated debate, adding that the Committee appeared to be complicating matters. Rule 32 had been approved and the debate was closed. A report had been submitted by a State Party, with draft amendments presented by another State Party. The Committee therefore had to make a decision on whether or not it supported the amendments without complicating the situation further.
29. The **Chairperson** clarified the situation in which Azerbaijan presented its report, with Armenia proposing amendments to the report. The question was whether a Committee Member seconded the motion of amendment as presented by Armenia.
30. Having followed the debate, the **delegation of Cuba** noted the many proposals on the table, and it was thus important to know whether the Committee was being asked to examine the draft decision paragraph by paragraph, as there were many amendments proposed. Thus, the delegation sought clarity on the procedure for the adoption of the amendments.
31. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from the Philippines.
32. The **delegation of the Philippines** concurred with Cuba on taking the correct way forward, and, in view of the position of the States concerned, believed that for the sake of transparency it was best to go paragraph by paragraph, as per the usual procedure of the Committee.
33. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed that it would beclearer to proceed paragraph by paragraph, even if it would take more time.
34. The **delegation of Armenia** also wished to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, adding that it would make clarifications on the draft amendments if necessary.
35. Noting the consensus, the **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision paragraph by paragraph, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 3.
36. In paragraph 3, the **delegation of Armenia** wished to delete ‘expresses its thanks to Azerbaijan’and replace it with,‘takesnote of the submitted report’, as it could not thank Azerbaijan for such a politically-biased report.
37. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** appealed to the Chairperson’s wise ruling, noting that there were additional amendments to those initially presented. It thus proposed considering the amendments that had been initially presented in substance by Armenia, which if accepted or not would allow the Committee to move forward with the others.
38. The **delegation of Kuwait** remarked thatit had not seena draft amendment proposing to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, but rather that Armenia had proposed returning the report to the submitting State Party. Thus, for the sake of legal correctness, a decision should be taken on whether the report should be returned.
39. The **delegation of Cuba** sought to hear from the Secretariat [with regard to the proposed amendment by Armenia in paragraph 3], as the Committee should exercise caution in changing the standard wording used in draft decisions for States submitting a report, as this would present an exception. The delegation remarked that it was standard for the Committee to express gratitude to a submitting State Party for its report.
40. With regard to the comment made by Kuwait, the **delegation of Armenia** clarified that Committee Members could make any amendments to the draft decision at any point.
41. Outlining the situation, the **Chairperson** explained that the general consensus was to proceed paragraph by paragraph, and the Committee was now amending paragraph 3. Cuba had stated its view that the Committee should be cautious when amending a paragraph so as to not create a negative precedent. Azerbaijan also agreed with the broad consensus to continue on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
42. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that it would take time to go paragraph by paragraph, and it supported the intervention by Cuba regarding the technical language used in a draft decision relating to the reports, which should be maintained.
43. The **Chairperson** sought to hear whether a Committee Member seconded the amendment by Armenia, noting that Cuba and Palestine had expressed reservations, adding that the amendment could not be considered without support.
44. The **delegation of Cuba** wished to clarify that it was not questioning the right to modify any of the wording in any of the decisions, but that there was standard agreed language used when adopting these kinds of decisions on reports. The Committee had the right to change any words it wished, and it agreed with the idea of proceeding paragraph by paragraph. However, the delegation appealed to Armenia to accept that this was a point of formality rather than a point of substance.
45. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked Cuba for its constructive proposal, but it also wished to ask the Committee Members whether it could adopt a biased and political report, even though it conceded that the use of language was generally a technical issue, though not in this case. It explained that this type of report was also setting another precedent for UNESCO and the Committee should not solely consider the technical aspect of the language.
46. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the debate was closed and it was being asked to decide on the amendment proposed by Armenia, while taking note of Cuba’s remarks on the use of standard wording and its support to proceed paragraph by paragraph. The Chairperson therefore invited support for Armenia’s amendment to replace ‘expresses its thanks to Azerbaijan’ with ‘takes note of the report submitted by Azerbaijan’.
47. The **delegation of Cuba** understood the Chairperson’s attempts to facilitate the decision. However, it did not support the idea of a vote in favour or not in favour, as there was already a general consensus in the room.
48. The **delegation of Djibouti** explained that although it was its first timeparticipating in the Committee, it recognized the customary use of ‘expresses its thanks’ rather than ‘takes note’. Thus, there was no reason to alter the standard wording for reasons other than technical ones, and in this way, the other amendments could be treated more thoroughly.
49. The **Chairperson** reiterated that there was no debate at this stage.
50. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked thatthe discussion on the draft decision could take a long time and therefore—for the sake of transparency and efficiency— it made a procedural suggestion that Armenia present all its amendments to the draft decision as a whole so that the Committee could decide on the package of amendments.
51. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with the proposalby the Philippines on saving time by asking Armenia to present all its amendments as a single package for the Committee’s decision, without suspending the meeting.
52. The **delegation of Cuba** also supported the proposal by the Philippines and supported by Palestine, but wished to first settle the language in the first operative paragraph, appealing to Armenia to show some flexibility.
53. The **Chairperson** was grateful to Committee Members for their constructive efforts in resolving this exceptional situation. Noting the broad consensus, the Chairperson proposed suspending the discussion to allow Armenia to come up with a formal amendment that would be duly circulated for consultation.
54. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** agreed with the proposal by the Philippines, Palestine and others, adding that it responded to its earlier concern that additional amendments were being proposed on top of the initial amendments. In this way, the Committee would receive all the amendments so that it could come to a final decision. The delegation therefore suggested suspending the meeting for five or ten minutes, because it was important to adhere to the procedures and what had been proposed, accepted and supported by the Committee.
55. The **Chairperson** concluded that in light of the interventions, and taking note of the mood of the room, he would suspend the consideration of this report and request that Armenia incorporate all the amendments into the draft decision for circulation to the Committee. The Chairperson proposed moving to the next item and, following the examination of all the reports, return to the report of Azerbaijan and all the amendments proposed by Armenia for a final decision.
56. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Chairperson for his patience, clarifying that it would incorporate its amendments into the draft decision to present it as one single document.
57. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for its cooperation.
58. The **delegation of Kuwait** wished to know whether this proposal was the intention of the Philippines.
59. The **Chairperson** confirmed that this was indeed the intention of the Philippines and he suspended the consultation of the report and turned to the second report submitted by **Belarus** on **Rite of the Kalyady Tsars (Christmas Tsars)**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.2) **adopted**.
60. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Brazil** on **Yaokwa, the Enawene Nawe people's ritual for the maintenance of social and cosmic order**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.3) **adopted**.
61. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by France on **Cantu in paghjella, a secular and liturgical oral tradition of Corsica**.With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.4**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.4) **adopted**.
62. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Guatemala** on **Nan Pa’ch ceremony**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.5**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.5) **adopted**.
63. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Kenya** on **Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda**. The draft decision was projected on the screen, and with no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.6**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.6) **adopted**.
64. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Kyrgyzstan** on the **Ala-kiyiz and Shyrdak, art of Kyrgyz traditional felt carpets.** With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.7**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.7) **adopted**.
65. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Latvia** on **Suiti cultural space**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.8**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.8) **adopted**.
66. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Mali** on **Sanké mon, collective fishing rite of the Sanké**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.9**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.9) **adopted**.
67. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Mauritania** on **Moorish epic T’heydinn**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.10**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.10) **adopted**.
68. The **Chairperson** then turned to the four reports submitted by **Mongolia** on **Mongol Tuuli, Mongolian epic**, **Mongol Biyelgee, Mongolian traditional folk dance, Traditional music of the Tsuur** and the fourth report, **Mongolian calligraphy.** With no comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.11**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.11)**, Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.12**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.12)**, Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.13**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.13) **and Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.14**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.14) **duly adopted**.
69. The **Chairperson** turned to the report submitted by **Uganda** on **‘Empaako tradition of the Batooro, Banyoro, Batuku, Batagwenda and Banyabindi of western Uganda’**. With no comments, the Chairperson declared **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.15**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.15) **adopted**.
70. The **Chairperson** presented the final report submitted by **Viet Nam** on **‘Ca trù singing’**. With no comments, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.16**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.16) **adopted**.
71. The **Chairperson** then suspended the adoption of the ‘chapeau decision’ of this item, while awaiting the consolidated draft decision with the amendments by Armenia.

**ITEM 7.c OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/7.c*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-7.c-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*13.COM 7.c*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.c)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the last sub-item 7.c and the reports of States Parties on the use of International Assistance from the ICH Fund; an important means to take stock of the implementation of the Convention on the ground.
2. The **Secretary** explained that Article 24.3 of the Convention provides that ‘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’. This session presented ten reports, submitted between 1 July 2017 and 30 June 2018 and available through the hyperlinks in document 7.c in either English or French. They included the final reports of completed projects and progress reports for those still under implementation. Summaries of these reports were also available in the Annex to the document. It was noted that the reports represented only a portion of the ongoing projects. The second table included a list of all ongoing projects, making a total of thirty-three active projects for a total amount of US$3.3 million. Regarding the current status of implementation of the International Assistance mechanism, since the establishment of the procedure for International Assistance, forty-three States Parties had been granted financial assistance for a total amount of US$5.42 million in support of eighty-two projects. During the current reporting period between July 2017 and June 2018, 64 per cent of the requests approved were submitted by African States, representing US$3.47 million, which was in line with UNESCO’s global priority on Africa. It was also encouraging to see that 50 per cent of the requests granted during this period came from States that had benefited from International Assistance for the first time. As a global trend, the International Assistance mechanism experienced a broadened scope of projects financed by the Fund. Even though inventorying continued to be an important thematic focus, the projects were increasingly comprehensive, covering a wide range of safeguarding actions, such as awareness-raising, inventorying and capacity building.
3. The **Secretary** further explained that the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in education as an emerging theme had led to funded projects to develop pedagogical materials and courses and degree programmes specializing in intangible cultural heritage. Through the funded projects, it was also observed that capacity-building interventions had been an effective implementation method, as they directly responded to the needs of States to develop the necessary knowledge and skills for safeguarding. In this way, the International Assistance mechanism was clearly being utilized to strengthen capacities and provide concrete support to national safeguarding efforts. It was consequently becoming a critical component of the implementation of the global capacity-building programme. In other cases, certain States had required more substantive support and guidance from UNESCO in carrying out their International Assistance projects. In light of this need for additional support, UNESCO Field Offices were currently working with States to implement projects through an alternative modality of ‘provision of services’ from UNESCO, which differed from the mere granting of financial assistance. The Chairperson had already provided detailed information on this point, but the Secretary wished to further stress the importance of monitoring the implementation of International Assistance projects. Although the submitted reports were useful to quickly glance at the project results, it was difficult to assess the project outcomes in a more systematic and robust manner. The creation of the new team was thus both crucial and timely. The support provided by this team for the substantive monitoring and evaluation of the projects would help States safeguard their intangible cultural heritage in the long term. Finally, one last emerging trend was the increasing number of multiple requests of less than US$100,000 submitted by a single country, which would be discussed further under item 12.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and opened the floor for discussion or clarifications on the report as presented. He then invited the Committee to adopt the draft decision, after which States Parties were invited to share their experiences.
5. The **delegation of Colombia** wished to share its experience in implementing its project, Safeguarding of the traditional knowledge for the protection of sacred natural sites in the territory of the Jaguars of Yuruparí, Vaupés Province[[11]](#footnote-11), which was inscribed on the Representative List in 2011. Colombia had worked on this project from June 2017 to February 2018 thanks to International Assistance for an amount of US$25,000 and Colombia’s contribution of US$15,000. It was a very important project because the vast territory was very difficult to access and the costs for any activity were always very high, but thanks to this project the work was carried out together with six different communities in the Paraná around the Amazon. The traditional knowledge of these jaguars of Yuruparí is an organic knowledge from many of the autonomous communities in that territory who believe that their region is the lung of the world and a sacred area. Therefore, the system of traditional knowledge is a way of taking care of, protecting and administrating this region. The bearers, the shaman (who are called the jaguars of Yuruparí), face many threats, including the asymmetrical relationship that exists between the indigenous communities and the western communities within the region. The social organization of these communities has been centred around their cultural space and the transfer of knowledge generated around the sacred sites of the territory within this traditional knowledge system and other cultural elements that demonstrate how important these sacred sites can be. The framework of this project focused on working directly with researchers and indigenous leaders, the majority of whom were young. In the six different communities, one of the main elements was to work on the importance of sacred sites within the region by working together with local communities on the rituals and asking for permission to access these sacred sites so that a special plan for the safeguarding of this element could continue to be developed. Knowledge from traditional knowledge bearers with adults, as well as with young people, was gathered and trips were conducted throughout the different communities within the territory. Among the main results, twenty-four young people were learning about the traditional knowledge and the defence of the sacred sites, and six bilingual pamphlets had been drafted in indigenous languages of the area about knowledge, not only of the area but also with pedagogical material in order to educate 1,800 people who live in the region. This project was thus proof that intangible cultural heritage is a way of strengthening the communities themselves, but also for the development of the regions and territories.
6. The **Chairperson** returned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no comments or objections to any of the paragraphs, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 7.c adopted**. The Chairperson noted that some States Parties that had benefited from International Assistance and completed their projects wished to share their experiences.
7. The **delegation of Botswana** thanked Mauritius for hosting this important meeting and for its warm hospitality. The project, Promotion of earthenware pottery-making skills in Kgatleng district,[[12]](#footnote-12) was nominated in 2010 and inscribed in 2012, and sponsored by Flanders Funds-in-Trust. Botswana applied for International Assistance to implement the safeguarding plan in 2014, which was granted in November 2016. The project was supervised by Kgatleng district ICH Committee. The practitioners of the element were involved in designing and planning the safeguarding plan. All four master potters identified in 2010 were crucial in implementing the project, which included the 100-year-old master and others spanning the generations. Community involvement included engagement with community members in twenty-one out of the twenty-three villages. Traditional leaders and village development committees of the villages concerned were also consulted and they took part in the implementation of the project. Challenges associated with the project implementation included the following: i) of the twenty youth targeted, only seventeen were involved; ii) a lack of adherence to the taboos associated with the element; and iii) a delay in the development of educational materials led to a three-month extension of the project. Twenty-one trainees across the district were trained, including three men and one woman living with disabilities. The project achieved several milestones and included consultation, research and the identification of new trainees in twenty-one of the twenty-three villages targeted. In addition, the Department of National Museums and Monuments contributed US$8,000 for labour costs to fund the cultural space, and Kgatleng district council facilitated labour and ensured fencing was done. Twelve new living treasures were discovered and trainees successfully mounted an exhibition, which was widely covered by the media. Educational materials like booklets, audiovisual materials and brochures were also developed.
8. Having introduced its project earlier, the **delegation of Colombia** projected a short video.

*[A short film on the jaguar shamans of Yuruparí was projected]*

1. The **delegation of El Salvador** thanked the Chairperson and the Secretary, and presented its project, Titajtakezakan, speaking across time: oral tradition and use of information and communication technologies,[[13]](#footnote-13) which had been developed by ICH staff under the auspices of UNESCO and which offered training to young people to carry out fieldwork in identifying and documenting oral traditions. They were also taught to use ICTs in updating products, such as videos, and the use of web tools for promoting the project. Thanks to this project, young people had access to knowledge, history, legends, stories and myths that had been transmitted from generation to generation via interviews that were carried out by elders, the bearers of this knowledge in these communities. They also obtained skills that would help them in their academic careers, and they learned of their culture and community with a view to assessing their culture and how it could contribute to its safeguarding. A short video of the work carried out in the project was projected.

*[A short film of the project was projected]*

1. The **delegation of Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson on his election and expressed its gratitude to the Government and people of Mauritius for their hospitality. The project, Promotion of traditional pottery-making practices in Eastern Kenya,[[14]](#footnote-14) was granted International Assistance in 2016 and completed by December 2017. The aim of the project was to help conserve the technology of pottery-making practices, a cultural tradition that was close to extinction due to the introduction of plastics and metals, and formal education in three locations around the Mount Kenya region, namely in Mbeere, Tigania and Tharaka. The project achieved the following outcomes: i) research on pottery-making was conducted in all three areas and recorded on both video and print, which resulted in a DVD production and printed booklets; and ii) five groups were started to enhance pottery-making practices, five kilns were established, and five potters were taken to a factory-making area within the outskirts of Nairobi where they were each trained for seven days, after which they came back to teach members of their group. This activity was carried out in three schools in the three locations, and a total of 350 children were trained. A total of 67 adults and children were trained during a village workshop. In terms of education, 200 booklets and DVDs on pottery-making were produced and a short documentary was made, which was duly projected.

*[A short film of the potters of Eastern Kenya was projected]*

1. The **delegation of Lesotho** congratulated Mauritius for hosting this important event and for its warm hospitality. As a beneficiary country of International Assistance, it appreciated the support by UNESCO for its project, Inventorying of intangible cultural heritage elements in Thaba-Bosiu[[15]](#footnote-15), which was approved in 2016 and implemented in 2017. The project was supervised by the initial expert from Malawi, two national ICH coordinators, the Department of Culture [Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture], as well as the Lesotho National Commission for UNESCO. The project covered nine communities within Thaba-Bosiu, which is a historical landmark for Lesotho as it is a founding monument of the nation of Lesotho. The objective of the project was to contribute to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Lesotho and to raise awareness among stakeholders, such as communities, custodians, practitioners and civil society. Within this project, fifteen community members were trained as researchers and field workers, as well as five officials from the Department of Culture. Gender balance was considered in the selection of participants and it was also composed of youth from nine communities with the idea of instilling knowledge on the importance of intangible cultural heritage and its viability. Twenty-four elements were inventoried and documented and are now accessible on the national ICH database. Two of them were projected onto the screen. The reason for the selection of these two elements is that they were selected or considered by the consenting communities for possible inscription on the Representative List. This project was implemented within five months; however, there were some unforeseen challenges and the project was unable to meet its deadline, resulting in the late acquisition of funds, which in turn led to a delay in the implementation of other activities. This also impacted the production of some of the information material and the photographic exhibition. Nonetheless, Lesotho had benefited by expanding its level of expertise on intangible cultural heritage, as well as updating its national ICH database. However, there was still a need to reinforce its safeguarding plans, awareness and revitalization to increase its safeguarding mission and the appreciation of intangible cultural heritage and its viability.
2. The **delegation of Malawi** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to share its experiences of the project, Safeguarding of Nkhonde, Tumbuka and Chewa proverbs and folktales,[[16]](#footnote-16) funded under the ICH Fund. The delegation began by thanking Mauritius for its warm welcome and hospitality, and recalled that the project had been granted International Assistance at its tenth session in Windhoek, Namibia, in 2015. The objectives of the project were to build capacities to document intangible cultural heritage to improve the safeguarding of proverbs and folktales, but most importantly, to transmit the documented proverbs and folktales to younger generations. Activities of the project included the identification of informants and research assistants, training on inventorying, collecting and recording proverbs and folktales, the translation of proverbs and folktales, the development and printing of books of proverbs and folktales, the development and printing of dictionaries, conducting storytelling sessions, and lastly, producing materials for TV programmes. In total, 150 proverbs and folktales were collected and six books were published; three on proverbs and three on folktales. Three thousand books were printed, as well as 1,500 dictionaries, i.e. three dictionaries in the three local languages (500 dictionaries for each language), and 90 storytelling sessions at the national library in Lilongwe were held. Programmes were also run on the documented folktales and proverbs, many with the national broadcaster. The project had since terminated and the final reports included financial statements that had already been submitted to UNESCO. The delegation thanked UNESCO for its support and looked forward to future programmes.

*[A short film of the project was projected]*

1. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Government and the people of Mauritius for their welcome and for showing some of its cultural heritage. It also appreciated the preservation of the country’s green spaces, adding that it was gratifying to note and see how culture breaks barriers and contributes to the process of peace, as was seen in the case of the two Koreas. The project, Inventorying of proverbs of Lala community of Luano District,[[17]](#footnote-17) had benefited from an amount of US$25,000 from the ICH Fund in 2016 mainly for the inventorying of proverbs of the Lala ethnic group of Luano District in the Central Province of Zambia. This is a small tribe whose origins lay in Congo, but along the way many cultural aspects had been picked up and were now under the risk of disappearing. The project ran from September 2016 to September 2017. Despite the challenges faced, the project achieved its objectives. The team had to deal with the rough terrain, which was inaccessible to vehicles, by walking and riding bicycles to reach certain people who were key to the project. There were other issues related to the rural nature of the site, such as power sources. One of the unexpected challenges was the translation from Lala into English, and the team had to repeatedly ask for explanations about the proverbs so that they could be properly translated. In total, twenty custodians and practitioners were trained by UNESCO-accredited facilitators in inventorying intangible cultural heritage, focusing on the Lala proverbs. Through the practical exercises carried out during the training, participants successfully inventoried the Lala proverbs, which were now part of the national ICH inventory. To ensure the transmission of the inventory of ICH, the project team engaged teachers from the various schools in the area, as well as community leaders and chiefs in the district to create cultural groups, which—through this project—had become very active and were being used to promote cultural education among children and youth. They were also using established traditional structures to pass on the tradition. There had been no definite inventory at the time of the project in Luano, but since the project, an inventory had been established and one of the outputs, a one-page booklet entitled *Proverbs of the Lala Ethnic Group in Central Zambia*, was soon to be published. There was now an existing ICH Committee to ensure the momentum and to keep an eye on ICH actions, while the involvement of gatekeepers was deemed important as they were encouraging the educational and cultural groups to continue. The delegation was thus grateful to UNESCO for having provided the funds for the project, and it looked forward to continued partnership as it brought more inventories to the Committee.
2. Having thanked the States Parties for sharing their experiences, the **Chairperson** noted that Côte d’Ivoire wished to take the floor to share its achievements in the implementation of its ongoing emergency International Assistance project.
3. The **delegation of Côte d’Ivoire** thanked the Mauritian authorities for their kind hospitality, and UNESCO for its financial support of US$299,972 that had allowed for the project, Inventory of the intangible cultural heritage present in Côte d'Ivoire in view of its urgent safeguarding[[18]](#footnote-18). Started in 2016, the implementation of the inventory had been beneficial to Côte d'Ivoire in more ways than one. Culture professionals, communities and even academics had discovered with interest the concept of intangible cultural heritage, and capacity building, as well as the documentation of the elements with the involvement of communities, increasing their awareness of the value of their intangible cultural heritage. This was the first time that a systematic inventory had been carried out in Côte d'Ivoire with all the major administrative regions of the country involved, resulting in the identification and documentation of about 800 varied elements present on the national territory. Today, the country has about 500 people, men and women, whose capacities have been reinforced on the Convention, and who are now sufficiently equipped to carry out an intangible cultural heritage inventory and to develop safeguarding plans for elements that require them. The inventory confirmed the impact of the 2010 post-election crisis on some elements of intangible cultural heritage and the urgent nature of their safeguarding. This was the case in Bangolo, in the west of the country, with the destruction of sacred mask enclosures, exclusive places of initiation in this area, and which had led the Ministry of Culture to exceptionally grant the practitioners the means necessary for their reconstitution. The analysis of the inventoried elements made it possible to understand that, in spite of the cultural diversity characterizing Côte d’Ivoire, there were ethnocultural and linguistic similarities at the level of some elements, which showed that the communities living in Côte d'Ivoire were not so different and should accept each other and live harmoniously together. Intangible cultural heritage can certainly help strengthen social cohesion. However, some difficulties had been experienced in the implementation of this inventory. The non-compliance with the project schedule was due to certain events at the national level, namely, the general strike of state employees throughout January 2017, and the latest municipal and regional elections in September and October 2018, which mobilized most of the actors working on the inventory. Expenditures not included in the original budget had proved indispensable in the field during Phase 1, i.e. costs necessary for the identification and documentation of certain elements, and transport and subsistence costs of the inventory teams, which had led the State to reassess its financial contribution. In agreement with the Secretariat, Phase 2 was split into two parts so as to complete the project. Côte d'Ivoire especially wished to thank the Secretariat for its constant guidance throughout the inventory of intangible cultural heritage present on its territory.

*[A short film of the project was projected]*

**ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA**

**REFORM OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING MECHANISM**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/8*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-8-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 8*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/8)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 8 on the ongoing reform of the reporting mechanism under the 2003 Convention, which had begun after the seventh session of the General Assembly in June 2017 with the approval of the overall results framework and the revision of the Operational Directives.
2. The **Secretary** explained that the periodic reporting mechanism was currently under reform to enhance its quality, usefulness and timeliness by aligning it in part with the overall results framework. At its previous session, the Committee had requested that the Secretariat provide an update on the reformand on the transition period, which was due to last until 2020. The Secretary began by thanking the Republic of Korea for its generous contribution that had allowed UNESCO to carry on with the process of reforming the periodic reporting mechanism. Working document 8 contained two parts: i) [updates of the reform] concerning the initiatives taken by the Secretariat towards this reform; and ii) the calendar for the first regional cycle of reporting. The Secretariat proposed two options in this regard. With regard to the updates of the reform, the Secretary was pleased to report thatrevisions to reporting Form ICH-10 and the drafting of the Guidance Notes for the overall results framework were advancing well. These two aspects were moving in parallel because they were interrelated, i.e. progress on the revision of the form should inform the preparation of the Guidance Notes and vice versa. The other ongoing activities included the preparation of the capacity-building approach and the information materials, as well as the adaptation of the existing online reporting tool. Progress on all these activities would be reported to the Committee at its next session in 2019.
3. Regardingthe reform, the **Secretary** wished to clarify several points. Firstly, the statutory obligation for States Parties to submit their periodic reports on the implementation of the Convention and on the elements inscribed on the Representative List had been suspended for the deadlines of 15 December 2018 and 2019. This was also valid for late reports by States for the current or past cycles. Secondly, the procedure for reporting on the elements listed on the Urgent Safeguarding List would not change for now, in other words, the Urgent Safeguarding List reports remained a separate reporting system based on a quadrennial and inscription-year schedule. As already discussed under items 6 and 7.b, a global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention, as well as transfers and removals, would happen soon and would thus also be an opportunity to discuss the reporting on inscribed elements. Thirdly, the reporting procedure for States non-party to the Convention on elements inscribed on the Representative List would not change. The Russian Federation, the only State in this situation, would have to report every six years on its two former Masterpieces incorporated in 2008 on the Representative List, whose next report was therefore expected by 15 December 2020 [paragraph 169 of the Operational Directives]. Regarding the calendar, the Secretary explained that the Committee now had to establish the calendar for the first regional cycle of reporting, adding that it was important to keep in mind that one of the main advantages of moving to a regional calendar of reporting, rather than a ratification-based calendar, was the multiple opportunities it offered for more efficient and targeted capacity building, including peer-to-peer and neighbour-to-neighbour technical assistance and cooperation. The document presented two options for the Committee’s consideration. Option I, as previously mentioned in working document [12.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-17-12.COM-10-EN.docx) under ‘Draft amendments to the Operational Directives on periodic reporting’, consisted of a six-year reporting structure with each year dedicated to one of the Electoral Groups, as defined in the Grouping of Member States for the purpose of election to the Executive Board[[19]](#footnote-19). In this scenario, the States Parties of the first Electoral Group would start preparing their periodic reports in early 2020 and submit them to the Secretariat by the deadline of 15 December 2020. The Committee would then examine these reports at its sixteenth session at the end of 2021. At the same time, the second Electoral Group would start preparing reports in early 2021 so as to submit them by 15 December 2021 and for examination by the Committee at its seventeenth session at the end of 2022. This would continue with the other four Electoral Groups until the twenty-first session of the Committee in 2026[[20]](#footnote-20).
4. The **Secretary** then presented Option II, which followed a suggestion made during the general debate on amendments to Chapter V of the Operational Directives at the twelfth session of the Committee[[21]](#footnote-21). This option proposed following the same regional cycle of reporting currently followed by the 1972 Convention with five regions, according to the definition of regions included in the UNESCO Basic Texts. This meant a five-year calendar whereby Electoral Group I and Electoral Group II would report together in the same year under the region ‘Europe’. The sixth year would be dedicated to the evaluation of the periodic reporting mechanism and any necessary revisions, before initiating the next six-year calendar[[22]](#footnote-22). The Secretary then presented another crucial aspect, which was to decide upon the order in which the Electoral Groups or the regions would report, and thus avoid a situation whereby States Parties would be reporting to the 1972 and the 2003 Conventions in the same year or in one year after the other. A beneficial gap of two to three years between reporting would help to not overburden States Parties in terms of workload and resources. Based on this consideration, two scenarios were possible.Option I was based on the Electoral Groups structure. States Parties of Electoral Group III (Latin America and the Caribbean) would start preparing their reports in early 2020 so as to submit them by the deadline of 15 December 2020. Group I (North America and Western Europe) would follow with the submission of reports in 2021, followed by Electoral Group V (b) Arab States in 2022, Electoral Group V(a) Africa in 2023, Electoral Group IV Asia and the Pacific in 2024, and finally, Electoral Group II Eastern Europe in 2025. Option II was based on the definition of five regions as per Chapter I of the UNESCO Basic Texts. In this instance, Latin America and the Caribbean region would initiate this new reporting cycle in 2020, followed by Europe in 2021, the Arab States in 2022, Africa in 2023, and Asia and the Pacific in 2024. The year 2025 would be reserved as a year of reflection before initiating the new cycle of reporting.
5. The **Secretary** also wished to bring the Committee’s attention to some additional points. The calendar to be established would concern only the first cycle. After the sixth year, the Committee would have another chance to examine the situation before establishing the calendar for the second cycle. It was also important to note that regardless of the option selected by the Committee, States that had newly ratified or would ratify the Convention during the transition period would be given due consideration in terms of the amount of time between ratification and their first due report. In both options proposed, Latin America and the Caribbean countries would be the first to report in December 2020. If that order were confirmed, only two States Parties out of thirty-two (namely Jamaica and Mexico) that had reported in 2018, as part of the last batch of reports examined by the Committee under the old system in item 7.a, would have to report again in 2020[[23]](#footnote-23). Lastly, the Secretary informed the Committee that prior to this session, the Secretariat had written a letter dated 18 October 2018 to the Chairpersons of Electoral Group I and Electoral Group II requesting that they kindly undertake a consultation within their respective groups on the options presented regarding the reporting calendar for the first regional cycle.
6. The **Chairperson** opened the floor, noting that the Secretary had a point to clarify.
7. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that draft amendments had been received, which were presented on the screen.
8. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision paragraph by paragraph, andparagraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. A new paragraph 7 was proposed by Djibouti, which read, ‘Encourages the Secretariat to take into account, during the planning of the capacity-building activities, the debates of the present session which highlighted the needs of States, by giving priority to the States who expressed such requests in this field’.
9. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the amendment proposed by Djibouti.
10. The **Chairperson** noted no objections to the new paragraph 7, which was duly adopted. He then turned to paragraph 8 [previously paragraph 7], which was duly adopted. The Chairperson then asked the Secretary to introduce paragraph 9 with its two options.
11. The **Secretary** explained that during the morning’s Bureau meeting, the Bureau had received an email from Austria and the corresponding States Parties [Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland], wishing to opt for Option II with amendments as they appeared in the draft decision. The Secretary invited States Parties that wished to be added or removed from the list as established to make it known.
12. The **delegation of Palestine** supported Option II with the amendments as proposed.
13. The **delegation of** **Lebanon** also supported Option II.
14. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** adopted paragraph 9 as amended. Paragraph 10 presented a proposed calendar [from 2020 to 2025] for the periodic reporting on a regional basis. With no objections, paragraph 10 was duly adopted. The new paragraph 11, as amended, was duly adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, and with no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 8 adopted**.
15. The **Secretary** announced a roundtable organized on the global facilitator’s network related to the global capacity-building programme and how it supports countries with the implementation of the Convention. Facilitators from the different regions would speak about their concrete experiences of facilitating capacity building in countries around the world.

*[Tuesday, 27 November 2018, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 7.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**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**

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the unfinished business under agenda item 7.b and the proposal by the Philippines to allow Armenia the opportunity to present its amendments to draft decision 13.COM 7.b.1. The amendments had been communicated to the Secretariat and were incorporated into the draft decision, as was customary. The Committee was thus invited to consider the various amendments on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Outlining the procedure, the Chairperson explained that from the interventions he would be able to establish whether or not there was support for the proposed amendments. In case there was no support, the Chairperson would assume that the position was to adopt the original paragraph.
2. The **delegation of Lebanon** apologized for interrupting theproceedings, but wished to make clear that despite taking into consideration the concerns of Armenia, this was a cultural issue that should have been settled by negotiation to reach a consensus among the parties concerned and in the interests of the Committee. It believed that the vote, direct or indirect, was not an appropriate manner to proceed. For this principled position, Lebanon would not participate in the exercise.
3. The **Chairperson** took note andreturned to the draft decision, noting no support for the amendment by Armenia in paragraph 3, and the original paragraph 3 was duly adopted.
4. The **delegation of Armenia** disagreed with the adoption of paragraph 3 and wished it to go on record that it rejected the paragraph as it stood.
5. The **Chairperson** took note of Armenia’s position, and turned to the next paragraph, paragraph 4, with the amendment proposed by Armenia [acknowledging that the report was the responsibility of the State Party and did not reflect the position of the Committee and UNESCO]. With no voiced support for the amendment, the original paragraph 4 was duly adopted.
6. The **delegation of Armenia** expressed the sameposition, and did not agree to paragraph 4.
7. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 5 with the amendment proposed by Armenia [referring the report back to the submitting State Party for corrections]. With no support voiced for the amendment, the original paragraph 5 was duly adopted.
8. The **delegation of Armenia** rejected paragraph 5 as it stood.
9. The **Chairperson** then turned to the new paragraph 6 added by Armenia [calling on the State Party to refrain from using politicized statements].
10. The **delegation of Cyprus** regretted the situation, as any political language in the Convention should be avoided. Nevertheless, it supported paragraph 6.
11. The **Chairperson** remarked that the original paragraph would be adopted.
12. The **delegation of Armenia** clarified that paragraph 6 was a new paragraph and thus there was no original language. It maintained its support for this new paragraph 6.
13. The **Chairperson** concurred that paragraph 6 had been added by Armenia.
14. The **delegation of Cyprus** reiterated its support for the new paragraph 6.
15. The **Chairperson** noted thatthe new paragraph 6 was supported by Cyprus.
16. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** explained that in an earlier intervention it had stated its position that its report was not incompatible with the UN Charter, making it inappropriate to place special emphasis on it, as this language was already provided in a chapeau decision adopted by the Committee four years ago. Thus, there was no need to repeat it here in a draft decision relating specifically to the Chovqan game or the report.
17. The **delegation of Armenia** replied that the Committee was obliged to refer to some of the decisions adopted in previous Committee sessions because these decisions were not duly taken into account by some Member States. For this reason, the delegation wished to reiterate previous Committee decisions in this particular decision.
18. The **Chairperson** noted that there were two suggestions: Armenia sought to add a new paragraph, and Azerbaijan was of the view that there was no need for this paragraph as it was part of a chapeau decision, which had yet to be taken. The Chairperson asked the Committee whether it supported the inclusion of the new paragraph.
19. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** recalled that any proposals or amendments presented by a State Party had to be supported by at least half of the Committee Members, without which the amendment could not be adopted.
20. The **Chairperson** remarked that in case there was no active support, it was understood that there was no objection and it would be accepted as such, but in this situation, Armenia wished to add a paragraph supported by Cyprus, whereas Azerbaijan wished to retain the original draft decision. The Chairperson sought the opinion of the Committee Members.
21. Without taking a position on the language, the **delegation of the Philippines** recalled the discussions in the ad hoc working group and the Bureau regarding the decision-making process for draft decisions wherein, as announced earlier, the same decision-making procedure would be adopted as in the last session in Jeju, i.e. in a step-by-step approach. In case of an objection to an amendment, relative support would be sought on an informal basis, towards one third of the Committee, and thereafter if an objection persisted, then the Committee would go towards one half. Thus, in order to remain consistent with the procedures announced, the same procedure should apply, to see how many supported the amendment informally before making a decision.
22. The **delegation of Palestine** followed the same line as the Philippines in that the decision-making had been agreed upon, and in the case of an objection then active support would be sought, with a minimum of one third active support at this stage for adoption.
23. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked Cyprus for its support, reiterating its request to the other Members of the Committee to support this amendment, not because Armenia proposed the amendment but for the sake of UNESCO and the Convention, and because the report is indeed politicized.
24. The **Chairperson** noted apoint of order by Azerbaijan.
25. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** noted the resumption of the debate when in fact the Committee was already in the process of adopting the decision. It urged the Committee to proceed to the adoption of the decision as soon as possible without opening up the debate, as expressed by the Philippines and Palestine, requesting that the Committee follow the procedures that were adopted and recommended by the ad hoc working group.
26. The **Chairperson** wished to reassure the Committee that the debate would not be re-opened. The Committee was on the point of deciding whether or not to include a paragraph. The Chairperson sought active support, and the Philippines and Palestine expressed the opinion that in fact there was no active support to include the new paragraph. Thus, at this juncture, there was no active support to amend paragraph 6, which was deleted, and the Chairperson turned to paragraph 7 [now paragraph 6] as amended by Armenia [requesting that the Secretariat work with the State Party on the resubmission of its first report]. With no support voiced for the amended paragraph 6, it would also not be included in the final document.
27. The **delegation of Armenia** sought clarification as to whether the new paragraph as amended by Armenia had been deleted.
28. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the two amended paragraphs had been deleted.
29. The **delegation of Armenia** took noteof the deletion of the amended paragraphs 6 and 7.
30. The **Chairperson** returned to theoriginal paragraph 6, which was duly adopted. He then turned to the original paragraph 7, asking Armenia whether it wished to retain its amendment as it was linked to the previous amendment, which had not been retained.
31. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Chairperson for hisunderstanding, concurring that it was indeed a continuation of its amendments, and adding that following its adoption it would make an explanation of a vote for the whole draft decision as it stood.
32. The **Chairperson** asked Armenia whether it was withdrawing its amendment.
33. The **delegation of Armenia** did not wish towithdraw its amendment because it was an outcome of the amendment that was proposed before.
34. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no active support for the amendment in paragraph 7 and the original paragraph 7 was duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole.
35. The **delegation of Armenia** rejected the paragraphs of the draft decision as it stood and as a whole, regretting that this draft decision had been accepted by the Committee. It thus voted against this draft decision and found it unacceptable that the report had been approved.
36. Thanking the Committee, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** wished to speak following the adoption of the entire decision.
37. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 7.b.1**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/7.b.1) **adopted**.
38. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Committee for its decision regarding the status of the element Chovqan a traditional Karabakh horse-riding game, inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List since 2013. It was pleased to see that the efforts of the communities to safeguard this traditional game had been acknowledged by the Committee, and it appreciated the position of the Committee on this issue. The experience in preparing this report had been very important for all the major stakeholders involved in the safeguarding of Chovqan in Azerbaijan, which would contribute to monitoring the safeguarding process as a whole. The main community organizations linked to the element, Karabakh horses, amateur associations and the Azerbaijani Equestrian Federation would continue their efforts to reinforce the transmission and viability of the game, involving the communities concerned as widely as possible, especially young people, despite the ongoing threats to the element. Azerbaijan was committed to continuing its active safeguarding efforts by supporting the transmission and promotion of the element.
39. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had deferred the chapeau decision under draft decision 13.COM 7.b, which covered all the reports, and proposed going back to the chapeau and an amendment by the Secretariat to add a new paragraph 13.
40. The **delegation of the Netherlands** remarked that it had a question in paragraph 8, yet the Chairperson had already moved to paragraph 13.
41. The **Chairperson** thanked the Netherlands for recalling the need to proceed paragraph by paragraph, and he turned to paragraphs 1 and 2, which were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 3 that thanked all the States Parties for submitting their reports.
42. The **delegation of Armenia** reiterated its position regarding the report by Azerbaijan on Chovqan, adding that it did not thank all the States Parties, with due respect to the other reporting States.
43. The **Chairperson** took note of Armenia’s position and paragraph 3 was duly adopted. Paragraphs 4–7 were also adopted.
44. In paragraph 8, the **delegation of the Netherlands** wondered to what the word ‘threats’ referred, for example, did it imply threats to the environment, natural resources, or social and economic changes, adding that the draft decision would be used in the overall report prepared by the Secretariat and thus clarity was required.
45. The **Chairperson** agreed that a clarification was required.
46. The **Secretary** explained that ‘threats’ pertained to the broader context of threats to intangible cultural heritage, such as climate change, and other threats that require working outside of the realm of culture. Many of them would be environmental threats, but would also include demographic threats, among others.
47. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thereforesuggestedadding,after threats, ‘for instance the environment and to natural resources, and risks due to social and economic changes’.
48. The **delegation of Zambia** preferred to maintain the original wording and the general meaning of ‘threats’, as it implied both the threats affecting the element itself and the environment of the element.
49. The **Chairperson** asked the Netherlands whether it could accept the explanation by the Secretariat and the views of Zambia.
50. The **delegation of the Netherlands** agreed to withdraw its amendment in paragraph 8.
51. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraphs 9–12, which were duly adopted.
52. The **Secretary** presented the new paragraph 13[[24]](#footnote-24), explaining that this new paragraph had been the suggested and adopted language used in past decisions as a general principle to be respected in the periodic reports.
53. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretariat for its efforts in introducing this paragraph, adding that it was quite clear why this paragraph had been included and it expressed support for its inclusion.
54. The **Chairperson** pronounced the new paragraph 13 adopted. Paragraph 14 [previously paragraph 13] was also duly adopted.
55. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to disassociate itself from the draft decision, with due respect to all the other reports that did not have political aims.
56. Noting the reservations expressed by Armenia to the draft decision, and with no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision 13.COM 7.b adopted**.
57. The **delegation of Armenia** reiterated its request that all its expressed reservations be recorded in the summary report and also in the Chairperson’s oral report.
58. The **Chairperson** took note of the request. Before turning to agenda item 9, the Chairperson was pleased to recognize the presence of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Gender, Entertainment and Sport of Jamaica, Ms Olivia Grange, whom he warmly welcomed.

**ITEM 9 OF THE AGENDA**

**ISSUES CONCERNING THE FOLLOW-UP OF INSCRIBED ELEMENTS ON THE LISTS OF THE CONVENTION**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/9*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-9-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 9*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/9)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, noting that this was a new item, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that this was indeed a new subject matter, clarifying that the Committee was not being asked to make a decision at the present session on the establishment of a follow-up mechanism. Rather, the Secretariat wished to launch a discussion on this subject based on the experience thus far. The Secretary briefly recalled that the status of inscribed elements was currently monitored through two existing mechanisms: i) periodic reporting; and ii) the guidelines on the treatment of correspondence. Periodic reporting was currently the main mechanism employed to regularly monitor elements following their inscription, as presented in sub-chapter V of the Operational Directives. Reporting on the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List is undertaken every six years by each State Party on the implementation of the Convention at the national level. For elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, the status is reported every four years following their inscription. In both cases, this reporting mechanism encourages community involvement, yet remains State-driven. Importantly, periodic reporting does not allow for the possibility for communities and other stakeholders concerned to signal emerging situations that might occur between two reporting cycles. In addition to the periodic reporting mechanism, in 2012 the Committee established ‘Guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from the public or other concerned parties with regard to nominations’. In this regard, the Secretary wished to underline the distinction made in the guidelines between the correspondence related to elements nominated for inscription on the Lists and to elements already inscribed. Correspondence related to elements nominated for inscription is transmitted by the Secretariat to the State concerned in the language received. The State’s response, if any, is then communicated back to the entity that sent the correspondence via the Secretariat. Correspondence, which includes the letter received and the [subsequent] response from the submitting State, is made available to the Committee and the Evaluation Body *prior* to their respective meeting. Through this mechanism, the Committee has the oversight—by means of the Evaluation Body established every year—to assess the correspondence received on nominations. The mechanism for correspondence related to elements already inscribed functions in a different manner. When received, correspondence is transmitted by the Secretariat to the State concerned in the language received. The State’s response, if any, is then forwarded to the entity that sent the correspondence. However, the guidelines do not foresee the correspondence being brought to the attention of the Committee. In other words, unlike the mechanism foreseen for correspondence concerning nominations, communication only occurs between the State Party and the stakeholder or sender of the correspondence by way of the Secretariat. There is no mechanism foreseen to inform the Committee of the correspondence, even though it may pertain to important issues that affect the status of inscribed elements.
3. The **Secretary** further explained that since the inception of the Lists, the Secretariat had regularly received letters concerning nominated elements, inscribed elements or elements of intangible cultural heritage in general. However, in the past two years, these letters had significantly increased, with around 100 assorted emails and letters regarding the latest developments affecting the status and viability of an inscribed element. These letters concerned twelve different elements inscribed on the Representative List and the Urgent Safeguarding List, practised in ten different countries. From these twelve cases, it was observed that information pertaining to the changing status of inscribed elements was brought to the Secretariat’s attention by a wide range of stakeholders. More than a third of the correspondence came from the community itself. In addition, States, the media, NGOs, universities or individuals outside of the community were also susceptible to alert the Secretariat on emerging situations. Furthermore, some of the letters received were anonymous, and were thus simply registered by the Secretariat without being transmitted. Another characteristic of recent correspondence was the seriousness of some of the issues raised. For example, several cases relate to the introduction of policy or legislative measures restricting the practice of an element by community members. At times, these initiatives appeared to contradict the safeguarding measures described in the nomination file of the element. The lack of community involvement in the implementation of safeguarding measures was also a cause for concern in several cases brought to the Secretariat’s attention. Facts described in these letters could contradict Article 15 of the Convention, as well as criteria 3 and 4 of both Lists. In one case, representatives from the communities in question had expressed deep concern over the decreasing viability of their intangible cultural heritage and considered requesting the transfer of the element from the Representative List to the Urgent Safeguarding List. Some messages, however, raised rather unusual—if not sometimes absurd—issues. The range of cases would therefore also need to be taken into consideration when deciding on the most appropriate way to treat such correspondence.
4. The **Secretary** described how the Secretariat treated such correspondence. In application of the ‘Guidelines for the treatment of correspondence from the public or other concerned parties with regard to nominations’ adopted by the Committee in 2012, the Secretariat forwarded the letters to the competent authorities of the nomination concerned in eight cases. In five of these cases, the States concerned provided a response that was returned to the entity having sent the initial correspondence. In two cases, the exchange of correspondence led to improved collaboration between government authorities and the communities for the joint development and implementation of safeguarding measures. However, in one of these cases, the State concerned confirmed that recent measures taken did indeed restrict the enactment of the practice, contravening the safeguarding measures developed in its nomination file. In a few cases, the transmission of correspondence led to concrete measures that could ultimately improve the viability of the element. However, in most cases, the current system for the follow-up of inscribed elements had demonstrated a limited impact. In fact, once correspondence had been received, the sole option for the Secretariat was to transmit it to the State concerned without the possibility of informing the Committee, and regardless of the seriousness of the issues raised in some of the correspondence. These cases point to the absence of an effective mechanism that would allow the Committee to fulfil its mandate such that the Committee was oblivious to the evolving status of elements post-inscription. This invariably affects the credibility of the listing system and was thus the reason why the Secretariat had decided to propose the inclusion of this item on the current agenda.
5. The **Secretary** then spoke ofbroader considerations related to the reflection around the need for a follow-up of inscribed elements that the Committee may wish to take into consideration. Firstly, this concerned periodic reporting. In 2017, the Committee had decided to reform the periodic reporting mechanism and move to a rotational system on a region-by-region basis. This currently only affects the submission of reports on the status of elements inscribed on the Representative List and not on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Any development of a follow-up mechanism would need to take into consideration the ongoing reform of the periodic reporting mechanism.Secondly, this concerned the transfer of elements between Lists. A follow-up mechanism for inscribed elements could also be relevant in this context and could indeed make it possible for communities and third parties to provide relevant information to assess the effectiveness of a safeguarding plan. This, in turn, would provide information that would allow the Evaluation Body and the Committee to take a fully informed decision.Thirdly, there was the question of the reflection on the future of the listing system. Beyond the inscription process, this reflection could include a discussion on the possible need for a follow-up mechanism for inscribed elements, which appears to be important to guarantee the credibility of the Lists and allow the Committee to properly fulfil its mandate. Interms of the way forward, and with these broader considerations in mind, the Committee was a­­­­sked to consider ways in which it could be informed of changing factors affecting the status of an inscribed element. The working document lists a number of aspects that the Committee might consider important in envisioning the possible establishment of a full-fledged follow-up mechanism. These were some of the key questions: i) What would be the objectives of a follow-up mechanism? ii) Who could initiate the follow-up mechanism for a specific element? And on what basis? iii) Should correspondence be screened prior to its potential transmission to the Committee? iv) Who should be involved in the follow-up of inscribed elements? v) What kind of monitoring actions could the Committee potentially request? vi) What were the budgetary implications of establishing a follow-up mechanism? The establishment of a follow-up mechanism could be seen as being linked to a number of broader issues and ongoing reflections that are crucial for the future of the Convention. These include the reflection launched by the Committee in 2017 on the procedures for the removal of an element from a List and the transfer of an element from one List to the other, on the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register, and on the relevance of the various criteria for each of these mechanisms. Draft decision 13.COM 9 therefore proposed integrating the reflection on the establishment of a full-fledged follow-up mechanism into this broader reflection and into the mandate of the open-ended intergovernmental working group that the Committee had decided to convene in 2017 and which was generously supported by Japan.
6. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
7. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked on this interesting item that did indeed have a bearing on the future directions of the Convention. On the one hand, it was important to monitor elements as they change over time, as it also gives greater meaning and significance to inscription on the Lists, including the transfer of elements between the Lists. It also mirrors the system under the World Heritage Convention in which inscribed sites are regularly monitored and the Committee takes action to send reactive monitoring missions to include or even remove sites on the World Heritage List in Danger. On the other hand, there were risks of further politicization, as it would involve screening communications that could be received from a wide range of stakeholders. A different set of procedures was thus required to assess the communications and the responses of States Parties. It could also require consultation and dialogue with the States Parties concerned. The delegation noted that very few elements received communications. Nevertheless, it was a matter to study. It believed that the Committee should be informed and have a say in the process, in accordance with Article 7. Regarding the screening of communications, perhaps the Bureau or any other body could be tasked with examining communications pertaining to elements, which could be a subject of discussion during the experts meeting funded by Japan. Only in the most serious instances should a matter be elevated to the Committee. Follow-up was related to Operational Directives 39 and 40, which provide that the Committee can remove an element from the Lists when it determines that it no longer satisfies one or more criteria for inscription. Whether accredited NGOs could play a role in this process was another issue to consider.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for bringing up this issue of the follow-up of inscribed elements on the Lists prior to discussing the nominations submitted for inscription this year, and for the very detailed document prepared. It was indeed a very important issue, as mentioned by the Philippines, which was sometimes linked to the complexity of issues around intangible cultural heritage elements, including sensitivities between different stakeholders in the process of safeguarding post-inscription. The delegation was in favour of a careful approach on this issue. From the first look, it welcomed the practice established so far with the monitoring of the elements, using the reformed periodic reporting mechanism, and it favoured the continued treatment of correspondence from the public or other parties concerned with regard to nominations on the basis of the established guidelines. The delegation believed that the Committee had to be cautious in considering correspondence that had never been part of the nomination file as originally submitted, as they outline and delimit the scope of elements and practitioners, as well as the social and cultural functions of elements. Moreover, the Committee has no evidence to confirm or deny if correspondence fully, partially, directly or indirectly relates to the elements inscribed, i.e. there is no monitoring mechanism within the Committee to verify whether the information provided in the correspondence is true or not. Many intangible cultural heritage elements have sensitive issues linked to the relationships within and among the communities concerned, and the Committee should be cautious in taking a position without a clear picture of the situation. Finally, it also noted that any development in a possible follow-up mechanism would imply an additional workload for the Committee, the Secretariat and possibly for the Evaluation Body, as well as certainly having financial implications. In that sense, it commended Japan for generously supporting this task and the reflection on this issue, adding that it supported gaining more experience and reflection on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, and possibly revisiting this issue after a full six-year reporting cycle.
9. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the information provided and also for putting this item on the agenda, adding that the monitoring process was particularly important with regard to the state of conservation in safeguarding the elements inscribed. However, it required a reflection process to uphold the credibility of the Committee and the Convention itself. This mechanism could develop along the lines of the reactive monitoring system for the 1972 Convention, which today was causing certain problems as it had become politicized. However, from the document presented, it appeared that the system was not intended to replicate the system used in the 1972 Convention. Nonetheless, Members of the Committee had to reflect on this issue fully, as well as States Parties to the Convention, in order to find a way of monitoring the elements without politicizing the Committee and without generating further problems seen in the 1972 Convention when cases are examined under a reactive monitoring system. The delegation surmised that the Committee could consider how—within the report of the State Party—to include replies to States on specific questions that pose a problem. The delegation conceded that it was perhaps easier to identify a problem in the 1972 Convention because it concerned tangible heritage and specific safeguarding measures, which was more difficult to ascertain in the case of intangible cultural heritage when an element can have manifestations throughout a country. For example, there might be issues related to a specific place without that implicating the element as a whole. Nevertheless, there must be a process in which dialogue with the States Parties is given deserved attention in order to find the best way to implement the Convention and safeguard intangible cultural heritage.
10. The **delegation of the Netherlands** noted that theSecretariat had clearly stated that information from different stakeholders on the changing situation of the elements, or concerns from communities about inscribed elements of intangible cultural heritage, was at stake, for which a follow-up mechanism was needed. The delegation believed that a mechanism of mediation that focused on mapping certain problems and finding ways to solve these problems could be a starting point or first phase in which States Parties and experts could play a role. In this way, the Ethical Principles, as referred to in paragraph 3 of the draft decision and in agenda item 5, could be applied, “to provide ways for communities and civil society to participate more directly in monitoring of inscribed elements”. The delegation understood that this would be part of the broader discussion in the expert working group supported by Japan.
11. The **delegation of Colombia** supported the Secretariat’s proposal to initiate a discussion and reflection on follow-up mechanisms for elements inscribed on the List, adding that it could benefit the communities by following up on elements, but it could also serve as a tool to be used by States by their national administration. It believed that aspects of the Convention could borrow from other Conventions and this would no doubt be discussed. The delegation provided its full technical support to this new proposed reflection.
12. The **delegation of Austria** understood that the growing number of letters of concern regarding the status of inscribed elements required a creative solution and additional resources, and it strongly agreed that communities, bearers, civil society and NGOs should be involved in the monitoring of inscribed elements. It believed that bottom-up approaches and dialogue were the best way forward and in this regard there was a need for a platform for exchange, dialogue and reflection, as previously mentioned by the Netherlands. The delegation then spoke of an exemplary meeting that was organized by the National Commissions of Germany, Luxembourg, Switzerland and Austria in 2018. Based on the individual experiences gained from the implementation of the Convention on the national level, community representatives, bearers, intangible cultural heritage experts, official bodies and media representatives from four European countries shared and discussed challenges, but also the positive developments and outcomes encountered before and after the inscription of elements. Issues discussed included topics such as gender, minority rights, commercialization and animal rights. Dealing with these issues is indeed very complex and highly sensitive, but experience has shown that a transparent and inclusive dialogue and reflection with all the stakeholders involved can foster mutual respect and understanding. As presented by the Secretariat, there were many serious questions on the follow-up of inscribed elements that required reflection, and which go beyond the scope of the discussions here. The delegation thus expressed its gratitude to Japan, whose generous contribution would allow for a thorough discussion of these sensitive and important issues at an expert level.
13. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
14. The **delegation of Belgium** thanked and congratulated Mauritius for its hospitality and the excellent organization, adding that this agenda item was very interesting and important as it was high time to start discussing the follow-up of inscription of the elements on the Lists and their associated safeguarding practices. Regarding the involvement of communities, groups and individuals, as emphasized *inter alia* in Article 15 of the Convention, the delegation noted in this and other documents that often only communities are mentioned, sometimes even in singular form. It had been remarked on several occasions that it would be best to avoid this reductionist interpretation and to stick as closely to the Basic Texts as possible, i.e. to systematically mention ‘communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals’. Regarding the number of steps that seem to be missing before and between the reception of the letter and comments on the one hand, and the possible examination by the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, the Bureau, or even the Committee on the other, there is a whole range of possible prevention, mediation and mitigation stages that could be developed in between, as mentioned by the Netherlands. There are thus several possibilities, and the first option would be to start working on the interactive online platform with ethical tools, which had already been decided and requested by the Committee in Windhoek in 2015 in its Decision [10.COM 15.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/15.a). This would help develop and share a set of forms, documents or procedures, much like the forms of prior informed consent, as mentioned in Ethical Principle 4[[25]](#footnote-25), and help avoid a number of problems and thus facilitate mediation. It would also be a way to involve NGOs and other stakeholders in finding solutions. Thus, it would be important to find a form of mediation, which could take the form of an ethical committee or a number of mediation committees to try and solve problems in a lighter way that could involve specialized mediators, NGOs and other actors without adding to the burden of the Evaluation Body. The delegation thus advocated for a lighter mediation structure using the resources and wisdom available among the many actors working on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, while following up on Decision 10.COM 15.a in its paragraphs 9 and 10.
15. The **delegation of Armenia** joined in the remarks made by Austria, adding that culture, especially intangible cultural heritage, is a tool to bring about peaceful global transformation, and to preserve and to pass the unique customs, traditions and national cultural expressions to future generations that would otherwise have disappeared. The role of the bearers in the communities was thus crucial and important. The delegation also wished to see more scrupulous screening of the nomination files so as to avoid receiving negative opinions, especially when the communications come from public NGOs or from one or more States, which should serve as a warning alarm for the Evaluating Body and the Secretariat.
16. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Secretariat for tackling this important issue in the implementation of the Convention. The monitoring mechanism is indeed a tool for evaluating elements already inscribed on the Representative List, which was essential and should therefore be entrusted to a working group body so as to advance the issue. The delegation felt that it was also important to recall that the communities, the custodians of intangible cultural heritage, have an internal system to regulate and manage the element and that any mechanism must take this into account. It was also important for the Secretariat to pay due attention and adequately screen any correspondence.
17. The **delegation of Algeria** had afew comments to add to earlier remarks made on the subject of the evaluation and monitoring of inscribed elements and wondered whether it was possible for the Secretariat, without adding to its burden, to develop an online questionnaire on this subject such that the survey of opinion among States Parties could be prepared prior to the open-ended working group meeting. The delegation also wished to know whether the legal texts of the Committee and the Convention would have to be changed once the proposals on the follow-up of the inscribed elements inscribed on the List had been adopted, given the legal implications that would result, as this should also be taken into consideration at the time of adoption. With regard to monitoring, the delegation wished to know how this would be done, but that in any case it was essential for the communities to be involved. Also, to avoid any form of politicization, it might be necessary to limit the representatives to those who are directly affected by the inscription, i.e. those who participated in the inscription process and who are involved and represent the whole community. In addition, the Committee should be given the opportunity to initiate a field investigation to determine the extent of damage to a listed element, which could be carried out by category 2 institutes, facilitators or other stakeholders, but that a field survey could be a good solution in such a situation.
18. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to shed light on the few points raised by Algeria.
19. The **Secretary** thanked all the delegates who had intervened and had raised multiple issues, which showed the complexity of the issue at hand, reiterating that the purpose was to initiate a discussion that would indeed require several steps and multiple consultations. With regard to the issues around screening, the Secretary noted the diversity of issues, and ideas like informal mediation, the need to be cautious, the need to have people, groups, communities and in some cases individuals fully involved when they are related to the nomination. The Secretary also found the comments by Cuba highly pertinent in that the monitoring of intangible cultural heritage should not be seen in the same way as the monitoring of sites and monuments because the implications were very different. The Secretariat certainly looked forward to receiving ideas, and the Secretary thanked the Government of Japan once again for making it possible to reflect on this issue. Electronic surveys could be one means, and incorporating this issue into other discussions would be another. Nevertheless, it was worth continuing this reflection and discussion, although it was still very early to come up with any concrete suggestions.
20. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraph 1 was duly adopted.
21. The **delegation of the Philippines** proposed a slight amendment in paragraph 2 that recalled Article 7 of the Convention, explaining that Article 7 of the Convention concerned the functions of the Committee and it should therefore be the locus of any monitoring if decided, which was duly adopted.
22. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the decision, and paragraphs 3 and 4 were duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 5 and the minor amendment by the Netherlands and Austria and the insertion of ‘groups, and where applicable, individuals’.
23. The **delegation of the Philippines** felt that paragraph 5 supposed preempting or prejudging the discussion with its use of ‘to strengthen’, but from the recent discussion it was clear that there were many suggestions and no real answers yet, and the process was only just beginning. Hence, the delegation suggested replacing ‘to strengthen’ with ‘to reflect on’, and delete ‘to provide’ and ‘more directly’, as this better reflected the earlier discussion.
24. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** supported the amendment proposed by the Philippines, which reflected the debate.
25. The **delegation of Cuba** also supported the proposal by the Philippines. Regarding the proposal by the Netherlands and Austria, it felt that opening up a list of possible stakeholders or persons involved right now could make matters more complicated, as they could also include research centres, universities, and other entities that were not necessarily linked to the State, which would open up a new debate. The delegation felt that it should perhaps be left to the community representatives speaking on the follow-up of inscribed elements, as the list itself could be never-ending as other actors could also be fundamental to participation.
26. The **delegation of Senegal** strongly supported paragraph 5, as it encouraged an inclusive and participatory monitoring mechanism on behalf of communities, which was extremely important.
27. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed thata reflection was necessary and supported the proposal by the Philippines. Taking the same line as Cuba, it agreed that the proposal by the Netherlands and Austria would open up a list of unending parties concerned, and there was no need to restrict the list. The delegation therefore suggested either retaining ‘ways for communities and concerned stakeholders’ or deleting it completely and simply use ‘communities’ or ‘concerned parties’ instead of ‘groups, individuals’, not least because communities was understood among Members and experts as a general term.
28. The **delegation of Colombia** supported the proposal by the Philippines, and echoed the proposal by Cuba to mention ‘communities and other stakeholders’ and to leave it at that because every country involved its people, communities or centres that were really different from case to case. Moreover, ‘communities and stakeholders’ already covered all the possible participants.
29. The **delegation of Poland** supported the amendment by Austria and the Netherlands, as it adhered to the language of the Convention.
30. The **delegation of Armenia** fully supported the amendment by Austria and the Netherlands, noting Palestine’s inclusion of ‘other concerned stakeholders’ or ‘other concerned parties’ to have the widest coverage possible as intangible cultural heritage elements really concerned people, the actual bearers.
31. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported the amendment by Cuba, Palestine and others, as reflected in paragraph 5.
32. The **Chairperson** noted two proposed amendments in that one ‘reflected’ instead of ‘strengthening’, which had consensus, and the second was whether the sentence should be limited to communities or be extended beyond the communities.
33. The **delegation of Austria** clarified that the only reason it brought up the amendment was to adhere to the standard language of the Convention, as also mentioned by Belgium.
34. The **delegation of Djibouti** agreed that this document was very important with regard to the follow-up, as highlighted by previous speakers. In addition to communities and civil society, it also wished to add ‘practitioners’ and ‘bearers’.
35. The **Chairperson** noted that Djibouti proposed more precise language that included ‘practitioners and bearers’ in place of ‘communities’, adding that it was not extending the scope too widely, while being more targeted.
36. The **Secretary** remarked that the Committee had once again returned to the question of ‘what are communities?’, which, although not specifically defined in the Convention, was generally understood to encompass practitioners and bearers, just as the communities (the practitioners and bearers) are identified throughout the nomination files. The Secretary concurred that ‘communities, groups and, in some cases, Individuals’ was the language used in the Operational Directives, which was understood to imply ‘practitioners and bearers’. This had been the practice for a number of years, particularly since the tenth session of the Committee. Thus, with the kind understanding of Djibouti, one could definitely consider ‘communities’ as the practitioners and bearers. The question as to whether to maintain the language ‘communities, groups and individuals’ that had been used since the Committee’s tenth session was in fact a decision for the Committee in this case.
37. The **delegation of Palestine** aligned with the remarks made by the Secretaryregarding the use of the terms ‘practitioners and bearers’ and ‘communities, groups and individuals’, as it was indeed the language contained in the Operational Guidelines. It was thus up to the Committee to decide on the preferred language.
38. The **delegation of Cuba** expressed concern in that the need for reflection right now was not simply about thinking about the way in which communities and individuals would to be able to work and contribute, which was implied by limiting this paragraph, but also about how to improve the safeguarding measures in terms of management. The aim of the reflection was thus to offer an easier path for communities and groups to be able to participate, and thus it needed to be wide-ranging to allow for opportunities to engage, thus the wording should be broader and a simplified version of the text would allow for this.
39. The **delegation of Lebanon** supported the proposal by the Philippines ‘to reflect on’ the follow-up, but also on the use of ‘communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals’, which is the language of the Convention.
40. The **delegation of China** echoed the proposal by Palestine and Colombia to add ‘other concerned stakeholders’ after ‘communities’, and it also suggested deleting ‘civil society’ as this was implied with ‘other concerned stakeholders’. Moreover, the wording of the decision should remain simple and precise.
41. Having listened to the suggestions, the **delegation of the Philippines** proposed a compromise text that took into consideration Lebanon’s remark to adhere to the language of the Convention and the Operational Directives, and also China’s remark to delete ‘civil society’, which is not mentioned in the relevant Article 1 of the Operational Directives. It was noted that the language in Operational Directive 16 read, “concerned communities, groups, and if applicable, individuals”.
42. The **delegation of Poland** favourednot only simplifying the wording but directly adhering to the language of the Convention so as not to create new definitions through the use, for example, of practitioners and bearers, which is understood by ‘communities’. The delegation therefore supported the language ‘communities, groups, and if applicable, individuals’ so as to avoid any misunderstandings.
43. The **Secretary** clarified that the text could be found under Article 15 of the Convention, which read, “communities, groups and, where appropriate, individuals that create, maintain and transmit such heritage […]”. The Secretary suggested referring directly to the language of the Convention to save time, not least because this issue had been debated before. The question therefore was whether to retain ‘other concerned stakeholders’.
44. The **delegation of Senegal** fully supported the remarks by the Secretary to use the language of the Convention because ‘communities’ was more inclusive and therefore appropriate.
45. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus among the Committee Members.
46. The **delegation of the Philippines** could go along with the suggestion to track the language of the Convention or the Operational Directives, adding that Operational Directive 16 referred specifically to ‘concerned communities’, which could be a useful way to address all the concerns. Thus, the text would read, ‘concerned communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals’, and the rest of the amendment could be deleted, including ‘civil society’.
47. Given the long debate, the **Chairperson** suggested following the guidance of the Philippines.
48. On a technical issue, the **delegation of Palestine** asked that the paragraph bemade clear by keeping only the last proposal presented by the Philippines.
49. The **Secretary** asked that the names of the supporting Members be removed so as to obtain a clearer reading of the sentence. The new paragraph would now read, ‘recognizes the need to reflect on the follow-up of inscribed elements and ways for concerned communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals to participate in the monitoring of inscribed elements’.
50. The **delegation of the Netherlands** remarked thatthe word ‘concerned’ was not the standard language of the Convention and that its addition implied that only the ‘concerned communities’ could participate and no other communities, which would therefore have the effect of narrowing down ‘communities, groups and individuals’.
51. The **delegation of Austria** did not seek to extend the discussion but felt that the paragraph should include other stakeholders involved in the monitoring of the element outside the ‘concerned communities, groups and individuals’ such as academia and other communities. In this regard, the delegation preferred to retain China’s amendment that included ‘all other stakeholders’ so as not to redefine ‘communities, groups and individuals’.
52. The **delegation of Palestine** supported its initial proposal.
53. The **Chairperson** asked that this be taken into account following the observations.
54. The **delegation of Poland** remarked that Austria had just expressed its own concern regarding stakeholders, as it was very important to include, for example, the scientific community and others who are involved in supporting the safeguarding of the element. It thus proposed retaining ‘other stakeholders’.
55. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Committee was close to finalizing the text.
56. The **delegation of the Philippines** was of the understanding that the text should track the language of the Convention and the Operational Directives, as ‘other stakeholders’ was in neither the relevant Article of the Operational Directives nor the Convention. However, it would not oppose the text should the Committee wish to expand the scope.
57. The **Chairperson** believed that the Committee should, as far as possible, adhere to the Convention in terms of harmonized language.
58. The **Secretary** proposed wording in place of ‘other stakeholders’ that would read, ‘recognizes the need to reflect on the follow-up of inscribed elements and ways in particular for concerned communities, groups and where applicable, individuals’, adding that ‘ways in particular’ placed emphasis on the communities, groups and individuals concerned but not on their exclusivity, i.e. it was not exclusive to them, and thus ‘other stakeholders’ could be deleted.
59. The **delegation of Palestine** felt that the proposed wording had rendered the sentence confusing because ‘ways in particular’ suggested ways to reflect on the follow-up of inscribed elements, with particular ways for parties concerned to participate in the monitoring.
60. The **delegation of the Netherlands** felt thatthe suggestion by the Secretariat was correct if ‘in particular’ was placed in front of ‘concerned communities’, whereas if placed afterwards it would refer ‘to the ways’ as understood by Palestine. Thus, the paragraph would read, ‘recognizes the need to reflect on the follow-up of inscribed elements and ways in particular for concerned communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals to participate in the monitoring of inscribed elements’.
61. The **delegation of the Philippines** supported the wording proposed by the Netherlands.
62. Referring once again to the language of the Convention, the **delegation of Poland** recalled that this exact formula could be found in the recently adopted overall results framework in the Basic Texts, which included groups, communities and ‘other stakeholders’ for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Thus, this was not new but rather a repeat of text already adopted. The delegation thus preferred to retain ‘other stakeholders’ in the paragraph.
63. The **Secretary** noted that Poland sought to retain ‘other stakeholders’ and delete ‘in particular’.
64. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to move forward and could agree with the wording as presented, adding that it simply sought to track the language of the Convention that defined communities, and thanked Poland for its reflection and reference to another part of the Operational Directives.
65. The **Chairperson** then turned to paragraph 6 as amended, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 7 was also adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 9 adopted**.

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2018**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/10*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 10*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10)

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that in the previous day’s session it had adopted Decision 13.COM 10.b.41 to inscribe ‘Traditional Korean wrestling (Ssirum/Ssireum)’ on the Representative List, and he thanked everyone for the spirit of cooperation that made this historic inscription possible. The Chairperson then resumed the examination of item 10 and the report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2018. He took the opportunity to note the generous contribution of the Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud Foundation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in support of Arabic interpretation during the examination of nominations, proposals and requests. The Chairperson then invited the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr John Moogi Omare from Kenya, the Vice-Chairperson, Mr Eivind Falk from the Norwegian Crafts Institute, and the Rapporteur, Ms Eva Kuminkova from the Czech Ethnological Society to join the podium.
2. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had established the Evaluation Body at its twelfth session in Jeju Island, Republic of Korea, to evaluate: i) nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List; ii) nominations to the Representative List; iii) proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices; and iv) requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000. The Chairperson explained that the Committee would begin item 10 and its four sub-items with the oral report by Ms Eva Kuminkova on a number of cross-cutting and specific issues raised during the Body’s work on the four mechanisms. The floor would then be opened to Committee Members who were asked to restrict their interventions to concern only issues raised in its report. The general debate on this item would take place after the evaluation of all the individual files, at which point the Committee would move to the adoption of the overall Decision 13.COM 10. The Committee was asked to first examine nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List (item 10.a), followed by nominations to the Representative List (item 10.b), proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (item 10.c), and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 (item 10.d). These would be accompanied by a brief presentation by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body and an explanation justifying the draft decision, along with photos projected on the screen. Concerning nominations recommended for referral, the Chairperson recalled that in conformity with Decision[9.COM 13.c](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/13.c) in 2014, the Evaluation Body would recommend a referral only in the case of information lacking in a nomination, whether of a technical or substantive nature. The submitting State could resubmit the referred file in the following or future cycle. It was noted that referred files that were resubmitted in another cycle would be considered as new nominations and therefore subject to the overall ceiling of files and the priority system described under paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives.
3. With the heavy task ahead with forty-six files to be examined, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that during its meeting on 2 October, the Bureau had agreed to adopt the same procedure as previous years, that is, Committee Members wishing to discuss or amend specific draft decisions should inform the Secretariat prior to the session. In this regard, a message had been sent on 15 November [2018] by the Secretariat to all Committee Members informing them of this working method. The Chairperson reassured the Committee that this procedure did not prevent any Member from taking the floor on any decision. The Secretariat had confirmed that two nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and six nominations to the Representative List had received requests for debate, and two files had been withdrawn. Regarding the working method for the adoption of draft decisions, in principle, the Committee proceeded with the adoption of draft decisions for which amendments were submitted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. For other decisions, they would be expected to be adopted as a whole. As was customary, the submitting State would be given two minutes for comments after adoption. The Chairperson also clarified the procedure with regard to amendments to the draft decisions on nominations, particularly in light of Decision [11.COM  8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/8), as well as the discussions of the informal ad hoc working group over the past two years and which had been the subject of numerous discussions during its meetings. These points would be further discussed under agenda item 16, which provided the opportunity to fully debate these ideas. Taking into consideration the outcomes of these meetings[[26]](#footnote-26), the Chairperson applied the following working method for the present examination of the nomination files under item 10 in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee. As reflected in Decision 11.COM 8, the spirit of consensus would prevail in the debates, and the Chairperson reminded the Committee that the draft decisions had been prepared by the Evaluation Body whose members were elected from candidates proposed by the Committee. The debates and the decision-making process should thus demonstrate respect towards the expertise and diligent work of the Evaluation Body.
4. The **Chairperson** further explained that in conformity with the decision made in 2017, he would seek to establish consensus by appreciating both supporting arguments and objections to amendments under consideration. To this end, when an amendment was proposed, he would first determine whether it received active *relative* support from the Committee, i.e. expression of support from at least *one third* of the Committee Members. In the case of an objection by a Committee Member to an amendment, he would then seek active *broad* support from the *majority* of Committee Members. This was deemed of prime importance as the decision-making process had an impact on the credibility of the work of this Committee, but also by inference on the Convention as a whole. It was therefore the duty and responsibility of the Committee to keep these considerations in mind. During the general debates, priority would be given to Members of the Committee, but the floor would also be given to States Parties non-Members of the Committee and other Observers, time permitting. However, the debates on draft decisions concerning specific nomination files would be limited to Committee Members. The Chairperson also recalled Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure whereby submitting States, whether or not a Member of the Committee, shall not speak to advocate the inclusion of their file but only to provide information in reply to questions raised, if any. The Chairperson took the opportunity to remind Members and Observers that large numbers of people were following the Committee’s work through audiocast and videocast, or through the news media, and it was therefore important to keep to the schedule. He then invited the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, Ms Kuminkova, to present her report.
5. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body**, Ms Eva Kuminkova, presented the final report of the Evaluation Body’s work in 2018 ([document 10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10-EN.docx)), which consisted of five parts. The other four documents were related to the four international mechanisms of the Convention: the Urgent Safeguarding List ([document 10.a](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.a-EN.docx)), the Representative List ([document 10.b](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.b+Add.2-EN.docx)), the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices ([document 10.c](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.c+Add.-EN.docx)) and International Assistance ([document 10.d](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.d-EN.docx)), which would be presented by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr. John Moogi Omare. In this cycle, fifty files were treated and submitted to the Committee for its recommendation, including six multinational nominations. One file concerned an inscription on an extended basis, eight files had been resubmitted after a referral or non-inscription in a previous cycle. The largest proportion concerned nominations to the Representative List (80 per cent), nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List (14 per cent), two proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (4 per cent), and a single International Assistance request. Out of the fifty files examined, a total of thirty-five files were recommended for inscription, selection or approval, twelve files were recommended for referral, and three files were not recommended for inscription, selection or approval. The twelve members of the Evaluation Body met three times in March, June and September. Each member studied every file so as to obtain a complete overview and for consistency. As only one quarter of the members are replaced each year, Evaluation Body members benefited from the experience gained in previous cycles. After submitting their individual assessments online, members of the Evaluation Body met in June to discuss all the files together. The evaluation of each file usually started with a diversity of opinions, but through intensive debates, all twelve members of the Body reached consensus, as presented in this report.
6. The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that membership of the Body respected equitable geographic distribution, allowing its debates to benefit from a wide range of expertise. Although the report was drafted by the Rapporteur, all members of the Body participated in its elaboration. The Evaluation Body strictly adhered to the principle of exclusively evaluating the information and facts contained in the files, and not making any assumptions about information that the State Party had not explicitly articulated. When the information needed to assess a certain criterion was lacking, the Body recommended the referral option. Mindful that a referral often caused disappointment, particularly among the communities concerned, the Body reiterated that the referral option was not a negative assessment of a file. In fact, it allowed the State Party to revisit the file and improve its quality, which would cast good light on the work of the States Parties and the Committee. In 2017, the Evaluation Body used a ‘dual system of draft decisions with two options’ on an exceptional basis for criterion U.5/R.5. This was applied in cases recommended for a referral only because factual information related to the inventory was lacking. This year, for the first time, the Body had evaluated nomination files benefitting from the new ICH-01 and ICH-02 nomination forms, in which Section 5 was broken down into several subsections. Consequently, it noted substantial improvements in the presentation of information compared with previous cycles. However, some files still lacked mandatory information, particularly concerning the periodicity and modality of inventory updating. The Body evaluated criterion U.5/R.5 positively when most of the information and an inventory extract were provided. However, in the draft decision, the Body suggested that the State Party clearly provide the information concerned in its periodic report. As a result of this approach, no nomination was recommended for a referral on the basis of criterion U.5/R.5 alone, and the reason the ‘dual system of draft decisions with two options’ was considered to be unnecessary in this cycle.
7. The **Rapporteur** further reported that the Evaluation Body had once again noted that some States Parties found criterion R.2 particularly challenging and that its purpose was still unclear, even to experienced submitting States. The Body had come to the conclusion that in all the other criteria the State Party was asked to justify the inscription of an element from a community perspective, whereas in R.2, an external and abstracted point of view was expected. Instead of explaining how the inscription can promote intangible cultural heritage in general and raise awareness outside the community, a large proportion of nomination files tended to address the impact of the inscription on the element itself and within its community. The Body had discussed this issue at length and suggested that the criterion was directly related to the purpose of the Representative List and was therefore highly relevant and important. For these reasons, the Body welcomed and encouraged the reflection on the nature of the Lists and the relevance of the criteria, particularly criterion R.2. The Rapporteur then turned to selected cross-cutting issues, which raised particularly serious discussions among Body members. In several cases, the States concerned attempted to claim or justify ownership of an element, mostly in sections corresponding to criteria R.1/U.1 or R2. The Body also noted that the titles of nominated elements sometimes implied claims of ownership. In such cases, the Secretariat was asked to propose to the submitting country a change in the title, such that it did not inadvertently provoke sentiments contrary to the Convention’s principle of mutual respect and international cooperation. Specifically, when formulating a title, it was generally advisable to identify elements as being practised *in* a country rather than being *of* a country.
8. The **Rapporteur** also noted, as in previous cycles, that some nominations showed poor language quality with many typographical errors and inconsistencies. Considering that this affected the understanding of the element, and as nomination files are made public and serve to promote the Convention, it was important that States ensure clear and coherent written explanations in the files and pay particular attention to correct translation. States were also reminded not to use expressions implying the immutability, excellence or uniqueness of elements, such as ‘authenticity’, ‘unique’, ‘original’ or ‘extraordinary’. Such expressions implied an externally imposed hierarchy of elements, whereas the Convention encourages equitable expressions. In several cases, States also proposed safeguarding measures aimed at protecting the authenticity of an element or to ensure that the element is conserved and unchanged in the future. Such an approach is considered contrary to the definition of intangible cultural heritage and the goals of the Convention, which emphasizes the living, dynamic and ever-changing nature of intangible cultural heritage, reacting to the needs and preferences of the practitioners. The Evaluation Body had encountered difficulties with nominations of generally well-known elements referring to different concepts not known to the Body’s members, and which were not explained in the file. The description of an element should be written in such a way that even someone with no prior knowledge of it would understand its nature. Due to the word limit, States also tended to use acronyms, but they should first be clarified. With regard to multinational files, the Evaluation Body had examined six multinational nominations in the 2018 cycle, and it encouraged States Parties to do their utmost in considering the submission of multinational nominations in the future, given their largely untapped potential. The multinational file that joined the element shared by North and South Korea the previous day was a good example of this. Preparing a joint nomination always requires a lot of coordination. Sometimes, these efforts are successful in demonstrating the principles of international cooperation. Occasionally, however, collaboration seems rather formal and does not reflect upstream joint efforts. In some cases, the Body had noted that the amount and quality of information from each country in the multinational nomination process differed, such that one country’s contribution hindered the entire nomination and caused disappointment among all the other countries and communities involved. States Parties should therefore strive to submit balanced files. Nevertheless, the involvement of communities, particularly in the planning and implementation of the safeguarding measures, must in these cases be treated with even greater care and attention.
9. The **Rapporteur** then turned to the thematic issues debated by the Evaluation Body. The Body noticed an increasing number of nominations related to sports, discussing the boundary between traditional sports and games and their professional forms. The Body was particularly concerned when a State focused on the rules and system of organization instead of their value as cultural practices and on the community roles. As community-based practices with a clear cultural meaning, traditional sports and games can be considered as expressions of intangible cultural heritage. However, when they become strongly professionalized, it can undermine their status as intangible cultural heritage. The Body was pleased to see that States were aware of the close linkages between intangible heritage and its tangible environment, deciding to safeguard living traditions in complement with the protection of associated World Heritage sites. Unfortunately, in some cases, the safeguarding plans prioritized the protection of *tangible* before *intangible* heritage, while not considering that the 2003 Convention applies a different approach and criteria. During the evaluation process, several serious issues linked to the commercialization of intangible cultural heritage had arisen, mostly in relation to its promotion. The Body expressed concerns when tourism promotion and commercialization were considered as key safeguarding objectives. Although sustainable tourism can be an important source of income for custodians, viewing the inscription of an element as a tool for attracting more tourists or creating a leisure park demonstrates a lack of understanding of the principles of the Convention and the objective of its Lists. If negative impacts following an inscription are foreseen, a monitoring mechanism should be designed that would allow the community to take appropriate measures when excessive numbers of tourists started negatively influencing the practice. It was encouraging that several nominations included such monitoring mechanisms. Some elements, particularly associated with traditional crafts, could have a strong commercial aspect, which is generally neither unusual nor undesirable when commercialization provides practitioners with a permanent source of income and thus sustainability. However, nominations should not concentrate primarily on the commercial aspects, particularly in terms of safeguarding measures, but rather highlight their social and cultural roles and features. The inscription should also not be seen as an excellence label granted by UNESCO to help promote the products. In several cases, the purposes of the Convention seemed to be confused with other UNESCO standard-setting instruments in the field of culture, particularly in terms of the economic significance of nominated elements.
10. The **Rapporteur** then turned to community involvement and consent; another major and recurrent issue. First and foremost, the communities and practitioners identified in each section of the nomination file should be coherent, i.e. the communities identified in Section C should also be those involved in safeguarding and expressing consent. States Parties should also bear in mind that criteria U.3/R.3 and U.4/R.4 both require detailed descriptions of community participation; however, they are different in context and perspective, though both equally important. As far as criterion U.3/R.3 is concerned, the communities and practitioners are expected to be the driving forces of safeguarding measures, not mere beneficiaries of top-down safeguarding. The Body often encountered situations in which community participation under criterion U.4/R.4 was declared but not demonstrated in the file. Despite long lists of workshops and meetings between stakeholders, the Body was unable to identify the nature of these meetings and the kinds of roles the practitioners actually played in the nomination process. This raised doubts as to the level of awareness among the communities about the purpose of the nomination, the meaning of inscription, and the expression of their free, prior and informed consent. Issues also arose in relation to the form and content of the consent letters. The Operational Directives require that a nominated element should have the widest possible participation of the community, group or, if applicable, individuals concerned. As no particular number of expressions of consent is prescribed, the Body studied their representativeness, information value and the process of acquiring consent. While diverse expressions of informed consent, including audiovisual materials, were always welcomed, sometimes standardized letters, petitions and signature sheets could not be considered because they did not demonstrate whether the signatories were fully aware of what they were signing. In the 2018 cycle, the Body had examined several forms of consent from children, and hence requested the position of UNESCO’s Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs on the involvement of children. Based on its position, and recalling Decision [8.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/8) (paragraph 16), the Body accepted the consent of minors as a form of attestation suited to the situation of the communities concerned, and concluded that in such cases information on the context of such consent is important and needed. In several cases, there was a discrepancy between the content of consent letters in the original languages and their English or French translations, with some referring to the ‘World Heritage List’, other Lists under the 2003 Convention other than the actual nominated List, or inaccurate expressions like ‘inscription at UNESCO’, and so on. The Body reminded States Parties that they are responsible for the accuracy and quality of their translations and that incorrect references are not valid as they raise doubts about the informed nature of the consent.
11. The **Rapporteur** then turned to inventories, noting that inventories under criterion U.5/R.5 in the 2018 cycle were presented in a diversity of formats, such as books, lists of resources, sample books, and so on. Although there are strict rules on the structure of an inventory, inventories are required to include certain information to meet the requirements of Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, particularly: i) the name and description of an element; ii) identification of the practitioners associated with it; iii) its geographical scope; iv) current social and cultural functions; and v) viability and modes of transmission. The Secretariat had drawn the Body’s attention to the ‘Guidance Note on Inventorying Intangible Cultural Heritage’[[27]](#footnote-27), which was released in spring 2018 and was now available on the [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en/guidance-note-on-inventorying-00966) of the Convention, in that it could aid in the process of designing and developing inventories at the national and local levels. The Rapporteur concluded by thanking the Committee for entrusting the Body with this task.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for having raised important issues that would inform the Committee’s debates, opening the floor for comments.
13. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its hard work and the quality of its report, recognizing that the report had raised a number of very important issues and challenges that would potentially guide the Committee and the States Parties for years to come. It noted that that some States faced serious challenges in describing criterion R.2 and it was pleased that this issue had been integrated into the agenda of the experts’ meeting and the open-ended intergovernmental working group on the criteria, purposes and nature of the Lists. The delegation also noted the observation that the current cycle of evaluation had brought up a series of cases where more detailed information on community representation could have been beneficial for the nominations, adding that it was indeed essential to explain the way community members had been chosen to represent their entire communities within the framework of the nomination process and given their free, prior and informed consent so that they spoke as legitimate representatives on behalf of their communities. This had been the reason for referrals under criteria 3 and 4 in the case of nominations to both the Representative and the Urgent Safeguarding Lists in the current cycle. The delegation believed that this could potentially be avoided in future cycles by integrating a specific question into the nomination forms where States would be asked to explain how certain community members had been chosen to represent their communities, and it had proposed a draft amendment to the decision in this regard. Regarding the examination of criteria R.2 and R.3, it was noted that often the draft decisions referred to safeguarding *plans*, whereas criterion R.3 required *measures* to be described as cited in the nomination form and paragraph 2 of the Operational Directives. It was thus important to distinguish between *measures* and *plan* for safeguarding, as the nature of criteria in both Lists were different, and a draft amendment on this issue was proposed. Finally, the delegation noted that the Evaluation Body did not present options with regard to criterion R.5, as in previous years, adding that a similar approach could still have been applied in a number of nominations in this cycle, even if other criteria within the same files had issues that required clarification.
14. The **delegation of Senegal** warmlycongratulated the Evaluation Body on its work, and for the very detailed report and the many proposals working towards the communication aspect between the submitting States and the Body. This question would certainly be taken into account in the working group, especially as it had been an ongoing topic over the past two years. As mentioned by Azerbaijan, criterion R.2 remained problematic, and the Committee needed to work towards a better understanding of this criterion so that it was better justified and presented in the nomination files. The delegation also brought up the issue of the names of the elements. In the case of Africa, for example, where borders are artificial because of colonization, part of a village may be found in an English-speaking country whereas another part is in another Republic, yet they share the same culture and rites, have the same names and use the same language. Joint inscriptions should therefore be encouraged, as in the case of Senegal with Kankurang, Mandling initiatory rite, which joined with Gambia, an autonomous Republic within the boundaries of Senegal. Thus, cultural continuity knows no boundaries. This is the case in almost all African States, especially in West Africa where cultural expressions share the same name and language within the same ethnic groups. That is why multinational inscriptions should be encouraged, even if a country decides to inscribe an element alone, such as Niger with ‘Practices and expressions of joking relationships’, even though the same element exists elsewhere. Other Conventions would call it an extension, but in the Convention it is not an extension but a multinational inscription, i.e. it has the same name in the different communities.
15. The **delegation of Colombia** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its immense work and for its detailed report that drew attention to the social function of intangible cultural heritage above and beyond its commercial dimensions, which at times benefited the communities but was not the sole benefit derived by the communities. It also drew the Committee’s attention to the need to include environmental sustainability and the gender perspective when referring to manifestations of intangible cultural heritage and their safeguarding. It believed that those elements, as well as other elements mentioned by the Evaluation Body, should be made more intersectoral. In this regard, the delegation referred to a [side event](https://ich.unesco.org/en/4-june-1345-international-assistance-in-action-00997) to the General Assembly held in June 2018 that made the point of how manifestations of intangible cultural heritage should be managed in a way that is related to other elements of the social and political sphere, as this would generate sustainable safeguarding mechanisms that would help the element endure in the communities in spite of changes that the communities might decide to effect on their own cultural heritage.
16. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Evaluation Body for its report and hard work, adding that it appreciated the important issues identified in the report. It had consistently called for dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the nominating States, not because it did not support or value the work of the Evaluation Body or it wished to change the manner in which it worked to mirror World Heritage, but because of all the problems and challenges observed over the past three years while it had served on the Committee. It was clear that there was a problem with R.2. Almost all States Parties receiving referrals had difficulties with R.2. The delegation also noted with concern that States Parties, which previously received referrals for nominations, were coming back with improved files but still received referrals over technical issues, questions or misperceptions that could easily have been addressed through dialogue or minor clarifications. Without the opportunity for a dialogue during the evaluation process, the Committee becomes the platform for dialogue but at a late stage, and it was thus difficult to contain the political process of lobbying and the high expectations of the communities concerned. It would be much better to upstream the dialogue in an expert-driven context, which would do much to enhance the trust and confidence in the system and raise the understanding of the Convention among States Parties and the communities concerned in a constructive and practical way. On many occasions, it only took a minor explanation to clarify an issue. The report clearly indicated the utility of dialogue in paragraph 28 concerning the adjustment of the titles of some elements. Hence, the working methods of the Evaluation Body needed to be reviewed and strengthened with a view to allowing for an opportunity for limited dialogue with nominating States. This would enhance credibility in the system and its inclusiveness. The delegation was willing to continue working with the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat to define the most appropriate parameters and procedure, noting that no one was against dialogue. Finally, it had an amendment on the language of the General Assembly on this issue.
17. The **delegation of Poland** expressed its appreciation of the report and the work done by the Evaluation Body. It understood and underlined the importance of the reflection on the nominations process, and shared the opinion expressed by the Philippines of the strong necessity for dialogue between nominating States and the Evaluation Body. The delegation agreed that there was a need to undertake a broader reflection on challenges encountered by the Evaluation Body, in particular, in evaluating criterion R.2, adding that it had some ideas that it would share with the Committee in the near future. In the meantime, it sought to hear the opinion of the Evaluation Body about possible solutions to this problem.
18. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the remarks made by the Philippines in that it agreed with the dialogue between States Parties and the Evaluation Body. The option of a dialogue would help avoid certain technical problems that may arise during the examination of a file. The delegation felt that the issue of dialogue between States Parties and the Evaluation Body could also be discussed during the expert meeting and the working group meeting.
19. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** commended the work of the Evaluation Body and the very clear presentation. It also welcomed the intention to address the concerns related to the R.2 criterion in reviewing nominations submitted by States Parties, as well as to share some of the concerns expressed by previous speakers relating to a dialogue between States Parties and the Evaluation Body.
20. The **delegation of Austria** congratulated the Evaluation Body for the coherence of its work and the detailed and insightful report that showed how the evaluation of files was an ongoing process, which evolved over time with experience, and also on the national level. The delegation took note with pleasure of the positive effects of the revised form for Section 5, as already mentioned, although criterion 2 remained challenging, though it would be discussed by the working group. However, the Committee might wish to define a set of indicators that would allow for the measurement of the impact of inscriptions. In this regard, the overall results framework and Indicator 15 on the role of intangible cultural heritage in the safeguarding of society, for example, could be a starting point. The delegation also wished to invite the Evaluation Body to elaborate on ideas regarding criterion 2. It noted the Evaluation Body’s comments on files related to crafts in paragraph 39 and, looking at the submitted files, it was clear that a lack of visibility or low interest in traditional crafts often posed a threat to the viability of the element. Considering that traditional craftsmanship can make a profound contribution to several goals of the 2030 Agenda, such as SDG 8 and 12, it was hoped that States Parties would continue recognizing, promoting and enhancing intangible cultural heritage elements related to the skills and knowledge of traditional craftsmanship. Unfortunately, there were only two proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices in this cycle, even though it was a very valuable and useful register, not only as a source of inspiration for others but also for the communities themselves. The Register helps reflect on the nature of the successful safeguarding measures, but also strengthens community ties and further contributes to the safeguarding of the element. The delegation concluded by thanking the Evaluation Body for its specific recommendations to submitting States, while clearly identifying those parts of the file that could be revisited and improved, which was highly appreciated.
21. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Evaluation Body for its report, adding that it was satisfied with the fact that dialogue had improved understanding between the States and the Evaluation Body and that 67 per cent of the nominations presented were given a favourable recommendation. The delegation conceded that many things could be improved in the process, but dialogue with States had improved. Thanks to the financial offer by Japan, the working group should help improve working methods and procedures in order to achieve the ultimate aim, which was the safeguarding and protection of intangible cultural heritage.
22. The **delegation of Guatemala** congratulated the Evaluation Body, noting its excellent work. However, it believed that the Convention, which promotes dialogue as a form of understanding between the different stakeholders involved in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, should fundamentally allow countries to express themselves and be heard. The criteria of the Evaluation Body should be respected, but the Committee should also do its utmost to promote dialogue with the States Parties and that meant allowing submitting States to be heard when clarifications were required. Two years ago, Guatemala spoke of the necessity for dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States. It was decided then that it was not yet time to create a mechanism because the necessary conditions had not been met to implement such an idea. In addition, it was undoubtedly the case that many States Parties to the Convention require capacity building, including the capacity to draft nomination files, and many experts from these countries continue to face problems interpreting the requirements for recognizing their vast heritage. This could be seen with certain criteria, particularly in R.2, which the Secretary recognized posed problems. The delegation remarked that in most of the nomination files considered that did not meet all the criteria, it was criterion R.2 that was at fault. The question was thus not how *many* criteria the Evaluation Body considered to be met, but rather the *quality* and content of each one. The delegation explained that there was no written rule on this and therefore the files should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis without establishing a rule that would penalize countries and make it impossible for them to express themselves. Although there were several points that still had to worked out when it came to evaluating the nomination process, the delegation believed that if there was no dialogue mechanism making it possible to reformulate the content of a file, then the Committee should show flexibility when evaluating the nominations.
23. The **delegation of Japan** appreciated the very good brief from the Evaluation Body on the current status of the evaluation system. Having listened very carefully to the comments from each delegation with interest and appreciation, the delegation remarked that they clearly reflected the need for greater reflection of the intangible cultural heritage system. Not only should the criteria be discussed, such as criterion R.2, but at the same time the mechanisms and procedure established ever since the adoption of the Convention should also be the subjects of discussion. As suggested in its statement the previous day: Was it really so bad to refer to other information sources outside of the file? Did the concept of ‘uniqueness’ and ‘originality’ really contradict the definition of intangible cultural heritage? The delegation believed that these points should also be very seriously addressed in a fundamental and philosophical reflection, which was very important at this juncture. For this reason, Japan was ready to sponsor this very important process and it was a great honour to do so.
24. The **Chairperson** reiterated thanks to Japan for the support provided to the Convention.
25. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Evaluation Body for its very detailed report, and agreed with all the comments emphasizing the importance of dialogue with the submitting State when a problem is identified or when there is a lack of clarity regarding criterion R.2, which would be taken up at the experts’ meeting. The delegation took the opportunity to reiterate its thanks to Japan for lending its great support to the Convention. It was clear that everyone agreed that R.2 was a problem, but yet the dialogue mechanism would not be ready by the next session. Thus, how was the Committee going to deal with R.2 at its next session? The delegation understood that it was difficult to introduce the dual option, as in the previous session for R.5, and that experts were examining this question, even though nothing would happen until next September 2019. However, in the meantime, perhaps a working group could be tasked with examining a solution for R.2 with the assistance of the Evaluation Body.
26. The **Chairperson** remarked that the session ended with an important question and he thanked all the delegations, inviting the Secretary to make some practical announcements.
27. The **Secretary** reminded the States wishing to hold performances or present audiovisual material to inform the Secretariat in order to facilitate their preparation.

*[Wednesday, 28 November 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 10.a OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/10.a*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.a-EN.docx)

**Files:** [*7 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10a-urgent-safeguarding-list-01012)

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning and revised the timetable of the Committee’s work. The day’s session began with the examination of item 10.a and would continue with 10.b. The Secretariat had received requests to open nine individual decisions for debate, and two States had withdrawn their files: Lao People’s Democratic Republic had withdrawn ‘Traditional art of Naga weaving’ for inscription on the Representative List (draft decision 13.COM 10.b.22), and Saudi Arabia had withdrawn ‘Al-Janadria, national festival of heritage and culture’ for selection on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (draft decision 13.COM 10.c.1). TheChairperson then turned to the first sub-item 10.a and the examination of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Committee wouldexamine seven nominations by Algeria, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Egypt, Kenya, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic. Inscription criteria U.1–U.5 were recalled, as they would guide the decisions. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Mr John Moogi Omara, was invited to present the nomination files.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the first nomination, **Knowledge and skills of the water measurers of the foggaras or water bailiffs of Touat and Tidikelt** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.1],submitted by **Algeria**. The element concerns the knowledge and skills of the water measurers of the foggaras (system of channels), or water bailiffs, of the ksour (village) communities of Touat and Tidikelt. The water measurers are involved in various operations from calculating water shares to repairing distribution combs and conducting water in the channel. Every foggara connects several categories of social agents and knowledge bearers, including owners, manual workers, accountants and water measurers, but it is the water measurers’ knowledge that appears to be under threat. Currently there is little knowledge transmission and a lack of communication between young people and their elders. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4 and U.5. The element is closely related to the way of life, economy and survival of the desert area of Algeria. The knowledge and skills of the water measurers are closely connected to the historical local land law system, which has been affected by state interventions in oasis agriculture and the introduction of technologically advanced underground water extraction methods. Community representatives, members of an association for the protection of the foggaras, students, knowledge bearers and practitioners actively participated in preparing the nomination. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.3. Additional information was required on: how the newly acquired knowledge and skills of trained practitioners would be utilized; how the entire knowledge system would be safeguarded, as the skills of the water measurers were not independent of the broader social context of this element; the financing for the safeguarding plan; the commitment of the State Party; and the objectives and expected impacts of the proposed safeguarding measures. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer Knowledge and skills of the water measurers of the foggaras or water bailiffs of Touat and Tidikelt to the submitting State.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that an amendment had been received for this nomination, opening the floor for comments.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Evaluation Body and the State Party for paying attention to this important element related to water, which was indeed at risk. Water is the lifeline of life itself, in Algeria and all over the world. Noting that R.3 had not been met, the delegation asked the State Party why earlier safeguarding had focused on infrastructure, and also sought clarity on the financing of the safeguarding plan as this was deemed unclear.
5. The **Chairperson** invited Algeria to respond.
6. The **delegation of Algeria** asked whether it was possible to group together two or three questions so as to avoid repetitions, while responding to all the questions at the same time.
7. The **delegation of Kuwait** supported the draft amendment submitted by Palestine. As explained by Palestine, water is a major element, especially in a region where there is a lack of water. The element had been preserved for so many years and it believed the Committee had a moral responsibility to preserve these water measurers and the water skills for the community now and in the future, and to appreciate and safeguard this water system in a region with low water resources. It also wished to hear from Algeria.
8. The **delegation of the Philippines** noted that this nomination had previously been referred and that the State Party had resubmitted it, taking into account the previous assessment of the Evaluation Body. As a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List, the delegation believed that the Committee should take an inclusive approach, as the element needed support. In this regard, the safeguarding plan presented by the State Party could help promote the viability and future transmission of the element as it involved the creation of a steering committee that included the main actors dealing with water and land resource management, including from the Government. It was also observed that the local community participated in certain aspects of the safeguarding plan. The delegation requested that Algeria provide more information on the documentation and awareness-raising measures.
9. The **delegation of Lebanon** emphasized the importance of this element of intangible cultural heritage, an inclusive element that describes the vital role of water measurers who are found around the Mediterranean basin, like water guardians in Lebanon. It requested more information on the involvement of the local community in the safeguarding process. Moreover, the community is present in criterion U.4 as a signatory of the project, but it was not apparent in U.3. The delegation also wished to know how the new acquired knowledge and skills would be used in the safeguarding plan.
10. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Evaluation Body and congratulated Algeria for this important element on water, the source of life. It also sought to hear more about the involvement of the community and the transfer of knowledge.
11. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Evaluation Body for the information provided and the evaluation of the file, joining previous delegations regarding the amendments presented by Palestine, which it supported. This is a nomination of special importance and significance, especially because of the link between intangible heritage and sustainable development in the domain of water. In the field of management practices and know-how, the sustainable management of water is a fundamental problem in societies, even today, and thus it was vitally important to help inscribe this element. The important points in the presentation of the file were linked to the community and the involvement of an aging population. The direct assistance by UNESCO would thus make it possible for the practices and know-how to be extended and kept alive in order to protect this intangible cultural heritage and its water management, which was so important for the entire Arab region.
12. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Evaluation Body for its efforts in evaluating this file, which presented an interesting element that was closely related to the interaction between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development and, notably, the equitable sharing of natural resources, and the prevention and resolution of disputes. The nomination demonstrated a close link between *intangible* and *tangible* heritage, as the system of foggaras, water wells and channels represented an important aspect of the practice of the element, whose viability was now under serious threat. Section 1 of the file in particular explained exactly how communities safeguarded the element in the past, as well as the role played by water owners, manual workers, accountants and water measurers. Regarding the proposed safeguarding plan, the delegation noted that the plan did not only suggest documenting the practice and training a new generation of water measurers as the mainlines of the safeguarding plan, it also suggested building relationships with stakeholders who also play a role in the practice of the element, such as foggaras owners and local municipalities. The focus on water measurers was also understandable as they probably play the most important role in the practice of the element. It was also noted that a budget had been foreseen for the implementation of the plan. Finally, the delegation believed the file provided sufficient information on the consideration of a broader social context, as local municipalities rely on the associations of foggaras owners to be involved, while mentioning awareness-raising activities targeted at the general public. Bearing all this in mind, the delegation supported the positive recommendation in U.3 for this file.
13. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** supported Palestine’s amendment. Considering that most countries only recently had the opportunity to offer remote areas better household facilities, such as centralized irrigation, electricity or heating systems, the delegation understood the goodwill of the Government to improve the living conditions of those living under harsh climatic environments. Whenever technology reaches rural areas, local communities cannot fully grasp the value of their traditional and sustainable lifestyles from the perspective of universal cultural heritage. As a Committee Member, the delegation gave the nomination credit for its realistic depiction of the situation that showed sincere concern from the community representatives, such as the measurers, accountants, students, researchers, as well as local and state authorities, to find practical, efficient and long-term safeguarding solutions. An appropriate water supply and land resource management system respecting traditional forms in terms of the viability of the element would require serious financial, technical and administrative resources from both the Government and communities, which make inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List hardly attainable. Bearing in mind that the survival of the element was threatened by changing traditional lifestyles, the delegation supported inscription on the basis of a more flexible and realistic evaluation of viability for such elements. Inscribing this element—a treasure of human genius and creativity and a model of an environmental and socially sustainable livelihood—would breathe new life into the element’s future survival by attracting comprehensive research, documentation, training and practical application, both as a living heritage in Algeria and as an innovative housing project abroad.
14. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated Algeria, as it also recognized the relevance of this traditional know-how related to the distribution of water under difficult climatic conditions. In this context, the Evaluation Body considered that the local community did not appear to have been involved in safeguarding the element as an expression of living heritage and, according to the file, there was a gap between youth and elders in the transmission of the element. The delegation sought information on the community’s involvement in safeguarding this element.
15. Thanking the Evaluation Body, the **delegation of Jamaica** recognized the significance of the water measurers of the foggaras and noted that the file had adequately satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4 and U.5. in clearly presenting the features of the water measurer with respect to the historical community and their role in ensuring the survival of the community through the management of the irrigation system. The delegation found that the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body on the issues of safeguarding the element and ensuring its viability could be clarified by Algeria, and further clarification of these areas could be provided in the event that the Committee required additional information. It therefore sought to hear the State Party address the concerns raised by Palestine, adding that it supported the amendment as submitted.
16. The **delegation of Algeria** began by thankingthe Members of the Committee for their questions and for the interest shown in this nomination, and invited his colleague— who had worked on the nomination file—to respond to the concerns raised.
17. The **delegation of Algeria** [second speaker]remarked that therewereseveral elements to take into account. With regard to the community involvement, the delegation referred to the discussion the previous day on the broad and theoretical concept of ‘community’. In this case, the members of the communities were directly concerned with the issue of water management as they were—first and foremost—owners of the foggaras. Foggaras were private structures that had been created in the past by groups of people who built foggaras to share water resources, which were later transmitted from one generation to another. Moreover, these water shares can be sold and bought by others. In addition to the owners of the foggaras, accountants kept records of all the transactions (shares bought and sold) that had been recorded for generations, even centuries. The third category of stakeholders, the most important in terms of the project, were the water measurers, called Kiyal al-Ma. Hence there were three categories of people involved. The first part of the work—carried out over a few years—involved inventorying all the stakeholders in each *ksar*, the equivalent of a village. Here, the owners, knowledge holders and accountants were all identified and then directly involved in the project. The delegation explained that the authorities had worked closely with them, even though this knowledge and know-how had been more or less marginalized since the 1970s with the intervention of public authorities and the implementation of modern techniques to access groundwater. However, after 30–40 years of experience, it had become clear that although the State projects worked, the old system of foggaras to access water should not be abandoned.
18. The **delegation of Algeria** explained that this traditional system had helped maintain the existing palm groves with around 300 to 350 palm groves currently extended over 600 kilometres. This project was therefore not in conflict with economic development, and was in fact complementary in that the State was allowed to create new farms in isolated places, while the project sought to continue working with the knowledge holders (the owners of the foggaras) to safeguard their knowledge. The fear was that if the trend continued, this knowledge would no longer be transmitted in one or two generations. At present, the average age of the knowledge holders is 55–60 years old, with young people turning towards other professions. The aim of the project was therefore to document the know-how and knowledge of the holders, which was empirical and transmitted orally, so that this traditional knowledge was formally established. The second part of the project sought to involve young people, and even older people from the age of 40–50, who are keen to access this knowledge and who are placed in direct contact with a number of knowledge transfer workshops, which are modern and use up-to-date media, video, film, print communications, and so on.
19. Turning to the issue of funding, the **delegation of Algeria** [first speaker] explained that the Government had made available funds of more than US$750,000 to the people who were safeguarding the element to carry out the project. Responding to the specific question on the safeguarding of the physical structure of the element, the delegation explained that without the physical element, the empirical knowledge of the foggaras would become obsolete as it served no purpose; like a musician without its instrument. It was hoped that the information provided had responded to the questions.
20. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Palestine had submitted an amendment in paragraph 3 [further deciding that criterion U.3 was met]. The delegations of **Zambia, Senegal,** **Kuwait, Djibouti, Cuba, Togo, the Philippines, Poland, Kazakhstan, Lebanon and Jamaica** supported the amendment in paragraph 3, which was duly adopted as amended. Palestine proposed an amendment in paragraph 4 [inscribing the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List], which received the active support of **Cuba**, **Cyprus**, **Djibouti**, **Jamaica**, **Kazakhstan**, **Kuwait**, **Lebanon**, the **Philippines**, **Poland**, **Senegal**, **Togo** and **Zambia**.
21. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 duly adopted.
22. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, and with no further comments or objections, **the Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.1**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.1) **adopted to inscribe Knowledge and skills of the water measurers of the foggaras or water bailiffs of Touat and Tidikelt** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
23. The **delegation of Algeria** began by thanking the Committee for its support, and especially for understanding this important issue for Algeria and for the community. It believed that sustainable development, and the development of sustainable agriculture in particular, could only be achieved through the protection of ancient customs, the old ways of our fathers, grandfathers and ancestors in their approach to the rational use of resources, especially water. Water springs from life, and that was why the element now inscribed was so emblematic. Algeria pledged to do everything possible to safeguard this element, promote it, and perhaps one day return to the Committee to see the element transferred to the Representative List, or perhaps the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its truly impressive work, for having understood the nature of the file, and for their recommendations, which it was committed to implementing to strengthen its action in this regard. Finally, on behalf of the entire communities of Touat and Tidikelt, it thanked the Secretariat for its invaluable assistance in the management of this file, with special thanks to the Chairperson for the manner in which he was conducting the Committee’s work, and especially Mauritius for hosting and organizing this important event.
24. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.2],submitted by **Azerbaijan**. Yalli, traditional group dances, are dance expressions based exclusively on collective performances. Until the mid-twentieth century, yalli were widely practised, but several factors such as the gradual loss of social functions for certain types of yalli, a preference for staged performances, labour migration and the economic crises of the late 1980s and early 1990s, a shift from informal to formal transmission, and a drastic simplification of the dances had impacted the transmission of the practice. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan, symbolize energy, solidarity and the rhythm of life, reinforcing social cohesion and friendship. Due to the loss of variety, the use of homogenized, simplified forms, the gradual loss of different roles of practitioners and social functions of the dances, the prevalence of stage performances and the young generation’s preference for other types of entertainment in urban contexts, its practice continued to decline. The proposed safeguarding plan was well-conceived with clear objectives, reflecting the identified needs and budget with the aim of creating favourable conditions to transmit yalli and sustain the practice in the future. The practitioners, communities and stakeholders were involved in the nomination process through consultations in a working group. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan, on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
25. The **Chairperson** noted that an amendment had been received for this nomination, inviting the Secretary to present the amendment.
26. The **Secretary** explained that an amendment had been proposed on this file, and asked the Committee to take note that as a result of the goodwill of the parties concerned, the Secretariat proposed an additional paragraph [5] to the draft decision, reflecting language that has been used in the past, which would read, ‘takes note that the heritage of traditional group dances is shared by communities in the region and beyond’. The Secretariat hoped that Committee Members would agree to this amendment.
27. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification and turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
28. The **delegation of Palestine** askedwhetherthe draft decision could be adopted as a whole.
29. The **delegation of Cuba** supported the proposal by Palestine.
30. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.2) **adopted to inscribe Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan,** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
31. The **delegation of Armenia** disassociated from the draft decision adopted. Certain elements of intangible cultural heritage are quite common in a number of States, especially in neighbouring ones, and cannot be bound within State borders. Unfortunately, a number of cases had seen attempts made to privatize one element or another. There were also cases of a form of envy when a neighbouring State replicated almost every nomination of another file. It was thus imperative to assert that an envious approach of a neighbouring State that attempts to reject others’ intangible cultural heritage in order to prove its own is not only pitiful but also very dangerous for the Convention and for the deliberations of the Committee. Contrary to the purpose and spirit of UNESCO, Azerbaijan continued politicizing this framework, using it to present its unlimited and groundless claims for every piece of history and culture in the region. Following the submission of the nomination ‘Kochari, traditional group dance’ by Armenia in 2014 and inscribed in 2017, a follow-up action by Azerbaijan was to submit a replica nomination ‘Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan’ for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The title itself was a clear example of provocation. Kochari is intentionally mentioned in the title, even though there are more than eighteen types of yalli as stated, and more than sixty-three forgotten types of yalli. It was noted that based on historical sources and data, group dances had been a wide and diverse practice among Armenia, Kurdish and Yazidi communities in Nakhchivan until the middle of the 20th century. Referring to the arguments on page 5 in the nomination file, the gradual decrease in the number of practitioners resulted from forced migration from the middle of the 20th century. However, the State Party failed to pay due attention to those communities that no longer exist in the particular region or to mention that the main community, the Armenian community, practising the kochari element had been forced to flee the autonomous region since the middle of the 20th century. Significant demographic shifts, in particular forced migration and ethnic cleansing of the Armenian community, were the reason for the decrease in the number of practitioners. Although the tradition of practising group dances is vitally shared by many countries in the world, the culture of dancing kochari in Armenia, with all its components, social functions, techniques, meaning and variety of cultural expressions, differs considerably from similar dances.
32. The **Chairperson** reiterated their congratulations to Azerbaijan.
33. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** did not wish to repeat the content of its letter to the Assistant Director-General in reply to all the allegations raised by Armenia, when unfortunately the Committee regretfully witnessed evidence that one State Party was trying to misuse its membership for political purposes despite the tough negotiations and efforts from the Secretariat and the Committee to find a compromise in language on the draft decision. Thus, despite the compromise and the flexibility shown, accusations were still being levelled against Azerbaijan that called for an end to this kind of unethical behaviour in the Committee and the pronouncement of statements for domestic consumption. The delegation explained that every year Azerbaijan showed flexibility on this issue, with webcasts showing that it accepts the constructive approach shown by the Committee Members and the efforts of the Secretariat. In return, it received aggressive accusations and allegations about politicization, when—on the contrary—it was always in favour of regional cooperation. Looking at the nominations presented by both countries, the delegation noted that Armenia, despite advocating for regional cooperation, did not have a single multinational nomination, whereas Azerbaijan had three multinational nominations.
34. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Committee for inscribing Yalli (Kochari, Tenzere), traditional group dances of Nakhchivan, on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and commended the Evaluation Body for the evaluation of the file. This was the second inscription of Azerbaijan on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the first inscription of an intangible cultural heritage element from Nakhchivan. It believed that it would raise awareness about other forms of intangible cultural heritage in this particular region of Azerbaijan, an exclave. Communities in Nakhchivan perceived the yalli dances as one of the most important aspects of their heritage that have reached us today, despite the challenges the communities have faced in the past. They are performed on various social and cultural occasions that represent a part of the identity of the communities in Nakhchivan. These dances promote feelings of friendship, sharing and belonging to the community, as well as gender equality, as they are also performed in mixed forms. The delegation thanked all the stakeholders involved in the preparation of the file, especially the Supreme Consul of Nakhchivan, Nakhchivan Ministry of Culture, Sharur Folk Yalli Dance Ensemble, children’s schools, as well individual dancers and practitioners who made a huge effort to focus on the safeguarding of yalli dances, and most importantly Kochari and Tenzere, and that would now partner to safeguard the element in the most effective way. A short video prepared by the Ministry of Culture on how the dance plays a social role in Nakhchivan and in Azerbaijan was projected.
35. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.3],submitted by **Cambodia**. Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet is practised in one community surrounding a Buddhist monastery, Wat Svay Andet, and is performed by men wearing masks to the accompaniment of a traditional orchestra and melodious recitation. After generations of transmission, however, several factors now threaten the viability of the element, including environmental factors, insufficient resources, economic migration from the community and a fourteen-year break in transmission from 1970 to 1984 due to war and the Khmer Rouge regime. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4 and U.5. Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet is a prayer for happiness and prosperity, especially rain and a good harvest, and is also considered to be a powerful tool to ward off calamities and diseases. The ritual practice of Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet unites the local lay population of the Ta Skor and Peam Ta Ek villages with the Buddhist monastic community at Wat Svay Andet where it has a deep spiritual meaning and social relevance. Although the last five masters of the Lkhon Khol continue transmitting their knowledge, the majority of them are over seventy years old and some are critically ill. The Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts established a working group to cooperate with the local community during the preparation of the nomination file. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.3. While the Body considered that the safeguarding strategy did not seem to require large financial inputs, a clearly defined budget supporting its implementation was completely missing. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet to the submitting State.
36. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the detailed explanation of the different issues raised during the evaluation of the file. It was noted that amendments had been received for this nomination, and the floor was opened for comments.
37. The **delegation of the Philippines** requested that the file be opened for discussion because it believed that the element should not be referred back to the State Party when the missing information had been duly provided to the Committee by Cambodia. This only emphasized the need for a dialogue between nominating States and the Evaluation Body in instances when a minor clarification or additional information could complete the picture needed by the Evaluation Body to finalize its recommendation. For it was apparent in the nomination file and the report of the Evaluation Body that the element merits urgent safeguarding and that the measures proposed were very clear and thorough. The element is highly important as a practice of the Buddhist monastery community and a source of spiritual meaning and social relevance. Thus, the delegation requested that the State Party be given the floor to provide further information on the budget of the safeguarding plan, adding that it had submitted amendments to the draft decision together with a number of Committee Members.
38. The **Chairperson** took note of the Committee Members wishing to intervene.
39. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with the comments made by the Philippines and thanked the Evaluation Body for its work, particularly concerning this particular element. It noted that the file had satisfied most of the criteria, and even in U.3 it was noted that the safeguarding plan was clear and solid, and it clearly supported the role of local communities in the safeguarding plan. The cost of the safeguarding plan was not excessive either, but there was no clear budget, which was the only negative aspect in the evaluation. The delegation therefore asked the State Party to provide some clarification on this point.
40. The **delegation of China** thanked the Evaluation Body for its efforts on the evaluation of this nomination. According to the draft decision, the information included in this file was not sufficient to satisfy criterion U.3. However, when it looked through the nomination file, it noticed that Section 3.b on the proposed safeguarding plan stated several times that resources came from both within the community and the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts, and other partners were also playing a supportive role by providing both financial and in-kind support. It was also noted that available sources for the implementation of the safeguarding plan came from the commitments of the different stakeholders. Thus, given this context, the delegation requested that the submitting State provide some clarification on this point.
41. The **delegation of Poland** agreed with the amendments proposed by the Philippines, stressing that the purpose of the Urgent Safeguarding List was to prevent the element from imminent threats and eventual extinction. As Cambodia’s nomination file pointed out, the element was threatened due to the consequences of the aging population of bearers. Thus, the element required inscription on an urgent basis, as leaving the element without international assistance would be against the spirit and objectives of the Convention. The delegation hoped that the clarification by the State Party would complete the nomination file and enable the Committee to decide in favour of the inscription of the element.
42. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Evaluation Body for its extremely important work and congratulated the submitting State on this very important file linked to Buddhism, as reflected in the colourful display demonstrating a wealth of cultural expressions related to agrarian rites, including the cycle of rice cultivation. The only negative point raised by the Evaluation Body concerned the budget, and the delegation asked that the submitting State be given the opportunity to provide the necessary information.
43. The **delegation of Zambia** supported the amendment by the Philippines in favour of Cambodia’s inscription to the Urgent Safeguarding List. As already noted, there were a number of cited threats to the element, such as migration and environmental and economic concerns, while in criterion U.3, which also deals with the community, the submitting State mentioned a number of points that—in the delegation’s opinion—appeared to satisfy U.3. It therefore supported the Philippines’ amendment and the inscription of the element.
44. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** supported the Philippines’ amendment, adding that the spiritual nature of Lkhon Khol theatrical performance and its geographic concentration into villages near Wat Svay Andet monastery placed the survival of the element in the hands of the community, and it was the community’s wish, as stated in the file, to focus on intangible and creative safeguarding measures like networking, training and fundraising. The budget allocated via the national Living Human Treasures programme provided regular financial allowances for local monks, and the hiring of a focal point seemed to satisfy the community’s requirement for municipal support. In this regard, it found Cambodia’s nomination distinctly interesting, setting a good example of community spirit in the role of the elderly population in safeguarding the element.
45. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** commended Cambodia for the nomination of this vibrant and diverse element whose practice was continued and maintained primarily by rural practitioners for the value and well-being this element brought to the community. With regard to criterion U.3, it noted with great appreciation the description of the past and current safeguarding measures under Section 3.a, which showed a balanced approach from both the consenting community and the national authorities towards safeguarding this element, which was threatened by a number of external and internal factors. With regard to the second part of this criterion in Section 3.b. and the missing budget for the safeguarding plan, as raised by the Evaluation Body, it was noted that the nomination did mention financial and structural support provided by the Ministry of Culture of Cambodia, the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts and other partners to strengthen the efforts of the community. Finally, the delegation also noted in the nomination form under this section the possibility of in-kind community inputs, which seemed to be the case in this particular nomination, as safeguarding of this element very much relied on the communities themselves. With this in mind, Azerbaijan believed that this criterion was met, even if a clear budget estimate had not been provided, as there were numerous instances of a clear commitment by the State to provide, secure or use existing mechanisms to provide financial resources.
46. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its great work on this file, and congratulated the State Party for the excellent file that clearly showed the involvement of the community in both the administration of this file and also through the financial aspect over the coming years. The delegation understood that the detailed budget in Section 3.b was missing and it awaited the State Party’s clarification on this minor point. Nevertheless, it was in favour of inscribing this file and it thanked the Philippines for opening the discussion.
47. The **delegation of Lebanon** expressed support for the amendments proposed by the Philippines and thanked the Evaluation Body.
48. The **delegation of Japan** appreciated the efforts by the Evaluation Body and greatly appreciated and recognized the value of the Buddhist culture, with which it had a very strong affinity. The file was very well-prepared in general, except for the budget section. Thus, should the submitting State provide good information on the budget, there was no reason not to inscribe this element. In that sense, the delegation supported the Philippines’ amendment.
49. The **delegation of Armenia** commended Cambodia for the nomination and asked that the State duly provide clarification so as to further consider the element for inscription.
50. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked Cambodia for its file and particularly the fact that it had worked hand-in-hand with the communities, making this a very technically qualified file. The delegation therefore supported the Philippines’ amendment, asking Cambodia to provide more clarity on the budget.
51. The **delegation of Cuba** joined the previous delegations in thanking the Philippines for the amendments, which it supported.
52. The **delegation of Guatemala** remarked that Cambodia had presented a good file, adding that the missing part was not of a substantive nature and it therefore supported the amendment by the Philippines and the inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
53. The **delegation of Cyprus** was in favour of giving the floor to Cambodia, and proposed that instead of giving the floor to all the Members they simply indicate that they agree to support to save time.
54. The **delegation of Cambodia** began bythanking the Government of Mauritius for hosting and organizing the Committee meeting in a beautiful country with very rich cultural diversity. It expressed its thanks to the Secretariat for its work in providing the very good working documents, as well as the Members of the Committee for their tireless work to improve the implementation of the Convention at each session.
55. The **delegation of Cambodia** [second speaker]appreciated the assessment of the Evaluation Body that had expressed a positive opinion on all criteria, except for criterion U.3, which was due to a technical misinterpretation. The delegation wished to clarify and assure the Committee that the five-year safeguarding plan 2018–2022 in the nomination file was articulated on the basis of the firm budget commitments from all stakeholders, Government, communities and partners. In relation to their respective activities, that budget is assessed annually after the activity is completed. It was on this basis of understanding that a clearly defined budget was missing from the nomination file. In this regard, Cambodia had prepared an *aide-memoire* with a clear budget breakdown for the Committee. It was also pleased to inform the Committee that those stated commitments, since the submission of the file, had allowed two elements identified as urgent in the file, namely, the stage performance and a set of costumes, to already be provided [with funds] thanks to the initiatives taken by the local community, together with the financial support of the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts, totalling more than US$75,000; a testament to the strong commitment of the communities and all the stakeholders to reinvigorating this treasured form. Cambodia assured the Committee that it was fully engaged and committed to providing all the necessary financial, human and material means to safeguard the Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet for generations to come. The delegation thanked the Committee for allowing this clarification and expression of commitment.
56. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. The amendment by the Philippines was introduced in paragraph 3 [further deciding that criterion U.3 was met].
57. The **delegation of Palestine** supported all the amendments proposed by the Philippines.
58. The **Chairperson** noted the broad support from **Cyprus, Kuwait, Japan, Senegal, Djibouti, Zambia, Kazakhstan, Togo, China, Colombia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Lebanon, Kuwait, Guatemala, Poland, Jamaica, Cuba, Zambia and Sri Lanka**. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.3) **adopted to inscribe Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
59. The **delegation of Cambodia** spoke of thismoment of joy and pride for Cambodia and especially for the community of Wat Svay Andet to see this fifth element of its intangible cultural heritage on this List. On behalf of the Royal Government of Cambodia and the communities concerned, Cambodia thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe Lkhon Khol Wat Svay Andet on the Urgent Safeguarding List, which would encourage the development of this form of Cambodian cultural expression. Cambodia was aware of its responsibility to assist communities in the implementation of the safeguarding plan. Many activities were already underway and the country considered this element to be a reflection of its cultural identity. It assured the Committee that this inscription would create a positive synergy between communities and other stakeholders, which would greatly support the safeguarding efforts and ensure the viability of the element. Cambodia regarded this session as a major step in the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to preserving cultural diversity.
60. Thanking Cambodia once again, the **Chairperson** then turned to the next nomination submitted by Egypt.
61. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Traditional hand puppetry** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.4],submitted by **Egypt**. Al-Aragoz is an old form of Egyptian theatre using traditional hand puppetry. The viability of the practice is threatened by the changing social, political, legal and cultural circumstances of its enactment, such as laws concerning public gatherings, the rise of religious radicalism, an overall decrease in interest among younger generations, and the advanced age of its active practitioners. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Traditional hand puppetry transmits moral principles, social norms and cultural values, addresses family relations and conveys messages about negative social behaviour and other topical issues. Efforts to safeguard the element include the identification and description of its contemporary state, scientific research and related publications. Through a series of meetings and training sessions, Aragoz practitioners and three NGOs had identified the element and provided their free, prior and informed consent to the nomination. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional hand puppetry on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
62. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
63. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work and for their analysis of this particular dossier. It congratulated Egypt and all the other countries in the region for this inscription because it is a vital element from a cultural perspective. As stated, there were threats facing this element, but Egypt, with its bearers and the communities concerned, was committed to taking the necessary measures to protect this living heritage.
64. The **delegation of Colombia** commended and congratulated Egypt for the work behind this high-quality nomination file and for maintaining this living heritage in such good health despite the threats faced, which only demonstrated the State’s deep commitment.
65. The **delegation of Palestine** extended its thanks to Egypt and the Evaluation Body for all the work undertaken, thanking the State Party for safeguarding this traditional hand puppetry element, which is a deeply rooted part of the culture of the region and which is unfortunately under threat.
66. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.4**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.4) **adopted to inscribe Traditional hand puppetry** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
67. The **delegation of Egypt** thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for the comprehensive assessment of its nomination file, which had been submitted for the first time in 2014. A lot of effort had been made to close all the identified gaps in the file, and it had been resubmitted in September 2017. The effort taken by the community provided an opportunity to compile a successful nomination file. The Al-Aragoz is an old form of theatre performed in Egypt that uses traditional hand puppetry, and is passed on orally from one generation to another. Regrettably, the number of surviving practitioners has dwindled and regular performances were now limited, thus affecting the smooth transmission of the element to future generations. In this regard, the delegation expressed sincere appreciation for the role undertaken by the practitioners to keep this performing art alive. As the communities concerned consider Al-Aragoz to be an integral part of their cultural heritage, they had wholeheartedly participated in the process of preparing the file, including the identification of past and current safeguarding measures, in addition to the suggested plan submitted, which would be implemented following inscription. Egypt was indeed delighted to receive this decision to inscribe Traditional hand puppetry on the Urgent Safeguarding List, which would undoubtedly create a positive atmosphere in the community concerned, but also raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage in general. The delegation reiterated its sincere appreciation of the Chairperson and congratulated him for the excellent organization of the meeting and the generous hospitality provided to all the participants.
68. The **Chairperson** noted that the next nomination was submitted by Kenya. As had been the practice in the past, a member of the Evaluation Body does not participate in the evaluation of the nomination submitted by the country of domiciliation of the NGO he/she represents or by the country of nationality. The floor was thus given to Mr Eivind Falk, Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, to share the Evaluation Body’s findings on this nomination.

*[The Vice-Chairperson presented the file submitted by Kenya]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.5],submitted by **Kenya**.Enkipaata is the induction of boys leading to initiation. Eunoto is the shaving of the morans, paving the way to adulthood. Olng’esherr is the meat-eating ceremony that marks the end of moranism and the beginning of eldership. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. Through the practice, young men acquire the knowledge, skills and social values needed to become respected and responsible members of the community, and to understand and fulfil their role in society. Knowledge concerning Maasai culture is transmitted to new generations together with the three rites. However, the practice appears to be rapidly declining due to the fast emergence of agriculture as a main source of income, reforms of the land tenure system and the impact of climate change. The safeguarding plan draws on a project co-funded by the government of Kenya, the Maasai community and UNESCO based on capacity building and training participants from all nine clans in community-based inventorying. The file attested to an active dialogue and cooperation among the Maasai community, the Department of Culture, the Cultural Initiative for Biodiversity Conservation, the Maasai Cultural Heritage and other stakeholders throughout the nomination process. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.5**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.5) **adopted to inscribe Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
4. The **delegation of Kenya** remarked that the inscription of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng'esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community on the Urgent Safeguarding List marked one of the happiest moments in the history of the implementation of the Convention in Kenya. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the opportunity to share with the world this great element of intangible cultural heritage, as well as the financial assistance received to safeguard the element. This was Kenya’s third inscribed element, which included ‘Traditions and practices associated with the Kayas in the sacred forests of the Mijikenda’ and the ‘Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya’. Kenya highly values its intangible heritage and has put in place mechanisms towards its safeguarding and transmission through the implementation of the Convention. This inscription was therefore a milestone for Kenya as it gave the Maasai community renewed energy for its promotion and safeguarding. The Maasai are made up of nine related sections that all share this common heritage. The three male rites of passage of Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng'esherr gives them a sense of identity and pride, and promoted traditional systems of governance, decision-making and responsibility among the Maasai. This heritage has been so outstanding to the extent of endearing the Maasai as a formidable community in the transmission and safeguarding of its intangible cultural heritage among Kenyan communities. Kenya was committed to the promotion, preservation and safeguarding of the cultural heritage of its diverse communities in addition to the inscribed elements. The delegation invited the international community to visit the Kenyan Maasai in Kajiado and Narok counties in the beginning of April 2019 when the celebrations of the Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng'esherr ceremonies take place so as to experience first-hand this outstanding element. The delegation invited tour operators and tourists to Kenya to consider adding the element to their travel itineraries, assuring the Committee that Kenya had a sustainable tourism management strategy to ensure no over-commercialization of its intangible cultural heritage as a result of increased tourism activities around the element.

*[A short film on the Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr rites was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Eivind Falk for the presentation.

*[The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body reprised his role]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Suri Jagek (observing the sun), traditional meteorological and astronomical practice based on the observation of the sun, moon and stars in reference to the local topography** [draft decision13.COM 10.a.6],submitted by **Pakistan**. Suri Jagek is the traditional Kalasha meteorological and astronomical knowledge system and practice based on the observation of the sun, moon, stars and shadows with respect to the local topography. The system is repeatedly referenced to allow the Kalasha people to predict the appropriate time for sowing seeds, animal husbandry and natural calamities. It is also used to govern the Kalasha calendar by determining the dates of important social events, festivals, feasts and religious ceremonies. However, with the advent of the digital age, people are increasingly opting for more technologically ‘advanced’ means of predicting weather conditions. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that, despite modernization and new global forecasting methods, Suri Jagek still plays an important role in the life of the Kalasha community, comprising fundamental knowledge that helps sustain their way of life. Suri Jagek strengthens solidarity among people and reinforces a sense of identity by pointing towards shared histories and deeply rooted cultural connections. The viability and transmission of the element rest on an innovative transfer of information through storytelling, particularly when the community gathers to observe the rising and setting sun. The proposed safeguarding plan had been carefully prepared and clearly demonstrated community participation. The nomination involved the widest possible participation of members of the Kalasha community, academics, NGOs and the Pakistani Government. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for submitting a well-prepared file. It further wished to remind Pakistan that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Suri Jagek (observing the sun), traditional meteorological and astronomical practice based on the observation of the sun, moon and stars in reference to the local topography on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.6 adopted**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.6) **to inscribe Suri Jagek (observing the sun), traditional meteorological and astronomical practice based on the observation of the sun, moon and stars in reference to the local topography** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
4. The **delegation of Pakistan** expressed its gratitude to the Committee for the inscription of Suri Jagek tradition on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and took the opportunity to convey its immense appreciation to the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their valuable support in achieving this milestone. This practice plays a pivotal role in the Kalasha community as a significant social event at festivals, feasts, rituals, and animal husbandry and farming practices are governed through this age-old practice. It is also used to forecast weather and predict natural disasters. This was Pakistan’s first independent inscription, with the joint inscriptions of Falconry and Nawrouz, which are both inscribed on the Representative List as multinational nominations. Suri Jagek is a fast disappearing element of indigenous Kalasha knowledge of nature and the universe, and was therefore proposed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. This vital tradition would now be protected as part of the shared human heritage of the entire world, and it would continue to serve its spiritual and utilitarian purpose. As a party to the Convention, Pakistan subscribed to its provisions and was committed to the preservation of its intangible cultural heritage, addinga that UNESCO is the only international organization that can pride itself on holding this immensely important mandate of building peace in the minds men and women through education, culture, science and communications. Traditional practices add value to our everyday lives, and heritage constitutes a national identity and a source of cohesion in an age of bewildering change. Listing culture at the heart of development policy is a priority of the government and an essential investment in its future.

*[A short film on Suri Jagek was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Pakistan and turned to the last nomination under item 10.a.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Shadow play**  [draft decision13.COM 10.a.7],submitted by the **Syrian Arab Republic**. Shadow play is a traditional art consisting of handmade puppets moving behind a thin translucent curtain or screen inside a dark theatre, now practised mainly in Damascus. Performances in popular cafes have waned and are now mostly confined to festivals, special holidays and theatres. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered Shadow play to be a popular Syrian traditional performing art with a deep social and cultural meaning which conveys social, religious and political content, and teaches people about proper social behaviour through satire. Its practice and popularity have been declining since the 1940s due to modern technology and new forms of entertainment. The proposed safeguarding measures included: training new puppeteers; increasing performances; participation in international festivals; documentation; transmitting knowledge; launching a website; returning performances to cafes; networking; and building a legislative framework to manage living heritage. The nomination was drawn up by governmental organizations in partnership with artists, cultural associations and civil society organizations. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Shadow play on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
4. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.a.7**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.a.7) **adopted to inscribe Shadow play on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
5. The **delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic** expressed its gratitude to Mauritius for its much-appreciated hospitality, the Secretary, the Committee Members, delegates, Observers and NGO representatives on behalf of the Syrian people for the positive inscription of Shadow play on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Shadow play is an element that is deeply embedded in the memory and traditions of the Syrian people. It has been lifted and transformed to represent more than the puppeteer and his screen. It is an example of how living heritage helps communities build social bonds between each other, how they connect with each other, and how they express their thoughts, opinions, feelings and grievances. In challenging circumstances, however, especially in war and displacement, the cultural heritage of communities is directly threatened, and therefore it is vital for national and international efforts to come together to safeguard this heritage within the spirit of the Convention. The Syrian Arab Republic, including its government institutions, civil society organizations and local communities, were committed to safeguarding this element and to guaranteeing its transmission to future generations. The delegation pledged its commitment to the implementation of the four-year safeguarding plan outlined in the nomination file, which was prepared with the direct participation of Syria’s last active puppeteer. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its professional work and took note of the recommendations included in its assessment. It thanked the Committee for the opportunity for its communities to celebrate their cultural identity, to enhance their safeguarding efforts of shadow play, and support the transmission and continuation of their living heritage.

*[A short film on Shadow play was projected]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/10.b+Add.2*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.b+Add.2-EN.docx)

**Files:**[*40 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10b-representative-list-01013)

1. The **Chairperson** then moved to sub-item 10.b and the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List. As the Committee had already examined the joint inscription submitted by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, and Lao People’s Republic had withdrawn its file, there were only thirty-seven nominations for examination. The Chairperson recalled inscription criteria R.1–R.5 that would guide the decisions, inviting the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the nomination files.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the first nomination, **Chamamé**  [draft decision13.COM 10.b.1],submitted by **Argentina**. Chamamé, a musical genre originating in the province of Corrientes, is the product of a cultural symbiosis comprising Guaraní, African-American and European elements. It is danced, played and enjoyed by people of all social spheres and generations during family, civic, popular and religious celebrations and festivals. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 and R.3. The Evaluation Body considered Chamamé to be a cultural expression that brings together people of different cultures, generations, religions and social classes. A wide range of safeguarding measures was proposed, including the repair and maintenance of musical instruments, the integration of Chamamé into education, and setting up an interpretation centre in Corrientes. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2, R.4 and R.5. The file concentrated exclusively on increasing the visibility of the element itself, while making inappropriate references to its uniqueness without demonstrating how the inscription could contribute to raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general. A long list of different meetings related to the nomination process was provided, but there was no clear description of the nature or mechanisms of involving communities. Evidence related to the inclusion of the element in an inventory was incoherent. The information provided referred to several different inventory mechanisms in an unclear and scattered manner. Basic information such as the date of inclusion of the element in the inventory, how the inventory is regularly updated and the modality of updating was also missing. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Chamamé to the submitting State.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that amendments had been received for this nomination, opening the floor for comments.
4. The **delegation of Guatemala** remarked that dialogue was important in this Committee, as previously discussed, as it provided an opportunity for the submitting States to express themselves. In this case, the delegation requested that the submitting State be allowed to speak in order that it explain some of the issues, which were perhaps unclear or which the Evaluation Body did not interpret in the way that the submitting State would have hoped.
5. The **delegation of China** appreciated the efforts of the Evaluation Body on this nomination, thanking the submitting State. It noted that the nomination file under Section 4.a on the participation of the communities mentioned the active participation of the communities by listing a series of events and activities. The delegation requested further clarification from the submitting State on this issue.
6. The **delegation of Poland** appreciated the recommendations prepared by the Evaluation Body. However, in light of the previous day’s discussion concerning dialogue, it wished to ask the State Party for clarification on a few points concerning the criteria mentioned by the Evaluation Body, adding that it appeared that not every argument was taken into account by the Evaluation Body, which the State Party could provide in this case.
7. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work on this file. It also thanked Argentina for protecting and recognizing Chamamé, which is a cultural manifestation inherent to the province of Corrientes. This is a product of symbiosis between the Guaraní indigenous population, the European population and the African population, which since the 17th century had been set up and managed by the Jesuit missionaries, sharing a common history in South America between several countries such as Paraguay, Bolivia and Colombia. This is manifested in several, very specific ways in South America, for example, in the use of instruments like the guitar, violin or the harp. The nomination file stated that the element had been inscribed on the intangible heritage list of the province of Corrientes; however, the information contained in the sixth section [of the file] referred to different mechanisms, including several laws and the List of Intangible Heritage of MERCOSUR. The information on the date of inclusion of the element or how the inventory is updated on a periodic basis was not included in the file. Thus, on the basis of the information provided, the Committee could not conclude whether the Chamamé is properly inventoried. For this reason, Argentina was asked to shed light on these issues.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** appreciated the work of the Evaluation Body and also the State Party for a very interesting nomination. It was noted that the tradition of Chamamé is hugely important for the people of Argentina and, in fact, is considered as one of the central elements of their cultural identity of no less importance than the world-famous Tango. It was also noted that some of the Evaluation Body’s more negative conclusions seemed to be more technical in nature, which could be clarified by the State Party. Given the well-known challenges related to the absence of a dialogue mechanism between States Parties and the Evaluation Body, the delegation believed that this file deserved close examination. In this regard, it would appreciate the State Party’s response on how inscription of Chamamé would contribute to greater visibility and raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage in general.
9. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work and also commended Argentina for the interesting Chamamé file. It joined Colombia in asking to allow Argentina to respond to the question on the inventory as, based on the information provided, it was difficult to assess whether Chamamé was included in an inventory in compliance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, or whether there was a technical misunderstanding.
10. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Argentina for submitting the Chamamé file, an expression of vibrant culture that represented several cultural traditions in itself and brought together people of different cultures, generations and religions. It particularly noted the involvement of persons with disabilities in the practice, which was one of the strengths of this element. With regard to criterion R.2, the delegation remarked that the Committee was once again confronted with a situation where the submitting State faced difficulties in adequately responding to the criterion. It partially agreed with the opinion of the Evaluation Body in that the response to Section 2 in the nomination file could have been better formulated. The delegation wished to hear from Argentina on how it believed the nomination would support the visibility of intangible heritage in general, and it would be ready to revisit the recommendation proposed by the Evaluation Body in that case. Regarding criterion R.4, the delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its detailed evaluation. The information provided in the form of community consent letters was indeed very limited. However, the delegation believed that not all the consent letters had been submitted by the State, and on the website http://chamameargentina.org—mentioned in the nomination—it indeed contained at least sixty pages of letters that expressed consent to the nomination, leading to the belief that this might be a technical issue. Regarding criterion R.5, the date of inclusion on an inventory was indeed provided, though it was not reflected in the form but rather in the inventory extract attached dated 6 January 2017. In that sense, the delegation reminded the Committee of paragraph 21 in Decision [10.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/10.COM/10) stating that the relevant extracts of inventories and the corresponding section in the nomination form should be considered together and complement each other for the purposes of the evaluation; an important principle that should be applied in the future. The remaining information on criterion R.5, such as community participation and the updating of the inventory, could also be found in the form and the inventory extract. For these reasons, the delegation did not find reasons for referring the file on this criterion and would support a positive recommendation.
11. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Evaluation Body for the information contained in the assessment, as well as the State Party. As already mentioned by some Members of the Committee, the delegation once again drew attention to the fact that the file encountered issues in R.2 and R.5, which underscored the need to reflect further on these criteria and how they are specifically used. Indeed, there is room for interpretation and such ambiguity needed to be clarified. With regard to R.4 in particular, the delegation noted a discrepancy between how the criterion was used by the State Party in the file and how it was assessed by the Evaluation Body, whose interpretation would need to aligned. Thus, it was pertinent to allow both parties to clarify this issue to enable the Committee to make an objective decision.
12. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for the work accomplished and also the State Party for submitting this important file on the Chamamé, adding that music always brought people together. It is a living form of heritage, especially in a multiethnic place that had seen a lot of migration over the years. Keeping this tradition and music alive was thus an important consideration. Owing to a lack of interpretation of the documentation submitted, some clarification was required on some of the technical issues that were apparent. For this reason, the State Party should clarify the issues raised by the Evaluation Body so as to have a more positive outcome for this file, as it was a really good file that brought people together.
13. The **delegation of Austria** had read the file several times and admitted to having reached the same conclusion as the Evaluation Body on almost every criterion. It sought to hear from the Evaluation Body concerning the use of social and mass media because the element appeared to have a very large community and the approach of involving them through the use of social media and a reflection forum online was interesting. The delegation thus wondered whether the Evaluation Body could elaborate on how they had come to this decision under R.4, and in general whether a dedicated website, as mentioned in the form, was consulted. This would also clarify the issue in future nominations.
14. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Evaluation Body for its extremely important work and joined the other Members who expressed the wish to allow the submitting State to provide the explanations needed to decide on the nomination.
15. The **delegation of Jamaica** recognized that R.1 and R.3 had been adequately met in the nomination file, but it also noted the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body in relation to R.2, R.4 and R.5. It supported the position of Cuba, Senegal and Kuwait that the State Party should be given the opportunity to address the concerns related to the element’s contribution to intangible heritage in general, on community involvement and the presence of an inventory.
16. The **delegation of Lebanon** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work, noting that it appeared to have been a difficult case. Nevertheless, on the basis of dialogue, it was important to give the submitting Party a chance to fill in the gaps.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee Members, and first gave the floor to the Evaluation Body to respond to certain issues that were raised, particularly the question raised by Austria, before giving the floor to Argentina.
18. Responding to the issue raised by Austria, the **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that in addition to the four consents that were submitted in the file, the Evaluation Body also visited the website that had been indicated, and where quite a number of other consents were available. However, the Chairperson recalled that R.4 was not solely about consent as there were several other aspects contained within R.4, including the mechanisms of involving the communities and the nature of their participation. There was also Section 4.c that sought a clear statement on the respect for customary practices. These were the aspects that had led the Evaluation Body to reach a consensus that the criterion was not fully met. Although they appear minor, they were some of the aspects that were required for the criterion to be met when going through the form section by section.
19. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Argentina to respond to the queries.
20. The **delegation of Argentina** began by thanking the Government and authorities of Mauritius for organizing this meeting and for the first-hand experience of its hospitality and cultural heritage. The delegation cited Mr José Ortega y Gasset, Mr Koichiro Matsuura and Mr Mohammed Bedjaoui as persons who would have understood the significance and importance of dialogue.
21. The **Chairperson** asked Argentina to respond directly to the points raised by the Committee.
22. The **delegation of Argentina** explained that its introduction was to emphasize the importance of communicating. It greatly appreciated the Evaluation Body’s work, but it would have wished to have been able to communicate beforehand with the Evaluation Body by email or telephone, which would have been the best way to clarify these points prior to the present session. Dialogue was of the utmost importance and Argentina had always been ready to provide the responses necessary. The delegation further explained that the communities concerned speak Spanish and Guaraní, the official language of the Corrientes province and also in the constitution of Paraguay, which is not simply understood such that its translation into French or English made the drafting of the nomination form, which is limited in scope, linguistically, culturally and procedurally more difficult. Moreover, providing all the information required in the nomination form to include and recognize each of the different communities and groups, where they held workshops, who took part, and on what dates was deemed impossible. The delegation highlighted certain key sentences that drew particular attention. For example, only four different consent letters had been submitted because it was unclear how many were needed; one or four thousand? The delegation explained that it had been working on the nomination file for years and that it had provided four consent signatures as an example, not least because the section only allowed for 150 words, but behind each of the four signatures were hundreds if not thousands of letters of consent with their dates of submission that can be seen on the Chamamé website. The delegation further explained that it was very involved in all the work undertaken by UNESCO, which consistently advocated for the use of ICTs as a modern way of communicating. However, in the examination of this nomination file, it appeared that everything had to be provided on paper. The drafters had used ICTs, and the dedicated website perfectly illustrated the wealth of information required. The delegation wondered whether the Secretariat could project the website onto the screen in order that everyone could see the information contained online, adding that this would surely allay any concerns regarding the information and the number of signatures required.
23. The **delegation of Argentina** referred to R.2 and the several concerns raised on the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, explaining that the drafters had worked with women, children, elders and all manner of associations and bodies who had participated in drafting the nomination file, as they were all naturally proud of the prospect of inscription. The delegation added that there may have been some confusion between the 2003 Convention and the 1972 Convention, but everyone working on the inscriptions understood the importance of clarifying why intangible cultural heritage in general was of great importance. Moreover, the issue of criterion R.2 was a question of comprehension and capacity. It was thus important to ensure that everyone understood the purpose of R.2, after which it would be easier to come up with better proposals that comply with R.2 in the future. Nevertheless, the pride of these practising communities meant that they used words such as ‘unique’, ‘exclusive’ and ‘exceptional’ to describe the unique nature of their intangible cultural heritage, which was perfectly understandable. The communities could indeed be asked to express their culture in a different way, but they should not be denied pride in their element because they are unable to interpret the language required to explain how the element would increase the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The Committee should therefore bear in mind the community’s perspective. With regard to the other issues raised, the delegation further explained that the inscription of Chamamé in the inventory allowed other elements to be inscribed, which in turn enabled the communities to participate, engage and learn more about intangible cultural heritage in general. The delegation conceded that the procedure could be improved upon and it was perfectly willing to demonstrate the results stemming from the criteria and inscription in the periodic reports, which would also demonstrate the pride of the communities, which should also be taken into consideration. Moreover, UNESCO needed to approach the communities more closely, just as the communities needed to approach UNESCO and the Convention in the case of inscription. Nevertheless, there should be respect for their culture by not focusing on asking for the impossible and reproaching the communities for their shortcomings. Instead, they should be given the opportunity to inscribe these practices, which are important for the country, the communities concerned and for the region more widely. It would serve to unite the communities throughout Argentina, as well as the communities that immigrated to other parts of South America. As concerns criterion R.4, it was noted that the nomination file had focused on providing consent from a small number of individuals. The delegation explained that the form was very limited in space and scope, with very few instructions on what was required.
24. Noting the time, the **Chairperson** reminded Argentina of Rule 22.4 that only information to the questions raised by Committee Members should be provided, asking the delegation to remain precise on the explanation under R.4.
25. The **delegation of Argentina** remarked thatit had been asked to explain different aspects of the Convention, hence its detailed explanations, but it was ready to respond more specifically to the questions raised. The delegation referred to the dedicated webpage on Chamamé where the very broad participation of these communities and the workshops held were very clearly indicated. Moreover, workshops had been held in 2016, 2017 and into 2018, which continued this work and directly involved the Chamamé communities; work that never ceased with workshops still being run in Argentina. For this reason, it was difficult to extrapolate figures, but this information was available on the website. With regard to the letters of consent, the delegation explained that more than 1,000 forms had been submitted, adding that the drafters had chosen this methodology because there were no clear guidelines on how to complete forms and how consent should be expressed. The drafters had thus chosen to submit four letters, representing four groups of consent, when in truth it represented thousands of letters showing the full support of all the communities concerned. Chamamé is an integral part of the Corrientes culture and throughout the country, and the entire community had taken part and had submitted thousands of signed letters, even though only a representative sample was provided. With regard to the noted register of intangible cultural heritage, the delegation made it clear that the register was in fact the inventory. The delegation recalled Article 12 of the Convention, which clearly stated that a national inventory should be drawn up in a manner geared to its own situation, and as a federal nation, each province had the right to draft its own regional constitution. Hence, Resolution 1553 established the institute that registers intangible cultural heritage in which the element was inventoried. The cited resolution was thus not referring to law but specifically to the inventory, which was also registered in MERCOSUR under this reference. Moreover, there was a typo in the form in Spanish, which should read ‘registro’ instead of ‘registo’ owing to the fact that it had been translated into Spanish from Guaraní, the language of the people of Chamamé. The delegation understood the time limit, but it was available to answer any further questions in more detail if required.
26. The **Chairperson** thanked Argentina, adding that a decision on the draft decision would be taken after lunch, and inviting the Secretary to make a few practical announcements.
27. The **Secretary** announced a seminar taking place during lunch organized by the Ministry of Culture of Colombia on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Urban Contexts. A meeting of the Arab Group was also being held.

*[Wednesday, 28 November 2018, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

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

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the session, recalling that Argentina had provided clarifications to the questions raised by the Committee, and turned to the adoption of draft decision 13.COM 10.b.1 on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Guatemala had presented an amendment to paragraph 3 [that further decides that the criteria R.2, R.4 and R.5 were met].
2. The **delegation of Colombia** supported the amendment presented by Guatemala.
3. The **delegations of Kazakhstan** and **Poland** supported the amendment.
4. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Evaluation Body for the evaluation of this file, and the State Party for its elaborate answer. However, it wished to refer to paragraph 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure in which it was stated that “representatives of a State Party shall not speak to advocate the inclusion in the list but should only provide information in reply to questions raised”. The Netherlands felt that the Committee should follow the Rules of Procedure, and as much as possible, the advice of the Evaluation Body for the benefit of improving the quality of files. The delegation reiterated that it was in no way discussing the value of the element itself, but rather the file at hand. In that respect, it welcomed the remarks of the Evaluation Body on the referral option to give the State Party the opportunity to revisit the file and improve its quality so that each file could serve as a showcase of intangible cultural heritage. It therefore did not support the amendment proposed by Guatemala.
5. The **delegation of Kuwait** wished to add its support to Guatemala’s amendment.
6. The **delegation of Armenia** joined the proposal by Guatemala.
7. The **delegation of Austria** thanked Argentina for the information provided, but based on the file and the information provided, some elements were still unclear. For this reason, Austria supported the position of the Netherlands.
8. The **delegation of Palestine** asked the Chairperson to allow the Evaluation Body to respond to the explanations provided by Argentina to determine whether or not the clarifications provided had allayed its concerns.
9. The **delegation of Lebanon** seconded the proposal by Palestine and thanked Argentina.
10. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** reiterated that the work of the Evaluation Body is to process the information contained in the file. When it examined this file, the Body concluded that some criteria were met while others were not met, meaning there was a lack of information required to help determine whether some of the criteria were indeed satisfied. The explanation provided by Argentina was no different from the information contained in the file in that it emphasized information that could be found via the weblink and that the date of the inventory could also be found on the website. However, the information in the file was not sufficient for the Body to determine whether the criterion was met, even with the explanation given. The Evaluation Body thus maintained its position.
11. Noting that the amendment by Guatemala did not receive broad consensus, the **Chairperson** returned to the original paragraph 3, which was duly adopted.
12. The **delegation of Colombia** supported the amendment by Guatemala in paragraph 4.
13. The **Chairperson** remarked that since the original paragraph 3 had been adopted [the named criteria were not met], the current amendment in paragraph 4 [to inscribe the element] could not ordinarily stand alone.
14. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that, according to the Operational Directives, an element must satisfy all five criteria to be inscribed.
15. The **delegation of the Netherlands** repeated that it did not support the amendments.
16. Noting that there was no broad support for the amendment, the **Chairperson** returned to the original paragraph 4, which was duly adopted.
17. The **delegation of Cuba** had been following the discussion, noting that this nomination had given rise to protracted negotiations within the Committee, perhaps owing to some of the details regarding R.2 and R.5 or perhaps due to some incongruence with R. 4. The delegation asked the Secretariat whether in the spirit of dialogue there was a way to allow the nomination to be resubmitted earlier than in two years’ time. It did not wish to run against the procedure in place, but at least in the written and oral report it could mention the possibility for the Bureau or the Evaluation Body to reconsider this nomination in order to gather the information that was considered to be insufficient by some Members during this session.
18. The **delegations of Colombia** and **Palestine** supported the remarks made by Cuba.
19. The **Chairperson** recalled an earlier suggestion by Cyprus that Committee Members supporting a particular position should say so right away in order to save time.
20. The **delegation of the Philippines** also supported the remarks by Cuba.
21. The **delegation of Cyprus** agreed with the comments made by Cuba and recalled that in the Bureau meeting the previous day, the Members had agreed that the floor could be given to a Member State to open a file, but the Committee would not normally accept any amendments at this stage. Argentina had been given the opportunity to speak, but the nomination file would be referred and not inscribed in the current cycle. It was hoped that the same approach would be applied to all the other files.
22. The **Chairperson** thanked Cyprus for this clarification and noted the request from Cuba, which was supported by three Members of the Committee. The Secretary was invited to voice his views on the situation.
23. The **Secretary** remarked that theCommittee was in a little bit of a legal and procedural bind. He fully understood the desire to see these kinds of referrals return to the Committee in the following year. Nevertheless, the Committee was bound by the Operational Directives established by the General Assembly, particularly in Operational Directive 36, which states that “nominations, proposals or requests that the Committee decides not to inscribe, select or approve or to refer to the submitting States for additional information may be resubmitted to the Committee for examination during a following cycle after having been updated and supplemented”. Thus, the current understanding of the rules did not actually allow for the file to be returned next year. Nevertheless, the Secretary was willing to look for an interpretation that would allow for such a situation, as the Secretariat was not necessarily against the idea. The Rules as they stood in the Operational Directives and to the Secretariat’s understanding were that they did not actually permit such a procedure whether through the Bureau or another course. In any case, a proper legal interpretation of the rules would be necessary, but the current interpretation did not unfortunately allow for this to happen.
24. The **delegation of Lebanon** encouraged the interpretation of the Rules to see whether the Committee—in fairness to some deserving files—could allow some countries to resubmit their nominations in the following year.
25. The **delegation of Colombia** would be very interested in this option, which would recognize the hard work carried out by the community and its deep involvement in the nomination. It is the people that make the Chamamé and the delegation sought to send a positive message of encouragement to the communities involved to encourage them to continue with this nomination so that it would have the required quality to receive support at its next submission. The delegation proposed some wording in this regard, which would read, ‘recognized the work of the community and encouraged them to continue in this direction’.
26. The **Chairperson** asked Colombia to provide the Secretariat with the written amendment.
27. The **delegation of Palestine** regretted the absence of the Legal Adviser and sought an explanation from the Secretariat in this regard. More importantly, it fully agreed with the Secretariat regarding the Operational Guidelines and the Rules of Procedure, but at the same time there were some exceptions, as had been seen, for example, at the opening of the session [with the case of Korea], which was supported by all the Committee Members. The delegation therefore asked whether the Committee could follow this exception for this element, which would have to be unanimous, in the interest of the communities concerned and also for the country to safeguard and promote this element.
28. The **delegation of Guatemala** regretted seeing the direction this discussion was taking. Nonetheless, it thanked the Chairperson for giving Argentina the opportunity to engage in dialogue. It surmised that the lunch break was perhaps detrimental to the dynamic, and it was hoped that there would have been an opportunity to ask a couple or more questions so that Argentina could be allowed to speak again. Noting that there was no consensus among the Members of the Committee, the delegation thanked both Argentina and the communities for this initiative, and for the acknowledged involvement of the community in this process. Moreover, the community was eagerly awaiting the results of the Committee. The delegation was sympathetic to how people and the community would feel, i.e. people who practise the different expressions of cultural heritage, but who unfortunately have to come before the Committee. The Rules exist and the Committee must respect them, but it recognized that the community would not receive the recognition it sought, which was an inscription on the Representative List. It was thus hoped that the role of the communities would be acknowledged and that the cycle would be abridged so that Argentina could earn recognition as early as possible.
29. Responding to the comment by Guatemala, the **Chairperson** wished to make clear at this early juncture in the examination of the filesthatthe session had run out of time, and that Argentina had been given more than fifteen minutes to speak. Moreover, the Chairperson had intervened on more than two occasions to stress the need for Argentina to respond directly to the queries, which had also been emphasized by the Netherlands.
30. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for its explanation, adding that it understood that the Committee had to respect the legal framework, the Operational Directives and the Rules of the Convention. Nevertheless, it was important to also bear in mind that the Convention was currently at a time of reflection; as a living Convention, it would continue to evolve. The delegation wondered whether the Bureau could provide an option based on the specificities and the symbolism of this particular case—on the understanding that the Committee had to follow the rules—as it not only affected Argentina, but had wider implications for the entire region. Thus, could the Bureau come up with a solution that on the one hand respected the legal framework, without setting a precedent, and on the other hand offered more flexibility in Argentina’s case?
31. The **Chairperson** noted the remarks by Cuba, and informed the Committee that the Legal Adviser was present and would soon share his views on the situation. In the meantime, the Chairperson asked Colombia to present its amendment.
32. The **delegation of Colombia** proposed the following wording: ‘Recognizes the hard work and commitment of the associate communities and related institutions in the elaboration of the file, and looks forward to a future consideration of the file’.
33. The **Chairperson** noted thatthe amendment appeared as a new paragraph 5.
34. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the wording presented by Colombia and the opinion of Cuba, and wished to hear from the Legal Adviser.
35. The **delegation of Poland** supported the amendment, having in mind that the community deserved such a wording.
36. The **delegation of the Philippines** also supported the amendment, adding that it had worked with Cuba and Colombia on the proposal.
37. The **delegations of Lebanon, Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Cyprus, Senegal, Jamaica, Japan, the Netherlands, China, Austria, Guatemala, Sri Lanka, Armenia and Togo** supported the amendment proposed by Colombia.
38. The **Chairperson** noted the broad support received for paragraph 5, which was duly adopted.
39. The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser to pronounce on the suggestion by Cuba to consider how to deal with this referral, and whether there was a possibility—with the consent of the Committee Members—to have this file referred prior to the two-year hiatus.
40. The **Legal Adviser** thanked the Committee for allowing him time to look into this matter. He understood that the Secretariat had already provided advice and an interpretation on this issue, which he supported from a legal standpoint. In this regard, the Legal Adviser referred to Article 36 of the Operational Directives, according to which “nominations, proposals, requests that the Committee decides not to inscribe, select, approve or refer to the submitting State for additional information may be resubmitted to the Committee for re-examination during a following cycle after having been updated and supplemented”. He agreed with the Secretariat that there was no provision to actually suspend this rule and that the Operational Directives had been approved by the General Assembly.
41. The **Chairperson** thanked the Legal Adviser for enlightening the Committee on the situation.
42. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked thatin similar situations in other Conventions in UNESCO, and particularly World Heritage, there had been occasions in the course of discussions when one of the alternative wordings had been used that was not actually a decision to inscribe or not inscribe. It was clear in paragraph 4 that the Committee was not inscribing the element. Thus, the Committee could perhaps use alternative language or find other wording inspired by the Operational Directives in this regard, thereby keeping it more general. In this way, it would open up some flexibility from a legal perspective. In this regard, the delegation wondered whether the Bureau or the Secretariat could look into an alternative wording that would enable the Committee to get out of the impasse. Without wishing to extend the debate, it wondered whether there was a way to work around the Operational Directives so that it did not refer to one of the four stated categories [inscribe, select, approve or refer].
43. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Committee had already adopted paragraph 4.
44. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that thissession had already borne witness to a few departures from the standard procedure, and it was not advocating a breach of the rules but rather an alternative wording in the spirit of cooperation that could resolve the issue.
45. The **Chairperson** took note of the sentiment among the Committee Members and also the advice given by the Legal Adviser as to the best way forward. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to share his views on whether other options could be explored.
46. The **Secretary** was uncertain of the various options available, adding that these issues had come up during some of the discussions of the informal working group, and it did look for options but could not find any in this regard. The Secretary reminded the Committee that paragraph 4 had already been adopted, and that the Operational Directives in this Convention were established by the General Assembly; in the 1972 Convention, the Committee had the authority over them. The Secretary was willing to hear suggestions, adding that an extra paragraph or particular wording in the chapeau decision could then be explored from a legal perspective, but that currently there were no options available. This was clearly part of ongoing discussions about dialogue and looking at the different ways of facilitating dialogue and to have the option of a one-year referral. The Secretary firmly pointed out that the language in the decision was not ‘not to inscribe’, i.e. the file was not being rejected by the Committee, it was a referral.
47. Given the sentiment in the room, the **Chairperson** suggested suspending the decision at this juncture and proceeding with the other nominations, by which time a possible means out of the situation could be explored.
48. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson for enabling this dialogue, adding that it supported Cuba’s remarks and shared the same request. In other words, it would also like to work towards a solution that enabled a one-year referral, and it would like to work closely with Argentina to ensure that in this short timeframe the nomination could satisfy all the requirements for inscription.
49. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee wished to move forward to draft decision 10.b.2 and return later to 10.b.1, inviting the Secretary to clarify the next steps.
50. Having received aspecific request, the **Secretary** explained that the Secretariat would need time to look once more into possible options by working with the Legal Adviser.
51. The **Chairperson** suggestedsuspending the examination of draft decision 13.COM 10.b.1 for consultation and exploring options for a one-year referral, as suggested by Cuba. He then turned to the next nomination submitted by Austria, Czechia, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia regarding the nomination of Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač, resist block printing and indigo dyeing in Europe.
52. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač, resist block printing and indigo dyeing in Europe** [draft decision13.COM 10.b.2], submitted by **Austria, Czechia, Germany, Hungary and Slovakia**. Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač is a practice of printing a dye-resistant paste onto a cloth before dyeing over it with indigo dye. The paste prevents the dye from penetrating the design, thus ensuring the applied design remains white or undyed after the dyeing process. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač has a strong regional diversity reflected in the patterns and technical skills comprising a set of techniques that are continuously recreated through experimental workshops, open-source approaches and new technologies. The element boosts a constant recreation of traditional motifs and skills by highlighting the intrinsic link established between living heritage and a diverse range of fields such as history, biology, chemistry, art and design. The safeguarding measures focused on the transmission, protection, documentation and promotion of the element through educational programmes. The communities concerned and a wide range of stakeholders actively participated in the nomination process through workshops. The Evaluation Body commended the States Parties for the excellent file, where each submitting State appeared to have contributed in a balanced manner, demonstrating active networking among the communities in the preparation of the nomination and the overall safeguarding of the element. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač, resist block printing and indigo dyeing in Europe on the Representative List.
53. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
54. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.2) **adopted to inscribe Blaudruck/Modrotisk/Kékfestés/Modrotlač, resist block printing and indigo dyeing in Europe** **on the Representative List**.
55. The **delegation of** **Czechia** thanked the host country for organizing the session and the warm hospitality. It was very happy that the blue print had been added to the Representative List, adding that living heritage, including traditional craftsmanship, knew no borders and it was very proud that the joint transboundary nomination had been developed by five neighbouring countries in the heart of Europe. The involvement of all stakeholders, the exchanges between the blue print communities, and the support and promotion of this element at the regional and State levels had been the basis for successful international cooperation, for which it extended its sincere thanks to all.
56. The **delegation of Germany** remarked thatblue print, also called blue dyeing, was a phenomenon that connected five submitting States and their communities. It perfectly illustrated how intangible cultural heritage is shared across borders and how it can serve as a springboard for international cooperation and mutual respect.
57. The **delegation of** **Hungary** explained that the multinational nomination provided an opportunity for blue dyers and experts to deepen cooperation among the five countries, culminating in a renewed commitment to safeguarding this common heritage. Since the blue dyeing tradition is mostly transmitted within the family, its survival depends on family workshops. At the national level, museums and NGOs support these workshops, while national and local festivals, exhibitions and shows provide networking opportunities for masters. Textile designers also have a crucial role to play in making blue dye products attractive to youth so that future generations can appreciate the value of this tradition.
58. The **delegation of** **Slovakia** highlighted the communities of practitioners from all States Parties whose sense of identity as blue printing masters had been strengthened through the nomination process. The different communities had become one community, and they continued to cooperate on various levels. Moreover, they consider themselves as part of a family, which is important as in most of the countries there are only a few workshops or even just one single master left.
59. The **delegation of** **Austria** hoped that the strengthened visibility of the element would continue to inspire and connect others in order to further the element, and to foster dialogue and cooperation. It hoped that many other countries would follow the invitation to participate in an international exhibition of indigo textiles that would illustrate the wide range of sustainable blue dyeing techniques developed by generations of artisans in many countries around the world.

*[A short film on resist block printing and indigo dyeing was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the States and then turned to the examination of the nomination of Heritage of Dede Qorqud/Korkyt Ata/Dede Korkut, epic culture, folk tales and music in a joint submission by Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkey.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Heritage of Dede Qorqud/Korkyt Ata/Dede Korkut, epic culture, folk tales and music** [draft decision13.COM 10.b.3], submitted by **Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Turkey**. The Heritage of Dede Qorqud is centred on twelve heroic legends, stories and tales, and thirteen traditional musical compositions shared and transmitted across the generations through oral expressions, performing arts, cultural codes and musical compositions. It is practised and sustained by the community concerned on a wide variety of occasions during family events and national and international festivals. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Heritage of Dede Qorqud conveys the history and common values of Turkic-speaking communities, thereby contributing to their sense of identity and belonging. The element symbolizes a strong tool for transferring the values of courage, mutual respect and tolerance to younger generations as it stimulates exchanges and enhances intercultural cooperation among countries which identify themselves with the cross-border practice. The proposed shared safeguarding plan involved close cooperation between the communities of practitioners represented by relevant NGOs and state authorities to be implemented jointly and at the national level. The nomination was initiated by the communities and bearers in collaboration with NGOs and national authorities during various discussions through a series of working group meetings. The Evaluation Body took note of the speed of the nomination process (six weeks) described in the file and encouraged submitting States, for future nominations, to allow sufficient time for deep and wide community participation in the process. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Heritage of Dede Qorqud/Korkyt Ata/Dede Korkut, epic culture, folk tales and music on the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
4. The **delegation of Armenia** regretted to have to take the floor again but wished to make a statement regarding the content submitted by Azerbaijan in paragraph d. and paragraph 5 (vi) of the nomination form. The provocative reference to some regions therein, Karabakh and others, gave a clear political connotation to the Azerbaijani part of the nomination, thus revealing its real motivation. It was mentioned that the element is practised and transmitted by communities in this region and that the file was prepared with the participation of a number of these communities, but it only presents the consent letters of three NGOs and none from the communities mentioned. With due respect to the experts of the Evaluation Body, the delegation encouraged them to carefully examine community involvement, the absence of the consent letters, and other very sensitive issues when considering files. Unfortunately, this issue would result in future political and biased reports and an overall misuse of the UNESCO platform for extending dividing lines as a sphere of culture and for building bridges of peace. The delegation was surprised to see inconsistency and factual errors in the nominations and reports of this State in areas they claim to have no access, as mentioned in their Chovqan report, but now presented the participation and involvement of these communities. The delegation remarked that [Azerbaijan] needed to make up its mind and cease manipulating the Committee and the Evaluation Body by falsifying the facts. It noted that this nomination contained politicized and very sensitive sections, which would result in the future presentation of ungrounded, false, inappropriate political reporting, further complicating UNESCO’s agenda. Armenia reiterated its position on the unacceptable nature of misusing UNESCO to promote conflict-related perceptions. It kindly asked the Secretariat to officially take note of its position and include its statement in the summary records, as well as its rejection of the draft decision for the above-mentioned reasons only.
5. The **Chairperson** took note of the statement by Armenia.
6. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.3) **adopted to inscribe Heritage of Dede Qorqud/Korkyt Ata/Dede Korkut, epic culture, folk tales and music on the Representative List**.
7. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** did not wishto respond to the allegations, leaving it to the Committee to judge. It expressed deep gratitude to the Evaluation Body and to the Committee for inscribing this heritage of the Dede Qorqud on the Representative List. The delegation appreciated the efforts of Kazakhstan and Turkey for the excellent cooperation in the preparation of this excellent multinational nomination, which again testified that regional cooperation and cultural heritage brought communities together. The inscription of the Dede Qorqud heritage would allow for greater dialogue between the communities of the submitting States, as many people of all ages identify themselves with this heritage. Dede Qorqud celebrates the unity and diversity of their heritage for the sake of peace and mutual respect. This inscription would stimulate further exchanges between countries and enhance intercultural cooperation; one of the core principles of the Convention. It was a moment of particular pride for Azerbaijan as the legends and tales of the Dede Qorqud still resonate in the memory of many Azerbaijanis. The Dede Qorqud epic promotes family values, the role of women in society, sharing, solidarity, hospitality, fairness and honesty, and this inscription is a tribute to those values and traditions. The delegation thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for this excellent work and the careful analysis of this multinational nomination, and it looked forward to other joint nominations with the countries of the region.
8. The **delegation of Turkey** thanked Mauritius for its warm welcome and congratulated the Chairperson on his successful efforts. Dede Korkut culture is still kept alive in Turkey today with its wide expression of composition, music tradition, various beliefs and social practices. Dede Korkut epics mention generosity, hospitality, bravery, mercy and solidarity, and play an important role in cultural dialogue, mutual understanding and building peace between all segments of society. Dede Korkut culture is still practised in all geographical locations in Turkey, therefore the delegation thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body on behalf of the Turkish people. It thanked the stakeholders, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan for the great efforts in the preparation of the nomination file. Finally, the delegation hoped that inscription would support the visibility of the Convention and not just Turkic-speaking communities, and also increase dialogue and create interaction opportunities among all the bearers and practitioners who are related to this epic culture in the world.
9. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked everyone for their kind support, as well as Azerbaijan and Turkey for their valuable collaboration and work on this nomination. The delegation gave the floor to a representative from the region who is strongly associated with the Korkyt Ata heritage. A **Representative** of the community [translated from local language] represented Kyzylorda Oblast, a region in the southeast west of Kazakhstan along the great Central Asian river of Syr Darya where people consider it as a place of origin for Korkyt Ata, also known as Dede Qorqud. The community sincerely appreciated the inclusion of Korkyt’s legacy on the Representative List. Kazakhs consider Korkyt Ata to be an inventor of kobyz, which is one of the world’s oldest string instruments. A brief performance from one of Korkyt Ata’s compositions was played by one of the region’s prominent performers of kobyz.

*[Performance of Korkyt Ata]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Strawcraft in the Bahamas** [draft decision13.COM 10.b.4],submitted by the **Bahamas**. The straw craft in the Bahamas involves the hand production of straw craft plaits and weaves by local inhabitants, using traditional plaiting and weaving methods. Strawcraft in the Bahamas is considered to be a dynamic component of the resourceful, resilient spirit of Bahamians and has played an intricate role in the economy of the islands. From the information included in the file, the nomination did not sufficiently satisfy criteria R.1, R.2, R.3 and R.4. Instead of explaining the cultural significance of the practice, the file stressed its economic dimension and its role as a product of a creative industry. It also concentrated on promoting the craft as a staple brand of the country and a source of pride, rather than explaining how its inscription could raise the visibility of living heritage in general, encourage dialogue among communities and promote respect for cultural diversity and creativity. The safeguarding plan did not reflect the unstable situation of the straw craft as concerned by its cultural and social meanings, and transmission to future generations. Instead, it appeared to promote the element as an economic activity, involving the production and marketing of crafts. The file failed to demonstrate how practitioners and local communities had participated in preparing the safeguarding plan, how they would be involved in its implementation, and how they had participated in the nomination process. Furthermore, the Evaluation Body considered that the information did not satisfy criterion R.5. Although the State had declared its interest in safeguarding the straw craft as an important element of intangible cultural heritage through the Straw Market Authority Act since 2011, the State Party did not manage an inventory in accordance with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended not to inscribe Strawcraft in the Bahamas.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.4**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.4) **adopted not to inscribe Strawcraft in the Bahamas** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Rickshaws and rickshaw painting in Dhaka** [draft decision13.COM 10.b.5],submitted by **Bangladesh**. Rickshaw craftsmanship is a traditional practice of fashioning and decorating the rickshaw, a human-propelled mode of transport on three wheels. The element is part of Dhaka City’s cultural tradition, which not only provides the communities, groups and individuals concerned with a steady source of income and employment, but also offers them a sense of pride, unity and continuity. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criterion R.1. The Evaluation Body considered thatRickshaws and rickshaw painting in Dhaka constitutes a significant part of the city’s cultural tradition, which simultaneously embodies important cultural meanings through the creative depiction of symbols, natural sceneries, historical events and contemporary themes. As an environment-friendly means of transportation, rickshaws also contribute to sustainable development. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5. The file failed to clearly demonstrate how the inscription would contribute to encouraging dialogue among communities and to raising awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in general at the local, national and international levels. The safeguarding measures concentrated primarily on the tangible components of the element and its documentation and promotion, while less attention was paid to safeguarding its social and cultural meanings. It was unclear how the communities were involved in identifying and defining the element, as well as their participation in the nomination process. Furthermore, the regular updating mechanism, including its mode, periodicity and community participation, was not explained. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Rickshaws and rickshaw painting in Dhaka to the submitting State.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received, but a request to open the debate had been received by Sri Lanka.
6. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** thanked Mauritius for its wonderful welcome and organization. It also thanked the Member States for electing Sri Lanka to the Committee, and the Secretariat for providing assistance to help its expert attend this meeting. The delegation had proposed that the nomination be open for discussion. It very much appreciated the Evaluation Body’s thorough and rigorous analysis of the nomination, and it did not to question or challenge the decision, as no amendments had been proposed to the decision. It understood that the element represented a vital form of art and a way of life for the urban working class of Bangladesh, contributing to the rich diversity of Bangladeshi living culture. As the nominating party had communicated some concerns, the delegation believed that opening up the file for discussion would present an opportunity for Members of the Committee to exercise their views. It was sincerely hoped that a dialogue would help the submitting State to revisit the nomination, and it requested that Bangladesh be given the floor to express its views on R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5.
7. The **delegation of Palestine** recalled that what had happened in Argentina’s case and generally in cases such as these was the result of a lack of dialogue, which showed the seriousness of the problem and how vital dialogue was between the States Parties and the Evaluation Body. For this reason, it supported the proposal by Sri Lanka to open the discussion on this particular file. Recalling the remarks by Cyprus on the agreement to open a discussion whenever a country requested it was surely the result of a lack of dialogue between the submitting State and the Evaluation Body. Nevertheless, although the discussion was open, the delegation asked the Committee to abstain from submitting proposed amendments for cases where there were more than two criteria resulting in non-inscription.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** acknowledged the shortcomings of the file, which were raised by the Evaluation Body, but regarded the nomination itself as very interesting and valuable. It therefore supported Sri Lanka’s proposal to open the file for debate. In this regard, the delegation sought to hear the State Party’s response to the comments of the Evaluation Body, especially in regard to the participation of the communities practising this element.
9. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked thatlike other files that had received referral recommendations from the Evaluation Body, it appeared that the State Party had had a difficult time providing a clear answer on R.2. The delegation reiterated its support for the review and reformulation of criterion R.2, and owing to the limit in the number of words per answer, the State Party was unable to elaborate comprehensive responses to R.3, R.4 and R.5. Moreover, matters related to the consent of the communities and the inventory could be addressed upstream in a technical manner. For example, the State Party could have been reminded at an earlier stage to secure an updated expression of consent from communities and not resubmit the 2013 consent form. On R.5, the State Party could have been provided with clearer guidance on inventories through dialogue and capacity building, and it may wish to submit requests for International Assistance in this regard. On R.3, it shared the view that a more detailed plan with a timeline and budget estimate could be useful. In conclusion, it agreed that Rickshaw and rickshaw painting constituted intangible cultural heritage, and it concurred with the recommendation of the Evaluation Body to refer the nomination of the element at this time so that the State Party could further improve the nomination with a view to its future inscription. It supported the request for the State Party to take the floor.
10. The **delegation of Japan** expressed strong sympathy with Bangladesh and a high appreciation of the value of this element, adding that rickshaw is also a Japanese word in that ‘rick’ means power and ‘shaw’ means vehicle. In Japanese, it is called *jinrikisha,* where ‘jin’ means human, i.e. a human-powered vehicle. The delegation remarked that this case gave many reasons to address the process of reflection and it agreed with Palestine that the issue of dialogue should be addressed. Once again, the point of whether the Evaluation Body should be allowed access to internet information should be determined in the reflection process and in the modality of the evaluation, as well as many other points, such as the modality of dialogue and consultation, as well as the instructions given to the Evaluation Body based on the Operational Guidelines and the *aide-memoire*[[28]](#footnote-28).
11. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Bangladesh for submitting this file on the vibrant heritage of rickshaws and rickshaw painting in Dhaka. It was particularly interested to discover an example of folk art and craftsmanship that had been transmitted from generation to generation in an urban setting. The delegation also noted with appreciation the environmental aspect of this urban heritage, as the rickshaw was indeed a very environmentally-friendly mode of transport, and it was thus interesting to see the case where culture contributed to environmental sustainability. Regarding criteria R.2 and R.3, it wished to hear from the State Party. Regarding criterion R.4, after careful study, although it agreed that more structured and detailed information on each of the subsections could have been provided, the delegation found some information that could possibly respond to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body. The delegation recalled that the issue of who is entitled to represent communities and why had been debated by the Committee many times during its previous sessions. In both Sections 4.a and 4.b, it found the information on community participation complementary, adding that it tended to interpret the representatives of the Dhaka City Rickshaw Hood Body Maker Welfare Association and the Association of the Rickshaw Artists, from whom consent letters had been provided, as the ones referred to in Section 4.a. and who indeed were the ones representing the community. With regard to the issues of community participation, the delegation considered that some parts of the information provided under section 5 were quite relevant to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body. This section spoke, in particular, of the approach of experts to undertake intensive fieldwork, while carrying out inventorying, which implied direct contact and dialogue with the bearers and practitioners. It believed that this information was sufficient. This being said, the delegation supported changing the draft decision under criterion R.4 from a referral to positive.
12. The **delegation of China** did not intend to return to the evaluation made by the Evaluation Body, but it did have some very interesting observations. According to the description of the element, it had already become an established part of the city’s cultural tradition, creating a feature of urban life in Dhaka City. This recalled one of the discussion topics during the present session on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts. It agreed with the Philippines and Palestine that the submitting State required more time to enhance capacity building, so that its nomination file could be considered in a future cycle.
13. The **delegation of Lebanon** stressed the need for dialogue as there was not enough communication between the submitting States and the Evaluation Body for some of the files, adding that hopefully the Committee would find a way to improve the situation.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee Members who had intervened and who had expressed their views on the need for dialogue, inviting Bangladesh to respond.
15. The **delegation of Bangladesh** thanked the Committee for allowing it this opportunity to share its thoughts on the Evaluation Body’s recommendation, noting that the Body had done a very thorough job with all the files submitted for its consideration. The delegation had full confidence and faith in the work of the Evaluation Body, noting their diligence, as demonstrated by the fact that 70 per cent of the files had received a positive recommendation. It was also very grateful to the Members of the Committee for having raised certain pertinent questions with regard to its own submission. The delegation believed that the discussion over the past two days on the issue of reporting and the absence of dialogue clearly revealed a major element that could possibly bridge the gap between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State. There was also a strong need for capacity building in many of the countries where submissions did not meet the exact language at times or manage the technicalities of the submission. A few of the remarks by the Evaluation Body were solid and strong, but some had been very minor, for example, the issue raised with regard to R.3, R.4 and the backdated consent of the community. The delegation explained that the nomination had first been filed in 2013, and later resubmitted in 2017. When the submission was made, Bangladesh was clearly advised that if there were no substantial revisions to the documentation, it did not need to provide new documentation. The consent letters given by the community representatives were the same group of people holding the same position in 2017, so it was felt that there was no need to obtain fresh consent letters. Although trivial, this issue became very significant when the Evaluation Body considered the file, and 100–150 words at times made it very difficult to summarize in a very concise way, particularly as English is not a native language. Regarding the national inventory, which was based on an earlier inventory and not updated, the delegation further explained that an altogether fresh study had been carried out in 2015–2016 and then submitted in 2017.
16. The **delegation of Bangladesh** believed that these minor issues could have been clarified earlier and better explained so that it would have been better off with two observations rather than four. Bangladesh placed great importance on the Convention, being the signatory to eight Conventions, and it had great awareness of the safeguarding of these national elements, which, once registered on the Lists of Intangible Cultural Heritage, would provide greater visibility and create a greater sense of responsibility and awareness both on the part of the community and the State to provide safeguarding for its continuity. The delegation was well aware of the four deficiencies in the file, and it did not seek any amendments for the simple fact that it wished to improve the file for the next cycle. Nevertheless, it reiterated the serious need for dialogue, as well as for capacity building, both in terms of understanding the criteria and to receive support from the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the international community to improve its capacities and hence its nominations. The delegation thanked the Committee for allowing it to present its points, and it hoped to come back in the next cycle with a better submission.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Bangladesh for putting its case forward, adding that the Committee had taken note, and he hoped the nomination would be successful next time. **The** **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.5**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.5) **adopted to refer Rickshaws and rickshaw painting in Dhaka to the submitting State**.
18. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.6], submitted by **Belarus**. Since the seventeenth century, every year on the first weekend of July, tens of thousands of pilgrims from all over Belarus and other countries have participated in the celebrations Budslaŭ Fest in honour of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered Celebration in honour of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady to bean important religious and cultural event which unites people of different backgrounds and age groups. The Budslaŭ Fest represents a general tradition of tolerance and mutual respect, which could be inspirational internationally, and hence would enhance intercultural and interfaith dialogue and promote cultural diversity. The proposed safeguarding measures are aimed at documenting and disseminating information concerning the element, especially among children and youth. The nomination file was prepared with the active participation of the local community, pilgrims, experts and other relevant stakeholders who had partaken in a series of roundtable discussions. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for the improved file following a referral in 2016. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Celebration in honour of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady (Budslaŭ fest) on the Representative List.
19. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
20. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.6**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.6) **adopted to inscribe Celebration in honor of the Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady on the Representative List**.
21. The **delegation of Belarus** spokeon behalf of the Minister of Culture, the National Commission for UNESCO, and, most importantly, the intangible cultural heritage festival, Budslaŭ villages and the numerous pilgrims to express gratitude to the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for the support and confidence demonstrated with regard to the Belarusian nomination, whose international recognition was a considerable accomplishment for Belarus. The Budslaŭ icon of Our Lady is most important for all Belarusian people and one of the symbols of their identity. The celebration of Budslaŭ always takes place in an atmosphere of universal respect and unity, involving different groups of society irrespective of religion, social status, gender and so on. Every July, thousands of pilgrims, including young people, hurry to visit Budslaŭ to participate in the significant ceremony. This tradition has existed since the 17th century and has continued to be transmitted from generation to generation. Friendliness and mutual understanding among visitors of this land correspond to the Belarusian tradition of tolerance and avoidance of any religious or social conflicts. Today, the light that comes from the Belarusian shrine expands to all people, bringing goodness, love and peace. This is the contribution of Belarus to the mosaic of common culture of humanity.
22. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Picking of iva grass on Ozren mountain** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.7], submitted by **Bosnia and Herzegovina**. Each year on 11 September, the day of the beheading of St. John the Baptist, inhabitants of all social, gender and age groups from villages around Ozren mountain go to Gostilij to pick iva grass. Iva is consumed as a tea, soaked in brandy or mixed with honey both for its curative and preventive effects. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatPicking of iva grass on Ozren mountain, initially carried out for medicinal purposes, served different social, cultural and integrating functions. Iva grass products are used to prevent and heal illnesses and are also served to guests and used as symbolic gifts. The involvement, interaction and joint efforts of different associations and groups during the picking of iva grass on Ozren mountain enhances dialogue among communities. The Sokol Club, a local NGO, strives to protect the area from any negative effects stemming from tourism and excessive numbers. The declaration of Gostilij as a protected cultural landscape would ensure the lasting protection of the natural settings. The nomination process was community-driven, led by local NGOs that regularly participate in the event and oversee its sustainable practice. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party to be aware of the possible negative effects of mass participation and to develop a plan to prevent the risks caused by the expected rise in tourism. The Evaluation Body further reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Picking of iva grass on Ozren mountain on the Representative List.
23. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
24. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.7**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.7) **adopted to inscribe Picking of iva grass on Ozren mountain** **on the Representative List**.
25. The **delegation of Bosnia and Herzegovina** spoke on behalf of the State Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO and the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia-Herzegovina to thank the Committee for its decision to inscribe the element on the Representative List. This was a very important and very special moment, especially for all the inhabitants of Ozren mountain who have practised this element over the generations. This is the third element from Bosnia and Herzegovina to be inscribed on the Representative List, for which it was proud. The delegation took the opportunity to express gratitude to all, adding that the decision would contribute to the promotion of this element and its transmission to future generations. It also confirmed its strong commitment to the implementation of this decision, the recommendations of the Committee and the provisions of the Convention. The delegation thanked the host for their hospitality and congratulated the Chairperson on the excellent organization of the session.
26. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa, knowledge and practices concerning life, health and illness prevention and treatment among the Tibetan people in China** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.8], submitted by **China**. Lum is the traditional knowledge and practices of bathing in natural hot springs, herbal water or steam to adjust the balance of the body and mind, ensure health and treat illness. The element plays a key role in improving health conditions, fostering a social code of behaviour and promoting respect for nature. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa, knowledge and practices concerning life, health and illness prevention and treatment among the Tibetan people in China to be a complex medicinal practice originating in a traditional environment that had evolved to become a respected part of institutionalized medicine in Tibet and several other provinces in China. The element is an important part of the daily life of the Tibetan people that fosters respect for social cohesion, inspires dialogue among other communities about practices associated with health, prevention and the treatment of illnesses, and encourages the sustainable management of natural resources. The safeguarding measures proposed clearly responded to the identified needs, and the documentation, research and promotional activities supplemented the measures to ensure the viability of the element. The communities, individual bearers, experts and research institutions concerned had participated actively in the preparation of the nomination file through workshops and working meetings. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for submitting a file that underlined the importance of traditional knowledge concerning nature and the universe, offering a positive example of the sustainable relationship between human beings and their environment. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa, knowledge and practices concerning life, health and illness prevention and treatment among the Tibetan people in China on the Representative List.
27. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
28. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.8**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.8) **adopted to inscribe Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa, knowledge and practices concerning life, health and illness prevention and treatment among the Tibetan people in China** **on the Representative List**.
29. The **delegation of China** introduced the Vice-Minister for Culture and Tourism [translation from Chinese]. The Vice-Minister expressed sincere gratitude to all the Committee Members, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their great efforts and contributions to the evaluation, examination and inscription of the element on the Representative List. This was the fourth inscribed element of China in the domain of knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe. Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa is knowledge and practices concerning life, health, illness prevention and treatment among the Tibetan people in China, commonly practised in their everyday lives. The element embodies folk experiences in illness prevention and treatment, and reflects the transmission and development of traditional Tibetan medicinal theories in present-day health practice. It believed that its inscription on the Representative List would contribute to enhancing the visibility and awareness of the significance of intangible cultural heritage to inspire dialogue among different nations on life, health and respect for nature. The inscription demonstrated the global attention to the importance of traditional knowledge and practices. China would work hard to fulfil its safeguarding commitment and would spare no effort in ensuring the sustained viability and frequent practice and transmission of the element so that a wider range of the communities and people would benefit from this valuable traditional knowledge and practice.
30. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Međimurska popevka, a folksong from Međimurje** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.9], submitted by **Croatia**. Međimurska popevka, a folksong from the Međimurje region, was historically predominantly a soloist vocal genre practised by women, but nowadays it is performed by individuals and groups, men and women. It is practised in a broad range of social contexts, from solitary music-making to family and community happenings, work gatherings, religious events, and performances within and outside of Međimurje. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatMeđimurska popevka, a folksong from Međimurje is a natural, regular part of the everyday lives of inhabitants of the Međimurje region, accompanying day-to-day activities as well as festive and ceremonial events. The element represents values shared and common to intangible cultural heritage that can only be transmitted through music. The safeguarding measures focused on community-driven educational activities, continuous field research and the systematic archiving of the collected material. All the major stakeholders were involved in nominating the file together with the researchers and experts from the Ministry of Culture. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Međimurska popevka, a folksong from Međimurje on the Representative List.
31. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
32. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.9**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.9) **adopted to inscribe Međimurska popevka, a folksong from Međimurje** **on the Representative List**.
33. The **delegation of Croatia** thanked the delegates and the Committee, adding that it was important not to forget that groups and, in many cases, individuals play an important role in the production, safeguarding, maintenance and recreation of intangible cultural heritage, which enrich cultural diversity and human creativity in the world. Međimurska popevka, in its richness and variability, represents values common to intangible cultural heritage in general. In particular, it concerns the meaning of life and rhythm that can only be transmitted through music. Popevka is a natural, regular part of the everyday lives of inhabitants of the Međimurje region, accompanying day-to-day activities, as well as festive and ceremonial events. As a living tradition, the element has evolved in terms of performance styles and performers’ gender. However, women remain the central tradition bearers, bearing primary responsibility for the transmission of the element.
34. The **delegation of Croatia** [second speaker]thanked the Chairperson for the warm hospitality in beautiful Mauritius. The people and bearers of Međimurska popevka would be very happy and even more motivated to safeguard and transmit the element to future generations, and—as we say in Croatia—the best way to say thank you is through song.

*[A short film on Međimurska popevka folksong was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Art of stonewalling, knowledge and techniques** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.10], submitted by **Croatia**, **Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland.** The art of dry stonewalling concerns the know-how related to making stone constructions by stacking stones upon each other without using any other materials except sometimes dry soil. The stability of the structures is ensured through the careful selection and placement of the stones, and they play a vital role in preventing landslides, floods and avalanches, and in combating erosion and desertification of the land. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription. The Evaluation Body considered the Art of dry stone walling, knowledge and techniques to be a living tradition, which has become increasingly well-developed for the sake of the sustainable management of cultural heritage, agricultural land, human dwellings and their environment. The art of dry stone combines a widespread technique that promotes the shared nature of traditional know-how, which illustrates the fundamental role of intangible cultural heritage in the creation and maintenance of the living environment. The proposed safeguarding plan in all the submitting States focuses primarily on the protection of existing dry stone monuments and sites with the involvement of all the stakeholders, communities and their associations. The safeguarding plan and entire nomination file were the result of intensive discussions among the communities and relevant organizations. The Evaluation Body wished to commend the States Parties for submitting an exemplary file, prepared with the utmost care, which testified to the spirit of the Convention in terms of international cooperation. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Art of dry stone walling, knowledge and techniques on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.10**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.10) **adopted to inscribe Art of stonewalling, knowledge and techniques** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **Chairperson** congratulated the large cultural family joined together, noting that Greece had the privilege of talking on behalf of all the submitting countries.
5. The **delegation of Greece** spoke on behalf of the communities of practitioners of the eight States and the NGOs that had helped with the submission of this nomination file, to thank the Evaluation Body for its thorough examination of the common file and the very positive evaluation of its merits, for which it was honoured. It also thanked Mauritius for the warm hospitality in making this meeting possible. The eight States Parties (Croatia, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Slovenia, Spain and Switzerland) regarded this humble building technique as an exemplary manifestation of the potential that traditional knowledge presents for the management of natural resources in an environmentally-responsible manner. In all the regions of the eight States, knowledge of the specific weather patterns, geological conditions and local stone is fundamental for the practice of the element, and this knowledge is acquired mainly through non-formal education and transmitted orally. Nevertheless, in some cases, it was almost as accurate as the data and analysis of natural scientists and as reliable as the structures made by highly trained architects and engineers. At the same time, building new dry stone works and repairing the old ones fosters the formation of strong communal bonds among practitioners. The file indeed elaborated on the many merits of the art of dry stone walling for the sustainable management of natural resources, as well as for social cohesion. The delegation invited the delegates to take a closer look at the documentation and was sure that other delegates would realize the practice of dry stone walling in their own communities. On behalf of the communities of the bearers in all eight States Parties, the delegation invited delegates to participate in the next cycle in an enlargement of the inscribed element so that the inscription would reflect the ubiquity of the art of dry stone walling almost all over the world. The delegation invited the delegates to watch a very short movie created by participants in the 16th SPS International Congress on Dry Stone Walling, the biggest collaborating international NGO, which had taken place in Menorca in October 2017.

*[A short film of bearers of the Art of stonewalling was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Festivity of Las Parrandas in the centre of Cuba** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.11], submitted by **Cuba**. Festivity of Las Parrandas was held for the first time in 1820 in the town of Remedios. It is now celebrated by eighteen communities in the centre of Cuba, mostly taking place towards the final months of the year. Everyone in the eighteen communities, regardless of their social class, gender, age, religion, profession or background, is involved in the festivities. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatFestivity of Las Parrandas in the centre of Cuba involves many different categories of practitioners, whose strong identification with the element is demonstrated every year through their innovative creation of floats, decorations and other associated artefacts. The element demonstrated the potential of intangible cultural heritage to integrate different skills, professions and cultural expressions aimed at facilitating intergenerational communication and cultural dialogue. A coherent set of proposed safeguarding measures included documentation, in-depth research into the social and cultural context of the element, and popularization and promotional activities. The practitioners had initiated the nomination process and actively participated through workshops and educational activities. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Festivity of Las Parrandas in the centre of Cuba on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.11**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.11) **adopted to inscribe Festivity of Las Parrandas in the centre of Cuba on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Cuba** wasparticularly gratified by the very good news to have the element inscribed on the Representative List. These festivities promote the cultural identity of the central Cuban communities characterized by the friendly rivalry between the two different districts. These festivities have become a place for cultural dialogue and for affirming one’s identity. Las Parrandas is a particularly popular festival organized by and for the people. The number of supporters, their involvement in designing and preparing the decorations, the floats and all the other paraphernalia involve everyone. It is a major fiesta in which there is music, dance and the replicas of monuments, and costumes for everyone who would be taking part in the procession. Every group makes some kind of allegorical statement about what is happening in the district and it is a place for coming together, for dialogue and tolerance in the centre of Cuba. The fireworks are launched throughout the celebrations and are a major part of the fun. All those who have made this success possible deserved thanks; from those who offered their support to the project to those who were involved at the grassroots level, and all the people, institutions and, in particular, the board of Las Parrandas who strongly supported this inscription.

*[A short film of the Festivity of Las Parrandas was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Handmade production of Christmas tree decorations from blown glass beads** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.12], submitted by **Czechia**. The handmade production of Christmas tree decorations from blown glass beads is a traditional practice connected with glass production in North Bohemia where blown glass beads have been produced since the late eighteenth century. Besides providing bearers with a source of income, the practice strengthens family relations and encourages intergenerational relationships. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.3 and R.5. The submitting State had demonstrated how the viability of the element was being ensured through a variety of safeguarding measures, ranging from inventorying initiatives to exhibitions and awareness-raising. The file demonstrated the State’s commitment to supporting the safeguarding of the element, through the provision of financial resources and the development of a policy framework. The element was identified with the participation of the communities concerned. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.1, R.2 and R.4. The description of the element made frequent reference to a ‘parent factory’, which was presented as the main intermediary between practitioners and the wider public, without any explanation of the relations between the tradition bearers and the factory. The file failed to present the nature and function of this factory, which raised severe concerns as to the risk of a monopoly of the practice by one entity. The nomination placed a heavy emphasis on the commercial and business aspects of the practice, which was detrimental to the promotion of the social and cultural functions of the element. Furthermore, the file did not demonstrate how inscription would contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Although the file stated that practitioners had participated in the preparation of the nomination, it did not provide sufficient information to understand their exact role in the process, as participation seemed to have been achieved at all times through a parent factory as the main broker. In addition, no consent from the parent factory was provided, even though it was presented as a key stakeholder. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Handmade production of Christmas tree decorations from blown glass beads to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received, but Poland requested to open the debate.
3. The **delegation of Poland** had asked to open the discussion on the nomination as it was convinced that the State Party should be given the opportunity to share additional information on the nomination file. Speaking frankly, knowing the expertise of the Czech colleagues, it was surprised that three of five criteria were not met, and it sought clarity on the relations between the ‘parent factory’ and the tradition bearers, as well as how the selling of these decorations contributed to the sustainable development of the community and of this practice.
4. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** supported Poland’s proposal to open the file for discussion. Representing both rural artisans in Czechia and a renowned brand of Bohemian glass blowing traditions, the delegation found the element satisfied most if not all the Convention requirements for intangible cultural heritage. Considering the general struggle many artisans and artists face in advertising and selling their products, it found the role of the mediator factory as a distributor quite helpful and not really jeopardizing the viability of the element. As stated in the nomination, the artisans are free to organize their home-based workshops, managing their working hours, creating and inventing new designs, as well as transmitting skills within their families and their communities. Thus, the principle of commission and cooperation via the distribution factory could be perceived as an instrument to support local handicrafts by identifying the customer market, providing a regular income for the craftspeople, maintaining quality standards, and popularizing workshop courses among users. In this regard, the delegation asked the State Party how they would explain the role of the factory, and what improvements they would propose to the nomination in case it was unsuccessful in this nomination cycle.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the two interventions from Poland and Kazakhstan, and thanked Czechia for presenting this element at this session, noting that there were two elements related to Christmas, both of which were fantastic.
6. The **delegation of Czechia** was grateful for the opportunity to comment on the nomination and thanked the Evaluation Body and the Committee Members for the detailed evaluation of its file. The delegation confirmed that if three criteria appeared not to have been met in the eyes of the Evaluation Body, then it was due to a combination of inaccurate formulations and misunderstanding, which it very much regretted. It had acted in good faith that the information entered in the form was sufficiently clear and obvious, and had done its utmost to ensure that the most comprehensive response to the R.1 criterion was provided and accurately described, how this factory, more of a family workshop, operates with a typical manufacturing division of labour with individual manufacturers working at home. The delegation assured the Committee that there was no monopoly over the production of this particular kind of Christmas decorations, but that it is a workshop like those that existed in the region half a century ago. This was the only one that prevented the *savoir-faire* from being forgotten, and it succeeded in preserving and handing on this *savoir-faire* to future generations through patient work with individual practitioners. It is a guardian of local patterns that were preserved from the past, but it also allows the creativity of individuals so that the element is not trapped in conservative forms but is constantly changing. The workshop is not licensed, and it did not prevent anyone else interested in operating this type of production from doing so. On the contrary, the workshop provided products for hobby production.
7. With regard to criterion R.2, the **delegation of Czechia** remarked that it had replied truthfully with regard to the media attention given to inscriptions on the Representative List in the Czech Republic that encourages public interest in the area of intangible cultural heritage, particularly concerning this element, which is associated in the country with the general sharing of traditional Christmas rituals. This element cannot therefore simply be seen as a commercial good, as its role as a Christmas symbol was far greater, which the nomination form failed to sufficiently emphasize. The Representative List could be enriched by another element of the calendar or New Year rituals, in this case, reflecting traditional Central European Christmas practices. The connection between the vitally known element and the Representative List would of course raise interest in intangible cultural heritage. The fact that this element represented glass craft, a technology that did not yet appear on the List, would also have contributed to its greater diversity. With regard to R.4, there was probably some misunderstanding because both representatives of the family workshop were not only among the signatories consenting to the nomination, as spokespeople for the other bearers, but also the guides to the film, which was part of the documentation. For these reasons, it was important for the delegation to be able to address the concerns because it believed that the element was an obvious part of intangible cultural heritage and could be of real benefit to the Representative List. However, it fully respected the work of the Evaluation Body and was prepared to clarify the arguments and resubmit the revised nomination in the next cycle.
8. The **Chairperson** proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole.
9. The **delegation of Poland** wished to hearthe response of the Evaluation Body on the statement just presented by Czechia.
10. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that this file did not clearly explain how the other stakeholders were involved as the factory appeared to play a very central role, and the Body was unable to identify where they had given consent in the form. At the same time, criterion R.2 was unclear in terms of raising the visibility of this element. The Chairperson took the opportunity to echo the remarks by the Secretariat in that a referral to a nomination was not a rejection. The information contained in the file was simply not sufficient to enable the Body to determine that the file satisfied all the criteria, hence its recommendation.
11. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Poland for its question and the Evaluation Body, expressing its sincere thanks to the elegant way Czechia had dealt with its file.
12. With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.12**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.12) **adopted to refer Handmade production of Christmas tree decorations from blown glass beads to the submitting State**.
13. The **Chairperson** **of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **The skills related to perfume in Pays de Grasse: the cultivation of perfume plants, the knowledge and processing of natural raw materials, and the art of perfume composition** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.14], submitted by **France**. The skills related to perfume in Pays de Grasse entail the cultivation of perfume plants, the knowledge and processing of natural raw materials, and the art of perfume composition. The practice involves a wide range of communities and groups. Perfume forges social bonds and provides an important source of seasonal labour. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered the skills related to perfume production in Pays de Grasse to be transmitted by three groups of interrelated, interdependent traditional bearers, thereby creating social bonds across society and generations. The practice encourages cultural dialogue with other communities and serves as a symbol of the community’s identity. The community of practitioners, traditional bearers and other relevant stakeholders widely supported the nomination process. The Evaluation Body invited the State Party to take into consideration the high risk of over-commercialization of the element and encouraged it to remain focused on the cultural and social aspects of the element when planning and implementing the safeguarding measures. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the skills related to perfume in Pays de Grasse: the cultivation of perfume plants, the knowledge and processing of natural raw materials, and the art of perfume composition on the Representative List.
14. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
15. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.14**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.14) **adopted to inscribe The skills related to perfume in Pays de Grasse: the cultivation of perfume plants, the knowledge and processing of natural raw materials, and the art of perfume composition** **on the Representative List**.
16. The **delegation of France** thanked the Chairperson for his remarkable chairing, UNESCO for the inscription of France’s 17th element of intangible cultural heritage, the Committee and the Evaluation Body, giving the floor to the Senator of the region, Mr Jean-Pierre Leleux.
17. The **delegation of France**, SenatorJean-Pierre Leleux, spoke of the element as being characterized by its values of universality, conviviality and dialogue, elevating the spirit by the beauty it inspires, and humanity needs beauty to survive. The perfume is a symbol of dreams, sharing and offering; a gift of nature in the service of a subtle and universal connection between people, a language that transcends prose, cultures, races, religions and peoples. These are the values of Grasse, a depository of know-how passed down from generation to generation, and which plays a major role in social mediation, relationships between families, mediation in schools, hospitals, prisons, and a pedagogical vector of social integration for young autistic adults who cultivate roses, jasmine and tubers in a specialized institute. The element is a factor of intercultural dialogue between communities of European gatherers, Gypsies and North Africans, at the service of international dialogue. In the ten years since the process began, the association had been able to establish a wonderful relationship with the communities in many countries of the world: Bulgaria, India, Egypt, China, Korea, Japan, Senegal, and many others. Many safeguarding measures had already been launched, including the extension of agricultural areas in local urban planning, the installation of training and transmission facilities, and the establishment of a UNESCO Chair at the University of Nice-Côte d'Azur in partnership with Indian and Algerian universities. On behalf of the Living Heritage of the Region of Grasse (APVPG), the practitioners and the entire region, the Senator thanked the Committee, all the States Parties that supported its approach, the Ministry of Culture, and the Ambassador of France to UNESCO, Mr Laurent Stefanini.

*[A short film of the skills related to perfume in Pays de Grasse was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated France, adjourning the session and inviting the Secretary to present a few practical announcements.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that the ICHNGO Forum would be holding a plenary session for elections to its steering committee, inviting States wishing to hold performances or presenting audiovisual material to inform the Secretariat.

*[Thursday, 29 November 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

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

1. Greeting the delegates, the **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning to discuss the organization of the work in the coming days. The examination of draft decision 10.b.1 had been opened, but the Committee had decided to suspend it and return to it in the present session so that the Secretariat could reflect on a creative procedure that would allow the file concerned to be examined by the Committee in 2019. The Chairperson therefore invited the Secretary to present its proposal.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that the Committee had decided under item 6 to initiate a global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, which would notably include preliminary meetings and the convening of an open-ended intergovernmental working group provisionally foreseen in 2021. However, many Members had raised concerns about the length of the reflection process, foreseen for completion in 2022. Members also repeatedly expressed the need to introduce a dialogue between submitting States and the Evaluation Body. Taking note of these discussions, the Secretariat proposed—on an experimental basis—a preliminary dialogue procedure that could serve the current needs, while also contributing and providing insights to the global reflection. At the same time, as mentioned by the Chairperson, the Committee had suspended the examination of the file Chamamé submitted by Argentina and asked the Secretariat to creatively reflect on a way that would allow this file to be examined by the Committee in 2019. In response to the Committee’s request, and taking note of the responses by Bangladesh and Czechia to the questions posed on their respective files, the Secretariat highlighted that any experimental procedure on a preliminary dialogue mechanism should also apply to all nominations referred by the Committee in the current session so as to take into account the primacy of the principles of consistency and fairness in the treatment of nominations among all States Parties.
3. However, the **Secretary** explained that the proposal still posed some questions in relation to paragraphs 36 and 54 of the Operational Directives, relating to the examination of files and the overview of procedures. In that sense, should the Committee decide to go down this path, the Secretariat was of the understanding that the Committee would need to be bound by the truly experimental nature of this decision and that it acknowledged responsibility for this process until the matter was brought for discussion at the next session of the General Assembly in 2020. At the same time, two States, namely Saudi Arabia and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, had withdrawn their files, and should therefore have the opportunity to cancel their withdrawals based on the primacy of the principles of consistency and fairness, and given that item 10 was still open for discussion. The Secretariat’s proposal was as follows: States whose files were or would be referred at the current session could submit to the Secretariat clarifications prior to the first meeting of the Evaluation Body foreseen at the end of February in 2019 should they wish. These clarifications should respond to the concerns of the Committee and the Evaluation Body on those referred criteria and must be submitted in the two working languages of the Committee, English or French. The word count should not exceed the total word limit set in the nomination form for the criterion concerned. The Secretariat would register and acknowledge receipt of the clarifications received. It would not check if the information was complete. The Secretariat would then forward the clarifications to the Evaluation Body, which would assess these against its original recommendations on those criteria and review their initial recommendation on the basis of the clarifications received. The files concerned would then be re-examined by the Committee at its fourteenth session in 2019 and therefore would not be considered as newly submitted files. The Committee would need to review this procedure for discussion at the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. These files would be considered above the adopted overall ceiling for the 2019 cycle and would not count in the quota of the States concerned.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the reflection on this very sensitive issue and also for the spirit of openness and flexibility to resolve the issue raised by various Members of the Committee. The Chairperson took this opportunity to underline, as explained by the Secretariat, that this procedure was not foreseen by the current Operational Directives and that the Committee would remain accountable to all States Parties to the Convention as a General Assembly. Bureau members were asked to undertake consultations on this matter. The Chairperson proposed suspending the discussion on this matter until the time of the overall decision 13.COM. The session therefore resumed with draft decision 10.b.15.
5. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Chidaoba, wrestling in Georgia** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.15], submitted by **Georgia**. Chidaoba (wrestling) is an ancient form of martial art practised by a large proportion of the male population throughout all the regions, villages and communities of Georgia. The practice encourages a healthy lifestyle and plays an important role in intercultural dialogue. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatChidaoba, wrestling in Georgia serves an important cultural function in the country, extending beyond the sporting performance. It promotes friendship and respect among people, and Georgians recognize it as an important symbol of their identity. The element would also promote human creativity by highlighting how resourceful wrestlers must be in combining different holds and making quick decisions. The proposed safeguarding measures included adjusting the national legal framework for sports and games, integrating wrestling into the educational system, providing training and coaching within the communities, improving the infrastructure needed to organize tournaments, promoting accompanying expressions such as music, dance or costume-making, and establishing a specialized museum devoted to Chidaoba. The identification and nomination of Chidaoba was done by local community and practitioners, represented by the National Federation of Georgian Wrestling, researchers and other experts. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for its precise description of community participation, including the division of gender roles and responsibilities. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Chidaoba, wrestling in Georgia on the Representative List.
6. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
7. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.15**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.15) **adopted to inscribe Chidaoba, wrestling in Georgia on the Representative List**.
8. The **delegation of Georgia** spoke on behalf of all the communities, groups and individuals involved who considered Chidaoba, Georgian wrestling as an inseparable part of their cultural identity. The delegation conveyed its gratitude to the Committee, the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and to all the people whose hard work and devotion had contributed to the success of this nomination. Chidaoba bears an important cultural function and has great social value in Georgia, combining the elements of wrestling, music, dance and special dressing traditions. This element promotes ties between generations, encourages mutual respect, and is widely spread among various religious and ethnic communities. The delegation believed that this new inscription would greatly contribute to the wealth and diversity of intangible cultural heritage and be vitally important for the preservation and further promotion of this element at both the national and international levels. Chidaoba is the fourth element from Georgia on the Representative List, and every new inscription dramatically increased awareness about intangible cultural heritage in the country, highlighting the exceptional value of the Convention, while promoting sustainable protection, the transmission and viability of the intangible heritage, as well as ensuring diversity of cultural expressions. The delegation congratulated all the communities in Georgia who consider this element as part of their cultural inheritance, and extended its gratitude to the host country for their hospitality and excellent organization of this meeting.
9. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Pantun Malay oral tradition** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.16], submitted by **Indonesia** **and** **Malaysia**. Pantun, Malay oral tradition is a poetic form most commonly dealing with the subject of love. Pantun is considered as the soul that brings together the various communities and aspects of Malay life, describing ideas and thoughts central to the local wisdom of its people. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criterion R.1. Pantun conveys social content as well as important moral and religious values, and serves as a means of communication and an instrument of guidance and support for its practitioners. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2, R.3, R.4 and R.5. The file mostly focused on the expected benefits of the inscription for the element and its community of practitioners, failing to explain how it could raise awareness about intangible cultural heritage in general or how it could promote cultural diversity. Safeguarding measures were mostly state-organized, disregarding community participation. There were significant differences between the safeguarding plans submitted by Malaysia and Indonesia, which implied insufficient collaboration between the States. Although the file described multiple meetings held between governmental authorities, researchers, communities and NGOs, the nature of these meetings was unknown and community participation was lacking since their relation to the nomination process was unclear. Though the element is included in two inventories of intangible cultural heritage present in the territories of the submitting States, the information on how the inventories are updated and the communities’ participation in the inventory process was unclear. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Pantun, Malay oral tradition to the submitting States.
10. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
11. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.16**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.16) **adopted to refer Pantun Malay oral tradition to the submitting States**.
12. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Hurling** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.17], submitted by **Ireland**. Hurling, or Camogie (a form of Hurling played by women), is a field game played by two teams which dates back 2,000 years and features strongly in Irish mythology. It is played throughout the island of Ireland, as well as overseas. Hurling is considered as an intrinsic part of Irish culture and plays a central role in promoting health and well-being, inclusiveness and team spirit. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatHurling provides Irish people with a strong sense of identity. The game has been practised across Ireland as well as in many other countries, and it has the potential to promote dialogue among different communities. The communities and groups were involved in planning the proposed safeguarding measures, which included the dissemination of knowledge primarily within the educational system and in a dedicated museum, through online platforms, workshops and courses, and in-depth research and documentation. The nomination was initiated and prepared by institutions representing the community of practitioners, consisting mostly of volunteers. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Hurling on the Representative List.
13. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
14. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.17**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.17) **adopted to inscribe Hurling on the Representative List**.
15. The **delegation of Ireland** thanked the Members of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their efforts on the inscription of hurling. Ireland was deeply honoured to have hurling inscribed as its second element on the Representative List. It understood the importance of safeguarding and passing on living culture in its many forms, and had always been proud to share its culture around the world. Hurling is a game played not only all over Ireland, but also in almost forty countries around the world. The delegation thanked the Gaelic Athletic Association and the Camogie Association, the bearers of traditional hurling, whose involvement in this nomination process had been instrumental to its success. For more than 100 years, these organizations have been committed to maintaining, strengthening and developing this ancient tradition. The game of hurling dates back well over 1,000 years and now its continuity and transmission to new generations under the UNESCO listing would be celebrated. Ireland looked forward to an ongoing and deepening engagement with the Convention and with UNESCO as a whole. It was truly honoured and grateful to have its cultural heritage recognized, alongside other precious traditions from around the world.

*[A short film on Hurling was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Reggae music of Jamaica** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.18], submitted by **Jamaica**. Reggae music of Jamaica originated as the voice of marginalized groups, mainly in western Kingston. However, nowadays the music is played and embraced by a wide cross-section of society, including various genders, ethnic and religious groups, while continuing to act as a voice for all. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3 and R.4. The file demonstrated that Reggae music plays a significant role in the life of musical communities and Jamaican society in general. The music gives creative expression to their belief systems, hopes and aspirations for the future, and serves as a very important factor of identity among the Rastafarian community. The viability of the element is ensured through transmission, research and awareness-raising activities. A wide range of relevant stakeholders led by a national technical committee were involved in the preparation of the nomination file. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.5. Despite the potential of the element as a tool for promoting dialogue among people and appreciating cultural diversity among ethnic groups worldwide, the nomination concentrated on the historical background highlighting Jamaica’s international recognition as the original birthplace of Reggae instead of contributing to a better understanding and improving the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The file did not demonstrate how the inventory was maintained, nor the involvement of the communities, groups and relevant NGOs in the inventorying process and information on the frequency of updating. The reference number and name(s) of the element in the inventory were also missing. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Reggae music of Jamaica to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** received an amendment by Cuba and Palestine, as well as a request to open the debate.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** asked that Cuba be first given the floor.
4. Thanking Palestine, the **delegation of Cuba** remarked that this was a very special nomination for Cuba and all Caribbean countries and the Latin American region. Having carefully read the file, it noted once again the difficulties that crop up time and again in various nominations concerning criteria R.2 and R.5. The delegation was of the opinion that in R.2, reggae is a tool, a vehicle for dialogue towards peace, understanding and tolerance through music, dance and culture. It is a symbol of unity and diversity that works towards social inclusion, which today is an essential path towards reaching true sustainable development. Its very message, which is transmitted by its incredible visual and auditory nature, goes beyond the borders of Jamaica, the Caribbean and the African region, and touches the entire world. The delegation believed that the contribution made by reggae towards the visibility of the Convention was quite clear in that it has a strong global impact in its message about the need for dialogue and mutual understanding, for understanding that the world is diverse but based on respect, a constructive fight for resistance, for going beyond differences. In this regard, the delegation had submitted a number of amendments to support the inscription of the nomination on the Representative List. It asked the Committee to allow the submitting State to provide more information on R.2 and R.5, and thanked the Evaluation Body for the information provided.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Cuba for its eloquence and pertinent presentation, the sentiment of which it shared, adding that this element deserved to be on the List years ago and it was surprised that it had taken so long. Regarding R.5, the delegation wished to hear from Jamaica, as the Evaluation Body had stated that there was no clear explanation of the involvement of communities and stakeholders in the inventorying process. Regarding R.2, in addition to the remarks from Cuba, it was clear to everyone that reggae music contributed to raising awareness and the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and of the Convention, even more so than UNESCO itself.
6. The **delegation of Colombia** believed that reggae was not only an expression of Jamaican culture but also the entire world, creating a sense of living together and tolerance among communities. The delegation believed that Jamaica should be given the chance to clarify certain points and provide the information that may not have appeared clearly in the file.
7. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** joined fellow Committee Members in supporting the discussion on this file, adding that prior to inscription to the Representative List, reggae already represented global music and a political phenomenon, shaping Jamaican cultural identity. Its existence in a variety of forms, like female reggae music addressing women’s rights, indicated high visibility and viability within the communities concerned. Open access, easy interpretation and active transmission on an everyday basis naturally sustain the element and popularize it worldwide. National safeguarding measures listed in the nomination file, like documenting, archiving and legal protection, shall complement existing knowledge and information on reggae music. Considering the scope of the element, the delegation believed that R.2 could have been met. Regarding R.5, it sought to hear from Jamaica to clarify the inconsistencies on the issue of the inventory.
8. The **Chairperson** concurred that the purpose was to seek clarification from Jamaica.
9. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** commended Jamaica for submitting its first nomination since 2008, a very vibrant element known widely beyond Jamaica and the Caribbean. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for the thorough examination of the file, adding that it partially shared the findings of the Evaluation Body. It conceded that the contribution of the element to promoting the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general could have been better explained, and most of the explanation under R.2 did not appear to answer the question. The delegation drew the Committee’s attention, however, to the first phrase in this section, which was also taken into account by the Evaluation Body in its recommendation on the role of reggae as a “facilitator for dialogue and appreciation of cultural diversity among racial and ethnic groups worldwide”. The delegation believed that the State Party had attempted to shed light on its vision of how the inscription would contribute to raising awareness about intangible cultural heritage in general, while referring to intangible cultural heritage as an appreciation of cultural diversity. It also drew attention to the statement in another section, R.2 (ii), that, “inscription will serve to add to the existing body of Caribbean elements to the Representative List and increase the visibility of these various local and diaspora communities who have contributed to its formation while highlighting their creative genius”. Here, the inscription was said to be a way to increase the visibility of Caribbean intangible cultural heritage in general among local and diaspora communities, which was valuable information. Considering this, the delegation tended to support a positive recommendation, while also taking into account the fact that many countries encountered difficulties in R.2.
10. Regarding R.5, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** carefully studied the evaluation by the Evaluation Body and appreciated the fact that Jamaica had already started to document reggae music as early as 1977, long before the Convention was adopted. While understanding the Evaluation Body’s reservations in relation to this criterion, the delegation nonetheless reminded the Committee that inventorying was supposed to be established and updated in a manner geared towards the State Party’s own situation, as stipulated in Article 12.1 of the Convention. It was of the view that the contextual manner of building inventories could also be reflected in the way inventories were named and referred to. In many countries, ‘inventory’ is used, while in others ‘database’ or ‘catalogue’ is preferred, which is fine as long as it abided by the principles of the Convention. This also concerned referencing, which also seemed to be done in Jamaica in a manner adopted long ago. Finally, the delegation found that in section R.5, the State spoke about updating through cataloging, classifying and updating materials related to the element. Concerning the participation of communities in the inventory, Section 5 (vi) mentioned a national technical committee under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture, Gender, Entertainment & Sport, which included the communities, groups and NGOs who were directly involved in the recording, practice, documentation, research and archiving of reggae music. The delegation thus concluded that there was sufficient information to change the referral to a positive recommendation for R.5.
11. The **delegation of Poland** wished to share its observations on the nomination, adding that in R.2, as had already been stated, the inscription of reggae would obviously contribute to enhancing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, as this music was already a global phenomenon. The main message of reggae music in the lyrics of reggae is the inclusion of all social actors, freedom and cooperation. This message was also a source of inspiration for the Polish solidarity movement. The delegation strongly believed that this nomination would contribute to raising awareness about intangible cultural heritage throughout the world, and that reggae bearers in Jamaica were fully entitled to express their happiness and pride that this music was born in Jamaica whose joy had an inclusive, not exclusive, character. The delegation understood that the language and terminology used by UNESCO might not be known by the local communities, and it did not expect any bearers to be experts in intangible cultural heritage terminology. Regarding R.5, the character of the inventory was clearly explained in the periodic reports submitted by Jamaica and adopted on Monday. However, perhaps the role and methodology of the inventory could have been better explained in the nomination form. Nevertheless, the thorough information presented by Jamaica in its report should be taken into account. Moreover, in paragraph 14 of the general report, summarizing the submitted periodic reports, the Jamaican inventory was considered to assist communities in establishing databases relevant to their own local situations.
12. Congratulating the Evaluation Body, the **delegation of Senegal** also spoke of criterion R.2 and how it had been problematic for a long time. Regarding the role played by reggae in the expression of cultural diversity, the rapprochement of peoples and cultural dialogue, the delegation expressed the view that reggae was more than a movement or a musical genre that conquered the world by its melodies; reggae also preached peace, love and unity, and where there was conflict and extreme diversity—in Jamaica even—reggae resolved it.The lyrics, “One love, one heart, let's get together and feel alright”, as sung by Bob Marley, reconciled politics in Jamaica. Africa had another relationship with reggae, because reggae invoked historical elements of Nubia from Ethiopia. Reggae had in fact become a rallying cry in Africa for African unity, “Africa must unite”, which was contained in reggae. The delegation explained that in Senegal, as in all African countries, reggae provided a sense of belonging to a diverse culture, to a message addressed to the world here in Port Louis. The delegation advocated for the inscription of reggae on the Representative Heritage List with the words of Bob Marley, “Do not live so that your presence is noticed, but so that your absence is felt”, adding that although he was no longer among us, his absence would be felt through this inscription. The delegation thus associated with the amendment by Cuba and Palestine.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked Senegal for its emotive statement.
14. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the significance of reggae music as intangible cultural heritage was apparent around the world and could not be denied. While it understood that the Evaluation Body limited itself to the answers provided by the State Party in the nomination form, it was difficult to fathom a Representative List without reggae. The delegation noted issues pertaining to R.2 and R.5, which remained challenging. Criterion R.2 was a difficult question to answer when States Parties were asked to assess the impact of the inscription of a specific element on the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, even though the answer is self-evident that the inscription of reggae would have a positive impact on the recognition of intangible cultural heritage as a whole, even if not clearly spelled out in the nomination dossier. Hence, it was felt that the State Party should be given an opportunity to respond to the Evaluation Body. Again, had there been an opportunity for dialogue between the State Party and the Evaluation Body prior to the Committee session, the Committee would not have had to go through this process and waste precious time. All the Committee Members recognized that the Representative List would only be enriched by the addition of reggae. Regarding R.5, the State Party indicated that the inventory is listed in an Automated Catalogue of the Africa Caribbean Institute of Jamaica, which is the focal point for intangible cultural heritage in Jamaica. It also indicated that the inventory was being reviewed and updated. In this regard, the delegation wished to hear from the Evaluation Body as to why they had concerns about the answer provided in R.5.
15. The **delegation of Guatemala** supported the statements made by Cuba to give Jamaica the opportunity to explain and expand on the information provided. One important thing to keep in mind in this particular case was the broad participation of communities, which was very present in the file. In this way, Guatemala acknowledged the value of Jamaica’s file.
16. The **delegation of Armenia** joined the positive ambience and quoted the words of UNESCO: “since wars begin in the minds of men and women, it is in the minds of men and women that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” Thus, in line with these words, the delegation expressed its gratitude to Palestine and Cuba for introducing the draft amendments, and joined the previous speakers to allow Jamaica to make the clarifications necessary for a positive outcome because music enhanced cultural dialogue and the exchanges between people without leaving anyone behind.
17. The **delegation of Zambia** joined the other Members of the Committee to congratulate the Evaluation Body on the job well done on this particular file. As a Member of the Committee that had that spoken strongly in support of the recommendation to establish dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States during the eleventh session in Addis Ababa, it was satisfied to read from this report that dialogue was one of the working procedures adopted by the Secretariat prior to submitting their files to the Evaluation Body. The delegation believed this had led to an increase in the number of successful submissions, in terms of proposals and nominations, and was thus a step in the right direction, adding that it would like to see this escalated to the engagement between the submitting State and the Evaluation Body. It was, however, concerned that a reasonable number of submitting States still seemed to struggle to understand the meaning of R. 2 and U.2 in particular. From its analysis of referrals related to R.2, it seemed that the Evaluation Body might need to further clarify what it required from submitting States. Was it to state how visible and significant an element is? Or how the inscription would specifically enhance its visibility or significance? In order to determine how a particular inscription was going to enhance the visibility or significance of intangible cultural heritage, the Evaluation Body should clearly indicate what was required in that regard. Once ascertained, few States would have a problem understanding or addressing this criterion. With these observations, the delegation supported the proposal by Cuba and Palestine to inscribe Reggae on the Representative List.
18. The **delegation of Togo** thanked the Evaluation Body and the State Party for submitting this element, adding that it was well-known that reggae is a unifying factor. As mentioned by Senegal, Palestine and Cuba, the delegation was delighted that this element was being presented, and it supported its inscription. Already in our childhoods, reggae made everyone dance, crossing boundaries and acting as a force for unity.
19. The **delegation of Japan** joined the positive ambience of the many other countries. Needless to say, reggae was well-accepted by the international community and loved by so many, including in Japan. The delegation [on a personal note] had loved reggae music for a very long time. Having checked the file, the delegation believed that the form in R.2 correctly pointed out the role of reggae as a facilitator of dialogue, and as such, the file had met this criterion. Regarding R.5, it already noted the very good support, and it looked forward to hearing a very positive and convincing explanation from Jamaica.
20. The **delegation of Lebanon** spoke ofreggae as international music that touches hearts and it thanked the countries for submitting the amendments, which it supported, but it also wished to hear Jamaica’s explanations.
21. The **delegation of Cameroon** thanked Mauritius for the arrangements made for the session, the Chairperson for his chairing of the Committee’s work, and the Secretariat for the quality of the documents. Cameroon joined the other delegations in their remarks, notably Cuba and Palestine, on this unifying element of reggae. It also sought to have more information from the State Party. The delegation agreed with Senegal that reggae should already have been inscribed as intangible cultural heritage of humanity, and it hoped that Jamaica would provide the explanations required to inscribe this very important element for peace in the world.
22. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated the Evaluation Body for the excellent work done, characterized by its technical approach and know-how. Indeed, the Evaluation Body constituted the fundamental pillar of credibility with regard to the examination of files. At this stage, the delegation stressed the importance of addressing criterion R.2, which required clarification and further development, as well as the need for capacity building at the level of the communities and the States Parties. Regarding criterion R.2, it agreed with the various remarks made in this sense. With regard to the file by Jamaica on reggae, it believed that the file should have been submitted a long time ago and already inscribed on the Representative List; it thought it had been inscribed in 2011. The delegation therefore supported all the previous interventions relative to the inscription of the element.
23. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the amendments for the inscription of reggae.
24. The **delegation of Kuwait** also agreed with the proposal by Cuba and the other Members, and wished to hear about the inventory from the submitting State.
25. The **delegation of China** followed the interventions by the Committee Members in appreciating this valuable element, adding that all these interventions held a common understanding that the Evaluation Body’s work was based on the material submitted in the nomination file by the State Party. Given that context, the comments or recommendations by the Evaluation Body did not attempt to judge the value of the nominated element, but were solely based on a technical evaluation. It believed that reggae music had numerous musical influences in the region, even in the world, and in that case it agreed with the other Members to request that Jamaica be given the floor for further clarifications.
26. The **delegation of the Netherlands** shared the sentiment in the room that reggae is a very interesting and unifying element. As remarked on by other Committee Members, many nominating States experienced difficulties with R.2. The Evaluation Body states that the community of practitioners who identify with the element should be at the forefront of any action undertaken to safeguard and raise the visibility of the element, and it asked the Evaluation Body to elaborate more on its conclusion on R.2.
27. The **delegation of Austria** wished to ask the State Party about one sentence under R.5 where it stated that the inventory was currently being reviewed and updated in keeping with the guidelines of the Convention. The delegation explained that it had a look at R.5 and also the report of the State Party submitted in 2018, which had already been dealt with under item 7.a, noting that Jamaica seemed to have a very complex inventorying process. Furthermore, as per Article 12 of the Convention, each Party should draw up an inventory in a manner geared to its own situation. The delegation thus asked Jamaica to explain the inventorying process and how in particular the community and groups were involved in the inventorying process.
28. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** agreed with the sentiments expressed by the other Committee Members and supported the amendments.
29. The **Chairperson** invited Jamaica to clarify the issues raised.
30. The **delegation of Jamaica** welcomed this opportunity to respond to the Evaluation Body in relation to criteria R.2 and R.5. Regarding R.2, in terms of how the element had inspired and could foster better understanding, reggae music has influenced and inspired many other major musical genres worldwide, such as pinoy in the Philippines, reggaeton in Latin America, reggaerajah in India, and Hawaiian reggae in Hawaii. The birth of these genres bears evidence of the strength of the oral, literary traditions, knowledge and practices embodied in reggae music itself, and which inspired other intangible cultural heritage elements such as dub and dub poetry. Dub technique and style originated in Jamaican reggae around the 1970s when the Roland Space Echo was used to produce echo and delay effects. In terms of initiatives and programmes in support of the element, formal academic programmes in reggae music have been established in territories, through such organizations as the Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts, the Reggae Studies Unit at the University of West Indies, and the Alpha Academy that caters to young students. Internationally, academic programmes and reggae music are offered at the prestigious Berklee School of Music in Boston and Musicians Institute in California. International conferences are also staged and improve the visibility of the element and intangible cultural heritage in general. The State Party is constantly engaged in the element and facilitating global dialogue to promote cultural diversity and, as such, it has hosted and is in the process of hosting international conferences, such as the 15th International Island Festivals and Music Tourism Conference, to be held in July 2019 in Jamaica. The delegation also pointed out that UNESCO selected Kingston, Jamaica, as one of three pilot projects to hold a series of workshops on intangible cultural heritage and creativity for sustainable cities, community-based inventories and the analysis of intangible cultural heritage in urban areas, commencing in early 2019. Communities where reggae music is practised and recorded, such as Trench Town, western Kingston, where Bob Marley lived, will be venues for community-based inventorying. This complements the fact that Kingston was designated a creative city of music by UNESCO on 11 December 2015, and is recognized worldwide as the birthplace of reggae music.
31. The **delegation of Jamaica** explained that since 2012, the African Caribbean Institute of Jamaica/Jamaica Memory Bank, the national focal point for intangible cultural heritage in Jamaica, had facilitated stakeholder networks comprising members of the Kumina, Rastafarian, Revival, East Indian, Chinese and Maroon communities, to name a few. This network has facilitated greater dialogue among traditional communities in a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect, and had encouraged the visibility of local cultural elements. In February 2008, Jamaica designated the month of February–incidentally the birth month of Bob Marley and the crown prince of reggae, Dennis Brown—as reggae month. During that month, there is an intensification of the engagement of the public both locally and internationally in cultural programmes throughout various communities around reggae. The Jamaica Reggae Museum, for example, hosts its annual Ground Nation series, and reggae practitioners make presentations in the industry associations lecture series. Also, the annual Bob Marley lecture is staged with the cooperation of the Bob Marley Foundation. It was noteworthy that iconic exponents of reggae music, including Peter Tosh and Bob Marley, were members of the Rastafarian faith. In recognition of the contribution of Rastafari to reggae music, and the fact that super stars Jimmy Cliff and Bunny Wailer celebrate their birthdays in the month of April—the month Jamaica also celebrates the anniversary of the visit of his imperial majesty Haile Selassie I and the spiritual head of Rastafari to the island— Jamaica observes April as Rastafari month.
32. Regarding criterion R.5, the **delegation of Jamaica** further explained that the African Caribbean Institute of Jamaica/Jamaica Memory Bank, the national focal point for the implementation of the Convention, maintains and updates an inventory on reggae among other intangible cultural heritage elements, and the inventory can be viewed online and is updated bi-monthly and reviewed annually. Jamaica was currently in the process of a major overhaul of the inventory, taking into account its current needs, as well as being mindful of the requirements of R.5. Jamaica’s Legal Deposit Act requires that all locally produced material on the element be deposited at the National Library of Jamaica, which itself also maintains an inventory of intangible cultural heritage. This ensures the upgrade and constant maintenance of the inventory, as well as other intangible cultural heritage elements present in the country. Communities have created and continue to maintain and update the record and music inventory of recording studios. This includes, but is not limited to, the recording studios of King Jammy, the Bob Marley Foundation and Tuff Gong. In the inner city community of Trench Town, the birthplace of reggae music, a state-of-the-art community studio, the Jamaica Music Institute (JaMIN), was opened in February 2012. Various inventories under the element are also housed at the Edna Manley College of the Visual and Performing Arts, the Bob Marley Museum, the Peter Tosh Museum and the Jamaica Museum, which are accessible to the public and to practitioners. UNESCO’s series of workshops on Heritage and Creativity for Sustainable Cities Community-based Inventory project will also reinforce specific community-based inventories in the western Kingston region, and will be used to further ‘inventorize’ the element. In terms of the visibility of the element, it was noted that the Smithsonian Institution put on a major exhibition on reggae a few years ago, highlighting the importance of the element. The Jamaica Jamaica! Exhibition was mounted in France and Brazil, which also demonstrates the visibility of the element and its attractiveness to other countries. Thus, the inscription of Reggae on the Representative List would raise visibility, not only of the element but also of the Convention as a whole, and in doing so would raise awareness about other elements worldwide.
33. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
34. The **delegation of the Netherlands** wished to have feedback from the Evaluation Body.
35. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** took the opportunity to thank the Committee Members for their contribution and comments, and noted that a number of the Members were lovers of reggae music, with most of the explanations talking about the element itself. The Chairperson explained that the Evaluation Body did not evaluate the element but the information contained within the file. In this case, the two criteria were not met. Criterion R.2 had three sections that requested information, with one section asking how the inscription contributed to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, another section on dialogue, and a section on respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. Thus, even if the information on dialogue was clear, the section on the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general was unclear, and thus the criterion was not met. Regarding R.5, there were some sections where some information was missing, with no information on the frequency of updating, with no name or reference numbers given for the inventory. Following the challenges faced by most States Parties in R.2 and R.5, the Chairperson took the opportunity to thank Japan for its generous contribution to the upcoming open-ended working group, which would give experts and States Parties time to reflect on R.2, which plays a very significant role. In the case of Jamaica, the Evaluation Body had requested this missing information, hence the referral recommendation. The information given by Jamaica was not information contained in the file, and the Chairperson regretted that this information had not been provided as the criteria would probably have been met, adding that further reflections on R.2 and R.5 would enhance the work of the Evaluation Body and the Committee in general.
36. The **Chairperson** took note of the explanations by Jamaica, the reaction of the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, and the sentiment of the Committee Members who spoke to support the amendment proposed by Cuba and Palestine. The Chairperson therefore requested that Committee Members raise their nameplates to record those in favour of the amendments.
37. The **delegations of Senegal**, **Sri Lanka**, **Djibouti**, **Guatemala**, **Poland**, **Togo**, **Cyprus**, **Japan**, **Zambia**, the **Philippines**, **Kazakhstan**, **Colombia**, **Armenia**, **Palestine**, **Kuwait**, **China**, **Mauritius**, **Azerbaijan**, **Cameroon** and **Lebanon** supported the amendment to inscribe. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.18**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.18) **adopted to inscribe Reggae music of Jamaica on the Representative List**.
38. The **delegation of Jamaica** expressed its sincere thanks for the tremendous support received from States Parties for the inscription of reggae music of Jamaica. It expressed particular thanks to Cuba and Palestine for their open and gracious support and was heartened by the show of camaraderie of many States Parties and their appreciation, love and respect for an element at the heart and soul of Jamaica. Intangible cultural heritage was said to be highly significant in the country’s identity, and Jamaica was proud that this element of reggae music was considered as intangible cultural heritage, often described as that which ‘we eat, sleep and breathe’. Reggae now belonged to the world. The delegation thanked UNESCO for this inscription, noting that Jamaicans had long recognized that this element meant so much to so many around the world. Jamaica was of the view that this inscription would invariably bring even more visibility to the Representative List and intangible cultural heritage as a whole. The number of reggae music practitioners across the globe grows every day and Jamaica continues to support academic conferences on reggae, such as the Jamaica Music Conference and the upcoming 6th biennial global reggae conference. These conferences include practitioners sharing with other reggae stakeholders, students and the public. The music also spawned a number of large music festivals across the globe, most notably the Rototom Sunsplash Reggae Festival in Spain, attracting over 100,000 music lovers and academics every year. Special note was made of the ongoing digitizing and bi-monthly updating of the national inventory. Jamaica was also committed to engaging in inventories in local communities, such as in Waterhouse and Trench Town, part of the UNESCO Heritage and Creativity for Sustainable Cities Community-based Inventory project. The delegation reiterated its deepest appreciation for the overwhelming love Jamaica had received for reggae music, which was a testament to its global impact, and fittingly ended with the words of reggae icon Bob Marley: “One love, one heart, let’s get together and feel alright”.

*[A 15-minute pause for the celebration of Reggae]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Raiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.19], submitted by **Japan**. Raiho-shin rituals take place annually in various regions of Japan on days that mark the beginning of the year or when the seasons change. Such rituals stem from folk beliefs that deities from the outer world visit communities and usher in the new year or new season with happiness and good luck. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatRaiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes plays an important role in children’s upbringing, strengthens bonds with other family members and promotes respect for local traditions. The element would raise awareness about the inclusiveness of intangible cultural heritage and its ability to transcend gender divisions and bring generations together. The safeguarding measures included the transmission, identification and promotion of the element. The preparation of the nomination file involved the active participation of community members at all stages. The Evaluation Body congratulated the State Party for submitting a well-prepared, clearly structured nomination file and commended it for delivering a video, which reflected all the key aspects of the element and allowed viewers to understand the element in detail. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Raiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.19**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.19) **adopted to inscribe Raiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Japan** spoke on behalf of the people of Japan, and in particular the ten communities concerned, expressing its heartfelt gratitude to all the Members of the Committee and the Evaluation Body, as well as the Secretariat for the inscription of Raiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes. The Raiho-shin comprises traditional rituals to celebrate the New Year or other particular seasons or events, and they are deeply rooted in each community, giving opportunities to people of the community to reconfirm their unity and folk beliefs. They involve everyone in the community, young and old, including those who have left the community for economic and social reasons. The ten communities are strongly committed to safeguarding the respective Raiho-shin ritual. The Government of Japan had also expressed a firm commitment to safeguarding these important rituals together with the communities concerned so as to pass this heritage to future generations.

*[A film on Raiho-shin, ritual visits of deities in masks and costumes was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **As-Samer in Jordan** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.20], submitted by **Jordan**. As-Samer entails mainly dancing and singing performed on various occasions such as during marriage ceremonies. The practice consolidates social bonds and promotes cohesion. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.4 and R.5. As-Samer is performed by different clans in all the governorates of Jordan during festive occasions and it embodies the history of Jordan and provides the communities concerned with a sense of identity and pride. A wide range of stakeholders, communities and NGOs had participated in the nomination process. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.3. Although As-Samer represents popular art and oral traditions based on collective performances, its contribution to raising the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and the promotion of human creativity were not clearly explained. Instead, the file concentrated on the benefits of the inscription to the country. The safeguarding measures proposed could raise the visibility of the element, but the Ministry of Culture intended to use a top-down approach of establishing a higher committee consisting of experts, specialists and practitioners responsible for ensuring that the art did not evolve or change in any respect, which is contrary to the spirit of the Convention as constant recreation is an inherent aspect of living heritage. In addition, the role of practitioners in the implementation of the safeguarding plan was missing. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer As-Samer in Jordan to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** had received an amendment by Palestine on behalf of the Arab Group, and a request to open the debate.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work on this file, as well as all the other files, and thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the explanations given. As-Samer is an element found in the entire region, in Jordan, Palestine and Saudi Arabia, as well as other Arab countries. This element brings together many different artistic activities, and embodies a wide range of activities and cultural references that include dancing, costumes, singing. The delegation recalled that the Evaluation Body does not evaluate an element itself; rather, its task is to evaluate the information contained in the nomination file. Unfortunately, as was known, criterion R.2 is problematic and unclear to submitting States, though experts would be working on this issue. Nevertheless, the delegation believed that at this stage the element deserved to be inscribed, and Palestine—on behalf of the Arab Group—had submitted amendments in this regard, hoping that Members would support these amendments after hearing the explanations by Jordan. Moreover, no file is perfect, even if some files have met the five criteria. It was noted that all the referred files had a problem with R.2, but in R.3—the most important criterion that goes to the heart of the purpose of the Convention—the remarks by the Evaluation Body on this file were pertinent. For this reason, the delegation asked that the Committee allow Jordan to answer the concerns raised, especially in R.3. For example, on the involvement of communities in preparing the safeguarding plan and the roles of these communities in its implementation, which the Evaluation Body found unclear. In addition, there was the question of ‘freezing’ the element, when intangible cultural heritage elements should be evolving.
4. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work. With regard to the As-Samer file, it is a vital element of Jordan’s intangible cultural heritage and is widely present in the lives of individuals and communities. The fact that it is performed at major private and public gatherings, as well as in a number of large folklore ensembles, showed the strong desire of the individuals, communities and institutions involved to inscribe the element to facilitate its survival and transmission, and to emphasize its importance. The delegation wished to hear from the submitting State on how the communities, groups and individuals were involved in the safeguarding measures, as well as the role of practitioners in the implementation of the safeguarding plan, as these points were unclear.
5. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** expressed its appreciation of the great work carried out by the Evaluation Body in its consideration of this file and the important remarks made. However, in response to the visibility and human creativity requirements for inscription, the delegation believed that As-Samer promoted heritage rituals and ethnic wedding ceremonies in Jordan and abroad, and the wider practice of cherishing family values, tribal affiliations, interaction of youth and elders, attracting local use, media and researchers to observe, participate and document different aspects of As-Samer. The nomination underlined that inscription shall depict Jordan’s cultural diversity as a rich variety of folk costumes, ancient rituals, music and dance elements, finding common historic roots with other cultures, and not necessarily neighbouring ones. The great concern and commitment expressed by the Government to safeguard the element was also acknowledged, and many measures, including establishing a higher committee of experts and bearers, were noted. The ritualistic nature of As-Samer sustained in different clans and communities emphasized the importance of safeguarding its innate purpose and meaning. In this regard, the delegation suggested that the wording used to ensure no exposure of the element to any change was a way of protecting the element from distortion and commercialization. It therefore supported Palestine’s motion to open the file for debate, and it wished Jordan to be given the floor to answer the following question: How would it respond to the Evaluation Body’s remarks on the undesirability of establishing a special higher committee under the Ministry of Culture?
6. The **delegation of Lebanon** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its painstaking work, and Jordan for its nomination file on As-Samer, a national but also regional dance performed on different occasions in all governorates of the country. The delegation supported the amendments presented by Palestine. It also sought information from Jordan on criterion R.3 in which it was mentioned that the Ministry of Culture planned to set up a senior committee of experts, specialists and practitioners to ensure that the element did not evolve or change in any way. The delegation recalled that this intention was contrary to the very definition of intangible cultural heritage within the meaning of Article 2.1 of the Convention, as recreation is an essential aspect of intangible cultural heritage.
7. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Jordan for submitting this very interesting file, which encouraged social cohesion among communities in Jordan, while promoting respect for women and highlighting their significant role in the practice of this element. It also commended the Evaluation Body for their accurate evaluation of this file. With regard to criterion R.2 and the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, it believed in a positive consideration of this criterion. Though the file could have elaborated on this issue better, the delegation drew attention to the second paragraph of Section 2, which stated, “UNESCO’s recognition of As-Samer art would lead to a broader interest in intangible cultural heritage. It will encourage national institutions concerned to continue their efforts in accordance with specific plans and strategies to put this heritage in the position it deserves.” The delegation felt that this information was enough to satisfy the criterion for visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. While considering the specific context of this nomination and element, and given the complexity of the question of promotion of human creativity in the case of As-Samer, the delegation supported the positive recommendation of this criterion. With regard to criterion R.3, it also believed that more specific information could have been provided on the role of communities in the safeguarding process. It was noted that the information in Section 3.b. spoke directly about the contribution of local communities and their wish to build on partnerships with popular bands to implement the safeguarding measures. It further noted the wish to establish a Jordanian As-Samer Association to support safeguarding and networking between popular bands in Jordan, which practitioners are expected to plan in the implementation of the safeguarding measures. Thus, the delegation would support changing the referral to a positive recommendation for criterion R.2.
8. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported the sentiments expressed by Palestine.
9. The **delegation of Armenia** also wished to open this file and sought a positive outcome.
10. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated the technical expertise of the Evaluation Body for its excellent work, and also Jordan for presenting As-Samer for inscription on the Representative List. It wished to allow Jordan to take the floor to present information on the safeguarding plan to be put in place, as well as the measures foreseen to ensure the recreation and dynamism of this element.
11. The **delegation of Cyprus** also supported the amendments, but sought further clarifications regarding criteria R.2 and R.3 by the delegation of Jordan.
12. The **delegation of China** appreciated the Evaluation Body’s work and thanked Jordan for submitting this nomination. It understood that this nomination represented a popular art and oral traditions, and that it also contributed to the interaction between different communities and cultural dialogue. The delegation had the same question as Kazakhstan with regard to the higher committee to be established by the Ministry of Culture, as mentioned in Section 3.b. It thus sought further clarification on why and how this committee would work and its intention so as to better understand this safeguarding measure.
13. The **delegations of Guatemala** and **Senegal** supported the amendment by Palestine.
14. The **delegation of the Netherlands** understood that As-Samer represented an important art of oral traditions and collective performances. Concerning R.3, the Evaluation Body expressed concerns about a top-down approach in the safeguarding measures through the establishment of a higher committee consisting of experts, specialists and practitioners responsible for ensuring “that the art of As-Samer does not evolve or change in any respect”. The Evaluation Body remarked that this intention went against the definition of intangible cultural heritage and it wished to ask the Evaluation Body to elaborate on this point.
15. The **delegation of Cuba** echoed the remarks made by previous speakers, lending its support for the element to be inscribed.
16. The **delegation of Austria** concurredwith the Netherlands that Section 3.b. in the file was problematic, adding that it was surprised that the Evaluation Body had not highlighted point 4 in the file, which read, “encourage women to contribute to and participate in this art highlighting the traditional role completely.” The delegation wished to hear from Jordan on the meaning of this sentence, as gender equality was of such importance that it sought clarity.
17. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** referred to the establishment of a specialized committee to ensure that the element did not evolve or change as being contrary to the Convention, explaining that the essence of intangible cultural heritage was that it is a living heritage that is constantly recreated, as outlined in Article 2 of the Convention.
18. The **delegation of Jordan** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to reply to the various queries and for his wise leadership, and the Evaluation Body for its valuable, continuous effort to evaluate the files in an objective and neutral way. The delegation explained that Jordanians believe that As-Samer represents them nationally and internationally, perceiving it as a communication channel through which to transmit their cultural values and way of life. For ideally, it reflects their traditions, norms and social character, and the dance performances are seen as the means to break down cultural barriers. Inscription of the element would enable Jordanians to strengthen their interaction with other cultures on the basis of parity and dignity, and result in better international recognition of the element that would arouse a growing interest among experts, actors, the public and others, thereby contributing towards enriching knowledge of As-Samer heritage. It would promote expressions around the world that are used to achieve sustainable development. As-Samer is increasingly present in international festivals and exhibitions, and in cultural cooperation activities around the world, and it would make the communities, groups, inter-Jordanians and the international community appreciate it and also become aware of such international policies as UNESCO with regard to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. As-Samer is an identity maker. Its inscription would serve to raise its profile, and promote cultural diversity and understanding in an increasingly globalized world.
19. Regarding the safeguarding measures, the **delegation of Jordan** explained that they included the promotion of the element through a programme designed by the communities, with support from cultural institutions, to promote the element and its viability. Through concerts, public and media appearances in Jordan and abroad, As-Samer gatherings constantly promote the value of Jordan’s traditional dances, making the general public more familiar with them. Special attention is dedicated to programmes presenting various versions of As-Samer to draw attention to the diversity of local variants of the basic patterns. The visibility of As-Samer continues to increase due to cultural entertainment programmes broadcast on radio and television. An important part of promoting As-Samer is its presentation at festivals and contests involving numerous intangible cultural heritage examples. Regarding the involvement of practitioners in the safeguarding plans, the delegation drew attention to the fact that around 80 per cent of Jordanians are practitioners of this art. The safeguarding plans summarized in the nomination dossier were mainly gleaned from Jordanian citizens. Attached to the nomination form were ninety pages of consent letters from the community, composed and undersigned by representatives of NGOs, young and old citizens, researchers, cultural historians, teachers, students, poets, and so on, and which covered the entire country including Bedouin, and rural and urban areas with the principle of free, prior and informed consent. They reflect their real feelings and passion for this element. Moreover, it was the local communities that asked the government to help them in submitting the nomination file. These consent letters show that Jordanians are not only declaring their interest in inscribing the element as part of their identity and a stimulator of social cohesion and cultural dialogue, but are also aware of all the consequences of inscription and therefore proposed safeguarding measures that guarantee the promotion of the element, while mitigating any possible negative aspects of inscription.
20. The **delegation of Jordan** proposed quoting some of the consents from the communities who had proposed the safeguarding measures in line with the Convention. With regard to the so-called higher committee of experts and specialists, Jordan understood its commitment regarding the intangible cultural heritage present on its own territories and was determined to safeguard it in line with the Convention, which stressed the involvement of communities, groups and, if applicable, individuals. It informed the Committee that Jordan had abandoned the idea of a committee since the preparation of this file because it was now considering establishing safeguarding policies for the sake of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in general, including As-Samer and with the involvement of the communities in harmony with the Convention and its philosophy. Regarding women’s involvement, the delegation explained that all over Jordan and other neighbouring countries, the As-Samer is male-dominated. Women used to attend with men more openly, performing together, but because of the changing nature of intangible cultural heritage, the participation of women had decreased, especially in the last thirty years. In Bedouin and rural areas, participation of women was less than in urban areas owing to the conservative nature of such communities. When women gather with other women there is dance and joyous music, and As-Samer sessions can be performed within a family context. Women regularly attend all-female wedding parties, sometimes several times a week, and they also participate as spectators, ululating during the performance. Participants wear traditional costumes embroidered by Jordanian women. Although it is performed by men, the participation of women in private sittings inside residences is not uncommon.
21. Thanking Jordan, the **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Paragraph 3 included an amendment by Palestine and Cuba [further deciding that criteria R.2 and R.3 were met].
22. The **delegation of Lebanon** supported the amendment.
23. The **Chairperson** requested that Committee Members supporting the amendments raise their name plates.
24. The **delegations of Djibouti**, **Senegal**, **Guatemala**, **Togo**, **Cyprus**, **Jamaica**, **Japan**, **Zambia**, **Armenia**, **Kazakhstan**, **Kuwait**, **Lebanon**, **Cameroon**, **Azerbaijan**, **Mauritius**, **Sri Lanka**, **Colombia**, **Poland** and **China** supported the amendments.
25. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 3 adopted. Paragraph 4 included the amendment by Palestine and Cuba, which also received broad support (as above) and was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.20**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.20) **adopted to inscribe As-Samer in Jordan on the Representative List**.
26. The **delegation of Jordan** took the opportunity to thank Mauritius for its kind hospitality and the good arrangements made for this meeting and for its tireless efforts and kindness. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for its work, paying tribute to the Body as an example to be followed by other bodies. The delegation thanked the Committee for its support, reassuring the Committee about its intention to protect and safeguard its heritage, which is an integral part of its identity. Without the people who are custodians of this heritage, Jordan could not protect it adequately. Intangible cultural heritage is like water flowing down the stream; it changes at every stage of its passage, and therefore the delegation did not seek to freeze this heritage. Jordan had started with modest steps, but now the inscribed element shall embark on a serious stage of work with the local community and the practitioners in order to safeguard this heritage. Jordanians believe that heritage is our ship towards achieving peace and welfare for the sake of all humanity, and it reiterated its thanks to everyone.
27. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.21], submitted by **Kazakhstan**. Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders marks the end of the old and the beginning of the new yearly horse-breeding cycle. The rites involve skills inherited from nomadic ancestors to present daily reality and manifests traditional Kazakh hospitality. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders are carried out annually to express gratitude to nature for the survival of people and horses through the long winter, and to ensure the fertility of the herds and the abundance of milk in the new season. The related festivities illustrate the creative use of the natural environment that helped people to adapt the tradition to the new living conditions. The safeguarding plan concentrated on regulating their attendance during the rites without any direct interference with the practice. The nomination file was prepared by the Initiative Group for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage, comprising representatives of the tradition bearers and experts, and other community members were also involved. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders on the Representative List.
28. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
29. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.21**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.21) **adopted to inscribe Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders** **on the Representative List**.
30. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked everyone for their kind support of this nomination, giving the floor to a representative of the community, bearer of this practice.
31. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** [second speaker], Director of the Museum of the region of Ulytau in central Kazakhstan where this practice is common, explained that the traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders is practised in the region and is an indispensable part of our community’s self-identity. The horse provided an invaluable contribution to the progress and spread of human civilization, and the earliest evidence of the horse’s domestication comes from the great steppes of Kazakhstan. Thus, its inscription was a great day for everyone who loves horses around the globe. He assured the Committee of the country’s commitment to making every effort to preserve this tradition, now newly inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation thanked everyone for their support for the nomination, which was prepared by the late Dr Yelena Khorosh.

*[A short film on Traditional spring festive rites of the Kazakh horse breeders was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to make some practical announcements.
2. The **Secretary** invited all the delegates to the information session on higher education networking on intangible cultural heritage organized by the Secretariat.

*[Thursday, 29 November 2018, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the session with the next nomination submitted by Malawi.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Mwinoghe, joyous dance** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.23], submitted by **Malawi**. Mwinoghe is an instrumental dance performed among three ethnic communities in the northern region of Malawi. The dance is performed at social gatherings for entertainment purposes and serves a unifying function among different communities. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatMwinoghe, joyous dance represents a cultural element deriving from an older ceremonial dance that has assumed new functions in modern society. The dance strengthens bonds among community members, fosters dialogue and helps people understand their own cultural identity. The safeguarding measures were prepared with the participation of communities, and the State Party strives to create a favourable legal framework to facilitate the communities’ safeguarding efforts. The element was identified during a project co-funded by UNESCO aimed at community-based inventorying, and Mwinoghe was duly included in the Inventory of Malawi´s Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2013. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Mwinoghe, joyous dance on the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
4. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.23**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.23) **adopted to inscribe Mwinoghe, joyous dance** **on the Representative List**.
5. The **delegation of Malawi** thankedthe Chairperson for the opportunity to speak at this joyous occasion, thanking the Committee for its decision to inscribe Mwinoghe, joyous dance on the Representative List. It strongly believed that the inscription of Mwinoghe would help reinforce self-confidence, self-respect and pride among the communities, groups and individuals concerned, and encourage stronger relations with other communities in the country that already had their intangible heritage elements inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation acknowledged that this nomination was developed at a time when it had the capacity-building project for Southern African countries, with the kind support of the Government of Flanders. This nomination was therefore a clear testimony of the positive impact of the capacity-building project implemented. For this reason, the delegation thanked the Government of Flanders for its kind gesture, and on behalf of the communities concerned and the Government of Malawi, the delegation thanked the Committee for its decision.

*[A short film of the Mwinoghe, joyous dance was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Art of crafting and playing Mbira/Sansi, finger-plucking traditional musical instrument in Malawi and Zimbabwe** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.24], submitted by **Malawi and Zimbabwe**. Mbira/Sansi concerns the art of playing and making a traditional finger-plucking musical instrument in Malawi and Zimbabwe. In Malawi, songs contain important messages about good behaviour and communicate information about events that happened in the past, while in Zimbabwe the instrument is played at spiritual invocation ceremonies, funeral wakes, memorials and traditional healing ceremonies. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3 and R.5. Mbira/Sansi music has a primarily spiritual and ceremonial function and reflects the rich cultural heritage of African communities. The proposed safeguarding measures were aimed at improving the documentation, promotion and enhanced transmission of Mbira/Sansi music. The element was included in the inventories of the territories of Malawi and Zimbabwe in 2011 and 2012, respectively. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.4. The file failed to explain and provide concrete evidence of how the inscription could contribute to increasing the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The file also did not clearly demonstrate how the nomination was prepared with the widest possible participation of the communities concerned, and letters of consent from one of the countries were dated September 2017, i.e. after the 31 March statutory deadline. The Evaluation Body thus recommended that the Committee refer Art of crafting and playing Mbira/Sansi, finger-plucking traditional musical instrument in Malawi and Zimbabwe to the submitting States.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination. He wished tohear the position of the submitting States concerning the decision earlier in the day, and announced by the Secretariat, that countries whose files had been referred could reconsider resubmitting their files for consideration in the next cycle. Given that a window of opportunity had opened to them to resubmit the file in March 2019, the Chairperson invited the submitting States to explain how they wished to proceed.
3. The **delegation of Zimbabwe** began by congratulating the Chairperson for his excellent chairing of the session and thanked Mauritius and its people for their fantastic hospitality and for hosting the meeting. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for the commendable work on the joint nomination file with Malawi. Zimbabwe and Malawi accepted the observations and recommendations of the Committee and would work closely together to resubmit the nomination for consideration in 2019.
4. The **delegation of Malawi** shared thesame opinion as expressed by Zimbabwe.
5. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.24**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.24) **adopted to refer Art of crafting and playing Mbira/Sansi, finger-plucking traditional musical instrument in Malawi and Zimbabwe** **to the submitting States**.

*[The Vice-Chairperson of the Philippines chaired the following session]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Dondang Sayan** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.25], submitted by **Malaysia**. Dondang Sayan is a traditional Malay art that combines elements of music (violins, gongs and tambourines or the tambour), songs and chants, featuring beautiful melodious strains of poetry. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Dondang Sayang promotes communication between performers and their audience. The element embodies the principal values of tolerance, empathy, sharing and harmony in society. The proposed safeguarding measures were aimed at promoting and disseminating the element, with regular performances and training activities. The decision to nominate the element followed a series of public meetings, seminars, discussions and requests with the community’s participation. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Dondang Sayang on the Representative List.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.25**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.25) **adopted to inscribe Dondang Sayan on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Malaysia** spoke ofon behalf of the Government and the Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture to thank the Evaluation Body for the inscription of Dondang Sayan. This was a significant and historic decision for Malaysia as it was its first inscription following the ratification of the Convention in 2013. Dondang Sayan is a traditional Malay art that combines elements of music, songs and chants. It is also known for its ballads used by the communities to convey feelings of love, and to give advice to the audience on special themes such as love, kindness and many other sentiments. Dondang Sayan is very well-known in the Malay archipelago, particularly in the state of Malacca. The most distinct features are the chants and poetry, a genre of entertainment and beautiful, melodious strains of poetry. The performance is special in terms of its grandeur and skills in delivering songs where the singer recites the poems spontaneously and naturally with full sonority. The inscription is just the beginning and Malaysia was committed to implementing the safeguarding plans, understanding the great responsibility. The delegation looked forward to good cooperation and would be grateful for working closely with all Member States in areas of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. It thanked the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their excellent work in ensuring the smooth running of the meeting. The delegation congratulated Mauritius for its excellent hosting and warm welcome, inviting the State Assemblyman of the Malacca State Executive Council to say a few words.
5. The **delegation of Malaysia** [second speaker] spoke on behalf of the state government of Malacca, Malaysia and the people of Malacca to thank the Committee for this historic decision. It was a very important achievement that would enhance Dondang Sayan as a cultural heritage of Malacca, thus making the whole community proud. The state would continue its efforts in advancing and preserving Dondang Sayan at all levels, which would add to the treasures and diverse cultures of Malacca, and it would strive to ensure that Dondang Sayan was practised and sustained for generations to come. The delegation thanked the Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture of Malaysia through the Department of National Heritage for its relentless efforts to successfully inscribe Dondang Sayan, inviting all the delegates to visit the World Heritage site in the state of Malacca, as well as Dondang Sayan.

*[A short film on Dondang Sayan was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **La Romería (the pilgrimage): ritual cycle of 'La llevada' (the carrying) of the Virgin of Zapopan** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.26], submitted by **Mexico**. La Romería is the most popular and strongly rooted tradition in west Mexico, dating back to 1734 and celebrated annually on 12 October; it honours the image of the Virgin of Zapopan. The planning of the activities depends on the interaction of the different communities; hence, it helps them renew and reinforce their social ties. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatLa Romería (the pilgrimage): ritual cycle of ‘La llevada’ (the carrying) of the Virgin of Zapopan merges official Catholic rituals with popular religious expressions and a large cycle of festive events involving native dance groups of different backgrounds. It establishes good relationships and serves as a symbol of devotion, continuity and cultural identity. The deep-rootedness of the ritual and the number of organizations involved, including the government and practitioners, ensure its viability. The communities concerned actively participated in the preparation of the nomination file through academic research and in workshops. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe La Romería (the pilgrimage): ritual cycle of ‘La llevada’ (the carrying) of the Virgin of Zapopan on the Representative List.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.26**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.26) **adopted to inscribe La Romería (the pilgrimage): ritual cycle of 'La llevada' (the carrying) of the Virgin of Zapopan** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Mexico** began by thanking Mauritius for its hospitality and Spain for making it possible to speak in its mother tongue. On behalf of the Government of Mexico and the Secretariat of Culture, as well as the National Institute of Anthropology and History, the delegation thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for satisfying the desire for the bearer communities to have La Romería inscribed on the Representative List; an element that has survived and been handed down through history from generation to generation. With this nomination, Mexico reaffirmed its commitment to safeguarding, preserving and promoting Mexico’s traditions that make up its cultural identity, as it worked closely with the bearer communities, some of whom were represented at the session, as well as the stakeholders, which could clearly be seen in the methodology implemented since 2010. The file is the result of a truly collective work based on consensus. The delegation emphasized the importance of intangible cultural heritage to strengthen and reconstruct the communities’ social fabric, in keeping with the spirit of the 2003 Convention. The delegation invited Mr Gerardo Ascencio, Director of Culture for the township of Zapopan, to say a few words, who was accompanied by representatives of the bearer communities.
5. The **delegation of Mexico** [second speaker], Mr Gerardo Ascencio, greeted the delegates on behalf of the municipal government of Zapopan in the state of Jalisco, and thanked Mauritius for its hospitality, as well as the Evaluation Body for recommending the inscription of the element. La Romería is deeply rooted in the personal and family histories of each inhabitant of the region. It is part of its memory and tradition, which had given the communities a sense of identity for nearly three centuries. The 35,000 dancers are organized into four groups with various independent groups of dancers. There is the guard of honour of Our Lady of Zapopan, and around 2 million participants take part in the procession every year from May to October when the image of the virgin goes back to the Basilica of Zapopan. This tradition had helped build networks of cooperation and reciprocity. Mr Ascencio underscored the commitment undertaken by the authorities of Zapopan to safeguard the cultural heritage of the inhabitants of Zapopan, recognizing the important role played in the preservation of cultural heritage, as well as for strengthening community bonds as fundamental factors in ensuring sustainable development. The delegation was committed to continuing and strengthening this perspective.
6. The **delegation of Mexico** [a dancer of the bearer community] spoke as a representative of all the communities and groups that make La Romería possible year after year, physically and spiritually. The bearers try out different sounds and prepare clothing to accompany the Virgin of Zapopan after having visited the many communities in the metropolitan area of Guadalajara. The dance is part of the bearers, part of its origins and its convictions. Dance is an offering. The bearers keep the tradition alive by transmitting the practice through their children. La Romería belonged to the communities today, but tomorrow it would belong to posterity. The active participation of the communities when drafting the nomination file and their explicit consent gave them hope that the inscription would serve to guarantee a long life for the tradition.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Horse and camel Ardhah** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.27], submitted by **Oman**. Horse and camel Ardhah is practised across many regions of Oman. People gather around the racecourse to watch shows by horse and camel riders that reflect Omani people’s skill in dealing with and taming the animals. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatHorse and camel Ardhah is a social and cultural activity in rural and urban areas in Omani society, and a source of pride embodying a message of respect and peace. The safeguarding measures proposed were aimed at strengthening the transmission of Alardhah, its promotion and related scientific research and documentation. The nomination of Alardhah was initiated by the practitioners and civil society with the active and continuous involvement of the community. The Evaluation Body reminded the State that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Horse and camel Ardhah on the Representative List.
8. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
9. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Vice-Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.27**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.27) **adopted to inscribe Horse and camel Ardhah on the Representative List**.
10. The **delegation of Oman** spoke on behalf of the Omani delegation to thank the Government of Mauritius and express its appreciation to the Ministry of Culture for the hospitality received. Thanks also went to the Secretariat of the Convention and the Secretary for the laudable efforts made in preparing for the session. The delegation congratulated all the Member States that were successful in inscribing their elements on the List, as well as the Evaluation Body for its serious work in examining the various reports. The Sultanate of Oman is one of the countries that is rich in intangible heritage. It was among the first countries to sign the Convention back in 2005, and it worked on the basis of a well-documented and studied plan. Oman attached great importance to intangible heritage, and promoted the role of communities and practitioners in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The country also integrated these interrelated concepts into safeguarding cultural heritage in the school curricula, and it promoted projects dealing with intangible cultural heritage in its development programmes. Horse and camel Ardhah had now been inscribed on the Representative List, which was indeed a source of happiness and joy for the practitioners. This inscription would provide further encouragement for greater efforts to safeguard it, and it would be included in future development projects in order ascertain its proper safeguarding and make sure that it was transferred from one generation to the next. The Convention would also be further promoted thanks to the cooperation and solidarity of all States Parties in disseminating the spirit of peace and love among all. The promotion of cultural heritage, seen through the various diplomatic and social forums, had contributed to peace and rapprochement, which was manifest in the submission of a single element for the two Korean nations. The delegation thus believed that cultural heritage could be the rallying call for all countries to work together and to show more solidarity.

*[A short film on Horse and camel Ardhah was projected]*

*[The Chairperson reprised his role]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Ritual and festive expressions of the Congo culture** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.28], submitted by **Panama**. The ritual and festive expressions of the Congo culture encompass the contemporary vision of a collective celebration of the black rebel descendants enslaved during the colonial period. For generations, the expressions fostered social integration and provided a way of expressing joy and identity. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered that Ritual and festive expressions of the Congo cultureis an important part of the cultural heritage of Panama’s communities, reinforces the cultural identity of the community members, strengthens their historical memory and helps them cope with their collective historical trauma. The proposed safeguarding measures included overall training on the 2003 Convention, awareness-raising activities, documentation and the establishment of academic degrees on intangible cultural heritage and cultural management. A wide range of community representatives, local governments and practitioners had participated in the nomination process. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Ritual and festive expressions of the Congo culture on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.28**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.28) **adopted to inscribe Ritual and festive expressions of the Congo culture on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Panama** thanked the people of Mauritius for their warm welcome, and on behalf of the Government, representing the Congo culture, extended its thanks to the Secretariat and to the UNESCO office in Costa Rica for their constant support with making the intangible cultural heritage of Panama universal. It especially recognized the work of Professor Emma Gómez, head of the team working at the Ministry of Trade in charge of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and her team of field researchers, particularly all the groups representing the Congo culture who had substantially enriched this nomination file. From the words of the Panamanian researcher and writer, and also Panama Canal Historic Memory Coordinator, Mr Ernesto Holder, who coordinated the inscription of a document on the UNESCO Memory of the World: “The Isthmus of Panama historically has been a place of transit over the centuries as merciless conquerors, resilient settlers and unfortunate but strong and proud slaves have created the social and cultural structure of its inhabitants, every so often being influenced by the diversity and richness of all the groups that have come, left or stayed in various ways and under diverse circumstances. With the cultural influence of the Congo of Panama, this intangible cultural heritage acknowledged its arduously obtained place in history and culture”.
5. The **delegation of Panama**, Ms Emma Gómez,gave a heartfeltmessage from Panama, explaining that the people behind the Congo had been working on the nomination since 2013 and on the inventory, each one having taken years. She spoke of their pride, not only for the descendants of the slaves who had come through the different places in Panama and then gone to other countries in the Americas, but also for the way they knew how to continue their love of their culture, passing it down until the present day in such places as Panama City, Chepo, Chilibre and Curundú, and other spaces with its different districts: Santa Isabel, Portobelo, Colon, Chagres and Donoso. The people thanked the Committee for the inscription, and Ms Gómez thanked all those who had worked on this project and for all the support received, as well as Africa that had a place in the Americas, and Mauritius for the recognition.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Nativity scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.29], submitted by **Poland**. The Nativity Scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow is a social practice performed every year during Christmas, centred on constructing cribs. The tradition is open to everyone with significant educational functions, passing on knowledge about the history of the city, its local architecture and customs. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatthenativity scene tradition in Krakow represents stylized depictions of the birth of Jesus Christ that are produced in many different countries. Crib production is an integral, living part of the cultural heritage of Krakow and its surroundings and an important cultural symbol for Polish society. The element builds on cultural identity and brings people together, thus creating new bonds. The nomination included a well-conceived strategy with clearly defined risks and corresponding safeguarding measures. The preparation of the file involved the widest possible participation of the communities concerned, including men and women. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for a well-prepared file, particularly in terms of community involvement, clear descriptions under criterion R.2 and the video, which highlighted the social and cultural meanings of the element and the central role of the practitioners in all the processes connected with planning and implementing the safeguarding measures. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Nativity scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow on the Representative List.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
8. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.29**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.29) **adopted to inscribe Nativity scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow on the Representative List**.
9. The **delegation of Poland** expressed its sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Committee for the inscription of its very first element on the Representative List. It was honoured to have finally joined the international community of intangible cultural heritage, adding that it was pleased to see the Representative List grow in diversity. The delegation also thanked the Evaluation Body for the commending remarks on the nomination file, welcoming them as an appreciation of its hard work, but also for future nominations.
10. The **delegation of Poland** [second speaker] spoke on behalf of the Minister of Culture and National Heritage to thank the Committee, the Evaluation Body and every person involved in the nomination process: the bearers, practitioners and experts. Since the ratification of the Convention, Poland had developed a set of safeguarding measures and created a national intangible cultural heritage list on which there were now thirty-two elements inscribed. The nativity scene (szopka) was the first element inscribed on the Representative List and the delegation was convinced that this element, as well as others in the future, would contribute to the diversity of the cultural heritage of humanity. The Nativity scene (szopka) is closely connected to the Christmas celebration, with the city of Krakow inscribed on the World Heritage List. Annually, the Christmas preparations start with the szopka and all the creators and practitioners gather at the main square to present the results of their skills. Following the decision of the Committee, the Christmas celebration would be particularly significant for all Polish people. The practitioners of the nativity scene (szopka) were placed at the centre of the nomination and safeguarding process, and the delegation invited a young girl, representing the young generation of szopka makers, to say a few words. **Emilka** was very happy to see the tradition inscribed on the UNESCO List, adding that she had learned how to make nativity scenes from her great-grandfather and now made szopka every year with her mother or by myself. Thanks to the inscription, she hoped to have more people making the szopka with her. [Another speaker] A Representative and creator of szopka nativity scene expressed gratitude to the Committee for the inscription of the element on the Representative List on this proud and historical moment. He gave the Chairperson, as the Minister of Arts and Culture of Mauritius, a szopka scene as a gift for the whole nation of Mauritius.

*[A short film on the Nativity scene (szopka) tradition in Krakow was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.31], submitted by **Serbia**. Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle is an ancient art of performing heroic epics practised for centuries as a form of historical memory and an expression of cultural identity. The songs reflect the value system of the community, and their interactive character fosters community feeling. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatSinging to the accompaniment of the Gusle is an important social, cultural and symbolic element rooted in the everyday life of its practitioners. The element contributes to cultural dialogue among communities and promotes friendship and cultural identity. Safeguarding measures included the documentation, promotion and transmission of the element, as well as education regarding the general importance of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The tradition bearers had initiated the nomination and actively participated in the preparation of the file. The communities concerned and other stakeholders participated during the different stages of the nomination process. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.31**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.31) **adopted to inscribe Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Serbia** thanked the host and the Secretariat for the organization of this meeting, and especially thanked the members of the Evaluation Body and the Committee for recognizing Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle as intangible cultural heritage of humanity. It was convinced that its inscription on the Representative List would contribute to the promotion and growing awareness of intangible cultural heritage in Serbia. This inscription was the result of the hard and dedicated work of a team of experts who had coordinated the preparation of the nomination file in cooperation with individual Gusle players, local communities and the institutions involved in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in Serbia. The element is recognized by the performers of Gusle and local communities as an important landmark and a structural part of their cultural identity, which particularly strengthens the sense of community. The delegation hoped that this inscription would encourage local communities to identify, safeguard and promote local varieties of the element and promote respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. It would also strengthen the awareness that different communities in the same cultural area share cultural heritage. The delegation invited countries in the region where singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle was also recognized as part of their living cultural practices to join the inscription.
5. The **delegation of Albania** [second speaker]spoke onbehalf of the following State Parties to the Convention: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro, congratulating Serbia for the inscription of Singing to the accompaniment of the Gusle on the Representative List. The practice is deemed important as it is historically established and a living practice in a very wide area of southeast Europe in which a multinational nomination applied perfectly. There is extensive and widespread information, solid documentation and ample proof that the element is an ancient cultural practice that has continued over the centuries and in several other countries, namely in Albania where the instrument is called *lahuta*, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro where Gusle is even considered as a national instrument. The delegation understood from Serbia that the nomination remained open for a future multinational nomination with other States Parties, adding that Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Montenegro were already working in this regard.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Bobbin lacemaking in Slovenia** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.32], submitted by **Slovenia**. Bobbin lacemaking in Slovenia is a handicraft skill of making lace by crossing and twisting thread wound on special wooden sticks known as bobbins. It has notable therapeutic functions, and is an ecologically clean and sustainability-oriented activity. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatBobbin lacemaking in Slovenia significantly contributed to the identity of many local communities by connecting family members from different generations, neighbours and local bobbin lacemaking societies, and fosters creative cooperation between lace makers and pattern designers. The inscription of bobbin lacemaking could substantially promote dialogue among the different communities of bobbin lace makers worldwide, and promote networking and joint projects. The proposed safeguarding plan promotes sustainable development and the use of natural local materials. The nomination was supported and approved by a large network of individuals, communities, schools and associations, whose consent was demonstrated. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Bobbin lacemaking in Slovenia on the Representative List.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
8. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.32**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.32) **adopted to inscribe Bobbin lacemaking in Slovenia on the Representative List**.
9. The **delegation of Slovenia** wholeheartedly thanked everyone for the precious international recognition of the element that is widely practised in Slovenia and part of the contemporary life of so many individuals, families and communities. The knowledge of bobbin lacemaking is transmitted from grandparents to grandchildren and practised in organized classes in lacemaking schools, in societies and groups, as well as in informal neighbourhood communities of women. The delegation was honoured to convey the message of the bearers who were following online, alongside several municipalities, local organizations and museum professionals who contributed greatly to ensuring its visibility and awareness, as well as conducting an open dialogue to encourage cooperation and put into words the pride of the bobbin lace makers for their craftsmanship and creative expression, especially the love with which these tiny threads are tangled. As one contemporary designer said so clearly, bobbin lacemaking is simply part of one’s personal and family history, as well as many other life stories that are discovered through socializing while making lace. The delegation was pleased that the tradition of bobbin lacemaking kept up with the times so boldly, even in the 21st century, and that new generations were recognizing it as a part of their world, thus guaranteeing its safeguarding in the future. Bobbin lacemaking is very much alive and deserved its inscription on the Representative List.

*[A short film on Bobbin lacemaking in Slovenia was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Tamboradas drum-playing rituals** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.33], submitted by **Spain**. Tamboradas drum-playing rituals are loud, group rituals based on the simultaneous, intense beating of thousands of drums, played uninterruptedly for days and nights in public spaces in towns and villages. The tamboradas are part of the Catholic Holy Week celebrations and have special significance according to different places, days and times. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatTamboradas drum-playing rituals are a living tradition with significant social and cultural functions shared by all the practising communities with respect to their local differences. The practice plays an important integrating role within the communities concerned, fostering a sense of belonging and strengthening ties among people of different ages, genders and origins. The practice also inspires other artistic fields such as literature, photography and poster design. The safeguarding measures were drawn up with the wide participation of the practitioners and local communities, and they include documentation and awareness-raising activities. The nomination was initiated by local communities and regional governments, which were involved in the entire nomination process through regular meetings. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for the improved file following the referral of this nomination in 2014 and further reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process, inviting it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Tamboradas drum-playing rituals on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.33**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.33) **adopted to inscribe Tamboradas drum-playing rituals** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Spain** began by thanking Mauritius for its warm welcome and congratulated the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Members of the Committee for their work over the last few days. The success of Tamboradas drum-playing rituals was ascribed to the long trajectory followed since it was first submitted in 2014. It was not inscribed at the time because some criteria had to be improved and thus the file received dedication and devotion for two years, which was a good example of the importance of the referral option for the bearer communities, the real protagonists behind the Convention. This process involved the tamboradas communities of Castilla La Mancha, Murcia and Andalusia in twenty-seven localities. There is growing participation in the practice with no distinction for social class or gender. They are noisy, loud rituals based on simultaneously and intensely beating thousands of drums uninterruptedly day and night in public spaces in Spain. It is a call for freedom, fraternity, peace and coexistence, which must be heard in all corners of the Earth. This is a common language, interpreted by the bearer communities in different parts of Spain, creating a captivating atmosphere of sound and emotion. Since Spain’s ratification of the Convention fifteen years ago, the delegation wished to thank all the municipalities involved who expressed their gratitude to UNESCO for accepting this message of peace. These drums are not war drums, but a wish that weapons be silenced throughout the world.

*[A short film on Tamboradas drum-playing rituals was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Rūkada Nātya, traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.34], submitted by **Sri Lanka**. Rūkada Nātya is a type of drama performed using string puppets, traditionally to provide light entertainment and convey moral lessons to village communities. The practice is therefore an effective way of conveying messages that are crucial for maintaining cohesiveness among community members. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatRūkada Nātya, traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka is a form of entertainment that conveys moral and ethical lessons to children, youth and other members of village communities. The practice fosters harmony and cohesiveness, and helps people socialize and share common values. The nomination process stimulated dialogue between puppetry groups and local experts, and the element had the potential to encourage youth to engage with their own heritage. The proposed measures included inventorying and documentation, encouraging studies through grants to conduct research projects aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and raising awareness through educational activities among school children and youth. The element was included in the National Inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Sri Lanka with the wide participation of the practitioners. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for the improved file following the referral of this nomination in 2016. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Rūkada Nātya, traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.34**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.34) **adopted to inscribe Rūkada Nātya, traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** expressed its immense appreciation and heartfelt gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its work recommending that traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka be inscribed on the Representative List. It was delighted with this result and was greatly honoured, especially as this was the very first intangible cultural heritage element inscribed for Sri Lanka. All Sri Lankans, particularly the practitioners, would be overjoyed when they heard the good news, inviting the specialist to briefly speak about the element and how the inscription was going to influence it.
5. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** [second speaker] explained that traditional string puppet drama in Sri Lanka had been one of the most popular forms of community entertainment and dialogue until the arrival of television and other mass entertainment media in the 1970s, which were more attractive to the younger generation. Consequently, traditional string puppet drama had begun to lose its popularity. The situation caused the decline of the practice, as well as the impoverishment of the practitioner. At present, the practitioners found it difficult to sustain the art and maintain their livelihoods. In this context, the inscription of the element on the Representative List would improve the visibility of the element, thus enriching the practice, empowering the practitioner, and ensuring the viability of this important element. At the same time, the delegation was fully aware of the potential dangers that improved popularity might pose, such as commercialization and overexploitation due to tourism. Steps to protect the element were already in place in the safeguarding plans. The delegation took the opportunity to thank the practitioners, the members of the national intangible cultural heritage committee, and all the stakeholders and well-wishers who had helped in numerous ways to prepare the successful file, thanking the Evaluation Body once again.

*[A slide presentation on Rūkada Nātya was shown]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Avalanche risk management** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.35], submitted by **Switzerland and Austria**. The Avalanche risk management entails the control of hazards and threats during winter that looms over the heads of the Alpine inhabitants, tourists, animals, as well as means of communication and other infrastructure so vital for life in the highlands. The element is entrenched in the everyday culture of the communities concerned and underscores the importance of solidarity in crisis situations. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatAvalanche risk management constitutes intangible cultural heritage and, as an inseparable part of their lives, provides local communities with a sense of identity and serves many different social and cultural functions. The inscription of the element would draw closer attention to the cultural aspects of natural hazard prevention and strengthen the linkages between intangible cultural heritage and natural sciences. The safeguarding measures reflected the different aspects of the element relating to the knowledge and practice concerning avalanche risk management, as well as its cultural dimension. Both States Parties had prepared the nomination file in close collaboration with the communities and stakeholders concerned. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Avalanche risk management on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
3. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.35**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.35) **adopted to inscribe Avalanche risk management** **on the Representative List.**
4. The **delegation of Switzerland** thanked the authorities and the people of Mauritius for the excellent organization of this meeting and its perfect hospitality. It thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe the element, acknowledging the remarkable work of the Evaluation Body. The inscription of Avalanche risk management is innovative in the field of intangible cultural heritage through the contemporary combination of traditional and technological practices and knowledge in relation to nature. It also showed, in a context of climate change, that natural hazards are not only technical challenges, but also cultural issues requiring collective responses. Recognition of the role of living heritage in risk management offered opportunities to enhance sustainable development, participation and resilience. The delegation also thanked Austria for the excellent collaboration in the development of this file, which involved a large and diverse bi-national community.
5. The **delegation of Switzerland** [Representative of the community via video message] spoke of the great pleasure to hear that Avalanche risk management was now part of UNESCO’s intangible cultural heritage. This distinction gave additional visibility to a significant but often underestimated danger. Switzerland is a country where more than half of its territory is made up of mountains. As a mountain country, it has always lived with avalanches. Today, this traditional knowledge is complemented by modern technologies and innovative science. The Representative thanked all those who had contributed to the preparation of the file, in particular, the Swiss Alpine Club, the Swiss Association of Mountain Guides, the Federal Office for Culture (OFC) and the Federal Office for the Environment (OFEV), the canton of Valais, and partners in Austria, as well as the Committee for its cooperation and commitment.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Chakan, embroidery art in the Republic of Tajikistan** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.36], submitted by **Tajikistan.** The art of Chakan embroidery is the practice of sewing ornaments, images of flowers and symbolic drawings with colourful threads on cotton or silk fabrics. It is used to decorate clothing and household items such as women’s shirts, headscarves, curtains, pillows, bedspreads and coverlets for cradles. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.3, R.4 and R.5. Chakan embroidery relies on collaboration between family or group members, thereby strengthening social cohesion and bonds among people. The production of Chakan embroidery and textiles provides Tajik women with an important source of income and contributes to the sustainable development of local communities. The safeguarding measures focused on documenting the contemporary state of the element, and raising awareness through festivals, competitions and exhibitions. The nomination process involved the active participation of many different stakeholders, including organizations led by tradition bearers and community members. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.2. The nomination failed to explain how the inscription of Chakan could serve to raise the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, and how it would promote cultural diversity and human creativity. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer Chakan, embroidery art in the Republic of Tajikistan to the submitting State.
7. The **Chairperson** noted a request to open the debate by Kazakhstan.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** appreciated the work of the Evaluation Body, reminding the Committee of the overwhelming issues with criterion R.2, and adding that Chakan embroidery, representing a cultural brand of Tajikistan, served as a source of inspiration for many textile artists, interior and fashion designers abroad. As stated in the nomination file, inscription would raise global awareness about various aspects of this element, such as raising the status of artisanship, the promotion of family values, closer transmission from master to apprentice training, raising the role of women in society and improving their employment opportunities, and the popularization of folk festivals and ritual weddings. Overall, the spiritual process of Chakan hand embroidery and its close affiliation with nature had the potential—like any sustainable craft—to address the ecological impact of the fashion industry. The year 2017 was announced as the year of traditional handicrafts and sustainable tourism in Tajikistan, making it the perfect timing for inscribing Chakan embroidery. The delegation thus appreciated the opportunity for the State Party to respond to the question posed by the Evaluation Body on how the inscription of Chakan embroidery could serve to raise the visibility of intangible heritage in general and promote cultural diversity and human creativity.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Kazakhstan and noted that Azerbaijan, Palestine and Jamaica wished to take the floor, giving the floor to Tajikistan to respond to the request from the Committee.
10. The **delegation of Tajikistan** wished toprovide more detailed information on how the inscription of Chakan embroidery could raise the visibility of the element and promote cultural diversity and human creativity, adding that the text limits in Section 2 could have constrained the information provided. As an element bonding families in local communities, younger and older generations, and rural and urban populations, the inscription of Chakan embroidery on the Representative List would raise the status of craftspeople and promote handicrafts as an environmentally-friendly lifestyle. It would also promote community spirit and family values, support women with broader employment opportunities, inspire research on the symbolism of ornaments, and encourage the spiritual and meditative benefits of the handicraft. Social contexts and events associated with the Chakan facilitate informal transmission in families, community centres, as well as formal transmission in schools, colleges, universities and museums, while popularizing folk costumes, commemorative celebrations and festivals inspiring designers and artists worldwide to cooperate with communities, and choose natural products and handiwork to produce high-quality clothing and furniture.
11. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Paragraph 3 included an amendment proposed by Kazakhstan [that the information provided satisfied R.2].
12. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with the amendments presented by Kazakhstan.
13. The **delegations of the Philippines, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Lebanon, Kuwait, Zambia, Japan, Jamaica, Poland, Guatemala, Djibouti, Senegal** and **Cameroon** supported paragraph 3, which was duly adopted.
14. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 4 adopted as amended [inscribing the element]. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.36**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.36) **adopted to inscribe Chakan, embroidery art in the Republic of Tajikistan** **on the Representative List**.
15. The **delegation of Tajikistan** spoke on behalf of the Government of Tajikistan, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister of Culture to express their gratitude to the Mauritius Government for its warm hospitality and for organizing such an important event. It also expressed its gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its kind support, adding that it was with great pleasure that the element was inscribed on the Representative List, which was very important to Tajikistan. The delegation underlined that 2018 had been proclaimed by the President of the Republic of Tajikistan, His Excellency Emomali Rahmon, as the year of tourism, development and folk craft, adding that the acceptance of Chakan was a highly appreciated gift for Tajikistan. Its inscription not only contributed to raising awareness about a Tajik traditional craft in the world but also promoted the popularization of the Convention and the implementation of its goals. A small exhibition had been planned during the session.
16. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Khon, masked dance drama in Thailand** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.37], submitted by **Thailand.** Khon, the Khon Masked Dance Drama in Thailand is a performing art that combines musical, vocal, literary, dance, ritual and handicraft elements. Khon performances depict the glory of Rama, the hero and incarnation of the god Vishnu who brings order and justice to the world. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatKhon, masked dance drama in Thailand represents the spiritual and value system of Thailand, as well as the hierarchy within the Thai nation, transmitting shared moral principles and reinforcing a sense of continuity with the past and cultural identity. The inscription of the element would help raise awareness about the importance of intangible cultural heritage and the need to safeguard all its components. The safeguarding measures focused on state-funded education of dancers and other performers, documentation and the dissemination of related knowledge to performers and the public. The element had been nominated with the broad participation of artists, researchers, state and private institutions and relevant communities. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for its first nomination and recommended that the Committee inscribe Khon, masked dance drama in Thailand on the Representative List.
17. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
18. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.37**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.37) **adopted to inscribe Khon, masked dance drama in Thailand on the Representative List**.
19. The **delegation of Thailand** spoke onbehalf of the Thai people and the Government to thank Mauritius for its warm hospitality. It also thanked the Chairperson, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the inscription of Khon, masked dance drama in Thailand on the Representative List. The delegation was proud that this was its first inscription and it would certainly raise awareness and encourage all the multiple Khon communities to safeguard and promote Khon for future generations, as well as contribute to cultural diversity in the world. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its hard work.

*[Live performance of Khon, masked dance drama]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Pottery skills of the women of Sejnane** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.38], submitted by **Tunisia.** The pottery skills of the women of Sejnane relate to the practice of using a specific technique to produce terracotta artefacts for the home, including cooking utensils, dolls and animal figurines inspired by the environment. Men are involved in the sales process, making this a family-based craft that promotes family cohesion. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatPottery making in Sejnane is a living tradition, deeply embedded in the life of the community, and perceived as part of the local identity. It strengthens social relationships within families as well as wider society through the principles of cooperation and solidarity. The inscription of the element could highlight the close link between sustainable development and cultural identity. The proposed measures included education and the transmission of skills, documentation and research, the supply of materials, finding new marketing channels, or adopting an excellence labelling programme aimed at maintaining the high standards of production. The file was prepared with the participation of representative associations, government authorities, universities and experts. The Evaluation Body invited the State Party to consider the high risk of over-commercialization of the element and further reminded it of the importance of updating the inventorying process, inviting it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Pottery skills of the women of Sejnane on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no amendments for this nomination.
3. The **Secretary** briefly interrupted to apologize for overlooking the inclusion of the standard paragraph that commended the State Party on its first nomination.
4. The **Chairperson** noted that there was no objection to the slight amendment, proposing to adopt the draft decision as a whole. The **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.38**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.38) **adopted to inscribe Pottery skills of the women of Sejnane on the Representative List**.
5. The **delegation of Tunisia** expressed its thanks to the authorities and the people of Mauritius for the warmth of their hospitality and the quality of the organization. Thanks also went to the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the thoroughness of their report and for understanding the nomination file. The know-how of the women of Sejnane is not just any file and their pottery is not just any element; it is a marker of Tunisian identity. First, by its extreme age, going back to the Neolithic period, it recalled the very ancient civilization that forms the nation. In addition, the beautiful region of Sejnane, in the north of Tunisia, is a meeting point where all the strata of Tunisian identity were fertilized, a place inhabited since prehistory and later Berber, Numidian, Carthaginian, Roman, until the present day. Last but not least, it is the know-how of the women of Tunisia who transmit this art from mothers to daughters, transforming the earth into a useful, beautiful and ecologically virtuous object, allowing them relative economic independence. The delegation was thus proud of the inscription of the Pottery skills of the women of Sejnaneon the Representative List. Tunisia was grateful to UNESCO for its technical and financial assistance in its capacity-building programme for intangible cultural heritage, which had resulted in this inscription. This inscription was first desired by the local communities that organized an association, accompanied by the Ministry of Culture and the National Heritage Institute, which the delegation commended for the quality of their work, expertise and support. This inscription instilled pride, but also obliged Tunisia to do everything to safeguard this element by letting it live and evolve. The delegation expressed its gratitude to the potters as the inscription would highlight the know-how, the craft and intelligence, as well as the feminine leadership whose contribution created such beauty.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Al Aflaj, traditional irrigation network system in the UAE, oral traditions, knowledge and skills of construction, maintenance and equitable water distribution** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.39], submitted by the **United Arab Emirates**. Al Aflaj is an irrigation system in the United Arab Emirates that uses an underground tunnel to conduct water across long distances from an underground source to a sharia (basin) where the community can access it. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 R.2, R.4 and R.5. Al Aflaj comprises a number of practices, customs and areas of knowledge concerning water management in difficult desert conditions, serving economic, ecological and social functions. Al Aflaj can promote dialogue concerning water distribution in difficult climate conditions, and cohesion within the local community. The nomination process was steered by the Intangible Heritage Department of the Abu Dhabi Tourism and Culture Authority with the active participation of researchers, landowners, teachers and expert practitioners. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.3. The Evaluation Body expressed serious concerns about the development project aimed at promoting Al Aflaj as a tourist destination and leisure area, which was presented as a core safeguarding measure. Members of the Body considered that this project would lead to heavy commercialization of the element and would cut off the community from its heritage, thereby ultimately endangering its visibility. Moreover, no specific measure had been planned to assess the impact of this project on the social and cultural values of the element. In addition, most of the measures appeared to focus on built structures and very little attention was actually paid to securing the transmission of the element and the cultivation of the active relationship of local communities to this vital part of their living conditions, particularly its knowledge, know-how and cultural meanings. The Evaluation Body strongly recommended that the State Party pay attention to the likely decontextualization of the element resulting from its use as a tourist attraction, and that it undertake suitable measures to safeguard the intangible aspects of Al Aflaj. In conclusion, although the Evaluation Body considered that the file met four criteria, the concerns raised by the safeguarding measures proposed in the file were serious enough for the Body to consider that criterion R.3 was not met. Therefore, the Body recommended that the Committee not inscribe Al Aflaj, traditional irrigation network system in the United Arab Emirates, oral traditions, knowledge and skills of construction, maintenance and equitable water distribution on the Representative List.
7. The **Chairperson** noted an amendment from Kuwait.
8. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body on its work and report. The Al Aflaj, traditional irrigation network system in the United Arab Emirates number about 300 in the country, and its traditions had been passed down the generations for over 3,000 years. With that in mind and with regard to R.3 and the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body, the delegation kindly requested that the floor be open for debate and requested some clarification from the submitting State regarding their plans for promoting this element, as well as on any development or safeguarding plans.
9. The **delegations of Palestine, Kazakhstan, Armenia, Lebanon, Jamaica, Azerbaijan, Cuba, Sri Lanka, Togo, Djibouti** and **China** supported the request to give the floor to the State Party.
10. The **delegation of the United Arab Emirates** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to clarify the concerns of the Evaluation Body, congratulating him on his wise guidance of the Committee’s work and thanking the experts for their work and keen interest in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. However, it wished to clarify that the main concern, namely, the establishment of a centre for the promotion of culture heritage to attract tourism, had not yet been established. Moreover, the aim of the project was to disseminate information about Al Aflaj and not to attract tourists to Al Aflaj. The delegation explained that when it raised this issue it did not expect any concern, adding that it was worried that it could be misconstrued as not safeguarding the country’s cultural heritage. Thus, the main goal of the initial project was not to attract tourists but to apply safeguarding measures to protect these skills and the practitioners. The communities and practitioners have a symbolic importance in the United Arab Emirates, as this intangible cultural heritage has been in existence for 3,000 years. The delegation reiterated that the main goal was not to attract tourists, and as a modern State it could have opted for modern and automatic irrigation systems, but instead opted for updating and preserving its heritage, which had been inherited from its ancestors and thus the State was truly keen to preserve it. The people who contributed to the preparation of the file were convinced of the importance and value of this element. The delegation paid due respect to the experts, but wished to reassure them that this element had a symbolic value linked to its cultural and historical heritage, as also part of measures to promote its development. It contributes to the production of the nation’s food and is an economic contributor to the production and export of palm dates.
11. The **Chairperson** recalled Rule 22.4 that speakers should adhere to providing the clarifications requested by Committee Members, noting that the United Arab Emirates had provided the clarifications. He reminded the Committee on a point of procedure that Members could not at this stage voice support and only after clarification from the submitting State.
12. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked the United Arab Emirates for the clarifications, and it also wished to have the views of the Evaluation Body concerning these clarifications.
13. The **Chairperson of the** **Evaluation Body** noted from the response of the State Party that it did not deny the concerns raised about the development project aimed at promoting Al Aflaj as a tourist destination and that it was not its intention. However, the information in the file led the Body to voice serious concern, and it remained concerned despite the clarification.
14. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the United Arab Emirates for its response, adding that it supported the Committee in whichever decision it wished to take.
15. The **Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Paragraph 3 included the amendment by Kuwait.
16. The **delegation of the Netherlands** expressed concerns about the amendments, as the Committee should follow the advice of the Evaluation Body as much as possible. In this case, the decision by the Evaluation Body touched upon the principles of the Convention.
17. The **Chairperson** took note of the point made by the Netherlands.
18. The **delegation of Austria** found the element very interesting, noting that there were two traditional water management systems submitted in this cycle. Nevertheless, with regard to the Operational Directives, Chapter 6, and the Ethical Principles, the delegation still had concerns about Section 3.b.
19. The **Chairperson** sought broad support from the Committee for the amendment by Kuwait. With no active support, the Chairperson pronounced the original paragraph 3 adopted. Kuwait also presented an amendment in paragraph 4. However, as paragraph 4 could not stand alone, the original paragraph 4 was adopted. Kuwait confirmed this understanding.
20. The **delegation of United Arab Emirates** fully respected the decision of the Committee, and expressed reassurances that the practitioners and bearers are recognized as such and that it would do its utmost to safeguard and preserve this element. It had sought inscription precisely in order to promote the element, hoping that it could persuade the Committee that the element met all the criteria for inscription. Nevertheless, corrections could be made in criterion R.3 in a future submission so as to convince the Committee and allay any misgivings.
21. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraphs 5–7, which were duly adopted. The **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.39**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.39) **adopted not to inscribe Al Aflaj, traditional irrigation network system in the UAE, oral traditions, knowledge and skills of construction, maintenance and equitable water distribution** **on the Representative List**.
22. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** turned to the next nomination, **Mooba dance of the Lenje ethnic group of Central Province of Zambia** [draft decision 13.COM 10.b.40], submitted by **Zambia.** Mooba is the main dance of the Lenje ethnic group of Central Province of Zambia, performed since pre-colonial times. Mooba serves both entertainment and healing functions, and contributes to the spiritual identity of the community. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria. The Evaluation Body considered thatMooba dance of the Lenje ethnic group of Central Province of Zambia plays an important role in the structure of Lenje culture, relating to the social and spiritual life of the local communities. The element brings together different ethnic groups, builds social cohesion, encourages dialogue among practitioners and ordinary members of the community, and fosters a sense of belonging and identity, especially among young performers. The safeguarding measures planned focus on the identification, presentation and safeguarding of Mooba dance and would be implemented by local communities, supported by various government authorities and national organizations. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information concerning this aspect in its next periodic report. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Mooba dance of the Lenje ethnic group of Central Province of Zambia on the Representative List.
23. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
24. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.40**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.40) **adopted to inscribe Mooba dance of the Lenje ethnic group of Central Province of Zambia on the Representative List**.
25. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Committee and the Evaluation Body for approving the element on the Representative List. The Mooba dance plays an integral role in the Lenje ethnic groups in everyday life in terms of social, religious, entertainment, and many other aspects of existence. This recognition by UNESCO therefore meant a lot, not only to the Lenje people but also to the Zambia people as a whole. Zambia is very rich in cultural heritage with seventy-three ethnic groups, each of them having diverse cultural traditions, which would keep the Committee busy with other nominations. The delegation believed that this approval would go a long way in motivating other ethnic groups, especially the younger generation, to be proud of their culture and to start protecting and promoting their cultural heritage, knowing that someday UNESCO would acknowledge their traditions. As a country, this approval reinforced its resolve to build capacities for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage. It fully understood that the inscription of the element would further unite the preservation efforts of the country in line with the seventh national development plan. The delegation invited the delegates to Zambia to personally participate in the Mooba dance. It was grateful for UNESCO’s assistance with training more people in the area of intangible cultural heritage and in preparing the Mooba dance file.

*[A short film of the Mooba dance was projected]*

**ITEM 10.c OF THE AGENDA**

**EXAMINATION OF PROPOSALS TO THE REGISTER OF GOOD SAFEGUARDING PRACTICES**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/10.c+Add.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.c+Add.-EN.docx)

**Files:** [*2 proposals*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10c-register-01014)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 10.c and the examination of proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. It was noted that Saudi Arabia had withdrawn its proposal, which meant that there was only one proposal for examination, submitted by Sweden. The Chairperson reminded the Committee that it would evaluate the extent to which the proposals best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention, and thus they were not required to meet every criterion to be selected. The purpose of the Register is to select effective safeguarding practices for dissemination and potential replication elsewhere. The Chairperson recalled criteria P.1–P.9 that would guide the decision, which were projected on the screen.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination **Land-of-Legends programme, for promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region (South-Sweden)** [draft decision 13.COM 10.c.2], submitted by **Sweden**. The Land-of-Legends programme is aimed at promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in the Kronoberg Region of southern Sweden. 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. The programme links storytelling to other forms of living heritage, helping to revitalize and promote it as a living art. Storytelling festivals have formed networks and the programme clearly promotes coordination at the national and subregional levels, as well as the sharing of experience and international cooperation. The safeguarding measures fully reflected the objectives of the Convention as they are community-driven and systematically revitalize the element, ensuring its effectiveness, viability and sustainable development. The programme had been implemented with the participation of local communities, particularly storytellers, story-lovers, experts, teachers, volunteers, staff of nursing homes and local organizations, with the support of local authorities. The project serves as a very successful national and subregional model for safeguarding activities. The submitting State Party and communities concerned are willing to cooperate in the dissemination of the programme if selected, as attested to by their formal agreement and the several practical steps undertaken. The file provided several examples of the external monitoring and evaluation of the programme, as well as feedback and reviews, which were used to improve the activities and safeguarding measures involved. The programme could be applicable to the needs of developing countries, mostly because the safeguarding of storytelling, oral traditions and verbal arts does not necessarily require a high level of funding. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for submitting an exemplary file that presented a successful and effective sustainable programme, which is deeply grounded at the community level and can serve as a model for countries where oral traditions still play important social and cultural roles. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee select Land-of-Legends programme, for promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region (South-Sweden) as a programme best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination.
4. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.c.2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.c.2) **adopted to inscribe Land-of-Legends programme, for promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region (South-Sweden) on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices**.
5. The **delegation of Sweden** thankedthe host country for its warm hospitality and also the Secretariat for the organization of this meeting. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for its important work and the Committee for the inscription of the Land-of-Legends programme in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. This was the first time that Sweden had presented a nomination under the Convention, and it was not a coincidence that this first nomination was a project for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Sweden considered this Register to be of the utmost importance because if one did not know how to transmit elements of intangible cultural heritage between people and to the next generation, the element would not survive as living heritage. Sharing methods of safeguarding with each other meant not reinventing the wheel. Sweden was thus pleased to contribute to this essential Register, hoping that more Member States would do the same. The delegation underlined that this Register provided the opportunity to highlight the decisive work of the practitioners, primarily civil society and NGOs, in the implementation of the Convention.
6. The **delegation of Sweden** [second speaker], Ms Meg Nömgård**,** Director of the Land-of-Legends programme at the Storytelling Network of Kronoberg, explained that the Land of Legends is filled with stories of a country in the very far north where giants, trolls and dragons used to live in endless forests. On behalf of the Storytelling Network of Kronoberg, she thanked the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the inscription and was pleased to now be on the Register, especially as sharing was one of its core values. The Network had helped others with storytelling activities for many years both in Sweden and abroad, by sharing failures and successes. It now looked forward to taking this work to a new level and to intensifying its work with the Convention and extending its international cooperation. Moreover, the Network was right now in the beginning of laying a foundation for an international institute for oral storytelling traditions, and new stories were being added all the time to the Land of Legends, which would begin: once upon a time there was a Committee meeting in the beautiful country of the Republic of Mauritius.

*[A short film on the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the video presented by Tunisia that had not been shown earlier on the Pottery skills of the women of Sejnane, presenting his apologies.

*[A short film on Pottery skills of the women of Sejnane was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for the fruitful session and adjourned the session.

*[Friday, 30 November 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA**

**INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN EMERGENCIES**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/11*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-11-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 11*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/11)

*[The Vice-Chairperson of Lebanon chaired the following session]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning to discuss the day’s organization. So far, the Committee had completed the examination of forty-six individual files under items 10.a, 10.b and 10.c, and still had to examine the International Assistance request submitted by Albania, as well as draft decision 13.COM 10.b.1 concerning Chamamé submitted by Argentina. The morning session began with the examination of item 11 on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, followed by the examination of draft decisions 13.COM 10, 13.COM  10.b.1 (Argentina) and 10.d (Albania) in the afternoon.
2. Providing a recap of the background, the **Secretary** recalled that in 2016, the Committee had examined a dedicated item on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies for the first time. At that time, the Committee had recognized two dimensions, namely, the effects of emergencies on the practice and transmission of living heritage, and the role of intangible cultural heritage as a tool for preparedness, resilience, reconciliation and recovery in situations of emergency. The Committee also wished to obtain more knowledge and experience from the ground to fully grasp the issue. In 2017, the Secretariat had carried out case studies and a desk survey addressing different contexts, including armed conflicts and disasters caused by natural and human-induced hazards. Upon examination of the results in 2017 in Jeju, the Committee asked the Secretariat to privilege the identification of needs by the affected communities. The Secretariat was also encouraged to enhance awareness raising and capacity-building on this issue and to strengthen cooperation with relevant UN entities. Thus, until last year, the focus of the Secretariat’s work had been on coming up with a preliminary analytical approach. In 2018, the Secretariat concentrated on: i) streamlining and applying the agreed approach into operational activities; ii) initiating cooperation with UN entities and other stakeholders in the humanitarian field; and iii) enhancing general awareness-raising and capacity building. Working document 13.COM 11 reports on a number of activities undertaken in this regard.
3. Regarding operational activities, the **Secretary** explained that the Secretariat tried to use the community-based needs identification approach in a systematic and coherent manner to the different responses and initiatives of UNESCO in emergency contexts. As reported in the document, the different endeavours included the Director-General’s initiative on Mosul, the UNESCO-wide Lake Chad and Sahel projects, activities related to Prevention against Violent Extremism, notably in Niger, and recent experiences in response to natural disasters, in particular in the Pacific and the Caribbean. The main idea was to move away from predefining an intangible cultural heritage element to be safeguarded in emergencies, and to start by identifying the needs led by communities, including capacity building. This is because the main lines of emergency actions should be based on community identification rather than by external actors in advance. In the field of disaster risk prevention and response, a pilot activity of the collection of knowledge and practice had been initiated in October 2018 with the involvement of communities in the Dutch Caribbean islands and the Suriname thanks to the contribution of the Netherlands. This activity paved the way for an inventory on intangible cultural heritage related to disaster risk prevention and response, and raised awareness at the institutional and community level about the importance of intangible cultural heritage in this area. In this regard, the Secretariat began working on capacity-building material on disaster risk reduction and inventories. Moreover, an awareness-raising activity was carried out at the subregional level in the framework of the conference ‘Regional approaches to disaster recovery and heritage preservation’[[29]](#footnote-29) organized in August 2018 by the International Council on Archives (ICA) and the Caribbean Archives Association in collaboration with the Government of Sint Maarten.
4. Regarding cooperation with UN entities and other humanitarian actors, the **Secretary** further explained that the working document also elaborated on the partnerships and activities led by the former Unit of Emergency and Preparedness Response of the Culture Sector that were relevant to intangible cultural heritage. In addition, the Secretariat convened a technical UN workshop in Beirut, Lebanon, on 31 October 2018, with the objective of sensitizing sister agencies in Lebanon as to what intangible cultural heritage entailed and initiating a joint reflection on the role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. Organizations such as the UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), the UNCHR (the UN Refugee agency), UN-Habitat, the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the UN Economic and Social Commission for West Asia (ESCAW) and the WHO (World Health Organization) had actively participated in the meeting. They welcomed the initiative and recognized the potential of intangible cultural heritage for their own activities, in line with the people-centred approach of humanitarian aid. Some of them, such as the UNHCR, asked for immediate collaboration with UNESCO to bring the intangible cultural heritage perspective into their work. In fact, they unanimously believed that this should happen from an early stage, expressing the need to benefit from UNESCO’s technical expertise and guidelines in this regard. Moreover, they called for training on intangible cultural heritage for UN staff in order to raise awareness about this issue among humanitarian workers. Hence, the meeting with UN colleagues from the field was very positive and encouraging, and the Secretariat looked forward to pursuing concrete cooperation as intangible cultural heritage had a role to play in the humanitarian arena. Moreover, on 16 November 2018, the Secretariat had the opportunity to bring the intangible cultural heritage view into discussions with the World Bank, ICOMOS and ICCROM in the framework of the launch of the UNESCO-World Bank Position Paper on ‘Culture in City Reconstruction and Recovery’[[30]](#footnote-30). They all welcomed the community-led approach of living heritage, which contributed to the people-centred approach of the position paper. The Paris Peace Forum[[31]](#footnote-31) was another opportunity to further affirm the people-centred approach. Among the 120 innovative projects showcased during the Forum, UNESCO and the Colombian authorities, including the President of Colombia, presented the emergency International Assistance project of Colombia on the reintegration of ex-combatants FARC using intangible cultural heritage as a tool for dialogue and reconciliation. After a year of better understanding the situation, followed by a year of exposure to external initiatives and partners, it was now known that there was a need for a call for action in the field of intangible cultural heritage in humanitarian responses to complex emergency situations.
5. The **Secretary** then referred to Section III of the document, ‘Moving forward’, which outlined the work currently undertaken by the Secretariat—at the request of the Committee in 2017—to conduct a mapping and analysis of the different methodological approaches used worldwide with a view to safeguarding and mobilizing intangible cultural heritage as a tool for resilience and recovery. The report was expected for early 2019 with the intention of developing recommendations for methodological guidance for Convention stakeholders faced with situations of emergency. On this basis, and based on the knowledge and experience gathered over the past three years, the Secretariat proposed convening a meeting of individual experts (category VI) in 2019 to explore operational modalities for the implementation of such recommendations in line with the principles of the Convention, which would cover both conflicts and natural disasters, as well as the two dimensions highlighted by the Committee, namely, i) to what extent intangible cultural heritage itself is disrupted and threatened under such circumstances and what can be done to safeguard it; and ii) in what ways intangible cultural heritage can be promoted, safeguarded or supported, as a critical means of rebuilding social cohesion, fostering reconciliation and/or facilitating preparedness and recovery for communities confronted with situations of emergency. Should the Committee agree, the conclusions of the expert meeting would be presented to the fourteenth session of the Committee in 2019 with a view to identifying methodological guidance for operational modalities of the Convention at the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. The Secretariat was of the view that a format, such as guidelines, would be appropriate and could be integrated into the Basic Texts as an annex, as was the case with the Ethical Principles[[32]](#footnote-32). It was noted that the Bureau of the Committee had approved funding in June 2018 under an action line on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies under the ‘Other functions’, and thus funds were available for the expert meeting. Moreover, the Government of China wished to further support the Convention in this area.
6. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
7. The **delegation of Palestine** noted that this issue had been debated for the last two years, and it thanked the Secretariat for its introduction to this important issue. It was also noted that there was an increasing interest in intangible cultural heritage, particularly heritage that was threatened or at risk. This category of heritage could be depicted in different ways: those associated with natural calamities or disasters due to climate change, and other risks associated with armed conflict, which currently prevailed in the Arab region. The delegation believed that the action taken by the Secretariat was going in the right direction, and it appreciated the work and hoped that concrete results, not necessarily guidelines, but operational modalities, could be adopted soon to help States Parties and other parties concerned better manage the protection of their intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations. For this reason, the delegation had tabled a few amendments, which accentuated both the importance of this safeguarding action and its urgency in emergency situations.
8. The **delegation of Japan** wished tobriefly introduce its own experience and ongoing projects concerning intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, as Japan had suffered through many disasters. It began by thanking the Secretariat for its work on this important issue, adding that natural disasters, such as earthquakes, tsunamis and typhoons, have serious impacts on the transmission of intangible cultural heritage. However, through these experiences it had learned that intangible cultural heritage is a spiritual pillar for communities during these hardships, playing a major role in establishing ties among community members. Following the great earthquake in eastern Japan in 2011, Japan had compiled knowledge of what was needed to safeguard intangible cultural heritage immediately after the disaster and several years afterwards. The Tokyo National Research Institute for Cultural Properties carried out the long-term monitoring project in the affected areas. It also constructed a network of local government officials who work to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The International Research Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific region (IRCI), the category 2 centre in Japan, had also been engaged in projects on the theme of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in natural disaster risk management and also on emergency protection of intangible cultural heritage in conflict-affected countries. These projects had been elaborated in response to the UNESCO midterm strategy. Japan wished to share its experience, know-how and the results of such projects in the discussion on this theme to contribute to supporting the recovery of intangible heritage in the event of such disasters.
9. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** welcomed the progress achieved by the Secretariat since the Committee’s last session in gaining experience on the impact of emergency situations, including armed conflict and natural disasters. Intangible cultural heritage is indeed particularly vulnerable when threatened by such situations, but it can also serve as a powerful tool for the recovery of communities. The delegation supported the idea that States need to ensure that communities, including internal displaced persons and refugees, should have access to the objects, artefacts, cultural and natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing their intangible heritage; a position that was clearly reflected in the draft decision. It welcomed the actions undertaken by the Secretariat in the Democratic Republic of Congo, as well as operational activities foreseen in Iraq, especially within the framework of the initiative ‘Revive the spirit of Mosul’[[33]](#footnote-33). It also noted with great interest the work being done in the field of intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in natural disasters, as well as inter-institutional cooperation opportunities. The delegation believed that it was important for these efforts to be in line with similar actions undertaken by the World Heritage Convention, and that synergies were being explored in that regard. It welcomed the study initiated by the Secretariat to map and analyze different methodological approaches in the field of intangible cultural heritage and emergency situations, as well as to develop recommendations for methodological guidance. In that sense, it highly supported the holding of a category 6 meeting of experts in 2019 that would explore operational modalities for the implementation of such recommendations. Finally, it was pleased to announce that Azerbaijan was ready to provide voluntary contributions to follow-up actions after the meeting of experts in 2019 with a view to developing a deeper set of guidelines and recommendations that may guide the work of States facing situations of armed conflict and natural disaster.
10. The **delegation of the Netherlands** wished toshare the experiences of one of its experts from the Dutch Caribbean islands, Curaçao, a UNESCO facilitator and the Secretary of the Dutch Caribbean ICH Committee who is involved in several projects concerning intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The delegation shared his words, “In documents of the twelfth session of the Committee the discussion pointed to a future direction that privileges community-based identifications of needs concerning the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and links between intangible cultural heritage and disaster risk management. It is important to stress the role of both aspects of these discussions. It’s only if they are seen as acting in tandem that the full extent of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies may be understood and be used towards a sustainable future. In capacity-building work, it has become obvious that intangible cultural heritage related to emergencies is not always a concept that is widely understood. At the same time, when looking at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, people tend to forget the active role that intangible cultural heritage could play in preparing for emergencies. Awareness-raising, capacity-building and training of implementing actors around both roles of intangible cultural heritage is crucial. There is also a need to adapt post-disaster needs assessments to not only include intangible cultural heritage as a factor to be assessed, but also as a potential resource that can be used for recovery efforts. Besides cooperation between institutes, it might be useful to also utilize UNESCO’s own network with a focus on emergencies. Facilitators Network, category 2 centres, accredited NGOs and other regional UNESCO network actors have functioned as mediators in fact-finding teams and as relief facilitators. There might be use in sharing good practices both within and across regions. Similarly, the ICHNGO Forum might be a very appropriate space for the exchange of knowledge. The regional meetings that were held in the past certainly help create a knowledge base. Having emergencies as a specific topic would help bring this information to the communities, groups and individuals. Judging from the success of the ICHNGO Forum publication on traditional medicine this might be one way to also disseminate this information to other actors. The Netherlands supported the regional approaches to disaster recovery in heritage preservation organized in June/August 2018 in collaboration with the Government of Sint Maarten. One of the outcomes of that meeting is the planned creation of a Caribbean heritage emergency network and that network is intended to fully incorporate intangible cultural heritage in the heritage system.” This was the recommendation by the expert, and the delegation appreciated the work by the Secretariat on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
11. The **delegation of Austria** expressed its gratitude to the Secretariat for the efforts made to organize initiatives and community-based interventions for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The delegation introduced another relevant and compelling example, which was Cunningham’s post-disaster research in Nepal that was conducted after the 2015 Gorkha earthquake. The research project was presented in Vienna a couple of weeks ago by academics and heritage practitioners from Nepal, Austria, Germany and the United Kingdom who had developed research methods and approaches for protecting and preserving the cultural heritage of Nepal. This research emphasized that intangible cultural heritage plays a significant role during post-emergency phases and the reconstruction of destroyed monument sites. It also presents the interdisciplinary heritage ecosystem approach for the protection and safeguarding of cultural heritage with the participation of local communities, particularly in the face of future earthquakes in this region. This approach includes an assessment of historic construction practices, traditional construction skills and materials, and the links between local communities, the built environment and social practices. Austria welcomed the initiatives concerning the development of methodological guidance in order to better understand the various methods of community-based support for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in cases of emergency, and it recommended considering the expertise of the UNESCO Chair on Archaeological Ethics and Practice in Cultural Heritage in this matter. The delegation concluded by thanking China for its generous contribution to this important issue.
12. The **delegation of China** appreciated the Secretariat for preparing the information and some activities on the topic of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, adding that it was increasingly concerned about this issue as more and more intangible cultural heritage in many States Parties was threatened by natural disasters or conflicts. The delegation noted, however, that many countries had varied experiences in natural disasters or conflicts. For instance, China had also suffered from severe earthquakes in 2008 in Wenchuan and 2010 in Yushu, which brought it to reflect seriously on what could be done to safeguard intangible cultural heritage on the one hand, and how intangible cultural heritage could help to rebuild social cohesion and community identity on the other. For this reason, China supported the organization of an expert meeting to share experience and knowledge among all States Parties confronted with similar situations and it was hoped that this would result in some guidance that could benefit all.
13. The **delegation of the Philippines** viewed this issue with keen interest, as it remained highly relevant to the application of the Convention to natural disasters and conflict situations with respect to the analysis of community-based needs identification in North Kivu in the Democratic Republic of Congo. It agreed that the revitalization of cultural spaces was an important aspect to consider in post-conflict or disaster situations. In relation to the ‘Revive the spirit of Mosul’ Initiative, developing an inventory of elements affected by an emergency would be a good initial step in an emergency context. It hoped to see UNESCO cooperate and coordinate more with other relevant United Nations agencies, and it thanked the Secretariat for stating the names of the United Nations agencies helping in this endeavour. Besides compiling the lessons learned and the analysis, it was important to test any potential guidance on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies in the field, applying them in real world situations. The Philippines would be very interested in working with the Committee and Secretariat in this endeavour. Finally, it thanked China for its generous support in the proposed expert meeting in 2019, and it sought to know when it would be held.
14. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the information presented, adding that this was an especially important and sensitive topic and UNESCO had been working much more deliberately around these questions in recent years. UNESCO had adopted an Action Plan to strengthen UNESCO’s work to protect cultural heritage in cases of armed conflict and in situations of natural disasters, and this had led the Executive Board to adopt UN Resolution 2347 (2017) where it recognized the destruction of cultural heritage as a war crime and that there was indeed a cultural component in terms of peacekeeping operations with the consent of Member States. The delegation thus supported all initiatives aimed at protecting heritage. In Cuba’s opinion, UNESCO’s work has been focused on preventive and post-conflict work and it was also important to develop a database of best practices in this respect. The delegation referred to the case of the Caribbean SIDS in the region that have been deeply affected by natural disasters and cyclones, which have damaged heritage, not only buildings but also intangible heritage, resulting in migration and, by consequence, global challenges. In Cuba’s case, it had a range of experiences, especially with cyclones and hurricanes, which affected the entire island, and it worked to protect culture and its values under very difficult circumstances that affected people and the communities in these types of situations. The delegation noted that UNESCO was beginning to compile best practices in all regions and to strengthen its upstream preventive work to strengthen capacities in this regard. The delegation wished to hear more on how the Convention had been involved in the Action Plan that UNESCO had adopted and had spent many years negotiating. It noted a disconnect that still existed between the different Conventions, adding that in future reports it would be good to have more precise information about the specific relationship of the Convention to other Conventions, especially in light of the Resolution adopted at the 38th General Conference.
15. The **delegation of Colombia** asked the Secretariat to project the photo of the Paris Peace Forum that was mentioned in the report as its wished to speak about the 120 innovative projects that were showcased at the Forum that were related to peacebuilding around peace and security, sustainable development and new technologies. The 120 projects were selected from more than 800 projects around the world, with Colombia projecting its project from the north of the country in the Caribbean region in a municipality where the FARC was heavily involved and which involved ex-combatants of the FARC. It was thus important to protect intangible cultural heritage for the communities and to reunite and create dialogue and resilience. This project was up and running thanks to the ICH Fund, which would implement a methodology, an inventory of intangible cultural heritage, and encourage dialogue for resilience. The photo projected showed the President of Colombia, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the President of the UNESCO National Commission in Colombia, the ADG for Culture and the national expert on intangible cultural heritage. This work was being carried out by ex-combatants and people working for peace through intangible cultural heritage in the region.
16. The **delegation of Lebanon** thanked the Secretariat for its report, which showed how the reflection on this issue was moving forward. Lebanon had experience in this domain as it had a tradition of research on the subject, particularly on civil wars and armed conflicts. In this respect, it had two questions that could perhaps enrich the reflection. Firstly, whether the issue of the return of displaced persons to their places of origin had been raised. From its own experience and research in Lebanon, it was found that what blocked people’s return was memory. When forced displacement is long-lasting, the older generations disappear, disorienting the younger generation when they return. They want their knowledge and know-how back, but they do not know how, owing to a lack of memory that is not easy to reconstruct. Secondly, armed conflicts in a globalized world are now moving towards civil wars with different belligerent parties. Has UNESCO reflected on ways in which communities in a conflict situation with the State could benefit from this safeguarding process? UNESCO acts through the State and therefore many communities remain on the margins of safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage because they are at war with the State.
17. The **delegation of Poland** welcomed with special interest the proposal submitted by the Secretariat in light of the documents prepared in Poland in May 2018. The Warsaw meeting was fully dedicated to the recovery and reconstruction of cultural heritage but with respect to the 1972 Convention, and the delegation felt that it was impossible to separate these two Conventions in cases of armed conflict. It was noted that local communities play a crucial role in the process of recovery, as personal and social memory is the most important aspect of recovery. Local communities—in this case, the memory bearer—were bearers of the possibility to live again, to re-start life as a social group in a destroyed environment. The delegation stressed the importance of this issue, as well as the document prepared by the Secretariat, for which it was grateful, thanking China for supporting this activity.
18. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Secretariat for its excellent work in the area of intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, as well as the Member States for having discussed their own experiences, adding that Kuwait would take all the necessary steps to protect intangible cultural heritage in cases of conflict and emergency situations.
19. The **delegation of Jamaica** thanked the Secretariat for the report on this very significant issue. Caribbean countries are often impacted by extreme weather conditions, such as hurricanes and earthquakes, which have become increasingly severe over the past few years as a result of climate change. The displacement of communities and the need to safeguard intangible cultural heritage as a result of these various disasters is of paramount importance. Jamaica welcomed the actions taken in the Africa, Arab and Caribbean regions. Moreover, following the 2017 hurricanes, the development plan of the Caribbean Heritage Network was very appreciated. Jamaica therefore supported the expert meetings to be held in 2019, and looked forward to the upcoming work in this regard for the benefit of all. Jamaica also thanked China for its contribution towards this effort.
20. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** spokeas a country that had experienced a thirty-year internal conflict and the Asian tsunami in 2004, and thus it fully understood the destructive effects both of natural disasters and conflict on intangible cultural heritage. The country still experienced disasters caused by floods and landslides annually, causing serious damage to intangible cultural heritage. At the same time, it understood the potential of intangible cultural heritage in recovery and reconciliation efforts. However, Sri Lanka did not currently have a local programme in place as preparatory measures. The delegation appreciated the work by the Secretariat in this regard and fully agreed with the previous speakers, expressing its support for UNESCO’s future plans in this matter. It also thanked China for the workshop and other plans to safeguard intangible heritage in disasters and conflict situations in the future.
21. The **delegation of Armenia** strongly supported the issue of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, and thus strongly supported UNESCO programmes in this area of competence. It also fully supported efforts to safeguard cultural heritage in conflict zones and condemned attacks on cultural symbols due to their diverse origin or belonging to a national or religious minority. In this regard, the delegation referred to the ‘Revive the spirit of Mosul’ Initiative and warmly welcomed the acceptance of Armenia’s offer to engage its specialist in this project. It reiterated its readiness to join efforts with UNESCO in promoting the preservation of cultural and historical heritage of humanity, both in its intangible and tangible forms, which remained a serious issue of concern, not only in the event of hostilities but during peace time when the ethnic appartenance of monuments served their intentional destruction. Acknowledgment and respect for the diversity of the world’s cultures and cultural expressions should be assumed so as to appreciate the core values and aspirations that unite humanity and allow it to preserve cultural heritage for future generations.
22. The **delegation of Djibouti** expressed concern about the situation of intangible heritage in emergency situations, especially with its long experience since independence in 1977, adding that it had always been confronted with armed conflict in the Horn of Africa. In this regard, it congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work and supported the programme, the awareness campaign and the proposed directions. In the case of Djibouti, the country was currently experiencing an influx of refugees from outside, for example from Yemen in recent years. With the International Organization for Migration (IOM), Djibouti had ratified several Conventions that consider the education and health of refugees, as well as their intangible cultural heritage. This was the direction to follow, as it was necessary to integrate foreign communities who found themselves outside of their country and in danger.
23. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Committee Members for their valuable contributions, opinions and for sharing experiences, inviting the Secretary to comment.
24. The **Secretary** thanked the Committee Members for their encouraging remarks on the Secretariat’s work and the direction taken, thanking Azerbaijan for its proposed assistance in the follow-up to the meeting in June and the expert meeting. The Secretary took note that Palestine, and to a certain degree China, tended to prefer the idea of modalities or guidance rather than Operational Directives, adding that he would keep this in mind as the Secretariat worked towards the next General Assembly. The Secretary also took note of Austria’s remark concerning working with Chairs in particular. The Philippines commented on working in real world situations, which was indeed very important and something the Secretariat had been working on. However, there were two categories of emergencies related to natural disasters and conflicts, and in the case of natural disasters it was obviously not possible to plan any intervention and any action must be clear so as not to interfere with established humanitarian responses. Nevertheless, the Secretariat had started to gain some experience in that regard and would subsequently report on it. Cuba also asked a question related to the creation of databases of good practices or guidelines; a direction that this could take in dealing with intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency. The second question from Cuba concerned how intangible cultural asheritage was integrated into the Action Plan on cultural heritage in situations of disaster. Indeed, it was integrated from a conceptual point of view, but when this discussion was started there was an acknowledgment that methodologies and means of intervening for built heritage were far more established than for intangible cultural heritage. The Secretariat was thus engaging as much as possible in line with the Action Plan. Moreover, these Committee items and the idea of bringing methodological tools to the General Assembly for guidance were part of being better integrated into that Action Plan. In fact, the Action Plan was precisely how these multiple sessions in these Committees were first initiated, resulting from the realization that the issues surrounding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies were as important but methodologically different from built heritage.
25. The **Secretary** turned to the question by the Philippines concerning the date of the expert meeting, which was planned for June 2019. There were two questions from Lebanon. The first concerned the long-term displacement of peoples or refugees and their return. It was noted that the Secretariat was planning an activity directly related to that issue, which was the result of a UNESCO activity commenced through its office in Dar Es Salaam in Tanzania about ten years ago. This concerned an intangible cultural heritage-related project initiated in the camps of long-term Burundian returnees to prepare children to return to Burundi after many years. The Secretariat intended to carry out an assessment leading up to the expert meeting of those children, now that they returned ten years later to see how UNESCO’s interventions had helped. The Secretary mentioned the ‘Revive the spirit of Mosul’ Initiative, which went to the heart of the issue, and in this way the Secretariat was considering opportunities as they arose, adding that these long-term issues were also part of the issue of returnees. The question was whether they could be considered as direct situations of emergency, but the Secretariat was broadening the scope and it would hopefully report on its experience with those projects in 2019. Concerning the modalities for communities to work without necessarily going through the state, obviously that was a contextual situation. The Secretary explained that any action would have to be seen within the framework of agreed United Nations operations and the infrastructure in place of humanitarian actions.
26. The **delegation of Palestine** asked about the role of NGOs in this regard.
27. The **Secretary** explained thatNGOs were indeed fully on board, for example in the work carried out in the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Secretariat had worked alongside NGOs. In addition, following the recent meeting held in Lebanon, the plan was to collaborate with UNHCR on guidelines with NGOs, and thus NGOs absolutely had a role to play.
28. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
29. The **delegation of Greece** was very pleased with the Secretariat’s report, as well as with the interventions of the Committee and States on this issue. Greece was very interested in this issue, having initiated the dialogue at the fourth General Assembly in Paris in 2016. It was thus very pleased to see that this issue had gathered momentum, which was well-deserved. Intangible cultural heritage demonstrates the centrality it plays in people’s lives, especially in difficult situations that require the mitigation of disasters, and also in the case of the violent displacement of populations. The delegation was impressed by the list of activities reported by the Secretariat and was very interested in the operationalization of this experience in the form of directives already at the next General Assembly, which would show just how central intangible cultural heritage is to our lives.
30. The **delegation of Switzerland** thanked the Secretariat for establishing and explaining the very positive status of the work. Switzerland recognized the interest, importance and potential of addressing intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and defining means of action. It welcomed the proposal to organize a meeting of experts and, beyond that, to set up an opportunity to discuss good practices for safeguarding, revitalizing but also reflecting on the contribution of living heritage in emergency situations. As such, Switzerland was developing a strategy for both tangible and intangible heritage at risk, and wished to make its reflections available as part of the experts' reflection in June and its follow-up.
31. The **delegation of Saint Lucia** thanked Mauritius for its generous hosting, and the Secretariat for its tremendous work and the progress made in this particular area of emergencies. The delegation spoke as a voice of the Caribbean, earlier expressed by Jamaica, as one of the most vulnerable parts of the world with respect to hurricanes that strike every year. In this regard, the issue of emergencies should also be seen in terms of preparation. It was not only when the hurricane strikes that one should strengthen and build resilience in recovery, but also in preparation for it. The delegation thus encouraged building preparatory strength in this area. Listening to all the presentations, it was clear that there was a tremendous amount of experience and resources across States Parties and it encouraged the Secretariat not only to centralize that response but to develop communication mechanisms in order to obtain quick responses and support among States Parties in the Convention. With regard to the comment by Cuba, it had made an interesting observation of synergies across the Conventions and, as the Secretariat prepared for this meeting of experts, the delegation believed it was important to invite experts in tangible heritage. In its experience with hurricanes, the biggest destruction were spaces that house and shelter intangible heritage and thus it would be worthwhile to bring intangible and tangible culture experts together. Preparatory strength, synergies across tangible and intangible cultural heritage, and helping to develop communication mechanisms that would allow direct reach and almost immediate communication across States Parties would be good starting points if the Secretariat could help develop such mechanisms. The delegation thanked China for its support with the expert meeting and it looked forward to working in the coming period.
32. The **delegation of Mexico** was grateful for the opportunity to take the floor, adding that it could join forces on two very important aspects of intangible cultural heritage, as well as the 1972 Convention. It referred to a topic of great importance and sensitivity at the present time, which it was dealing with first-hand, related to refugees and their needs, generated as a result of their movement across many Central American countries as people sought greater opportunities in the United States. There were still no clear answers as to which measures were being adopted with regard to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in this case, and the delegation wondered whether this topic could be added to the discussion in the upcoming sessions, possibly in June 2019, which could be an appropriate forum for this kind of discussion. The delegation reiterated the importance of this complex phenomenon in terms of its dynamics, as well as the applied measures and responses by authorities or civil society in the hope of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Indeed, this was also related to cultural heritage sites. The delegation spoke of the series of seismic activities that had occurred in Mexico over the last two years when, in the wake of those quakes, it had called upon UNESCO and had received a response that was worth examining, perhaps at the expert meeting in June 2019. It was thus worthwhile to look at the issue within a holistic, wide-reaching strategy for dealing with intangible and tangible heritage in emergency situations.
33. The **delegation of Belize** thanked the people and Government of Mauritius for the wonderful hosting of this meeting, and congratulated the Secretariat on the work so far. With regard to the issue, the delegation was aware of the initiative undertaken by the Secretariat to update the guidance note on inventorying so as to provide insights on the links between disaster, risk management and inventorying, which it considered as an important step. However, the delegation wished to make a general request for a more proactive approach, dealing with the root causes of crises induced, in particular, by human actions and social conditions. It was noted that the emphasis in the Caribbean had been on hurricanes, earthquakes and so on, but Belize—because of its geographic location, both in Central America and the Caribbean—had witnessed the caravans heading north towards the United States. This was a major situation unfolding in the region. The delegation understood that the request for a proactive approach was difficult and must also be carried out in conjunction with other United Nations agencies, some of which had already been done, for example, several countries had been involved in temporary or permanent settlements of refugees in the region. The delegation therefore encouraged the Secretariat to undertake case studies in countries that had settled refugees to see how they had dealt with the issue of intangible cultural heritage as a component of the process of settlement. Some States were said to be philosophically concerned with issues of nationalism and thus there may be concerns that local cultures were threatened. However, from its own experiences, if States really considered the social processes of assimilation and social integration, they may be better able to manage some of these human-induced crises. Moreover, States have diverse conditions and such an investigation would thus require a case-by-case study. It therefore encouraged discussions with States that had been involved in processes of settlement and dealing with refugees.
34. The **delegation of Burkina Faso** thanked the host country for its efforts and hoped there would be other opportunities to return to this beautiful country. With regard to the issue, it remarked that the Sahel was also confronted with these kinds of difficult situations, notably violent contexts involving terrorism and terrorist groups, which made life difficult for the country and also for the communities. A recent workshop organized by the Ministry of Culture had tackled this theme: How can intangible cultural heritage participate in the process of resilience and community dialogue to bring about peace? It was hoped that this would be the country’s contribution to this reflection for the benefit of all.
35. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to the representatives of NGOs.
36. The **Representative of NGO Traditions pour Demain**, Ms Christiane Johannot-Gradis, began by thanking Palestine for introducing the question of NGO participation as indeed they had an important role to play in emergencies. Traditions pour Demain joined others to commend the efforts of the Secretariat and States Parties in carrying out actions aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in cases of emergency, either in the event of armed conflict or natural disaster. She also paid particular tribute to the collaborative efforts that the Secretariat had developed with international organizations, both United Nations and non-United Nations and, in particular, with the Special Rapporteur in the field of cultural rights and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. In view of the importance of the task at hand, these coordinated initiatives were considered as an indispensable approach by her NGO, which had been actively involved in this regard. The NGO welcomed the meeting of experts scheduled for June 2019, which would be an essential step in helping States put into place the institutions, structures and programmes aimed at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in times of emergency, including targeting key authorities and defining training strategies, and the means to accomplish these tasks. That being so, Traditions pour Demain considered that it would also be important to continue the efforts already made in recent years within UNESCO to develop synergies between the culture Conventions in order to amplify their impact on the safeguarding of cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible.
37. The **Representative of NGO Traditions pour Demain** referred to the excellent report by the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body in that there was already a rapprochement with the 1972 Convention, particularly in situations where intangible cultural heritage activities manifested on a site or element of World Heritage. Traditions pour Demain suggested that these efforts towards synergy also continue with the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict for two main reasons. In the first place, in the event of an armed conflict, the 1954 Convention was the first instrument to be applied, as it was widely utilized and implemented, including its provisions obliging States to designate competent authorities and training them, especially armed forces, to identify protected property. Intangible cultural heritage safeguarding efforts could build upon these achievements when expressions of intangible cultural heritage take place on listed cultural property. The second reason is that—unlike the 1972 Convention—cultural property under the general protection of the 1954 Convention is selected by the States themselves. These properties are therefore considerably more numerous and frequently chosen because of the intangible heritage that takes place in these sites, and thus a rapprochement with the 1954 Convention could be beneficial for intangible cultural heritage. For these reasons, Traditions pour Demain proposes that further contacts be made to develop synergies between the 2003 Convention and the 1954 Convention. In this regard, Ms Johannot-Gradis recalled that at its last sessions, the Committee of the Second Protocol to the 1954 Convention had adopted decisions committing it to fostering such synergies, particularly with the 2003 Convention.
38. Responding to the previous speaker, the **delegation of Belgium**—as a Member of the Committee of the Hague Convention and its Second Protocol—wholeheartedly agreed with all the interventions that sought to foster greater synergies between the Conventions, such as the World Heritage Convention, the Hague Convention, the 1970 Convention and the 2003 Convention, to bring together all the actors in the field, including in Belgium or within the Belgium Interministerial Commission for Humanitarian Law (ICHR) that tries to bring all these aspects into consideration. The delegation believed that this type of organization could exist in other countries so that all heritage stakeholders, including at the humanitarian level, could come together, and it fully supported this type of initiative.
39. The **Secretary** thanked the speakers for their comments, adding that it was important to understand that the resources available to UNESCO were not unlimited. The best way was to partner with those who had the resources and who were already working in those areas by making them aware to integrate intangible cultural heritage into their perspectives, notably in humanitarian situations, but also in situations with refugees, displaced persons or people separated from their places of living. The idea of communication mechanisms was a very interesting idea, which could be discussed and further elaborated. Synergies were also mentioned and of course the Secretariat was always trying to work with tangible heritage or other Conventions. As mentioned by Cuba, the Action Plan covering all the Conventions was adopted by the UNESCO General Conference, which sought to better integrate working methodologies for the implementation of the Action Plan. The Secretary conceded that although the Secretariat was working towards synergies, intangible heritage was lagging behind other methodologies in terms of intervention in these situations, but that it was moving forward and catching up. Nevertheless, a lot of the answers required working with partners, whether NGOs (which are very important in the field of intangible cultural heritage) or United Nations humanitarian agencies.
40. The **delegation of Senegal** appreciated the relevance of this theme, especially the use of cultural heritage elements for conflict resolution. Senegal had experience in this regard in the southern region of Casamance that was currently under conflict. The delegation explained that Senegal had played on the heritage elements to pacify this conflict by playing on what is known as the joking kinship. The southern region is home to a majority ethnic group, the Diola. This Diola ethnic group is a joking cousin of another ethnic group in Senegal called the Serer, the ethnic group of Léopold Sédar Senghor. The State of Senegal plays on this joking kinship because it is known that a Diola would never hurt a Serer and vice versa. This is why negotiations to settle the conflict were regularly held in Serer areas. In this way, an element of intangible cultural heritage was used to ease the conflict in Casamance. Another aspect that explained the peaceful social climate in Senegal and the use of this joking kinship concerned religion. In Senegal, there are so-called religious Islam brotherhoods. There is the Tijâniyyah and the Mouridiyya, with both sharing a joking kinship that helps appease the social climate. In this way, Islam also uses cultural heritage in Islamo-Christian dialogue to fight against irredentism. Burkina Faso spoke earlier about the terrorist movements in the Sahel. In Senegal, the State promotes Islamo-Christian dialogue such that when there is a Christian religious festival, it is celebrated throughout the country, even among Muslims who also associate with Christian holidays, whether Easter or Christmas. In the same way, on a Muslim religious holiday, Christians associate with Muslims to celebrate the event. Thus, there is a climate of cordiality based on this joking kinship, founded on dialogue between cultures to oppose conflicts. Even cemeteries in Senegal are mixed with Muslims and Christians buried together. The delegation wished to share this experience so that it could be put to use as a good practice that could help resolve such conflicts.
41. The **delegation of Djibouti** reiterated the importance of relations between UNESCO and the IOM, which deals with displaced refugees in terms of education and health, and UNESCO and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
42. The **Secretary** concurredwith the last comment,adding that this was precisely the work undertaken by the Secretariat with proposals already in Lebanon based on this experience, particularly with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to find ways of cooperation, including in the field of intangible cultural heritage.
43. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Committee Members for the very engaging item,turning to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.It was noted that amendments had been received.
44. The **delegation of Armenia** asked whether an English version of the draft decision and the amendments had been distributed.
45. The **Secretary** explained that no documents had been distributed and that they could all be found online and seen on the screen.
46. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to paragraph 1, which was duly adopted. Palestine proposed an amendment to paragraph 2, inviting Palestine to present its amendment.
47. The **delegation of Palestine** presented references to legal resolutions [of the Human Rights Council] in paragraph 2, and a reference to tangible cultural heritage in paragraph 4, which echoed the sentiments in the room regarding synergy between Conventions.
48. The **delegation of the Philippines** had a technical question on Palestine’s first amendment that made reference to the Human Rights Council resolutions and A/HRCH/37/L30, adding that from its own experience in the Council, a document with the suffix L30 was not the final adopted version. It therefore suggested adding the reference to the final version.
49. The **delegation of Palestine** fully agreed with the Philippines and relied on the Secretariat to find the right code.
50. The **Secretary** sought time to review the resolution, suggesting that it not be included at this stage.
51. The **delegation of Palestine** trusted the Secretariat tofind the right code, unless there was opposition to the amendment.
52. The **delegation of the Philippines** was notopposed to the amendment, only that the final document should be the one cited.
53. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked thatin addition to the amendment in paragraph 2, the UN Security Council Resolution 2347 should also be mentioned, as it recognized UNESCO’s work in protecting cultural heritage, setting forth a number of measures in a historic resolution to protect heritage and culture.
54. The **delegation of Kuwait** agreed with Palestine that threats to both tangible and intangible cultural heritage should be added, particularly in cases of armed conflict.
55. The **delegation of Colombia** alignedwith Cuba and was in favour of referencing UN Security Council Resolution 2347.
56. The **delegation of Palestine** presented the correct document code A/HRCH/37/30, and also supported the proposal by Cuba to include UN Resolution 2347.
57. The **delegations of Lebanon, Djibouti, Cyprus, Jamaica** and **Sri Lanka** supported the amendments.
58. The **Secretary** noted the addition ofthe UN resolution and sought an indication of its placement in paragraph 2.
59. The **delegation of Cuba** remarked that the UN Security Council Resolution should be in the first sentence, adding that it was also important to mention the UNESCO Action Plan to strengthen the safeguarding of heritage. In addition, there was also the resolution of the Human Rights Council. Thus, in terms of hierarchy, the Security Council resolution should go first, followed by the Human Rights Council resolution.
60. The **delegation of the Netherlands** remarked that as these resolutions were presented for the first time, more time was needed to check the references.
61. The **delegation of Palestine** asked that theSecretariat reflect the names of all those who supported the amendments.
62. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted support from the delegationsof **Sri Lanka**, **Djibouti**, **Poland**, **Togo**, **Cyprus**, **Jamaica**, **the Philippines**, **Lebanon**, **Cameroon**, **Kuwait**, **Colombia**, **Senegal** and **Kazakhstan**.
63. The **delegation of the Netherlands** asked whether there was broad support.
64. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that there was broad support.
65. The **delegation of Palestine** clarified that Cuba and Palestine had presented two amendments that were now one joint amendment. Thus, all voiced support was for both amendments.
66. The **Vice-Chairperson** pronouncedparagraph 2 adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 was also duly adopted.Paragraph 4included an amendment by Palestine, which would read, ‘often also elements of their tangible cultural heritage’ before ‘whose existence is necessary for expressing their intangible cultural heritage’.
67. The **delegation of China** asked Palestine to clarifyits amendment as reference was being made to the 1972 Convention on elements of *tangible* cultural heritage. It requested the Secretariat’s help to avoid any misunderstanding in the context of this draft decision.
68. The **delegation of Djibouti** emphasized the fact that the 1972 Convention also makes reference to the cultural and natural space. The delegation also wished to add ‘in collaboration with international organizations’ after ‘States Parties […] to the extent possible’.
69. Responding to China, the **delegation of Palestine** confirmed that the amendment did indeed refer to the 1972 Convention in that it was going in the same direction and in the spirit of synergy that was requested by so many Members for more than three years. In this regard, it thanked Belgium for the very active efforts made in favour of synergy between Conventions during its chairing of the Second Protocol Committee. The delegation did not see an impediment to the citation of tangible cultural heritage and the 1972 Convention.
70. The **Secretary** clarified thatthe proposed language of the first draft referred to the Ethical Principles, Chapter 6, and in particular paragraph 5, “access of communities, groups and individuals to the instruments, objects, artefacts, cultural and natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing their intangible cultural heritage should be ensured including in situations of armed conflict. Customary practices governing access to intangible cultural heritage should be fully respected, even where these may limit broader public access.” Thus, references to these situations of armed conflict had already been specifically included.
71. The **delegation of Cameroon** had an issue with the terminology, as reference to the 1972 Convention spoke of cultural properties and not elements.
72. The **Secretary** understood the desire to create synergies between the various Conventions, and indeed, it was an overarching principle. He confirmed that the 2003 Convention uses the term ‘element’ to denote expressions of intangible cultural heritage. Referring to the Ethical Principles and to the overall Action Plan of the General Conference and heritage in situations of conflict, the Secretariat was working in synergy as much as possible with the other Conventions, and thus it was unnecessary to have detailed discussions on the synergy aspect as they were already contained in the Ethical Principles, as well as the overall chapeau, including in the first decision of the Committee on situations of emergency.
73. The **Vice-Chairperson** returned to paragraph 4, which was duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 5 was also pronounced adopted. An amendment was proposed by Palestine in paragraph 6 to include, ‘particularly in cases of armed conflict’.
74. The **delegation of Armenia** preferred to retain the original paragraph.
75. The **delegations of Cyprus, Azerbaijan, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Cuba, Kuwait, Jamaica, Zambia, Guatemala** and **Zambia** supported Palestine’s amendment.
76. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatthe decision-making process adopted stipulated that in case of an opposition, a one-third minority was required.
77. The **Vice-Chairperson** concurred andparagraph 6 was duly adopted.
78. The **delegation of Cuba** noted that there were two amendments to the paragraph and in order to obtain maximum clarity and balance, the second part of the paragraph should—in addition to armed conflict—also refer to natural disasters and post-conflict situations in terms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The delegation asked whether Palestine had suitable wording to accommodate all these aspects so as not to create this imbalance.
79. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed with the remarks by Cuba and suggested inserting ‘including’.
80. The **delegation of the Philippines** shared the sentiments expressed by Cuba, and suggested including armed conflict and natural disasters.
81. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed with the Philippines as this would place armed conflict and natural disasters on an equal footing.
82. The **delegation of Cuba** foundPalestine’s proposal acceptable but wondered whether ‘post-conflict situations’ could also be included.
83. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the proposal by the Philippines and appreciated a proposal to address the last concern expressed by Cuba.
84. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to add ‘and also during peacetime’ to the sentence.
85. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that the various contexts of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies had already been defined in multiple previous decisions, and although it was possible to reproduce those contexts in one paragraph should the Committee so wish, situations of emergencies already implied pre-conflict, post-conflict, conflict and natural disasters.
86. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned toparagraph 6, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 7 and 8 were also adopted. An amendment was proposed by Palestine in paragraph 9 to add the following text, ‘or for any other relevant national or international stakeholders’.
87. The **delegation of Cuba** referred to the use of *intervenant* in Palestine’s amendment,remarkingthat its use had caused some difficulties when looking at the UNESCO strategy and Action Plan as it implied consent. The delegation thus suggested using another word such as ‘participation’, in keeping with the spirit of the sentence.
88. The **delegation of Senegal** suggested ‘any other actor’ instead of ‘*toute autre intervenant’*.
89. The **delegation of Palestine** noted that it was a matter of wording, as in English *intervenant* implied stakeholders.
90. The **delegation of Senegal** suggested ‘*les parties prenantes*’*.*
91. The **Vice-Chairperson** remarked that both suggestions were acceptable, andpronounced paragraph 9 adopted as amended.Paragraphs 10 and 11 were also duly adopted.
92. The **delegation of Palestine** presented the final code of the decision L30 [in paragraph 2] that should be 17, following verification by Kazakhstan for which it was grateful.
93. The **Secretary** asked Palestine to explain the reference to this particular document.
94. The **delegation of Palestine** explained that it referred to the current emergency situations in different parts of the world with regard to the protection of heritage in general and in cases of emergency and armed conflict in particular.
95. The **delegation of Colombia** clarified thatit supported Cuba’s proposed amendment, specifically with regard to UN Security Council Resolution 2347.
96. The **Secretary** remarked that it was difficult to have a last-minute reference change to a document after the support had been voiced and with the document now changing numbers, as it posed a problem in terms of procedure. Thus, either the Committee should support the original number, as had been supported by Members, or remove reference to this document altogether. The Secretary explained that the discussion focused on a specific referenced document that was now being re-opened with a new reference number and the Secretariat did not have the time or means to check whether it was indeed the same document. It was thus the opinion of the Secretariat to either reject the change in number or not include it until the reference could be examined to determine if it was indeed the same document.
97. The **delegation of Colombia** reiterated that it had expressed support for UN Security Council Resolution 2347 and did not seek to re-open the debate.
98. The **delegation of the Philippines** called a point of order, recalling that in the decision-making process, it was up to Committee Members to amend or not amend, approve or not approve. It thanked Poland because its initial comment concerned the L30 suffix in that draft documents presented to the Human Rights Council are L documents, and this resolution pertained to the issue of protecting culture in armed conflict adopted in March 2018. When it was adopted by the Human Rights Council, the document became 17. Thus, this was not a substantive change to the document but simply a change in the reference number, a mere procedural change, which the Committee had every right to do.
99. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines and Poland, and supported the change in this case from L30 to 17, when it became definitive, so as to remain logical and coherent.
100. The **delegation of Austria** foundthe situationproblematic because not all Committee Members were experts and knew precisely what these resolutions referred to, especially given the short time. However, it was willing to go along in the spirit of consensus, even though this was problematic.
101. The **delegation of the Netherlands** seconded the comments by Austria, adding that it would like to see the resolutions projected onto the screen so that they could be read.
102. Following the explanation by the Secretary, the **delegation of China** wished to have time to check the resolutions and thus preferred to retain the original draft decision at this juncture.
103. The **delegation of Djibouti** agreed with theconcerns raised by the Committee Members regarding knowledge of and access to the different resolutions.
104. The **delegation of Colombia** remarked thatif the Committee could not make the clarification then it would be in favour of returning to the original wording.
105. The **delegation of Palestine** understood the concerns raised by the Committee Members, conceding that it did not have enough time to communicate, consult and explain the scope of the amendment. These amendments all related to heritage, heritage in cases of conflict, the rights of children in humanitarian situations, and so on, and thus were directly related to the issue. However, it also understood the need to be informed of the items adopted. However, as everyone was aware of UN Security Council Resolution 2347, the delegation proposed keeping Resolution 2347 and deleting the other references, adding that it would take the time needed to explain the issue on the next occasion.
106. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked Palestine, and with no objections proposed adopting the draft decision as a whole. **The** **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 11 adopted**.

**ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA**

**MULTIPLE SUBMISSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/12*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-12-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*13.COM 12*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/12)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to agenda item 12, informing the Committee that the Bureau had discussed this subject during its first two meetings earlier in 2018. It was first brought to the Bureau’s attention that an increasing number of International Assistance requests were being submitted to the Bureau at the same time or in quick succession. This came about during the Bureau meeting in March 2018 when during one sitting, the Bureau was asked to examine four International Assistance requests submitted by a single country. The Bureau subsequently asked the Secretariat to analyze the number of assistance requests having been granted to a single country, together with any other pertinent administrative issues. Having discussed the results of that analysis, the Bureau felt it was important that the matter be discussed by the Committee, hence the inclusion of the item in this session.
2. The **Secretary** explained that as the only funding mechanism exclusively intended to supplement States Parties’ national efforts to safeguard living heritage, International Assistance is of paramount importance in the implementation of the Convention. This unique tool under the ICH Fund allows States to safeguard intangible cultural heritage tailored to their particular needs and national contexts. Despite this, the International Assistance mechanism was systematically underutilized. The Committee and the General Assembly recognized this, and consequently, at its sixth session, the General Assembly decided to increase the ceiling of requests presented to the Bureau from US$25,000 to US$100,000. Since the sixth session, the Secretariat had observed an important increase in the number of International Assistance requests presented to and approved by the Bureau, confirming the effectiveness of that resolution. This positive trend did not come without challenges. As a result, the Bureau of the Committee had examined an increasing number of International Assistance requests up to US$100,000, some with multiple requests submitted by a single country in the same year, for example, four requests from a single country examined by the Bureau in March 2018, as mentioned earlier by the Vice-Chairperson. For this reason, a discussion was initiated by the Bureau concerning multiple requests from a single country, i.e. What are the implications of the multiple submissions? What is the opinion of the Bureau?
3. The **Secretary** further explained that the implications could be discussed from different angles. Firstly, multiple submissions may be seen as a way to divide a single large request into several smaller ones. However, in some cases, this could create governance concerns in the sense that multiple smaller grants might be above the limit set by the directives for the authority of the Bureau which bypasses the Committee. Secondly, the amount of assistance that can be examined by the Bureau was increased four times such that the amount granted by the Bureau was significantly higher, meaning that the impact on the Fund would be correspondingly higher when there are multiple requests. Thirdly, the Committee could consider the ability of States Parties to implement several projects at the same time. The Secretariat is regularly faced with challenges in closing projects due to delays in their implementation, and this can sometimes call into question their conformity with criterion A.7[[34]](#footnote-34) of the Operational Directives, which is of the utmost importance in mitigating potential financial risks. Moreover, the Operational Directives are silent on the issue of multiple submissions, and there are no indications regarding the number of files a State can submit nor the amount it can request over a given period through the Bureau. Therefore, the Committee was asked to consider revisions to the Operational Directives limiting the amount of International Assistance that a single country can be granted through the Bureau. On this point, the Bureau was inclined to suggest either limiting the amount a State could request to US$100,000 per year or US$200,000 per biennium, regardless of the number of requests submitted in both cases. The Secretariat believed that the limit should be based on an amount rather than the number of requests, and that the amount of US$200,000 provided greater flexibility than US$100,000 a year. This measure would of course exclude requests in cases of emergency as the time and scope of an emergency cannot be anticipated, in compliance with the Operational Directives. The draft decision was prepared in this sense.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the useful analysis, opening the floor for debate.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Secretariat for the report, but was a bit puzzled as to why US$200,000 per biennium was preferred over US$100,000 per year. Regarding the annex to the report, detailing the number of requests per country, the outcome, and the recommendation (approved, rejected, inappropriate), the delegation sought clarity as to why the total amount calculated for a State Party included all the requests, even those rejected.
6. The **delegation of the Philippines** had a number of points. Firstly, every State Party had a right to request International Assistance, as stipulated in the Convention and Operational Directives. Secondly, developing countries were the main beneficiaries of the International Assistance mechanisms. Thirdly, multiple requests from one State Party may not necessarily be objectionable, as long as they are needs-driven. The delegation therefore did not think it necessary to limit the total amount of International Assistance that can be given to a single State Party within the biennium to US$200,000. States Parties are different and they request International Assistance in accordance with their various national and local capacities and conditions. There can be instances where larger amounts and multiple projects are needed by States Parties and the communities concerned. Hence, the status quo should continue and the delegation proposed an amendment to the draft decision. Furthermore, it also had a comment on the annex with regard to the assistance approved for the Philippines of US$7,500, which it did not pursue and hence should be reflected in the document.
7. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the informative report, adding that for the benefit of the implementation of the Convention and because of the shortfall experienced at one point in the Fund, the time had come to reflect further on the whole mechanism. It shared certain concerns voiced by the Philippines and that indeed every country had its own specificities and should thus be examined on a case-by-case basis, but it suggested looking at what happened with other Conventions, for example in the case of cultural diversity. The delegation thus cautioned against the idea of limits, but instead look towards other Conventions and different bodies. In addition, cases should be viewed with regard to the situation on the ground with the communities involved, as one project might benefit one group of people but might not actually have an impact on a diverse group elsewhere in the country. Thus, before looking into limits, it was first important to maintain a balance across the whole of the International Assistance mechanism so as to protect the enshrined priorities and principles of the Convention itself.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** commended the Secretariat for the outstanding work in preparing document 12. The detailed explanation of the situation, the dates and the statistics provided on the International Assistance submitted and approved so far were valuable. The delegation looked forward to seeing the information on submitted and approved International Assistance available on the website of the Convention. Multiple submissions in absence of limits for requests of International Assistance had obviously become an issue with the experience gained so far since the increased ceiling that can be approved by the Bureau. The delegation had taken note of the proposals by the Secretariat in terms of different considerations that could be given to the issue. It believed that it was important to take into account whether or not International Assistance proposals were submitted by the same institution within the country whose communities and institutions vary a lot from one country to another. The delegation also believed that flexibility in terms of limits should be permitted to allow emergency assistance requests, and it was pleased to see that this had been reflected in the draft decision. Finally, it was also very much in favour of knowing more about the motivations and contexts of the countries that had submitted multiple successive requests within one year, and it wondered whether the Secretariat had approached these countries to better understand the reasons, contexts and roles of the different stakeholders involved in the submission and implementation of the requests. The delegation believed it was important to be aware of the contexts of multiple submissions in that sense, and asked the Secretariat to include this information in the next Committee’s document on this question.
9. The **Secretary** notedthespecific question and broader questions about process. The specific question related to differentiating the number of requests and the amount requested, as not all requests were at US$100,000. The Secretary had heard a number of comments that it was perhaps not the time to reflect on this issue and more time was required. The overall concern, however, was that the new mechanism was showing positive trends; in the last two years, the Secretariat had implemented roughly the same approved and processed requests as for the previous seven to eight years. Thus, the Fund that had initially been accumulating funds was now starting to be implemented, as the new mechanism allowed better and easier access to the Fund. The Secretariat did notice that larger amounts were coming through the Bureau that had the authority to grant requests up to US$100,000, i.e. they were not coming through the Committee. The Secretary understood that the Committee wished to wait and see how this new mechanism continued and how it would impact the Fund overall. However, concerns about future implications still remained in that regard.
10. The **delegation of Palestine** asked the Secretariat to respond to its two questions.
11. The **Secretary** explained that the annex looked at the different status of the various projects that tracks all the projects, including those rejected, as well as all the requests even though some had not been approved. The document thus provided the difference of the requests and not how much money was spent. The document thus showed requests and not expenditure. In the case of the Philippines, the Secretary apologized, admitting that there was indeed an error. The project had been approved, but the request was withdrawn thereafter and this should have been updated.
12. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked thatwhen the measure was taken at the time to submit requests of US$100,000 to the Bureau, it was to ease procedures, and to facilitate and encourage States to request International Assistance due to lack of requests. Thus, it was from this perspective that this measure was taken. In the case of multiple submissions, it was true that they could satisfy a need from communities in a particular context, or in an emergency. However, this posed a problem, which could be appreciated in different ways. Although States and communities are respected, when the Bureau examines requests up to US$100,000, with higher requests taking more time, then invariably multiple requests are in fact submitted and not just from one country. For this reason, it was important to take into account the contexts and the urgency of each request, even though it would be difficult for the Secretariat to monitor these projects given the staffing issues. Nevertheless, it was important to recall why this measure was introduced, while taking into account the need for monitoring, which is a crucial aspect in the implementation of these projects. The delegation explained that although the requests were submitted by different communities, the institutions and the State Party played a role in coordinating and submitting the reports of the outcomes, not least as this concerned the implementation of the Convention and thus the State Party’s responsibility vis-à-vis UNESCO.
13. The **Secretary** wished to add that the draft amendment proposed continuing the reflection so as to gain experience on how this new mechanism was working. At the moment, the Fund was not at risk, but it could potentially become so should the trend continue. The Secretariat was thus of the opinion that the current situation did not present a serious problem, but that the issue required monitoring.
14. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted. An amendment was proposed by Azerbaijan and the Philippines in paragraph 5, [which read, ‘as well as the importance of knowing the context of multiple submissions by a single country’.]
15. The **delegations of Palestine** and **Senegal** supported amendment 5.
16. The **Vice-Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 5 adopted. Paragraph 6 also had an amendment by Azerbaijan, [which read, ‘to closely monitor the situation of multiple submissions and report thereof…’], which was duly adopted as amended. With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 12 adopted**.

**ITEM 13 OF THE AGENDA**

**REFLECTION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF NGOs IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/13*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-13-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*13.COM 13*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/13)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** then proceeded to agenda item 13.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that in 2017, the Committee had invited the Secretariat—in consultation with accredited NGOs—and the informal ad hoc working group to reflect on ways to enhance the participation of NGOs. This request was made in the context of debates on the identification and definition of advisory functions that could be fulfilled by accredited NGOs, expressed as *inter alia* functions in paragraph 96 of the Operational Directives. Document 13.COM 13 highlights the preliminary analysis undertaken by the Secretariat in this regard. The informal ad hoc working group was also reflecting on possible ways to further enhance the participation of NGOs in the framework of the Convention and how it would be reflected in the accreditation and renewal mechanisms of NGOs. Following the twelfth session of the Committee in 2017, the Secretariat proposed facilitating this reflection through a multistep consultation process leading up to the fourteenth session in 2019, which was supported by the ICH Fund through funds allocated under ‘other functions of the Committee’. Regarding the timeline of the reflection process, following a launch in April 2018, the consultation process started with preliminary consultations from May to August with the steering committee of the ICH NGO Forum and the co-chairpersons of the informal ad hoc working group. Representatives from States Parties and the NGO Forum were able to exchange their respective experiences and expectations regarding the accreditation system. In September 2018, an electronic consultation was initiated with a communication sent to all 176 accredited NGOs and 178 States Parties to the Convention. This aimed to gather ideas and comments on the potential advisory functions of accredited NGOs and possible ways forward for the accreditation system. A total of sixty-five accredited NGOs and thirty-three States Parties from all six regions took part in this electronic consultation. The Secretariat was still in the very early stages of analyzing the responses, which came on 19 October 2018. Nevertheless, based on this preliminary analysis, 82 per cent of accredited NGO expressed a positive opinion regarding the impact of the accreditation system on their work. However, the consultation revealed many areas in which the current system could be improved. For instance, around half of the respondents (including accredited NGOs and States Parties) considered that the accreditation system should take into account the disparity in the size and capacities of NGOs. They also recommended including different types of accreditation to accommodate the various capacities and scope of NGOs. Respondents were, however, split on how these considerations would translate in terms of accreditation criteria and process.
3. The **Secretary** remarked that these observations were only based on very initial data gathered, but it was already clear that the heterogeneity of accredited NGOs would lead to a diversity of opinions and suggestions regarding the future of the accreditation system. These might include the introduction of additional criteria, different types of accreditation system, or specific measures to improve the geographic balance of accredited NGOs. However, these measures would depend on the future advisory functions of the NGOs, i.e. How does the Committee wish NGOs to concretely contribute to its work? Together with the debates of the Committee and those of the ICHNGO Forum during the present session, the electronic consultation would feed into the working documents of a consultation meeting to be held at UNESCO Headquarters in the spring of 2019, involving representatives from the ICHNGO Forum and the informal ad hoc working group. The meeting would focus on identifying the *inter alia* functions of NGOs. At the next session of the Committee in December 2019, the Secretariat planned to report to the Committee on the outcomes of the consultation meeting. If the proposed redefined accreditation system of NGOs required the revision of the Operational Directives, the Committee may wish to discuss this at its fourteenth session, with a view to possibly submitting draft revised Operational Directives to the eighth session of the General Assembly of States Parties in 2020.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for presenting the steps of the reflection process, opening the floor for debate.
5. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked thatthe lack of geographical balance in the current NGO network was a cause for concern, as only accredited NGOs were involved in the consultation process with States Parties and this would in some sense merely continue the imbalance in the system. As indicated on page 2 of the document, the co-Chairs of the ad hoc working group had a good informal brainstorming with representatives of the ICHNGO Forum earlier in 2018. Some ideas and issues were: i) reviewing the governance of the NGO network to see how it could develop into a more institutional presence with permanent focal points; ii) ensuring feedback to NGOs whose applications are not approved; iii) mapping of the current NGO network would be useful to determine the capacities and scope of contributions that accredited NGOs can provide to the processes and mechanisms of the Convention, which may need a possible classification system in terms of national, regional or international activities or advocacies; iv) capacity building for NGOs would be important, including through a possible MOOC (massive open online course) to raise awareness and participation in the Convention; v) incentives could be considered to address the lack of an equitable geographical balance in the NGO network and promote the establishment of NGOs in other regions (one idea was to make a portion of the International Assistance budget available for accredited NGOs, or to create a new budget line or fund. Another suggestion was tolink inscriptions on the Representative List or the Urgent Safeguarding List to the establishment of NGOs); vi) the establishment of category 2 centres that could enhance engagement with accredited NGOs; vii) in terms of the *inter alia* advisory services outside of membership in the Evaluation Body, by providing inputs to the new results framework in the periodic reporting; and viii) some Member States expressed an interest in developing a code of conduct for accredited NGOs. The NGO network was looking into this matter through a working group on the Ethical Principles for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The delegation supported the draft decision with a minor amendment.
6. The **delegation of the Netherlands** appreciated the role of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention, as they play an important intermediary role in strengthening the communities in participative approaches involving communities in the local, regional, national and international levels in capacity building of communities and in sharing safeguarding experiences. It welcomed the ongoing transparent reflection process and consultations between the open-ended working group, the Secretariat and the ICHNGO Forum on the possible future roles of accredited NGOs so that all could benefit from the roles NGOs play between communities, States Parties and UNESCO. There is a wide variety of accredited NGOs with broad expertise that is very valuable to the Convention, and the reflection process should find ways to map this expertise and make it available in a differentiated way. The delegation emphasized the important role of accredited community NGOs with special expertise in specific types of intangible cultural heritage. Not all types of communities are represented in this way within the Convention, but when they are they can voice their expertise, and Member States could encourage these NGOs to work towards accreditation, especially from underrepresented countries. Therefore, a system is needed that is flexible and links the Convention directly to communities and grassroots organizations, and at the same time is in line with the international community at large. A key to this is the improvements in governance of the ICHNGO Forum. For the first time in 2018, it elected a steering committee and it was hoped that these developments in governance would facilitate the process in such a way that working groups of the NGO Forum could focus on strengthening the outreach of the Convention to civil society, with regional networking contributing to the overall results framework and reports. The delegation also hoped that the ICHNGO Forum strategy of regional networking and cooperation would contribute to the involvement and accreditation of NGOs from underrepresented countries and regions of the world, which still remained a problem.
7. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the information presented, adding that this issue was of paramount importance given the situation at UNESCO where strategic transformation is thinking through questions such as the role of NGOs and civil society in UNESCO, while nonetheless emphasizing the intergovernmental role of UNESCO. The intergovernmental role UNESCO plays with respect to these Conventions and the State Party’s role is to stimulate dialogue within civil society, while working to improve these mechanisms, which today seem to place NGOs on the periphery. Yet NGOs play a positive role, for example, in relation to the Convention on cultural diversity, the importance of the network of NGOs, and also to dispel the idea that NGOs only have a research function. In fact, they play a very important role in relation to communities and have a very direct role around tangible heritage. They also play a role in inventorying intangible cultural heritage.
8. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Secretariat and the informal ad hoc working group for this important initiative that concerned various Articles of the Convention, thanking the ICHNGO Forum as well for its active engagement and participation in this process. It also welcomed the multistep consultation approach. Nonetheless, the small number of States Parties, as well as the geographically imbalanced distribution of NGOs that participated in the electronic consultation, which was clearly related to the geographic distribution of accredited NGOs in general, have to be taken into consideration when interpreting the outcomes of the consultation meeting. The delegation also supported the statements of the Philippines and the Netherlands that the Committee may wish to promote accreditation in underrepresented regions with a view to strengthening international cooperation, as outlined in Article 19. In this regard, it welcomed the proposal of the working group concerning possible ways in which the participation of NGOs could be further enhanced, for example, by providing capacity-building opportunities. It suggested that this topic be reflected in the upcoming consultation meeting. As mentioned in the report, around half of the respondents considered that the accreditation system should include different types of accreditation, and the delegation sought clarification on what form these types of accreditation would take and also the reasoning behind this proposal.
9. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that this issue was important on two levels. Firstly, NGOs play an extremely important role on the ground. In the case of Africa, at least in Senegal, human resources are very limited at the regional level, and there is not enough human resources available to do all the work on the ground with the communities. Thus, NGOs become essential intermediaries, especially when working directly with communities. For the last ten years in most parts of Senegal, all the work had been carried out by NGOs. However, it was true that there was a problem of imbalance in the participation of NGOs by country. In the case of Senegal, there had been an NGO for a while but it no longer operates. Today, the State was working with NGOs in inventorying, working at the community level, but these NGOs were not accredited either. Thus, States Parties had a responsibility, as administrators, technicians and experts, to encourage NGOs that do not necessarily know about the NGO network for intangible heritage, even though they work alongside State authorities yet were still unaware of accreditation or how to become accredited. For this reason, following the General Conference in 2017, when it was realized that only Zimbabwe had one accredited NGO, Senegal decided to work with NGOs and now three NGOs were preparing their documents to submit their nominations. The delegation believed that this was the way forward to improve representation at the geographic level. States Parties thus had a role to play to encourage and work with NGOs, especially as they are known by authorities having worked with them in the field. This was the example that Senegal wished to set to help NGO underrepresentation, but which also takes place in most African countries.
10. The **Secretary** thanked the Philippines for its comments, noting that a lot of the points raised would be in the forthcoming document under the informal working group report, which was why they were not included in this report even though the issues were being treated. One of the questions concerned the different levels of accreditation, and another concerned geographic representation. The Secretary explained that it was true that sending a questionnaire to a broader group of NGOs was a good idea, though it was not sure that they could actually relate to these issues of accreditation and advisory functions to the Committee because unless they were already approaching the Committee, it is in a language that is probably unfamiliar, especially to those working on the ground. The Secretariat had sent letters to National Commissions asking that they encourage requests from NGOs, which brought about the second point on what accreditation implies. From the outset of the Convention, the Operational Directives set out advisory functions *inter alia*, which defined the Evaluation Body’s role as the only advisory function in any true sense. As the Secretariat prepared for the Committee’s renewal of the evaluations based on the criteria, it became complicated and unclear what exactly the criteria for renewal were. This was why the consultation had been initiated in 2017, although it was still only preliminary. Moreover, the idea of broadening it beyond accredited NGOs was a good one, although it may need to be broadened in a different way than through the survey sent by the Secretariat.
11. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
12. The **delegation of Belgium** thanked the Secretariat and the Committee for their active exploration of the possibilities for accredited NGOs to contribute to the success of implementing the Convention. It looked forward to the results of the survey and the reflections. The delegation would in any case recall Decision [10.COM 15.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/15.a) under points 9, 10 and 11 that had already been taken up by the Committee at Windhoek in which it included the *inter alia* functions in this exploration. It was hoped that inspiration would be found in this decision when developing the work on the overall results framework.
13. Speaking on behalf of the **ICHNGO Forum**, Ms Jorijn Neyrinck from theNGOWorkshop Intangible Heritage Flanders was very happy with the transparency, dialogue and reflection on how the participation of NGOs could be further enhanced and how this would be reflected in the future accreditation process. The Forum looked forward to learning from the online consultation results, and to reflecting with the Secretariat and the informal ad hoc working group towards a Committee decision at its fourteenth session in 2019. It shared the observations expressed in the document and by the Philippines’ report from the meeting in June, among others, on efforts needed on geographical distribution and working through capacity building. As mentioned earlier, the NGO Forum has been working firmly on its governance in recent years. As a result, this week had seen the presentation of the first fully elected steering committee. Members come from each of the six regions, along with a member representing international NGOs, to maximize its governance structure and guarantee good participation. A document on ethical principles had been prepared at this session and the Forum was working on an ethics Action Plan, as well as a code of conduct for steering committee members. From its side, the Forum was also taking initiatives for consultations on the roles of NGOs *inter alia* for the implementation of the Convention. Three NGO meetings in 2018 were especially devoted to *inter alia* process, which included the Forum’s annual symposium held on Sunday [at the present session] with over ninety participants from NGOs, States Parties and other actors in the Convention in attendance. It was proposed that the possible contributions of NGOs be mapped, in alignment with the functions of the Committee, Article 7 of the Convention, and the overall results framework. NGOs indeed form a rich resource feeding the implementation of the Convention to its full potential. NGOs take up roles of mediation and facilitation with respect to cultivating local to global safeguarding processes in intangible cultural heritage. These benefits were highlighted in previous debates and were also mentioned in the chapter in the Operational Directives on sustainable development.
14. Ms Jorijn Neyrinck of the **ICHNGO Forum** then spoke of the possible advisory functions of the accredited NGOs, adding that the Forum had already identified five new dimensions in addition to the current evaluation role and the Evaluation Body. Firstly, NGOs may serve as a laboratory of ideas and inspiring practices for raising and discussing new issues in relation to societal changes, highlighting critical aspects in safeguarding, methodologies and procedures. This often happens through transnational cooperation and the effective networking of NGOs, building connections with other actors like research institutes, civil society and other partners. Such cross-border collaboration of NGOs, for example in the case of dry stone walling inscribed at the present session, or the Register of Good Practices of the storytelling network of Kronoberg the previous day, or the ICH on museum project in Europe started by accredited NGOs with support from the Forum. Secondly, an obvious NGO role lay in contributing to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. NGOs contribute to safeguarding measures and methodologies in general or specific elements of intangible cultural heritage whether or not inscribed, as well as for the follow-up of inscribed elements. Thirdly, NGOs are well-equipped to share safeguarding experiences in lighter and accessible ways. A nice example is the online platform [www.nordicsafeguardingpractices.org](http://www.nordicsafeguardingpractices.org) in which accredited NGOs play a vital role, as well as the [#HeritageAlive](http://www.ichngoforum.org/wg/heritagealive/) online journal of the Forum. Fourthly, NGOs play a role in awareness-raising on intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding in society, and for building and strengthening capacities with stakeholders at large. Finally, NGOs provide a multitude of reporting functions, serving the Committee and the overall results framework, regional reporting on the status of inscribed elements, and others. It was hoped that the Forum could further enrich the reflection on the functions of NGOs in the Convention and that—as a result of the consultation process—a set of valuable functions could amplify the implementation of the Convention in the future.
15. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
16. The **delegation of the Philippines** presented an amendment in paragraph 5, which was a reference to ‘the informal ad hoc working group’, as cited by many Committee Members.
17. The **Vice-Chairperson** then returned to the draft decision, and paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted. With no objections to the amendment by the Philippines, paragraph 5 was duly adopted as amended. With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 13 adopted**.
18. The **Secretary** informed the delegations that information sessions on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education would take place during the lunch break.

*[Friday, 30 November 2018, afternoon session]*

*[The Chairperson reprised his role]*

**ITEM 10.d OF THE AGENDA**

**EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/10.d*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-10.d-EN.docx)

**File:** [*1 request*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10d-international-assistance-requests-01015)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 10.d*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.d)

1. The **Chairperson** began by thanking the Vice-Chairs of the Philippines and Lebanon for their assistance, noting that the Committee had completed its examination of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, as well as the examination of proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. There remained the examination of item10.d, the request for International Assistance, before the examination of draft decision 13.COM 10concerning a number of cross-cutting issues common to the different mechanisms. There was one request submitted by Albania under this sub-item. The Chairperson recalled that the Committee had to evaluate the extent to which this request met the criteria for International Assistance as a whole. In other words, not all the criteria had to be met in order for International Assistance to be granted. Before starting the examination of the request, the Chairperson recalled criteria A.1–A.7 that would guide the Committee’s decision, which were projected on the screen. In addition, paragraph 10 of the Operational Directives referred to two other considerations in 10(a) and 10(b)[[35]](#footnote-35). The Chairperson then turned to the request by Albania for a project entitled ‘Community based Inventory of ICH in Albania with a view to safeguarding and transmitting to future generations’.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination **Community based Inventory of ICH in Albania with a view to safeguarding and transmitting to future generations** [draft decision 13.COM 10.d], submitted by **Albania**. Albania had requested International Assistance of US$213,260 from the ICH Fund for the implementation of the project aimed at carrying out a community-based inventory of intangible cultural heritage, with a view to drawing up tailored action plans for safeguarding and transmission to future generations. From the information included in the file, the request responded as follows to the criteria. The project involved a suitable set of activities to guarantee its feasibility by training a large number of community members and experts in community-based inventorying, as well as the wide dissemination of the principles and working methods of the Convention. The active involvement of the state administration, research institutes and regional NGOs could guarantee further development of the inventory when the project concludes. The State Party had implemented previously financed activities. As a national project, the State Party would invite experts with the necessary know-how to ensure the appropriate quality of the project outcomes. However, the Evaluation Body considered that it was unclear how the communities had been involved in the preparation of the request, and the implementation and evaluation of the proposed project. Although the budget breakdown and timetable were well-structured, the lack of coherency between the request, the budget and the timetable did not allow for an assessment of the appropriateness of the requested amount. The digitalization of data was budgeted for twelve months but was scheduled to last fifteen months according to the timetable. The State Party’s contribution covered less than 1 per cent of the total cost of the project, which raised concerns about the sustainability of the project at the close of the project. The file also did not explain how the project would stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources or similar efforts elsewhere. In addition, the Evaluation Body invited the State Party, should it wish to resubmit its request in another cycle, to provide a clear and detailed explanation of its commitment, both financial and in-kind, to demonstrate the sustainability of the project once the International Assistance ends. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee refer the International Assistance request to the State for the project, inviting it to submit a revised request to the Committee for examination at a later session.
3. The **Chairperson** noted an amendment from Lebanon.
4. The **delegation of Lebanon** remarked that Albania’s request for International Assistance showed that despite the country’s efforts to safeguard living heritage, the national inventory with the participation of communities had not yet been realized, hence the importance of the proposed pilot project for three districts in the country. Now at the end of the examination of nomination files in this cycle, the delegation noted that several files had not been adopted due to technical flaws. This file was one more example, which led to the conclusion that a major capacity-building effort had yet to be done. To this end, it would present amendments, but it first wished to hear from Albania on the comments made by the Evaluation Body.
5. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** invited Albania to respond.
6. The **delegation of** **Albania** thanked the Evaluation Body for its evaluation and for duly recognizing the considerable efforts already undertaken to safeguard living heritage in Albania and its transmission to future generations. It also highlighted the crucial importance of the project in order to build capacities, and to establish a comprehensive inventory with a very clear impact on the community. In the three districts chosen, out of twelve in the country, five groups of national minorities were living, which confirmed a clear value added in fostering cooperation within and among communities with an understandable broader impact at the regional level as well. One of the main deliverables of the project would be to create the mechanism to involve the communities in the safeguarding process by creating a pattern for the inventory, which could later be replicated to the other eight regions in the country. The assistance, if provided, would strongly support efforts already underway in order to speed up the process, and train and empower communities, which was the focus of the project with a clear bottom-up approach contrary to what had previously been done in the country. The community would play an important role in monitoring and validating the results of the inventorying process. Their views, experiences and preferences would be taken into account, as would their reflections on the meaning and significance of the intangible cultural heritage inventoried. The Evaluation Body had rightly identified some inconsistencies in the compilation of the budget and the timeline. The delegation apologized and regretted that the file did not undergo a final proofreading, which could have corrected those inconsistencies.
7. The **delegation of Albania** explained that the Evaluation Body also rightly pointed out that the in-kind contribution of the State Party, although clearly mentioned in the file, had not been quantified. It gave the wrong impression that the involvement of the State Party was insufficient and could raise concerns about the sustainability of the project during its implementation and thereafter. These issues in fact echoed a remark made several times before and during this session of the need for a better and more fluid communication and interaction between States and the Evaluation Body. In fact, the many, various technical and other means and the dedicated human resources that would be engaged by local and central authorities amounted to a considerable contribution to ensuring the smooth implementation of the project and ensuring continuation and sustainability so that the experience in the three districts chosen would be duly and hopeful successfully replicated and extended throughout the country. It may thus serve as a model for the countries in the region should they wish. The best sustainability proof will be some 100 community bearers in the targeted area, in the three districts, who would directly benefit from the project. Sustainability was also ensured by the fact that the project was the starting point of a much larger effort in order to compile not just an inventory of the three districts involved but an inventory of the intangible cultural heritage at the national level. If the request were approved as proposed by the amendments, the delegation stood ready to work to reach an agreement to resolve any technical issues identified prior to implementation. The delegation would duly quantify the substantial in-kind contributions by the local and central authorities, which was not 1 per cent but way beyond 10 per cent of the requested assistance, and it would make sure that the project was sustainable for its duration, as well as the follow-up community-based inventory in the remaining parts of the country.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** closely studied the nomination and found the request to be strong, adding that the Evaluation Body had indicated many high qualities of this request and that some of the issues were more technical in nature and could have been solved by requesting additional information from the State Party. Thus, this was a very strong case that deserved consideration by the Committee, according to the amendments.
9. Thanking Kazakhstan, the **Chairperson** noted the recommendation of the Evaluation Body and also the clarifications from the submitting State, and with no forthcoming comments, proposed moving to the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted.
10. The **Secretary** noted the clerical error by the Secretariat in the file number in paragraph 2.
11. With no comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 2 adopted. Paragraphs 3–6 were also duly adopted. An amendment was received from Lebanon in paragraph 7 [approving the International Assistance request].
12. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** voiced support for the proposed amendment.
13. The **delegation of Palestine** asked the Secretariat whether there was a need for coherency between the many concerns raised by the Evaluation Body and reflected in the previous paragraph, which were not amended, and the amendment from a referral to an approval.
14. The **Secretary** replied that indeed it would not be coherent if the texts of the criterion were not aligned to the Committee’s decision in the evaluation of this file.
15. The **delegation of Palestine** added thatsome time should be given to amend the previous paragraph for the sake of coherency in order to adopt the new recommendation.
16. The **Secretary** was not saying it was not coherent, only that it would need to be coherent.
17. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that as it needed to be coherent then some time should be spent amending the previous paragraph to adopt the new recommendation.
18. The **Secretary** replied that there was a solution to the potential inconsistency, should the Committee approve, as there was a precedent in the context of International Assistance where the Committee asked the submitting State to work with the Secretariat for a later presentation to the Bureau. This meant that the later paragraphs would be amended in line with the precedent.
19. The **delegation of Palestine** noted thegood proposal that the Committee could approve.
20. The **Secretary** requested time to ensure coherence and consistency with the precedent.
21. The **delegation of Palestine** asked whether it would be agreeable to suspend the item in order to save time to allow the Secretariat to correctly amend the paragraphs.
22. The **Chairperson** suspended the item to allow the Secretary to carry out some corrections.

*[Suspension of agenda item 10.d]*

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

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

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that it had so far completed forty-seven individual files and sub-items 10. a, b, c, with sub-item 10.d just suspended, and one file remaining for Chamamé, submitted by Argentina. It was recalled that the examination of its corresponding draft decision had been suspended. As a reminder, when it was suspended on Wednesday, the Committee requested that the Secretariat reflect on a creative procedure that would allow the file to be examined by the Committee as soon as 2019. Responding to its request, the Secretariat gracefully accepted and presented to the Bureau the previous morning a proposal for a preliminary dialogue procedure. Following this, Bureau members undertook consultations within their respective Electoral Groups. It was the Chairperson’s understanding that in order to come to a consensus on draft decision 13.COM 10.b.1, the Committee first had to discuss the proposal presented by the Secretariat. The Chairperson therefore proposed first opening a general debate on the proposal for a preliminary dialogue procedure, after which there would be two possible solutions. If the Committee came to a consensus, then it would discuss and adopt the paragraphs concerning the dialogue mechanism that would be integrated into the draft chapeau decision 13.COM 10. Then the Committee would return to the remaining files under item 10.b. However, if a consensus around a preliminary dialogue mechanism did not emerge, then it would be best to resume the examination of the remaining files under 10.b. before starting a general debate under item 10 as originally planned. The Chairperson sought the comments and views of the Committee on this procedure. With no objections to the proposal made, the Chairperson opened the debate on the proposal for a preliminary dialogue. As this was a matter was of great interest, not only to Members of the Committee but also to all States Parties to the Convention, the Chairperson wished the debate to be as inclusive as possible. In accordance with Article 22.3 of our Rules of Procedure, he would first give the floor to Committee Members and then to Observers. As required, he may also seek the opinion of the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to present the Secretariat’s proposal.
2. The **Secretary** presented the proposal that offered States—whose files would be referred at the current session—the possibility to submit clarifications to the Secretariat prior to the first meeting of the Evaluation Body foreseen at the end of February in 2019 should they wish. These clarifications should respond to the concerns of the Committee and the Evaluation Body on the referred criteria and must be provided in the two working languages of the Committee, English and French. The word count should not exceed the total word limit set in the nomination form for the criteria concerned. The Secretariat would register acknowledged receipt of the clarifications received. It would not check if the information was complete. The Secretariat would then forward the clarifications to the Evaluation Body, which would assess these against its original recommendations on those criteria and review their initial recommendation on the basis of the clarifications received. The files concerned would be re-examined by the Committee at its fourteenth session in 2019 and would not be considered as newly submitted files. As previously mentioned, the Committee would need to review this procedure for discussion at the eighth session of the General Assembly, taking into account the preliminary remarks previously mentioned by the Secretary. These files would be considered above the adopted overall ceiling for the 2019 cycle and would not count in the quota of States concerned.
3. Taking note of the proposal, the **delegation of the Philippines** wished to clarify its position in that a dialogue had been called for in last two years, which was in fact a dialogue within the evaluation process. This proposal concerned files that were referred at this present session, which was thus a little different from the dialogue previously called for, and which the ad hoc working group had been working towards in consultation with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body. The delegation also wished to emphasize that the General Assembly had taken a decision on the dialogue within the evaluation process.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** noted the ongoing discussionamong Committee Members and other States Parties concerning this proposal, which it strongly supported, even though it was unfortunately an exception, albeit in an experimental phase. It fully agreed with the remarks by the Philippines that this was not the procedure that had been sought for two years, but it would nonetheless underline the importance of dialogue, as well as the need for dialogue as expressed during the present session. Having said that, the delegation felt that some Members might raise concerns in that it did not fully respect the provisions of the Operational Directives, accepting that this might be a problem. In any case, to address the concerns of the Philippines, the delegation suggested at this stage, and also on an experimental basis, that the Committee begin a pilot phase of upstream dialogue. This meant that for the files already in the pipeline for evaluation at the next session in February and June 2019, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat could be solicited once the recommendations on each file were terminated in June. They would then be asked to address questions on the criteria that were not satisfied, which would be sent to the States Parties concerned so that they could have the opportunity to respond in one of the two working languages and ahead of the third meeting of the Evaluation Body when it finalized its report in September. In September, the Evaluation Body would consider the replies and if they were satisfied, they would change the recommendation on the criteria concerned. If not, they would maintain the recommendation. This was the understanding behind the mechanism of dialogue that was being sought.
5. The **delegation of Djibouti** welcomed the proposal by the Secretariat, which was in fact a way to settle these minor problems. Nevertheless, it was stressed that the mechanism of dialogue sought was outside the framework of this session and must become a formal and standardized procedure that must enter into the different mechanisms of the Convention. The Committee was thus asked to consider whether it was necessary to experiment with a first phase to see how effective it could be in relation to the various minor issues that may arise. The delegation believed that it was indeed a laudable proposal.
6. The **delegation of China** welcomed the idea of the proposed dialogue procedure, which would help improve the evaluation mechanism and facilitate States Parties in their nominations, and it appreciated the Secretariat’s contribution. However, the Committee should be very cautious in taking this approach in order to make the dialogue mechanism really effective and efficient. The delegation emphasized a number of observations based on some facts. Firstly, the Evaluation Body follows some principle working methods, including recalling the recommendations of previous Bodies, as well as past decisions of the Committee when encountering cross-cutting issues. The delegation understood that the Evaluation Body should strive to be consistent throughout the files and remain neutral and equitable, taking into account the individual circumstances of each file. It should also strictly adhere to the principle of exclusively evaluating the content of the files without making any assumptions or value judgements. The Committee had already emphasized this approach in its Decisions [9.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/10) and [8.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/8.COM/8) that a decision not to inscribe or refer an element in no way constituted a judgement on the merits of the element itself but only on the adequacy of the information presented in the file. The General Assembly had adopted the first version of Operational Directives at its second session in 2008, which included the five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. In the past 10 years, 309 elements had been inscribed on the Representative List, satisfying all 5 criteria. The delegation took note that during the nomination process, States Parties found it particularly challenging to respond to criterion R.2. There was a frequent misunderstanding of the purpose of this criterion, resulting in the failure to satisfy this criterion, i.e. that inscription contributed to ensuring visibility and awareness of the significance of intangible heritage and encouraged dialogue reflecting cultural diversity and human creativity. This fully reflected the purpose of the Convention, according to Article 16, and also the Representative List, which should always be kept in mind. The good thing was that Form ICH-2 had been revised and would be used in the next cycle thanks to the efforts of the Secretariat. Section 2.1 is broken down into three subsections and States Parties are requested to explain how the inscription would be achieved at the local, national and international levels, respectively. Although the results of this revision were awaited in the 2019 cycle, the delegation believed that dialogue between States Parties and the Evaluation Body should be carried out upstream of the evaluation process instead of downstream, which was right before the Evaluation Body comes to finalize its recommendations.
7. The **delegation of China** nonetheless had three questions. Firstly, according to paragraph 28 of the Operational Directives, every year the Committee shall renew one fourth of the members of the Evaluation Body to balance the need for continuity and fresh inputs. If those clarifications are to be submitted before the first meeting of the Evaluation Body in 2019, how will it be ensured that the new members of the Evaluation Body remain consistent with the file and clarifications as the previous Body? At the same time, the limited resources available and the heavy workload that this might entail for the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body should also be taken into account. Secondly, will this dialogue mechanism be open to all criteria or only to files in R.2, as it was known that R.2 referred to the definition of intangible heritage as an overarching criterion? Regarding R.5, the delegation recalled that in 2017, the Evaluation Body used a dual system for draft decisions and that in this cycle nominations benefited from the new Form ICH-2 in which Section 5 was broken down into seven subsections. It was noted by the Evaluation Body that improvements had been made in the way States Parties provided information compared with previous cycles. As a result, no nomination in this cycle was recommended for a referral on R.5 alone. Thirdly, in this proposed dialogue procedure, even on an experimental basis, is it consistent with the relevant Rules of Procedure or does it touch upon any legal issues should the Committee decide to apply it before the relevant Operational Directives are amended and approved by the General Assembly?
8. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Secretariat for the work accomplished in presenting the Committee with an option, which it did not think ran counter to the Operational Directives. It was unsure whether this was indeed the case but it appreciated the effort and hoped the Committee would take a responsible decision in this session. The delegation could approve this proposal as it constituted a solution that would not create a precedent, nor would it be detrimental to either the spirit of the Convention or the selection criteria for the Representative List. It drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that since 2016, it had become increasingly clear from ensuing debates that there was a need to thoroughly review the criteria and the mechanism for nomination to the Representative List precisely in order not to create an imbalance or crisis situation as had occurred in Ethiopia when most of the files were approved by the Committee in many of the criteria. It was thus in the spirit of all the Members of the Committee to strike a balance so that the Convention became stronger. The Committee sought a just and balanced List that would allow for better protection, safeguarding and visibility of the Convention. The delegation could agree with the Secretariat’s proposal, but did not wish to dwell upon the issue much longer.
9. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Secretariat for its pragmatic and creative proposal, which was a step forward vis-à-vis the subject discussed three years earlier. The Secretariat had found a possible solution with this proposal, which responded to the situation that had arisen in the present session. The delegation understood that the Secretariat had undertaken this approach in careful consideration and with the assistance of UNESCO’s Legal Affairs. It thus saw this proposal as a pilot project that was moderate and cautious, with a very carefully delineated field of action. Its very restricted nature gave the Committee the possibility of advancing one of the goals of the Convention, i.e. dialogue; a goal that was shared by all. The delegation did not believe that this pilot project was going to change the Convention, simply creating some new, humble conditions for limited dialogue, which would be useful in managing the change towards more dialogue, as desired by the Committee. Moreover, should this pilot project work then the Committee could present positive results to the next General Assembly. The delegation thanked the Chairperson for asking the Secretariat to work on this proposal, which Colombia supported.
10. The **delegation of Jamaica** remarked thatthe proposal could inform the proposed dialogue mechanism. Jamaica felt that it should be mindful of the spirit of the Convention, which should encourage inscription. This was not to say that there should not be rigour in terms of evaluating nomination files, but at the same time the Committee should be cautious about seeming to be unnecessarily rigid. The proposal by the Secretariat was a useful way forward, at least on an experimental basis, and therefore Jamaica supported the proposal and it thanked the Secretariat for its considered input in this regard.
11. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Secretariat for the very welcome initiative, adding that it was not prohibited or addressed in the Convention, and thus provided the possibility of conducting a type of pilot or experimental project. The delegation remarked that often there was no possibility of dialogue prior to the Committee, which made it hard for submitting States to make the appropriate amendments. This proposal therefore allowed dialogue to take place after or at least during the Committee, and was thus a very beneficial initiative for the communities and bearers. They were the ones, after all, that needed to be recognized for their work and for contributing to the intangible cultural heritage of the submitting State Party. Guatemala was satisfied with the different interventions and noted that the proposal was not violating the Convention nor changing its spirit or nature. In addition, there was no Article ruling out an experimental project. The delegation thus urged the Members of the Committee to support this initiative. It was hoped that by 2020 a new article or a rule in the Convention would be in place to benefit the communities taking part in promoting these different manifestations of intangible cultural heritage, because there can be no intangible cultural heritage without culture bearers. In this regard, the proposal was very appropriate, as it considered the valuable participation of the communities.
12. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to respond to the proposed dialogue mechanism by the Secretariat, which it fully supported as it was part and parcel of the process discussed during the present session regarding dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States. It thus supported the proposal by Palestine and the Philippines to have this dialogue mechanism. However, it also asked that the dialogue be restricted to the first or second submission because further dialogue after the second submission would render the Evaluation Body redundant in the process. At the same time, it encouraged meaningful dialogue, i.e., that second chances when given were not squandered, which would again render the Evaluation Body irrelevant. The mechanism proposed was thus a good one, providing that it worked well.
13. The **delegation of Cyprus** also supported the proposal, on an exceptional basis, by the Secretariat, recalling that a working group had been established during the session in Addis Ababa to specifically work on dialogue. Unfortunately, for the last two years, other themes had been added to the work on dialogue, and therefore it had not reached its goal. At this session, it was clear that dialogue was a necessity and therefore it accepted this proposal in the hope that there would be a dialogue in the next examination cycle before the decision reached the Committee.
14. Having carefully listened to the discussion, the **delegation of Japan** had the impression that the reflection process had already started. It understood the need for a creative approach that would be satisfactory to all stakeholders given the issues faced in the implementation of the Convention. It appreciated the proposal by the Secretariat, but at the same time, the proposal was an exceptional measure with certain irregularities and ambiguity in its legality. Normally, exceptional measures are justified only to the minimal extent necessary. Hence, this measure should also be limited to the extent necessary. The delegation noted some differences between the amendment, which was proposed on an experimental basis, and the ongoing reflection of the listing mechanisms. It therefore wished to know whether these measures would only be applied to the files that had been referred at the present session. In other words, this proposal would not establish a precedent and therefore would not be applied to files presented at the Committee’s next session. In addition, the wording suggested that this procedure might continue until the reflection reached its conclusion, which, according to the calendar, would only conclude in 2022. The delegation’s second concern was related to the legal ambiguity that might arise from such an exceptional measure, which should be corrected as soon as possible. It was of the view that this proposal should seek endorsement by the next General Assembly in June 2020, as clearly the Committee could not wait until 2022. With regard to the proposal, the delegation therefore believed that: i) the verification should only apply to the files submitted in the present session; ii) its endorsement should be sought at the next General Assembly in order to correct the irregular conditions; and iii) a two-step reflection process was necessary, comprising a first step that required the General Assembly to agree on an ‘early harvest’ package that included this matter, and a second step that would see the completion of this process in 2022.
15. The **delegation of Senegal** fully supported the Secretariat's experimental proposal, which was going in the right direction. This was seen as a first step, even though it was hoped that a genuine upstream dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State would result in successful inscriptions for the submitting State. The Evaluation Body played a role, not to penalize but to accompany the submitting State in a pedagogical way, hence the need for upstream dialogue before a decision was made. Nevertheless, it was a process, hence why this first step was important. The delegation supported the proposal and congratulated the Secretariat.
16. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to speak, and also the Secretariat for preparing this proposal. Sri Lanka believed that the dialogue mechanism would benefit a large number of States Parties as an educational process in preparing the files and it therefore supported the proposal.
17. The **delegation of Lebanon** thanked the Secretariat for the proposal, which it supported, adding that it was a good start towards dialogue that everyone recognized as necessary.
18. As expressed at the Bureau meeting, the **delegation of Armenia** supported this initiative, commending the Secretariat for finding a way forward.
19. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Secretariat for its work and supported the proposal.
20. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** joined the other Members to support the mechanism.
21. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Members who supported the Secretariat’s proposal for their openness, adding that it also shared some of the concerns raised by some Members who did not want to see this experiment return in the next cycle. Thus, in order to avoid this outcome and given that the proposal was experimental, the delegation proposed that the dialogue mechanism be applied upstream and not downstream so that it could also apply to files in the next session of the Committee. Thus, at the second meeting of the Evaluation Body in June, after it concluded its recommendations on all the criteria, the Body could address its questions to the State Party concerned on the criteria that were unmet. The State Party could then respond to the Evaluation Body in August in either of the working languages, which would then be examined in September. If the Evaluation Body were satisfied, the recommendation would be changed accordingly; if they were unsatisfied, the original recommendation would be maintained. This would constitute an upstream dialogue mechanism, corresponding to the sentiment expressed by Members for an upstream dialogue. Noting the broad support for the Secretariat’s proposal, the delegation proposed discussing this second proposal.
22. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
23. The **delegation of Palestine** was not against giving the floor to the Observers, as they should give their opinion; however, there was a second proposal. The delegation suggested that the Committee first discuss this second phase, after which the Observers could give their opinion on the two proposals.
24. The **Chairperson** first wished to summarize the situation, which was supported by Jamaica. Despite the general feeling that there was a need to review the evaluation mechanism, three questions had been raised by China, and Japan had also raised a point regarding the legal ambiguity and the scope of the proposal, which were very pertinent issues. The Chairperson observed the quasi-unanimity among Committee Members on the need for an upstream consultation, an issue that had been raised for some time. While listening to the Committee Members, the Chairperson recalled that the Secretary had made his proposal on an experimental basis, but there was also the proviso that the Committee would need to acknowledge responsibility for this process until the matter was brought for discussion at the next session of the General Assembly in 2020. Japan and China had in fact raised very pertinent issues and the Chairperson wished to hear the opinions of the Committee Members on these issues, as it was important that the Committee, as an emanation of the General Assembly, went to the root of what it what advocating at the present session.
25. The **delegation of Japan** remarked that the summary was very precise and concise. Generally, it was ready to support the proposal if its concerns could be allayed on the two points raised earlier, that is, on the scope of application and the need to settle the legal ambiguity at the earliest possible time, i.e. by the next General Assembly in 2020. The delegation was thus ready to support the proposal if these points were properly addressed.
26. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Japan for its clear and understandable position, adding that all the Members of the Committee shared the concerns raised by China. However, it was understood that the proposal was exceptional and experimental, which meant that it did not comply with the provisions of the Operational Directives. It was known that the General Assembly adopts the Operational Directives, but it also accepted exceptions. Thus, at this stage—and after hearing all the Members supporting this mechanism—the delegation proposed this second phase so that it did not have to repeat this downstream procedure. In any event, after experimenting with these two procedures, the Committee would return to the General Assembly and remain accountable for its decision. The delegation did not believe that the General Assembly would solidly oppose, particularly if the positive outcome of these two procedures would provide further reflection on this mechanism. In addition, the amendments to the Operational Directives, as mentioned by Japan, could be adopted at the next General Assembly, such that this experiment would determine the positive and negative points that could be adjusted moving forward. Moreover, if the measures proved insufficient, the Committee would wait until the following General Assembly.
27. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that the discussion over the last few days had shown a need for dialogue and reflection on the listing mechanism, which it fully supported. It associated with the issues raised, most notably concerning the Committee going beyond its functions, as specified in Article 7, as well as the implications for the Evaluation Body in terms of workload and organization. In this regard, it wished to hear the opinion of the Evaluation Body. If the Committee had the mandate to assign these additional tasks then it could also ask for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, offered by Article 4.2. The delegation would therefore only support the proposal if it fell within the legal framework that ensured the legitimacy of the decision, adding that it would otherwise be very frustrating to create a false expectation now for the communities concerned at a later stage. It also wished to know whether the Committee’s decision now could be changed later due to its illegitimacy.
28. The **delegation of Djibouti** shared the same concerns as Austria on the legitimacy of this procedure. If the Committee were to carry out this experimental phase, it wondered whether a similar situation would arise at the Committee’s fourteenth session as the precedent would have been created such that this phase would continue into the next General Assembly.
29. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
30. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked the Chairperson for giving the floor to Observers, and for having indicated, quite rightly, that the Committee acts on the mandate of the General Assembly. Thus, in a decision of this type, all Member States should offer their opinion and remain well-informed. The delegation recalled that Algeria was one of the first delegations in Addis Ababa to call for dialogue, but it was also committed to the rules, and especially to the Convention. As the first signatory of the Convention, Algeria had more than once shown its commitment to the Committee and to the Convention. It had chaired the Drafting Committee of the Convention and hosted its first Committee, and it therefore held the Convention dear to its heart. The delegation was in favour of encouraging inscription and dialogue, but not at any cost. The integrity of the Convention, the Committee and the Evaluation Body must be preserved. Moreover, the Secretariat works very hard to enforce the Committee’s decisions and it should not be put in a difficult or impossible situation. Most importantly, the procedures that had been established by States Parties must prevail and be respected. The General Assembly elected the Members of the Committee with a very clear delegation of power, which must also be taken into account. As co-Chair of the ad hoc working group, the delegation remarked that during the almost one-year discussions with Member States on the topic, not one person was against dialogue but many were aware of its inevitability. However, dialogue must be realized within the rules, and adopted in a formal, clear and, above all, legal way. It should not serve as a consolation, but rather as a tool for improving the system and facilitating the work of the Committee. Thus, the Committee should be cautious over what it adopts. Algeria was not against dialogue, but the dialogue must remain within the rules.
31. The **delegation of Switzerland** had followed the discussions with great interest, but also a certain perplexity and concern, which echoed the remarks expressed by several of the preceding delegations. It understood the value of establishing a mechanism for dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States, and it supported those efforts. However, the establishment of a new system, which was not provided for in the Operational Directives approved by the General Assembly, even on an experimental basis, raised issues that needed to be seriously considered. For this reason, echoing what had been requested by other delegations, the delegation asked the Legal Adviser whether this proposal went beyond the terms of reference of the Committee, as specified in Article 7(e) of the Convention and approved by the General Assembly. In other words, was the proposal covered by this Article both formally and in a spirit of respect for the prerogatives of the General Assembly?
32. As a member of the General Assembly, the **delegation of Belgium** was very surprised by the proposal, the so-called preliminary dialogue with immediate effect. It agreed that the introduction of a mechanism of dialogue would be useful, but it would like to see it approved first by the General Assembly. The same was true for any other creative solutions that might come up later. In any case, experience-sharing and capacity building made for excellent nomination files, which would always be the best solution. First and foremost, the delegation questioned the urgency of this problem. It could understand it in the case of a nomination file for the Urgent Safeguarding List, Article 17, i.e. if there was a life-threatening urgency, but this experiment was triggered by a nomination file on the Representative List. Where was the urgency that motivated the decision to dispense with normal procedure and submitting it first to the General Assembly? The delegation sought the opinion of the Legal Adviser because in practice this decision suspended Operational Directive 36, which explicitly refers to the following cycle. Was it possible for the Committee to suspend one or more formal Operational Directives approved by the General Assembly, particularly on a so-called experimental basis in the middle of a procedure? The delegation did not find any such a possibility in the Rules of Procedure for the Committee. As this might influence a change in several Operational Directives approved by the General Assembly, the delegation wondered whether it might be better—if indeed it were so urgent—to mobilize Article 4, paragraph 2 of the Convention to convene an extraordinary General Assembly. Thus, fine-tuning the procedure was useful and a dialogue mechanism would be welcome, but only after approval by the General Assembly.
33. Thanking Belgium, the **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser to join the podium, requesting that the Secretariat refer the Legal Adviser to the two Articles mentioned by Belgium and the Article mentioned by Switzerland for his legal opinion.
34. The **delegation of Estonia** understood the goodwill that motivated this proposal, but it strongly shared the opinion that the Committee simply could not bend the rules of the Operational Directives, as established by the General Assembly. For this reason, it joined the request that the Legal Adviser explain how this proposal could be in line with paragraphs 36 and 54 of the Operational Directives. It also understood that the open-ended working group had reflected on the dialogue mechanisms for a long time and that many good ideas had been put forward, but the best and most viable solution had yet to be found. It would take time and therefore rushing into this kind of experiment was certainly not a good way forward.
35. The **delegation of Greece** found itvery interesting to hear all the different views. Leaving aside the legal issues raised by Belgium, Switzerland and Estonia, it found this experimental pilot procedure very useful, but only if it could be applied according to the rules that the Committee had itself established in previous cycles. Nevertheless, it would be in favour of this procedure, as it believed that it could be a valid way to foster real compliance with the requirements of the criteria for inscription, particularly on the Representative List. In many cases, there is a *verbal* compliance in the decisions, i.e. the Committee’s decisions can be quite different from the recommendations made by the Evaluation Body, and not a *real* compliance with the spirit and criteria under examination. The dialogue needed must therefore be structured, and this proposed procedure could be a real way for transparent dialogue such that there was compliance between the recommendations of the Evaluation Body and what was expected from the submitting State. This was the rationale behind this procedure and thus a good way forward, but only if the legal issues were not grave or in contravention. Furthermore, the delegation echoed the observations and concerns made by China, particularly on criterion R.2. It believed that this signified a moment of realization on the part of the submitting States and the communities that true compliance with the spirit of the Convention can only be expressed if R.2 is met accordingly. Another issue raised concerned the compliance of criterion R.5 or U.5 in the two Lists, which required receiving evidence or declarations that the element had not just been inscribed in an inventory but that the inventory was regularly updated. Just as intangible cultural heritage elements are dynamic and evolving, the inventories should follow and reflect this evolution. However, after the inscription of an element on the Representative List, there is no such requirement or even a relevant provision. This discrepancy between the two rules may in a sense be resolved with a new periodic reporting mechanism. However, unless a further discussion on the matter took place, the delegation believed that this contradiction would remain unresolved. Perhaps the Secretariat would deem it worthy to start some form of reflection process on this issue, or it could be included in the discussion on dialogue to ensure that already inscribed elements are updated. The delegation explained that there had been many instances where files had been inscribed with many sections not in true compliance with the Convention.
36. The **delegation of Germany** expressed the same position asAlgeria, Belgium, Switzerland, Estonia and Greece. It very much supported any creative, pragmatic or transparent approach for more dialogue, as discussed in the open-ended working group, but it wished to hear the position of the Legal Adviser, particularly with regard to Articles 36 and 54 of the Operational Directives. Was it possible to practise this new dialogue on an experimental basis without a prior change of the two Articles of the Operational Directives of the General Assembly?
37. The **delegation of Hungary** joined others in thanking Mauritius and the Chairperson for the generous hosting of this thirteenth session of the Committee. It also expressed its appreciation for the work of the Secretariat in preparing this meeting and for the smooth conduct of business. Hungary also believed that the issue of dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States Parties was indeed essential and an important question for the future of the Convention. Like the Committee, Hungary also felt the urgent need for this dialogue. However, it expressed concern regarding the procedure the Committee appeared to follow on this issue, adding that it agreed with the points raised by several delegations, including China, Japan, Algeria, Belgium, Greece and Germany. Indeed, the implications were far-reaching and this draft decision raised legal and procedural issues and was thus a question of governance. The question was whether the Committee had the power to take such a decision and overrule a decision previously taken by the General Assembly. The examination of files and the timetable was governed by the Operational Directives adopted by the General Assembly. Given these circumstances, did the Committee have the right, even on an exceptional basis, to override these positions of the Operational Directives?
38. The **delegation of Niger** took into account that the Convention is a dynamic Convention that has a certain rigour in its approach. The Evaluation Body applies the normative and regulatory texts of the Convention when it gives its opinion, decides and then transmits all its observations to the Secretariat. Regarding the dialogue mechanism, Niger was for a dialogue mechanism, but this mechanism needed to be carried out upstream, as well as to be endorsed within a framework for reflection, taking into account the Operational Directives and validated by the General Assembly before its application.
39. The **delegation of Latvia** expressed its appreciation for the hospitality of Mauritius and the Chairperson’s personal commitment to the Committee’s work. Referring to the discussions under agenda item 10.b and the possible way to proceed with nominations that had been referred, Latvia shared the concerns raised by several States Parties. According to Article 7 of the Convention, one of the functions of the Committee was to prepare and submit to the General Assembly for approval Operational Directives for the implementation of the Convention. The Committee, however, did not have the mandate either to amend the Directives or to suspend their application. As had already beennoted by previous speakers, according to paragraph 36 of the Operational Directives, as decided by the General Assembly, nominations, proposals or requests that the Committee decides not to inscribe, select or approve or to refer to the submitting State for additional information may be resubmitted to the Committee for examination during a following cycle after having been updated and supplemented, with paragraphs 54–56 providing the timetable of the respective procedures. Should the Committee wish to amend the Operational Directives, it may prepare and submit such amendments to the General Assembly for approval. This would be expected even for a procedure on an experimental basis, as was the case, for instance, regarding the present paragraph 27 of the Directives, where it is stipulated that this paragraph had been adopted on an experimental basis. As a State Party to the Convention and thus a member of the General Assembly, Latvia expected that the Operational Directives would be duly respected by the Committee.
40. The **delegation of Morocco** fully understood the purpose of the proposal submitted to the Committee. However, it seemed difficult to grasp its scope as the implementation procedure seemed complicated. In addition, the questions posed by certain Members of the Committee and Observer States seemed particularly pertinent in their references to the relevant articles and paragraphs of the Convention and the Operational Directives. Moreover, the proposed procedure was likely—if adopted—to have political, legal and practical implications that should be fully appreciated before going further. Another issue concerned the significance of certain words. For example, the notion of an ‘experimental’ procedure supposed that the process would continue until such a time as the experiment proved conclusive or not, which was distinct from an ‘exceptional’ procedure. In this case, it was unclear which approach was being proposed. The question was whether it was an experimental procedure that would be pursued over time, or an experiment on an exceptional basis that would not set jurisprudence thereafter, as it was for the General Assembly to decide the way forward.
41. The **delegation of Turkey** noted thegeneral agreement on the need for a dialogue during the evaluation process. It also understood the need for a creative approach to solve the issue and it appreciated the efforts of the Secretariat to that end. However, there should not be any doubts when adopting any exceptional measures so as to avoid creating a precedent that would go against the Convention’s own legal framework. Moreover, the Committee should seek the endorsement of the General Assembly before adopting any such measures that went beyond its mandate. The delegation wished to hear from the Legal Adviser on this issue, and if it was considered that the case before the Committee required urgent consideration then there was the option of holding an extraordinary session of the General Assembly, as suggested by Austria.
42. The **delegation of Norway** concurred that there were indeed several concerns regarding this suggested procedure, and it wished to receive more clarification on the matter. In addition, what would be the implications for the Evaluation Body and for the Secretariat in terms of workload, organization and mandate?
43. The **delegation of Sweden** agreed with several of the Observer States such as Algeria, Niger, Belgium, Morocco, Hungary, Estonia and Turkey, adding that it had not heard convincing arguments for the urgency of this proposed suggestion on an experimental basis. Although it welcomed any improvements in terms of dialogue, it believed that in order for it to be a truly legitimate process it needed to pass the General Assembly. In this regard, it wished to hear the view of the Legal Adviser on all the questions posed.
44. The **delegation of Belize** observed that the proposal put forward by the Secretariat was in fact an opportunity to uphold the spirit of the Convention centred on communities, and was thus an opportunity to test a procedure within the timelines of the Convention itself and the Operational Directives in the examination of files and to offer dialogue in a timely manner. Regarding the argument for going first to the General Assembly, the delegation remarked that the purpose of conducting an experiment was to have information to use going forward and it was thus an opportunity for the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body to test whether the procedure worked. It understood that the Operational Directives provided legal parameters for the Convention, but law comes out of philosophical approaches. In this regard, either one goes to the General Assembly to receive the mandate to act, or one goes to work towards an outcome that actually informs what happens at the General Assembly, which was a rather philosophical matter. It was the spirit of the Convention and the communities involved that prevailed and the delegation thus supported the proposal by the Secretariat. With regard to the valid point made by Japan, if the proposal referred only to the files in this cycle then it should be supported. Just like countries, the laws of the Convention evolve as situations evolve, and the need for dialogue had been discussed over a long period of time. There was no perfect system and, as such, this presented an opportunity to test a new procedure, which was not a violation of the spirit and in fact upheld the spirit of the Convention with respect to giving communities visibility. The Committee thought in terms of files, but communities were waiting at home, and for this reason the delegation endorsed the Secretariat’s proposal.
45. The **delegation of Mexico** reiterated the need to carefully examine the proposal put forward by the Secretariat on the possibility of changing the rules for the Evaluation Body. Many delegations, both Members of the Committee and Observer States, expressed a certain frustration over some of the decisions taken, which needed to be corrected. The delegation remarked that the Committee was fully entitled to thoroughly review the reasons for concern and that it was absolutely necessary for the Legal Adviser to support the Committee by providing more specific guidelines that would help guide this extremely important instrument. Moreover, the Convention was one of the most important instruments UNESCO had developed over the last fifteen years. Therefore, it was duty-bound to perfect it as much as possible, as States Parties were engaged in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.
46. The **delegation of Argentina** reminded the Committee that it was here to safeguard the intangible heritage of all peoples of the world and their cultures. It noted that a few Observer delegations consisted of only a single representative because certain States did not have the resources to travel and thus defend their points of view. The delegation listened to the many Observers that had expressed concern, but it had the sentiment that most of the Observers represented a single region of the world and not the peoples they were here to defend. The delegation returned to its open file on Chamamé whose community from Corrientes comprised one million inhabitants, almost the same population as Mauritius. The delegation explained that it had sought to provide some of the replies to all the questions in the file, but was unable to be convincing even though all the information existed in electronic form. Moreover, it had not been given the opportunity to speak after the break, although it had all the responses required. Laws are very important, but [on a personal note] as a former Legal Adviser at the Ministry, he also believed that the way a question is asked is also very important. With regard to the Secretariat’s proposal, the delegation felt that an opinion did not imply an obligation or was indeed binding. The question that should be asked is: Is this mechanism expressly prohibited? In that case, virtually every legal instrument in UNESCO would not be permitted. Moreover, exceptions were applied all the time, and the Committee had itself applied an exception at this very session to accept the inscription of the two Korean nations, which was an outstanding achievement. Consequently, Argentina had asked for an exception in order to have more dialogue, as desired by everyone, and to give the communities [of Corrientes] the opportunity to inquire as to why the information was not accepted in the proper form when the information was contained in the file, especially as the answer could be provided to the Evaluation Body in fifteen minutes during the present session.
47. The **delegation of Argentina** recalled [on a personal note] that, as a student learning economic theory, he had been told that reality was wrong if it did not fit with the theory. This was what had indeed occurred; reality was deemed wrong because it did not fit the rules of the game, even though the Committee was here to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. For this reason, the delegation had sought this experimental exception to promote dialogue and to see the results of this dialogue when the communities—through the submitting States—were given the opportunity in one month to provide the information requested. The delegation reiterated that the information required had been included in the annex of the document, which could be consulted at http://chamameargentina.org. Everything that the Evaluation Body had requested could be consulted online. For this reason, the delegation sought to implement the experimental dialogue mechanism, pursuant to the spirit of UNESCO, which advocated for the use of new technologies, to help the communities provide the information that bureaucrats themselves could not provide. These communities do not speak English or French, and in this case they speak Guaraní, the official language of the people of Chamamé. It was hoped that the Committee would feel empowered to not necessarily go along with the majority, which was not always in the right.
48. The **Chairperson** thanked Argentina, adding that he was glad to have listened to all the Committee Members and a few Observers. Summing up, the Chairperson noted a general consensus for dialogue during the process, before and at the time the nominations are considered by the Committee. This was more or less the universal consensus. The issue at hand was whether—while considering a particular file—the Committee could reconsider the file earlier than set by the procedure. The Committee had asked the Secretariat to formulate some recommendations, which had been offered. At the level of the Committee, most Committee Members wished to go in the direction proposed by the Secretariat, but a few Members—China, Japan, Djibouti and Austria—aquestioned the legality of the proposal and sought reassurance. Austria had gone a bit further and stated that the recourse could be an extraordinary meeting of the General Assembly to consider this issue. Various Observers had also expressed their views and what had emerged was the wish that dialogue should prevail, with various Members now wishing to be reassured by the Legal Adviser as to whether the Committee had the mandate to act in the way it wished. There were also a few Members who raised the issue as to whether there was an urgency, which could, accordingly, serve as a justification for an exceptional decision to provide a dialogue mechanism prior to a General Assembly. The Chairperson first gave the floor to China, after which the Committee would hear from the Legal Adviser.
49. The **delegation of China** thanked the Chairperson for his summary of the debates, adding that it wished to clarify its position. China felt a strong need for the dialogue mechanism and it very much appreciated the Secretariat’s creative approach. It had no objection to the idea of setting up a dialogue mechanism and it also agreed to include upstream dialogue in the evaluation process. Regarding the legitimacy issue, the delegation sought the contribution of the Legal Adviser to lead the Committee out of the ambiguity. If the Committee were completely assured of the right to adopt this proposal, then the delegation would be happy to go along. Moreover, it did not see two proposals, only the proposal by the Secretariat.
50. The **delegation of Palestine** askedthe Legal Adviser to differentiate between legitimate and legal, adding that such a decision could be legitimate even though not necessarily legal.
51. The **Legal Adviser** thanked the Chairperson for summarizing all the points raised, adding that he would try to respond to the question of legality versus legitimacy, and whether the Committee had the mandate to take this course of action and engage in this experimental procedure. The Legal Adviser began with some important overarching comments. The procedure was not compliant with the Operational Directives or a least not fully, and it would require a deviation from the Operational Directives for which the Committee did not have the authority. His advice in this regard was really no different from the advice provided earlier when he had spoken on this matter. The Legal Adviser recalled, as already mentioned on the floor, that based on Article 7(e) of the Convention, the Committee’s function and authority with regard to the Operational Directives was limited to “prepar[ing] and submit[ing] to the General Assembly for approval operational directives for the implementation of this Convention.” In other words, the Operational Directives constituted the legal boundaries within which the Committee could operate as approved by the General Assembly. The Operational Directives did not allow the Committee to either suspend or otherwise deviate from the provisions contained in the Operational Directives. It thus followed that procedures departing from the Operational Directives would remain the prerogative of the General Assembly unless, of course, the General Assembly delegated the Committee to do so, which was not the case at hand. At least two provisions of the Operational Directives would require derogation. Paragraphs 36 and 54, which were previously mentioned; paragraph 36 provides that referred nominations may be resubmitted for examination during a following cycle, and paragraph 54 provides a timeline of the cycle, which spans almost two years and not one.
52. The **Legal Adviser** explained that because the identified cycle constituted an integral part of the Operational Directives, the Committee did not have the authority to set a different cycle for the resubmission of referred nominations. A question was posed as to whether this procedure would constitute a change in the Operational Directives. The Legal Adviser understood that this procedure would apply on an experimental basis and for a limited period of time. However, the crux of the matter was quite different, as the Committee did not have the required authority for a temporary derogation either. The main legal consequence of adopting such a procedure, albeit on a temporary or experimental basis, would be that the Committee would be acting beyond its mandate. Should the Committee consider making changes to the referral mechanism, including the cycle, the proper way would be to propose amendments to the Operational Directives to the General Assembly for its approval, in line with Article 7(e) of the Convention unless, of course, the General Assembly convened an extraordinary meeting and delegated the Committee to do so for the purpose of the proposed procedure. A number of other provisions of the Operational Directives may be called into question, in light of what was said concerning the lack of authority of the Committee, and as such any discussion on any other provision would be moot. Regarding the issue on legality and legitimacy, the Legal Adviser did not believe that such a discussion would abate the legal concerns flagged, given the lack of authority of the Committee.
53. The **Chairperson** thanked the Legal Adviser and opened the floor to the Committee in light of the observation and in order to make an informed decision on how it wished to proceed given the possibilities to deal with the matter at hand.
54. The **delegation of Palestine** expected the opinion of the Legal Adviser and understood his position, which was very clear. It sought, however, to hear from the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body in order to come to an appropriate decision.
55. The **Secretary** replied that it had been asked to find creative solutions and this was as far as the Secretariat could go with the creativity as requested.
56. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** remarked that the Body worked under the terms of reference provided by the Committee and it could not go beyond what it was mandated to do. On issues of legality, it had no mandate to comment, and it operated on the mechanisms given.
57. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that thiswas indeed an important and very complicated issue. It thanked the Secretariat again for its efforts in this regard, explaining that they had spent all night working out this creative procedure that the majority of Committee Members supported. Unfortunately, however, a majority of Observers that were also States Parties to the Convention did not support the proposal and upheld the position of the Legal Adviser. Thus, at this stage, it was more appropriate to withdraw the proposal and maybe listen to other colleagues to look at another way to create a dialogue mechanism.
58. The **delegation of Poland** felt that in light of the explanation by the Legal Adviser, the Committee had no other choice, even though it supported the proposal by Palestine. The Committee had to think about a better future global mechanism for dialogue, which could be a possible area for reflection concerning these very difficult cases where the outcome greatly affected the local communities or bearers. The next session of the Committee would be the time to think about such instruments for presentation at the next General Assembly in 2020.
59. The **delegation of Japan** hadlistenedcarefully to the Legal Adviser and agreed with Palestine and Poland to withdraw the proposal. Neverthless, the Committee had engaged in a very fruitful and important reflection on the dialogue procedure, and the heated discussion reflected the imminent nature of the reform. While respecting the Secretariat’s proposed calendar, the delegation proposed that this issue and other impending issues should be tentatively addressed by the time of the next General Assembly in 2020.
60. The **delegation of Senegal** agreed that,in light of the advice by the Legal Adviser, it was advisable to withdraw the proposal and find another solution that respected the rules.
61. The **Secretary** remarkedon the very clear and interesting discussion on the dialogue mechanism and the need for reform of the evaluation process, noting that the Committee appeared to have come to a culmination of frustrations that started two years ago in 2016 in Addis Ababa. The Secretariat stood ready to fully support work on an upstream dialogue process to the best extent possible with a view to proposing a way forward at the next Committee, with draft amendments to be proposed to the General Assembly in 2020.
62. The **Chairperson** proposedreturning to the examination of the file by Albania, after which the Committee would return to the nomination file by Argentina. The Chairperson thanked everyone for having taken the opportunity to discuss such an important issue.

**ITEM 10.d OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the draft decision on Albania, recalling that the Secretariat had to undertake an exercise to clarify some wording. The draft decision was projected onto the screen. It was recalled that paragraphs 1–6 had been adopted. The Chairperson turned to paragraph 7, which ‘decides to approve the International Assistance request from Albania for community-based inventory of ICH in Albania with a view to safeguarding and transmitting to future generations, and requests the submitting State to work with the Secretariat in order to present to the Bureau within a maximum timeframe of six months a request revised in line with the recommendations of the Evaluation Body’. As Lebanon had proposed the amendment, the Chairperson asked the delegation for its views.
2. The **delegation of Lebanon** approved the revised amendments.
3. The **Chairperson** noted support for the new paragraph 7 from **Kuwait, Kazakhstan, Sri Lanka, Poland** and **Armenia**, which was duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 8 was the standard clause pertaining to a precedent case of International Assistance, as previously explained. The delegations of **Zambia, Sri Lanka, Kazakhstan** and **Armenia** supported paragraph 8.
4. The **delegation of Zambia** remarked that if Albania failed to submit a revised document within six months and did not receive the assistance, should there be an amendment to paragraph 8 that said ‘once granted at the end’ to anticipate such a scenario.
5. The **Secretary** clarified that this standard language had been used in a precedent case where this situation had arisen and a six-month period had been granted, thus changing the paragraph may not be in line with the precedent set.
6. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** of the **Secretariat** returned to the point raised by Zambia, noting that it raised the issue of reporting and the use of the ICH form. Zambia was making the point that in case Albania failed to work with the Secretariat to complete this International Assistance request, this clause on the report would be unnecessary or irrelevant. Thus, adding ‘once granted’ would bring coherence between the eventuality that it would be completed and the need for the report. The Secretariat was thus fine with this proposal.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that this responded to the request by Zambia and turned to paragraph 8, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 9 and 10 no longer served any purpose and were duly deleted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 10.d adopted**.
8. The **delegation of Albania** wholeheartedly thanked Lebanon for the amendments proposed, Kazakhstan for its very active support, as well as all the other Members of the Committee for their understanding, trust and support. The delegation reiterated that it was committed to making the best use of the assistance provided, first and foremost with and in favour of the communities involved for the safeguarding of the intangible heritage of Albania. It would therefore comply with the request in due time and work closely with the Secretariat.

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

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

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, recalling that paragraphs 1–5 had previously been adopted.
2. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked those who had expressed opinions on the experimental proposal, adding that it wished to see the presence of the Legal Adviser on the podium in future Committee and General Assembly meetings, as his opinion was valuable albeit not necessarily binding when it came to decision-making. Moreover, it was not the way to envisage neutrality given that he is a member of the Secretariat, which could suggest a certain manipulation. Thus, for the sake of transparency and decision-making in the future, there should be more participation [from the Legal Adviser], and the Committee should be given more tools in order to make the right decision. In the case of Argentina, the Committee was not able to make an informed decision, but the delegation encouraged the Argentine people to continue cultivating good practices and promoting intangible cultural heritage. The delegation identified with the communities and when such a request was not accepted, it was sad news for the communities. In the future, the delegation hoped that there would be an opportunity to make proposals and have prior dialogue before these assemblies.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Guatemala for its statement and proceeded to paragraph 6 as originally drafted, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 7 was also adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**13.COM 10.b.1** adopted](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10.b.1) **to** **refer the nomination of Chamamé to the submitting State Party**.
4. The **delegation of Argentina** spoke on behalf of the one million inhabitants of Corrientes who entrusted UNESCO, which had a duty to approach the community, just as the community had approached the Convention. It thanked the Secretary for his assistance in this case, which had taken up so much time and energy. The delegation remarked that it had to convince the Guaraní people to approach the culture of experts and UNESCO officials accustomed to the language of documents, forms, paperwork, when they had to use English and French to complete forms that were imposed upon them, which perhaps were not as clear as they could have been. The delegation had convinced the communities to use ICTs and that was why they included all the information requested by the Evaluation Body online, as referred to in the file. The file contained two annexes, one of which had all the information requested. The delegation now had to return in two years with a new proposal and resume the inventory, which was said not to have been given a date even though the nomination file clearly mentioned 6 January 2017, which was never mentioned. If new technologies taught to indigenous people served no purpose in the future, then they should be informed. The delegation insisted that Chamamé is intangible world heritage, even though it takes bureaucrats to recognize it as such. Moreover, the file had been prepared a long time ago and the Guaraní communities need to be respected. The delegation asked the Members of the Committee to safeguard intangible cultural heritage by not driving people away from UNESCO. This file would be presented again without the use of new technology.

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2018**

1. Thanking Argentina for its statement, the **Chairperson** noted that the Committee had completed the examination of forty-nine individual files under sub-items 10.a., 10.b., 10.c. and 10.d. He then proposed returning to the debate on the report of the Evaluation Body under item 10.
2. The **delegation of** **Japan** had listened to the debate with great interest and proposed a two-step approach to address the immediate need of the pending issues, particularly the evaluation process that would be a central part of the discussions in the reflection process. Step one should be completed by the next General Assembly in 2020, which should discuss the immediate issues, including the evaluation, possibly completing the comprehensive review by 2022. The second step concerned the central issue of the evaluation process, and the delegation suggested a few points that should be discussed based on the debates of the present session: i) the length of reference ii) good access to information by the evaluators, particularly the information available on the internet, ensuring a very good formula to enable this; iii) the important issue of dialogue, particularly upstream dialogue. The nominator should be given the chance to revise the file after the initial discussion with the evaluators. This process would not only encourage a revision of the file, but would also encourage the revision of their programmes and policies so as to strengthen the safeguarding of the element, serving the basic purpose of the Convention; and iv) the issue of R.2, should also be addressed. One suggestion was to devise the questionnaire in a way that made it easier for the nominator to respond, but at the same time, there were some fundamental issues reflected by so-called inappropriate language, and one should return to the original intention and purpose of those who created the Convention. The delegation understood that intangible cultural heritage was different from the concept of OUV and World Heritage, but at the same time, did the terms ‘uniqueness’, ‘originality’, ‘authenticity’ and ‘universality’ have to be categorically rejected? The delegation strongly doubted so. Communities cherish, maintain and safeguard an element in many cases because the element is a reflection of their unique identity. Thus, uniqueness provided the foundation for the community to bear, cherish and safeguard the element. In many cases, it was because of its uniqueness and originality that it could help promote the diversity of culture and the creativity of humanity. In addition, the concept of inappropriate language made the preparation of the file very difficult for the nominators, which was entirely unnecessary.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that Japan had expressed much of its sentiments.
4. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its hard work and for the quality of its report. It noted that the report had raised a number of important issues and challenges, which would potentially guide the Committee and the States Parties in the years to come. The delegation had some concerns regarding the examination of criterion R.3, noting that very often the draft decision referred to a safeguarding *plan* while criterion R.3 required *measures,* as described in the nomination form under paragraph 2 of the Operational Directives. It was thus important to keep the distinction between safeguarding *measures* and *plans* as the nature of the criteria in both Lists was different. The delegation proposed an amendment to the draft decision in that sense. Finally, it noted that, compared to previous cycles, the report of the Evaluation Body did not present options this year with regard to criteria R.5 and U.5, and it considered that a similar approach could still have been applied in the case of a number of nominations evaluated in this cycle.
5. The **delegation of Poland** joined the comments made by Japan and the focus on the need for a global dialogue, as the most important aspect for UNESCO was to safeguard intangible cultural heritage through its promotion among members of the communities, the bearers of the intangible heritage, for whom the most important thing is their own cultural identity. The delegation spoke of R.2 that would be used for the 2019 cycle, thanking Japan once more for providing an opportunity for the global reflection on the listing mechanisms. It also flagged its will to discuss with all interested stakeholders, in the framework of this global reflection, the possibility of introducing changes in the nomination form that would simplify it by keeping the original wording of this criterion. The delegation was available for further discussions on this issue, knowing that the result of the new revised nomination form would be available in 2020.

The **Chairperson** suspended the day’s session, thanking everyone for having participated, and the interpreters for the extra time accorded to the session.

*[Saturday, 1 December 2018, morning session]*

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2018**

1. The **Chairperson** began the session by informing the Committee that it was behind schedule at this point, adding that the remaining agenda items were crucial for the Committee to able to function in 2019. These items included: i) the establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2019 cycle (item 14); ii) the number of files submitted for the years 2018 and 2019 and the number of files that could be treated in the 2020 and 2021 cycles (item 15); iii) the date and venue of the fourteenth session (item 18); iv) the election of the Bureau of the fourteenth session (item 19); and v) the adoption of the list of decisions (item 21). The Chairperson therefore suggested returning to item 13.COM 10 and adopting the draft decision, recalling the long discussions on the main lines and needs concerning the nomination process. In light of the limited time, the Committee Members were asked to keep their interventions short and to the point. The rest of the morning should see the completion of agenda items 14–16. The Chairperson also shared the news that the interpreters had agreed to take one hour for lunch instead of two. In the case of limited time, the Committee would not examine item 17, follow-up on the implementation of the relevant recommendations of the open-ended working group.
2. The **delegation of the Philippines** hoped to have enough time to discuss item 17, as it would not take very long to adopt the draft decision.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that under ‘other business’, Palestine had a brief issue it wished to raise. Concerning item 21, the Committee had to adopt the list of all the decisions adopted up to the lunch break, and the Chairperson suggested that in the interest of time the Committee delegate to its Rapporteur the responsibility for validating the remaining decisions. For the sake of transparency, the Secretariat would distribute the decisions adopted during the lunch break. The Secretariat would publish the decisions in the final [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM) version by the end of 2018. The Chairperson then turned to draft decision 13.COM 10.
4. The **Secretary** informed the Committee that amendments from two States had been received the previous evening. Three amendments had been presented by Azerbaijan in paragraphs 11, 12 and 13; four amendments had been presented by the Philippines, Palestine and Sri Lanka under paragraphs 15, 16, 17 and 18; and two new paragraphs from Japan in paragraphs 18 and 19.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to proceed on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
6. The **Chairperson** remarked on the many proposals for amendment, and turned to the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 had a slight technical correction, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 3–10 were also duly adopted. Azerbaijan proposed a new paragraph 11 [recalling the importance of distinguishing between safeguarding plans and measures], which was duly adopted. Paragraph 12 [previously paragraph 11] had an amendment at the end of the sentence.
7. The **Secretary** explained that this particular amendment posed a problem because it asked for a description on how individuals were chosen to represent communities to be able to give free, prior and informed consent on their behalf. The Secretary explained that there were no clear directives on which individuals could represent communities, and there are many different forms of communities in different parts of the world. Some are represented by individuals, others by groups of individuals, and some have different forms of representation. The Secretary believed this requested amendment would put the Secretariat in a bind as it would not be able to implement it given that there was no clear definition in any directives in this matter. Moreover, it was for the communities to decide how they wished to represent themselves.
8. Following the explanation, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** withdrew its amendment in paragraph 12.
9. The **Chairperson** thanked Azerbaijan and the original paragraph 12 was duly adopted. A new paragraph 13 was proposed by Azerbaijan [concerning inventory extracts].
10. The **delegation of Armenia** asked for time as it was first time it had seen the amendment.
11. The **Secretary** explained that this was the same wording as in Decision [10.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/10.COM/10), a decision already adopted by the Committee at its tenth session, and was thus a reiteration. The Secretariat did not see a need for this paragraph, but neither did it change the status relating to R.5.
12. The **delegation of Palestine** noted a linguistic error in ‘refers its decision’, which should ‘refer to a decision’, as it could be confused with ‘referring the decision’, implying a rejection.
13. The **delegation of Armenia** asked Azerbaijan for the rationale behind this paragraph and what was implied by ‘complementary to the information included in the nomination file’.
14. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** added that this amendment was based on the report of the Evaluation Body, adding that it wished to keep the amendment, though it was very flexible.
15. The **delegation of Armenia** remarked that the Secretary did not see the need to repeat this paragraph and, noting the flexibility of the delegation, preferred to omit the amendment.
16. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** showed flexibility and withdrew its amendment.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Azerbaijan for withdrawing the amendment and the paragraph was deleted. The paragraphs were duly renumbered, and paragraph 13—with the slight amendment from ‘refer to’ to ‘further recalls’—was duly adopted. Paragraph 14[[36]](#footnote-36) had an amendment presented by the Philippines.
18. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that this proposal was supported by a number of Committee Members. It explained that the overall theme of this session had been dialogue and it was fitting that it was here in Mauritius, a model of interracial intercultural harmony. It was noted from the earlier discussion and in the summary presented by the Chairperson that there was a general consensus for dialogue as an upstream mechanism in the evaluation process. The General Assembly had in fact delegated to the Committee the need to develop an appropriate dialogue mechanism. This had been done at the last General Assembly through its Decision [7.GA 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/7.GA/6), paragraph 5. The proposal took all this into account and sought a pragmatic approach to remain compatible with the suggested two-step process discussed the previous day; that the reflection procedure would look first at the evaluation and then towards possible amendments for the 2020 General Assembly. The delegation thus suggested a pilot dialogue mechanism for 2019 with a view to coming up with the right amendments to present to the General Assembly in 2020. It did not think that this proposal in any way contravened the Operational Directives nor the will and desire of the General Assembly, which already mandated the Committee to work on dialogue. Nor did it infringe the Committee, which had clearly witnessed over the last four or five days the need for dialogue, nor the expectations of the many communities in the field where this work was necessary.
19. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that theproposal from the Philippines was very clear, adding that it did not affect the Operational Directives.
20. The **delegation of Cuba** supported this proposed amendment, adding that it was consistent with the earlier discussions among Member States. The Philippines was very clear so there was no need to reiterate the valid arguments.
21. The **delegations of Cyprus** and **Colombia** also supported the amendments.
22. The **Chairperson** recalled the events of the previous days and the issues raised by a few Committee Members regarding the additional workload, inviting the Secretariat to respond to the potential concerns in paragraph 14.
23. The **Secretary** thanked the Philippines who had indeed highlighted the importance of dialogue, which had emerged from this Committee session, as well as many others themes including overall reform and rules. However, although workload is a constant problem, and the proposal did represent an additional work, the issue lay in Rule 55. Rule 55 states, “Phase 2: Evaluation, Meeting April–June for final evaluation by the Evaluation Body”. This meant that by June, the Evaluation Body had to make its final evaluation. Thus, according to Rule 55, the Evaluation Body could not change its evaluation *after* the June meeting. With regard to paragraph 14, this meant that the procedure could apply, but that the Evaluation Body would not be able to take the information into account and change its evaluation based on the upstream dialogue. It could nevertheless be tested on an experimental basis, but it would not affect the evaluations made in 2019, in the application of the Rules.
24. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretary and took note of his response. It agreed that the paragraph in Operational Directive 55 did mention the April–June meeting for the final evaluation by the Evaluation Body. However, there was no mention in the paragraph of the Evaluation Body’s September meeting. The delegation wondered why it is not contained in the Rule, and therefore why indeed it took place. It therefore appeared that the practice was already in contravention of Rule 55. The argument had always been that the Committee must follow the Rules, but the September meeting was absent from Rule 55. Indeed, there was mention of the September meeting in the previous Rule 54; however, that pertained only to the deadline. The delegation wished to be constructive, having heard the political will of the Member States from the General Assembly to the Committee over the last two years since the debacle in Addis Ababa in which certain decisions of the Committee might have been different under the current situation. The delegation was therefore asking for some flexibility, as it was not going against the Operational Directives, and that the Committee should go ahead with this provisional measure to see how it would progress.
25. Regarding the meeting in September, the **Secretary** explained that this meeting was held so that the Evaluation Body could get together to agree on the content of the reports; this had always been the practice. The Secretary invited the Evaluation Body to speak about the evaluation process and also for the Body to make clear whether it had ever changed one of the decisions in September.
26. The **delegation of Cuba** recalled thelengthy discussion the previous day on the mandate of the Committee, as delegated by the General Assembly. Thus, it would save time to go to the General Assembly with a concrete proposal. The delegation recalled that the Committee was an intergovernmental entity and that there was never enough time in the General Assembly. It therefore requested a bit of flexibility, as this intergovernmental proposal was a way forward in bringing a concrete proposal to the General Assembly, not least because this had been discussed over the last few sessions and it was within the guidelines.
27. The **delegation of Austria** remarked on the palpable tension in the room, adding that it had already expressed support for dialogue and reflection. In Austria there was a saying *Vom Hudeln kommen die Kinder,* which roughly translated as, ‘if you are too hasty, there will be children’, implying that one has to live with the consequences for a long time. The delegation recalled that Decision [7.GA 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/7.GA/6) referred not only to the Committee but also to the [informal ad hoc] working group, so the proposal should also go through the open-ended working group.
28. The **delegation of Palestine** noted that the Secretariat had two approaches in respecting the Operational Directives, adding that the Philippines was clear that Rule 55 has no mention of the September meeting. Thus, from a legal perspective, the meeting was illegal. The delegation also agreed with Austria that paragraph 5 of Decision 7.GA 6 also mentioned the [informal ad hoc] working group and the Committee.
29. The **delegation of Poland** tookaccount of the previous day’s discussions and concerns and suggested that the Legal Adviser be allowed to share his opinion as to whether the Committee had the right to suggest such solutions.
30. The **delegation of Cyprus** noted that theSecretary explained that the meeting of the Evaluation Body was held in September when the Body gave its final decision on the examination of the files. In this case, the Body could indeed report its final decisions after the dialogue.
31. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that it hadalways been consistent in wishing for upstream dialogue, and therefore if this experimental phase was possible and in line with the Operational Guidelines, it would support it.
32. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
33. The **Secretary** wished to assure the Committee that the idea was to move towards upstream dialogue, but he also wanted to be sure that this was conducted in compliance with the Rules. He also clarified that the final evaluation did not mean final decision in that the final evaluation takes place in June. The Secretary asked the Evaluation Body to provide an explanation on how it conducts its business. However, it was clear that the Committee was bound by the Rules of the Operational Directives. The Secretary was happy to take on this workload in the current cycle, but he was not convinced that the Evaluation Body was allowed to change its evaluation after June. The Rule had always been that the Evaluation Body conducted its evaluation on each criterion in the files in June, which did not get changed in September. The Secretary was nonetheless open should there be legal flexibility.
34. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explainedthat in early March, the Body has its first meeting with the new members to share the procedures with them, to conduct a mock evaluation and to agree on the timetable and work to be accomplished within the year. The Members then immediately start their individual online evaluation of each file from March to May. Before the Body meets in mid-June, a general sense of what everybody has done is appraised. The Body then meets for the entire week where every item, criterion by criterion, is considered in every file, taking into account the opinions of all twelve members (six experts and six NGO representatives) to reach a consensus. Each file is reviewed to consider the content in the file, and around July, the Rapporteur begins to draft the recommendations. The purpose of the September meeting is to validate, and ensure that the information in the report is exactly as agreed in June, and normally no changes are made at all. The Chairperson was concerned that if the drafting of the recommendations started in July and covered the early part of August, at what point would the Body communicate to the State Parties to submit the new information. Essentially, when the evaluations have been made, in case the file has some technical incompleteness, there is a chance—up to around June—to submit any additional information. The lingering questions are: Will the nomination file be revaluated? At what point is the Body going to receive the information? Is the Body going to conduct an individual online examination of the new information before reaching a consensus? For these reasons, the Body required the Committee to come up with a mechanism that would enable the Body to accomplish its work before September, because in September the Body validates and then works towards a final draft to ascertain whether this is exactly what was previously discussed, after which the documents are translated and made available online by the end of October. The Chairperson remarked that it was the time limit that might really affect the Body, depending on the mechanisms followed, but the Body also supported dialogue as long as it did not contravene any Operational Directives in its procedure.
35. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat and the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for their comments and for sharing their procedures. It appreciated the willingness to try, as no one was against dialogue. Responding to Austria, the delegation explained that the decision of the General Assembly referred to the informal ad hoc working group and the Committee. The informal ad hoc working group had in fact worked on dialogue for the last two years. The delegation believed that the time was now ripe, following the discussions during the present session and noting that it did not go against the Operational Directives, as well as the flexibility and openness to try. Moreover, if the Committee were to propose amendments, should it not try some kind of mechanism beforehand to ensure that the proposal was good and workable? Even if it were not to work the following year, it should still be attempted. For these reasons, the delegation had submitted these amendments, and in consideration of the hesitation and/or opposition over two Committees already. This was now the third Committee and it was thus time to make a decision in this sense.
36. The **Secretary** had no objection to try this procedure in this cycle, but he wanted to be assured that the Evaluation Body could change its decision after June, even if it were on an experimental basis to prepare Operational Directives to see what works. Still, it remained unclear whether the Evaluation Body could change its recommendation after its June meeting, but the Secretary was willing to ask Legal Affairs on his return to Paris.
37. The **delegation of Kuwait** supported the position voiced by the Philippines.
38. The **delegation of Palestine** wanted tosee the support by Members of the Committee noted on the screen. It thanked the Secretary for accepting that the proposal was indeed possible and feasible, even though it would involve some additional work and the concern centred on whether the Evaluation Body could legally change the recommendations in September. However, legally speaking, the Body could not meet in September, as it was not written into the Rules, suggesting that there was a double standard.
39. The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat to add all the names of support to the amendment.
40. The **delegation of the Netherlands** regretted that the Legal Adviser was absent, as it sought to hear his advice on this issue, recalling some of his words the previous day, such as, ‘this is not compliance, this is a deviation’, ‘you do not have the authority to adjust’, and ‘we cannot allow to suspend or deviate from procedures’. In addition, the co-Chair of the ad hoc working group from Algeria also had some serious objections to this proposal.
41. The **delegation of the Philippines** called a point of order, adding that despite the valid point made by the Netherlands, it was referring to the Secretariat’s proposal and not this proposal, which was different. The Secretariat’s proposal sought to change the referral cycle, which clearly contravened the Rules. However, this proposal did not change anything.
42. The **delegation of the Netherlands** took note of the point made, nevertheless if the proposal attempted to change the Rules then the Committee should have legal advice. Moreover, Decision 7.GA 6 requested that the informal working group present its recommendations to the General Assembly, which did not imply the presentation of an experimental proposal.
43. The **Secretary** reiteratedthat the Secretariat was not unwilling to test the procedure, only that there was a question of process. He also maintained that the September meeting was not illegal because it was not an evaluation meeting but a report writing exercise. The Secretary noted the Committee’s desire to start a process now and test it towards 2019. He agreed that it could be done, and this was probably the creative solution that was sought. Having gone through this process in 2018, he could not be assured that the Evaluation Body could actually change its evaluation after June. However, it may be that the Committee in 2019 finds itself having to confront a report where the Evaluation Body includes references to clarifications that were made *after* the June meeting, but that do not affect its initial evaluation, somewhat similar to the dual option, while pending the revision of the Operational Directives in 2020. He believed that this could be a way forward on this issue.
44. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** supported the proposal of the Philippines.
45. The **delegation of Lebanon** noted thatthemood was to support dialogue and therefore some flexibility should be shown. However, this situation appeared confusing because if the Committee applied this dialogue but the Evaluation Body could not change the decision, then there seemed little point to the exercise. Nevertheless, the delegation called on everyone to be more flexible and to support changing [the procedure] on an experimental basis or pilot project so that the Committee could come up with a serious proposal to the General Assembly.
46. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** reiterated its decision to support the Philippine’s proposal.
47. The **delegation of Cuba** wondered whether all the decisions taken so far in the present session were actually in perfect compliance with the rules and regulations. Moreover, the presence of a Legal Adviser might actually have resolved this situation, as there had been different answers to the various questions throughout the debate and he would have been a deciding voice. The delegation noted, however, that there was broad support for this proposal, and as an intergovernmental body, the Committee had the mandate to decide.
48. The **Chairperson** moved toclose the debate, as it was clear that all Committee Members were agreeable to adopting the proposal.
49. The **delegation of Senegal** alsovoiced its support.
50. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of paragraph 14 and remarked on the discussion and the endeavour to find flexibility, which had been sufficiently canvassed.
51. The **delegations of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Sri Lanka, Senegal, Lebanon, Zambia, Togo, Guatemala, Jamaica** and **Djibouti** were added tothe list supporting the proposal by the Philippines that included the Philippines, Palestine, Cuba, Cyprus, Colombia and Kuwait.
52. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 14 adopted.
53. The **delegation of Palestine** suggested that, for the sake of time, the same Committee Members also supported paragraphs 15 and 16.
54. The **Chairperson** had the same intention and added the same support for paragraphs 15 and 16, unless otherwise stated, which were duly adopted. It was noted that paragraphs 17 and 18 had an amendment proposed by Japan.
55. The **delegation of Japan** presented its amendments to paragraphs 17 and 18, which reflected its previous discussion on the idea of the two-step approach for the reflection process. Paragraph 17 concerned the first step and the ‘early harvest package’ of the reform, including the evaluation process, in time for the General Assembly in 2020.
56. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatit was clear that there was coherence with the proposal in paragraphs 14, 15 and 16 and that it reflected the appeal by all Members of the Committee. The delegation thus supported paragraphs 17 and 18.
57. The **Chairperson** noted support from the same delegations that had supported the previous paragraphs, including **Palestine, Lebanon, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Poland, Cyprus, the Philippines, Colombia, Guatemala, Togo, Jamaica, Zambia, Armenia, Cuba, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Azerbaijan** and **Djibouti**.
58. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that the title ‘Towards a dialogue mechanism’ should be moved from paragraph 15 to precede paragraph 14, as it referred specifically to dialogue.
59. With no further comments, **the Chairperson declared decision 13.COM 10 adopted**.

**ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2019 CYCLE**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/14*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-14-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 14*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/14)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the next agenda item, item 14, inviting the Secretariat, Ms Fumiko Ohinata, to present the item.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** of the **Secretariat** explained that the Committee was invited to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body (Annex 1 to working document 14) and to nominate two experts and one NGO (in conformity with Decision [9.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/11)) with one expert from Electoral Group I, one expert from Electoral Group II, and one NGO from Electoral Group V(a) (as well as to re-elect the nine elected members of the preceding years). Ms Ohinata informed the Committee that: i) 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) two experts from Electoral Group I; ii) three experts from Electoral Group II; and iii) three NGOs from Electoral Group V(a). Annex 2 of document 14 listed the candidates, the experts’ CVs and associated websites, and NGO accreditation requests.
3. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding in the order in which the Secretary introduced the work by first looking at the terms of reference, before proceeding with the appointment of the three new members of the Evaluation Body. In accordance with the Committee’s Rules of Procedure and in particular Section B of Rule 39, the Committee would proceed with a vote by secret ballot to elect the three new members of the Evaluation Body. The terms of reference of the Evaluation Body in Annex 1 were shown on the screen.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** sought some time to include some amendments so as to be coherent with the decision just adopted, and suggested suspending the discussion on the terms of reference and going to the election.
5. The **delegation of the Philippines** supported the suggestion by Palestine.
6. The **Chairperson** suspended the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body.
7. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that all Members of the Committee would receive three ballots, one for each vacant seat and one envelope. Each Member was invited to select a choice for each of the three 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 encircle 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 as an abstention. Ballots on which more names than vacant seats had been encircled, and those with no indication of voter intent, would be considered as invalid. A roll-call would be made after a five-minute break.
8. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for any questions on the process.
9. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to remind the candidates, especially the NGOs, to present their CV and activities so that the Committee knew for whom they had voted, as not all the CVs of the experts or the credentials for the NGOs had been received. The delegation surmised that the working group could think of something similar as for the 1972 Convention.
10. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** asked a colleague to display the annex to document 14 that presented the CVs for Electoral Groups I, II and V(a), which was accessible by clicking on the hyperlinks, or by going to the accreditation forms for the NGOs whose information was also available.
11. Thanking the Secretariat for the explanation, the **Chairperson** sought two tellers among the Committee Members. The delegates of **Kazakhstan** (Ms Zhazira Kul-Mukhammed) and **Sri Lanka** (Mr Asoka Siriwardana) joined the podium.
12. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** conducted the roll-call in French alphabetical order of Member States: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Cameroon, China, Cyprus, Colombia, Cuba, Djibouti, Guatemala, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritius, the Netherlands, Palestine, the Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo and Zambia.
13. The **Chairperson** noted that all the envelopes had been collected, and while waiting for the count, proceeded with agenda item 15.

**ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA**

**NUMBER OF FILES SUBMITTED FOR THE 2018 AND 2019 CYCLES AND NUMBER OF FILES THAT CAN BE TREATED IN THE 2020 AND 2021 CYCLES**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/15*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-15-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 15*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/15)

1. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** of the **Secretariat** explained it was customary to include this item on the Committee’s agenda every year. However, the Committee had already established the ceiling of files for the 2019 cycle at its eleventh session and thus this item was not on the agenda at its twelfth session in 2017. Following the same reasoning, the Secretariat proposed that, from now on, the Committee examine this issue every two years at sessions falling in even-numbered years, which would better distribute the Committee’s workload, not least because several items were examined only in odd-numbered years. Examples included the Report of the Committee to the General Assembly, the draft plan for the use of the resources of the ICH Fund, the accreditation and review of accredited NGOs, and so on. It was noted that document 15 addressed two issues: i) the experience regarding the files submitted for the 2018 and 2019 cycles; and ii) the number of files that can be treated in the next two cycles (2020 and 2021). Ms Ohinata further noted that the Committee—by its Decisions [10.COM 13](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/10.COM/13) and [11.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/11.COM/12)­—had set a ceiling of fifty files per year, with at least one file per submitting State to be processed over the two cycles. In accordance with those decisions and the priorities established by paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives, fifty-one files would be treated for the 2019 cycle and fifty files were treated for the current 2018 cycle. For the 2019 cycle, fifty-one files instead of fifty files would be treated because five files had the same level of priority; the Secretariat exercised flexibility to include all the files in the same category, according to Decision 11.COM 12. The files fell into four categories: i) category zero (0) files from States whose national files could not be treated in 2018, corresponding to thirty-two files for the 2019 cycle; ii) files from States with no elements/programmes/International Assistance requests or Urgent Safeguarding List nominations, corresponding to three files for the 2019 cycle; iii) multinational files, corresponding to five files for the 2019 cycle; and iv) files from States with the fewest elements inscribed, in ascending order. For the 2019 cycle, the ceiling of fifty-one files, representing fifty-one submitting States, had been reached with the nomination of Tajikistan, which had one element already inscribed; twenty-two States with two or more elements inscribed could not have their files treated but would have them treated in priority for the 2020 cycle. Fourteen States with four or more elements inscribed could not be treated in the 2018 cycle but would be prioritized for the 2019 cycle. It was noted that in recent years there had been a significant increase in the number of files from submitting States that had not had their files treated in the previous cycle, i.e. category zero. In the 2019 cycle, there were thirty-two such files, i.e. two thirds of all files treated.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** referred to the table on the screen, which showed the clear trend in the increasing number of files in category zero (0) and the decreasing number of files in category (iii). Should this trend continue, States Parties may face a situation where even multinational files might not be treated, and thus the current system of priorities might require a revision in the near future.The Committee was called upon to decide on the overall number of files to be treated in 2020 and 2021 by keeping in mind the available resources of the Committee, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body, including the time available and the collegial nature of the Evaluation Body. The Secretariat proposed keeping the ceiling of fifty files per cycle. Ms Ohinata explained that the Committee was asked to pay attention to a broader scope of implementation of the Convention, as well as more complex and a greater number of issues. These included the issues related to sustainable development, intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and in urban contexts, and intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education. Additionally, the Committee was asked to review a number of the mechanisms of the Convention, fifteen years since its adoption. In the current session alone, the Committee had been called upon to discuss a number of complex issues. Furthermore, the Secretariat was facing an increasing workload, in line with the growing number of States Parties. The Secretariat was also supporting States Parties both through the global capacity-building programme and through statutory mechanisms. The capacity and workload of the Evaluation Body was also another consideration. Each of the twelve members assesses every file individually before the joint evaluation to reach a consensus on each specific criterion for each file, as previously explained by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body. Experience showed that even if the Evaluation Body was reinforced with more members, the time available during a cycle was very tight.Regarding the future, even though the trend towards a greater number of files to be treated was worrisome, the Committee should perhaps consider other reflections that had begun in parallel before taking steps to change the existing practice. Ms Ohinata recalled that under item 6, the Committee had accepted Japan’s offer to support the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, and it was clear that the future of the inscription process would be affected by the outcome of that reflection.
3. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
4. The **delegation of Cyprus** askedwhether it was possible to transfer a nomination file to 2019 that would normally be examined in 2020 because two files on the same subject would be examined in the same year.
5. The **Secretary** remarked that there had been very long discussions on whether files could change cycles to enable the evaluation of files from one cycle to another, which had been a big issue at this particular Committee session. However, the Chairperson had been very clear that the evaluation of a file could not be moved from one cycle to another, unless there was a revision to the Operational Directives.
6. The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision.
7. The **delegation of Cuba** wanted to add that the order in which files are examined was a very sensitive issue, and it wished to draw the Secretariat’s attention to that fact so as to invite further reflection in order to strike a balance vis-à-vis the criteria used to determine the cycle of examination. The delegation reminded the Committee that submitting a file raised a lot of expectations such that it was a delicate matter when a file was only examined in a much later cycle. Hence the need to fine-tune the mechanism, which should be borne in mind.
8. The **Chairperson** took note of the observation. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, **the Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 15 adopted**.

**ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT OF THE INFORMAL AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/16*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-16-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 16*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/16)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 16 and the report of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group, recalling that it had first been established at the eleventh session of the Committee in 2016 and led by the Chairperson of the twelfth session, H.E. Ambassador Lee Byong-Hyun. At its twelfth session in 2017, the Committee decided to continue this working group, opening it to all interested States Parties. The Committee also redefined the working group’s mandate to cover five main areas, as outlined in Decision [12.COM 13](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/13). The Committee at that time did not appoint a Chairperson, which was discussed at the first Bureau meeting in March 2018. As the Chairperson was not based in Paris, the delegations of Algeria and the Philippines had kindly agreed to serve as co-Chairs for the group, taking on the role with enthusiasm and advancing the work well, for which the Chairperson was grateful. The Chairperson also thanked the States Parties that had participated in and followed the work of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group throughout the year, adding that the fruitful discussions would contribute to the better implementation and sound governance of the Convention. As noted in document 16, the report and the draft decision had been prepared by the working group. The Chairperson invited the co-Chairs to present their reports.

*[The Co-Chairs of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group joined the podium]*

1. The **delegation of Algeria, co-Chair of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group,** thanked the Chairperson and the Members of the Committee for the chance to work on this issue. Speaking on behalf of the co-Chairs, the delegation was very honoured and happy to present his report. It was noted that many States Parties had attended the meetings held in Paris throughout the year, which took place between the twelfth session in Jeju Island [in 2017] and the present session. The report outlined fourteen recommendations made to the Committee. During the several meetings, many delegations had spoken, but there were also discussions with representatives from NGOs and the Evaluation Body. The co-Chair was very happy with the way the discussions had taken place, which would have been enhanced had colleagues been able to express more about their concerns so as to help solve some of the problems that arose during the meetings. Nevertheless, he hoped that the report captured the spirit of the discussions and the spirit of what the Committee wished to happen at this session. Regarding the discussion around dialogue, the co-Chair remarked that it was one of the most discussed points in the meetings, and there was a sense of inevitability of dialogue as Member States want this dialogue to happen. In that sense, he was happy to note the decision that had just been adopted.
2. The **delegation of the Philippines**, **co-Chair of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group**, expressed thanks for the confidence and trusted bestowed upon the delegations of Algeria and the Philippines to co-chair the working group in 2018. The co-Chair also warmly thanked the Secretariat for its support and presence during the meetings, and the Evaluation Body and NGO Forum representatives with whom there had been very constructive dialogues and discussions. He thanked the co-Chair from Algeria for his dedication, wise counsel and efficient teamwork throughout the year, as well as all the States Parties that had attended the three meetings in Paris. The co-Chairs had tried their best to reflect the consensus on the key issues that were under its mandate, as provided by Decision [12.COM 13](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/13). In a nutshell, the issues tackled concerned resource mobilization, the implementation of the governance recommendations, reflection of the dialogue mechanism, and the accreditation of NGOs, as well as other matters to facilitate the work of the Committee. Good discussions had been had and fourteen recommendations proposed, which he hoped would strengthen all the mechanisms of the Convention. The co-Chairs were available to answer any questions, and it was hoped that the report reflected the true spirit of engagement of all States Parties in the discussions.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked the two co-Chairs for promptly agreeing to share their report of the open-ended ad hoc group, and all the Members who had participated during the discussions.
4. The **Secretary** remarked that in paragraph 7 of the draft decision, it was not indicated whether the group would indeed once again be open-ended or not. Committee Members were thus invited to decide its nature before adopting this decision. The Secretary appealed once more for resources, adding that the Secretariat was unable to provide secretariat services to the working group owing to limited human and financial resources, as was the case in 2017 and 2018.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** wished tothank the two co-Chairs for their hard work, adding that it had some slight amendments to present.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine, knowing that it had participated in the open-ended committee. He then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. Palestine had an amendment in paragraph 7.
7. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatas Decision 13.COM 10 just adopted had proposed a provisional pilot mechanism for dialogue, paragraph 7.a could now be deleted. In which case, paragraph 7.b would become 7.a. and the delegation proposed a minor amendment in the now paragraph 7.a.
8. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether the meeting was going to be open-ended.
9. The **delegation of Austria** believed that theworking group should remain as inclusive as possible, and thus wished to add ‘open-ended’. However, it did not seek the deletion of paragraph 7.a, adding that just because the Committee had adopted a decision to start this creative experiment, the working group could still further reflect on a dialogue mechanism, also in consultation with the Evaluation Body.
10. The **delegation of Zambia** aligned with the comment by Austria, adding that it had no issue with retaining paragraph 7.a, so that the decision remained as self-contained as possible.
11. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated the working group that had produced this report on the recommendations, which it fully endorsed. It also supported expanding the group of reflection to allow all States Parties to express their views and to participate actively.
12. The **delegation of Cuba** supported the proposed amendment by Palestine, but it also understood the concerns of the Secretariat given the lack of resources and its growing workload. Nevertheless, it was vital that the process continue and that the Secretariat remain part of it, even if it could not provide secretariat services, as long as it was present.
13. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported Austria on the working group remaining open-ended.
14. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatthe new proposed paragraph, ‘other issues to facilitate the work of the Committee’, could also include the dialogue mechanism and thus opened the door for any issue that Members wished to raise, knowing that the result of the mechanism would be tried in 2019. The paragraph was therefore not in contradiction, and the reflection on the dialogue mechanism would still be contained in 7.b.
15. The **delegation of the Netherlands** supported the suggestion by Austria to keep the working group open-ended. However, it did not support the suggestion to delete 7.a, adding that there was a saying in the Netherlands, ‘you shouldn’t throw the baby out with the bath water’, implying that one should be cautious, and thus it was best to keep reflecting on the appropriate mechanism. The delegation suggested that Palestine and Cuba agree to combining paragraph 7.a and 7.b, which would read, ‘further reflect on appropriate dialogue mechanisms to strengthen transparency […] and other issues to facilitate the work of the Committee’.
16. The **delegation of Algeria** thanked the Chairpersonfor thefloor, adding that it did not wish to interfere in the decision-making of the Members of the Committee, who are sovereign. However, offering some advice, it suggested that the Secretariat, when it came to finalizing the wording of the dialogue, could meet with the Member States to explain the steps that it would put in place and that the open-ended working group was the appropriate place to discuss this point. Thus, instead of ‘reflection’, the delegation proposed ‘exchange’ with the Secretariat on the future steps of the dialogue, which was more pertinent. In this way, there would at least be one meeting with the Secretariat, the Committee Members and Observer States to better understand the range of steps on dialogue envisaged by the Secretariat. The recommendation was therefore to meet on the issue of dialogue, perhaps not ‘to reflect’, as the decision just adopted was in this sense, but on how the dialogue would be established.
17. The **Chairperson** thanked Algeria for its pertinent suggestion, which aligned with the sentiment expressed by Cuba.
18. The **Secretary** thanked Algeria, whose last comment made a lot of sense. Indeed, the proposal was experimental, but the Secretary was still unconvinced that evaluations could be changed, though there could be a way for it to work. He agreed that it would be important to have some kind of informal gathering with the working group so as to present the proposal once the Secretariat had been able to examine the procedure.
19. The **delegation of Austria** found that the mention ‘other issues’ seemed too vague and that there was no alternative proposal should the experiment prove unsuccessful. It also wanted to see legal grounds developed, hence why [paragraph 7.a] should remain.
20. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the proposal by Algeria, noting that the Secretariat was very much in favour of an exchange between the Secretariat and the working group.
21. The **delegation of Djibouti** recalled that it supported the extension of the mandate of the informal working group and it also supported the proposal by Algeria, as co-Chair.
22. The **Chairperson** asked whether Palestine could take the comments into consideration and propose the wording so as to reach a consensus.
23. The **delegation of Palestine** thankedall the speakers and Algeria for their inputs. Indeed, it would be useful to have an exchange with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body to discuss the implementation of the experimental phase of the dialogue mechanism, as well as any other issues that might facilitate the work of the Committee. It also supported the working group remaining open-ended. The delegation thus proposed, in paragraph 7.a, ‘exchange with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body on the implementation of the experimental dialogue mechanism as well as any other issues to facilitate the work of the Committee’.
24. The **delegation of Lebanon** supported the open-ended nature of the ad hoc working group.
25. The **delegation of Djibouti** reiteratedthat it wished to see its name among the supporters of paragraph 7.
26. The **delegation of China** believed that that there was a different understanding between the proposal by Palestine and that of Austria, as the exchange with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body did not necessarily mean that all the interested parties that would like to participate in the working group can be involved in this exchange process, which was a different process. The delegation was thus unsure which approach the Committee should take. In any event, it agreed that the working group should remain open-ended.
27. The **delegation of the Netherlands** wondered whether it was possible in paragraph 7.a to add a reference to reflect on alternatives to the experimental dialogue mechanism.
28. The **Secretary** understood the concern given the highly sensitive nature of the issue of dialogue and reminded the Committee that the working group is informal and nothing is decided in the working group that cannot come through a formal working group, a Committee session or a General Assembly. As informal discussions, these meetings are not mandated to make decisions, but only to present them to the Committee or to the General Assembly. In that sense, the Secretary took note of the comment from China, adding that once the meeting is open-ended, all States Parties may attend any meetings that this group organized.
29. Addressing the concerns of the Netherlands, the **delegation of Palestine** explainedthat the Committeewould indeed continue its reflection, but at this stage it had adopted an experimental mechanism so the reflection would continue after having experimented with this phase, following the results, whether successful and useful or not. The delegation agreed with the Secretariat that this was an informal working group, but that this exchange was actually a form of reflection on the implementation of the mechanism itself, hence the latter part of the paragraph, which read ‘any other issues to facilitate the work for the Committee’.
30. The **Chairperson** noted that China and the Netherlands were reassured with the explanation, turning to paragraph 7 as amended, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 8 was also pronounced adopted. Turning to the adoption of the decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 16 adopted**.

**ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2019 CYCLE**

1. The **Chairperson** returned to agenda item 14 and the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body, on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. It was noted that the Philippines had proposed an amendment to paragraph 6 of the Terms of reference.
2. The **delegation of the Philippines** proposed a new paragraph 6, which would read, ‘Shall conduct a provisional dialogue with submitting States Parties during the evaluation process in accordance with Decision 13.COM 10 and 7.GA 6’.
3. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** of the **Secretariat** understood that the proposal was ‘on an experimental basis’ and wondered whether this aspect could be reflected in the decision.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed to the amendment by the Secretariat.
5. The **delegation of Austria** did not oppose theamendment, but regretted that the Legal Adviser had not been consulted on these overall decisions, as mentioned by the Netherlands.
6. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced the new paragraph 6 adopted. Paragraph 7 [previously paragraph 6], and the last paragraph [not numbered] were also duly adopted. The terms of reference were thus adopted.
7. The **delegation of Palestine** had a small remark concerning the Evaluation Body and its terms of reference, explaining that it had been composed, on an experimental basis, of twelve members. It was understood from the procedure that the 12 members had to present their recommendations on each criterion, i.e. 5 criteria in every file multiplied by 50 files, equalling 250 criteria that had to be examined and a consensus reached on each. The delegation added that the inclusion of ‘other issues that may facilitate the work of the Committee’ could include a reconsideration of the composition of the Evaluation Body, perhaps diminishing it in size, which the working group could examine.
8. The **Chairperson** was pleased to announce that the ballots had been counted. Twenty-four Committee Members were present and voted. The following candidates had received the following votes:

I. **Electoral Group I** – seat for one expert.

i. The expert Ms Stavroula Fotopoulou (Greece) received **6** votes.

ii. The expert **Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo (Italy)** received **18** votes and was duly elected.

II. **Electoral Group II** – seat for one expert.

1. The expert Mr Donatas Brandišauskas (Lithuania) received **9** votes.
2. The expert Ms Milica Nikolić (Montenegro) received **5** votes.
3. The expert **Ms Ľubica Voľanská (Slovakia)** received **10** votes and was duly elected.

III. **Electoral Group V(a)** – seat for one accredited NGO.

1. The NGO Amis du Patrimoine de Madagascar (APM) received **6** votes.
2. The **NGO Association pour la sauvegarde des masques (ASAMA) (Burkina Faso)** received **14** votes and was duly elected.
3. The NGOMali Cultural Heritage Agency (Mali) received **4** votes.
4. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three new members of the Evaluation Body and thanked the other candidates, inviting the Secretariat to provide information on the draft decision.
5. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** clarified that, in accordance with paragraph 28 of the Operational Directives, the Committee was invited every year to renew three members of the Evaluation Body. The term of office of members must not exceed four years. When the Committee had established the first Evaluation Body at its ninth session in 2014, a specific rotation system had been set up for a four-year period. According to this system, the term of office of each member varies from one to four years in order to ensure equitable geographic representation and to make three seats vacant each year. This rotation system was completed with the Evaluation Body that served in the 2018 cycle. For the next cycles, each member would be similarly elected for a four-year term. Paragraph 5 of the draft decision was formulated to keep the Committee informed, and to record in writing the date on which certain seats become vacant.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for the clarification, and with no forthcoming comments, turned to the adoption of the draft decisionon a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted. The names of the three newly elected members were added in paragraph 6, which was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 14 adopted**.
7. The **Secretary** noted a certain apprehension or unease on the part of some States on the experimental approach to the upstream dialogue as proposed. He wished to reassure everyone that the decision in its current form could be implemented without breaking the rules. However, the final decision would most likely come through the Committee rather than through the Evaluation Body, meaning that the Committee could be faced with a dual option scenario, as had occurred in 2017, in order to apply this procedure and make it fully compliant. The Secretary also insisted that the September meeting [of the Evaluation Body] had never been illegal, reassuring the Committee that the Secretariat would work hard to move ahead with this upstream dialogue process and ensure that all the Rules of the Operational Directives, under the mandate of the General Assembly, were respected.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the comforting remarks, and turned to agenda item 17 and the Follow-up on the implementation of the relevant recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Governance, Procedures and Working Methods of the Governing Bodies of UNESCO, which had been included at the request of the Committee in 2017.

**ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA**

**FOLLOW-UP ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RELEVANT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON THE GOVERNANCE, PROCEDURES AND WORKING METHODS OF THE GOVERNING BODIES OF UNESCO**

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/17*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-17-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 17*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/17)

1. The **Chairperson** introduced the next agenda item, item 17, recalling that it was included on the current agenda at the request of the Committee at its twelfth session in 2017.
2. Referring to Decision 12.COM 16, the **Secretary** confirmed that the decision had indeed been taken by the Committee in 2017 to include this item on the agenda. Moreover, the work of UNESCO’s house-wide Open-Ended Working Group on Governance Procedures and Working Methods of the Governing Bodies had already been discussed at the Committee’s twelfth session, as well as at the seventh session of the General Assembly in June 2018. It was recalled that, at its twelfth session, the Committee had focused on Recommendation 107 that specifically addressed the 2003 Convention, which states, ‘the need to strengthen decision-making procedures and credibility of Committee, taking due note of Ad Hoc Working Group established to address these issues’. Based on the deliberations of the twelfth session of the Committee, at the seventh General Assembly the Secretariat had prepared a table containing twenty-six recommendations of direct relevance to the 2003 Convention, with a description of each of their situations at that time. These recommendations were analyzed in terms of four categories: ‘closed’, ‘ongoing’, ‘action proposed’ and ‘action required by States Parties’. The Assembly noted two parallel processes linked to the issue of governance: i) one was prompted by Resolution [6.GA 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Resolutions/6.GA/11) on harmonizing the Rules of Procedure of the different culture conventions of UNESCO; and ii) one concerned the recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group on Governance. This was particularly valid because some of the recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group called for harmonization of the rules and procedure of the international and intergovernmental bodies of UNESCO.
3. The **Secretary** explained that faced with a situation of two parallel processes, the General Assembly considered that these two issues should not be discussed in isolation. The Assembly had therefore adopted Resolution [7.GA 13](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Resolutions/7.GA/13) to consider the amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly within the framework of the recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group in order to produce a single set of consolidated amendments. The Assembly had also called upon the Culture Sector to facilitate the process ‘by providing a matrix containing the consolidated amendments to the rules of procedure of the above-mentioned bodies’. Following the seventh session of the General Assembly, the Cultural Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG) had discussed Resolution 7.GA 13 and decided on the necessary steps for the preparation of the matrix. It was noteworthy that for the 2018 publication of the Basic Texts, the Secretariat ensured that gender-neutral language was used, according to Recommendation 73 and Resolution [7.GA 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Resolutions/7.GA/12).Document17presented not only the status of recommendations, as presented to the General Assembly, but also the progress made in implementing them since the seventh session of the General Assembly. The draft decision suggested that the Committee take note of the status of recommendations regarding the Convention, as well as the ongoing efforts of the Culture Sector in harmonizing the rules of procedure of the governing bodies of the six culture Conventions.
4. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
5. The **delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the Secretariat for its excellent work on this item, which it had closely followed and supported over the years. In particular, it welcomed the publication of the Basic Texts with gender-neutral language, and Recommendation 67 on harmonization of the composition of the Bureau, as mentioned by the Secretary. The delegation was also in favour of amending the Rules of Procedure of the Committee at a future date at the General Assembly. It also had a slight technical amendment to the draft decision to present.
6. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. An amendment was proposed by the Philippines in paragraph 7.
7. The **delegation of the Philippines** suggested replacing ‘Open-Ended Working Group’ with General Conference 39C/Resolution 87, explaining that the Open-Ended Working Group had fulfilled its mandate and that its recommendations had already been adopted by the 39th General Conference.
8. The **Chairperson** noted that the Secretariat had no issue with the proposed change. With no further comments or objections, paragraph 7 was duly adopted as amended. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, **the Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 17 adopted**.

**ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/18*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-18-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 18*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/18)

1. The **Chairperson** the turned to next item on the date and venue of the fourteenth session of the Committee in 2019, referring to document 18 and its corresponding draft decision. The Chairperson was happy to inform the Committee that Colombia had graciously proposed to host the next session, inviting Colombia to directly extend the invitation to the Committee.
2. The **delegation of Colombia** invited the GRULAC Member countries – Saint Lucia, Panama, Mexico, Belize, Cuba, Argentina, Guatemala, El Salvador and Jamaica – to join its delegation for the first time that Latin American would host the Committee. It thanked Mauritius for its warm invitation to this beautiful island, even though it would have liked more time to explore its beautiful landscapes. The delegation extended its thanks to the Committee and all the countries supporting its candidature as the next host, as well as UNESCO, CRESPIAL[[37]](#footnote-37) and the city of Bogotá. Colombia had had difficult moments in its past and in those difficult times there were many people that had fought to keep their intangible cultural heritage. Colombians had been able to use the Guahibo or ancestral knowledge and sayings for comfort. At the same time, Colombians had been continuing to celebrate the Carnival de Barranquilla or the Carnaval de Negros y Blancos in San Juan de Pasto despite those turbulent times, and they had always had time to listen to the music of Vallenato or to recall some of the songs of the cattle ranchers in the eastern highlands. It was also a reminder that this heritage did not only belong to Colombians but to everyone from all the 163 countries that comprised the Convention. Colombia extended its invitation to the big family of this Committee, inviting everyone to taste the heritage. It sincerely hoped that despite all the discussions and proposed amendments there would be time to step out from one’s working roles to join together and be reminded of just how marvelous this Convention was. The delegation invited the Committee to watch a video message presented by the Minister of Culture, Ms Carmen Inés Vásquez Camacho, from the city of Bogotá.
3. The **Chairperson** congratulated Colombia, turning to the Committee with the proposal from Colombia to host the fourteenth session, suggesting that the kind offer be accepted by acclamation. He thanked Colombia for this excellent opportunity, giving thanks from the Committee.

*[Adopted by acclamation]*

1. The **Secretary** recalled that Rule 4.1 of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that the Committee shall determine at each session, in consultation with the Director-General, the date and place of the next session. The Secretary had confirmed with the Director-General and the authorities of Colombia that the fourteenth session could be held from 9 to 14 December 2019, and the draft decision was amended accordingly.
2. The **delegation of Cyprus** asked the Secretariat to check that the proposed dates did not coincide with other meetings, especially the 1954 Convention and the Second Protocol.
3. The **Secretary** thanked the future host country of Colombia for its flexibility in working with the Committee to ensure that it could find a date that did not conflict with any of the previous meetings, particularly the 13th meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the 1954 Convention on 2 December, the 8th Meeting to the Parties to the Second Protocol to the Hague Convention from 3–4 December, the 14th Meeting for the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict from 4–6 December, and the 13th session of the Committee of the 2005 Convention, which was yet to be decided and it was still unknown whether it would be hosted in December or postponed until February to allow enough time between the various culture conventions.
4. The **Chairperson** also wished to thank Armenia who voluntarily agreed that the next session in 2019 would be in Colombia.
5. The **delegation of Armenia** offered sincere congratulations to Colombia, but its invitation to visit its beautiful country still remained.
6. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared 13.COM 18 adopted**.

*[A short film on Colombia with a message from the Minister of Culture was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Secretariat would distribute the list of decisions adopted up to the morning session during lunch. It was the responsibility of the Rapporteur to validate all the decisions of the thirteenth session, including those that would be adopted in the afternoon. The Secretariat would then publish the final versions of the decisions by the end of 2018.
2. The **Secretary** announced that the Secretariat would send a satisfaction survey to the delegates’ email addresses and would appreciate their timely submissions in order to improve the organization of the statutory meetings of the Convention.

**ITEM 19 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*ITH/18/13.COM/19*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-19-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*13.COM 19*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/19)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 19 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. It was also customary for all Electoral Groups to be represented in its Bureau through the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons. In such cases, according to the Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs, the Rapporteur should not express his/her opinion or vote in the capacity as Rapporteur so as to respect the principle of equitable geographical representation within the Bureau pursuant to Rule 12.1 of the Rules of Procedure. The role of the Rapporteur was to validate the decisions taken by the Committee and its Bureau after having been prepared by the Secretariat. It was also customary for the Chairperson of the Bureau to come from the host country and therefore Colombia would serve as Bureau Member for Group III. The Chairperson announced that Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano, Secretary of Culture of Bogotá, Colombia, had been proposed.

*[Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano was elected Chairperson by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to propose a Rapporteur.
2. The **delegation of Cuba** proposed Mr Bernard Jankee of Jamaica as Rapporteur, who was duly elected.
3. The **Chairperson** noted from the Bureau the proposals for the Vice-Chairpersons, which were as follows:
   1. Electoral Group I: Austria
   2. Electoral Group II: Poland
   3. Electoral Group III: Colombia
   4. Electoral Group IV: Philippines
   5. Electoral Group V(a): Zambia
   6. Electoral Group V(b): Palestine
4. The **Chairperson** noted that the draft decision had been amended accordingly. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared decision 13.COM 19 adopted**.

**ITEM 20 OF THE AGENDA**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Decision:** [*13.COM 20*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/20)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the examination of item 20, other business, inviting Palestine to take the floor to raise its issue.
2. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to propose a draft decision related to indigenous languages. The United Nations had declared 2019 as the International Year of Indigenous Languages and there were UNESCO reports of hundreds if not thousands of languages disappearing every year. The purpose of the draft decision was therefore to highlight the importance of safeguarding indigenous languages and also to highlight the action of UNESCO in this regard, while encouraging States Parties in their future nominations to consider nominating elements related to these languages, as language is mentioned in the Convention as a vehicle for intangible cultural heritage elements. In this regard, the delegation wished to hear from NGOs involved in the safeguarding of indigenous languages.
3. The **Chairperson** opened the floor for Observer NGOs.
4. A Representative of the **NGO Traditions pour Demain,** Mr Diego Gradis, remarked that all accredited NGOs were invited to join the ICHNGO Forum online on its website. So far, the five NGOs working in the field had offered their support: Teje Teje (Colombia); Conseil québécois du patrimoine vivant (Canada); Contact Base (India); Gulu Theatre Artists (Uganda); and the Mauritanian Association for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Many accredited NGOs work directly with indigenous peoples and communities in five continents to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage. For this reason, Mr Gradis appealed to the States Parties concerned with this issue to make a substantial contribution to the International Year of Indigenous Languages ​so as to engage a maximum number of possible inscriptions on the Urgent Safeguarding List for elements related to indigenous languages, and so that concrete programmes in this area were also designed and implemented. It was noted that the Convention specified that intangible cultural heritage is also manifested in oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vector of intangible cultural heritage. Oral traditions, values, knowledge of nature and its management, intergenerational transmission, in fact almost all traditional knowledge and cultural expressions depend on language. To cite one example, the Inuktitut language of the Inuit in the Arctic has no fewer than a dozen basic words, i.e. not derived from another basic word, to refer to snow and a dozen words to describe ice, all of which are very important, especially for hunting and the displacement of people. According to the latest edition of the *2011 Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger[[38]](#footnote-38)*, to date 3,000 of the 6,000 living languages are threatened with extinction in the short or medium term. A large majority of them are aboriginal languages. To deprive a person of his or her language is to directly affect not only the person but also future generations. A language that disappears is an immense loss for the community and the world, seriously degrading the social cohesion of the community and its identity. Accredited NGOs working to safeguard intangible cultural heritage will implement many language projects in 2019 as part of the international year and disseminated by UNESCO. Globalization and the digital world, as well as migration, whether for economic, security or environmental reasons, have compounded the threat to languages and the cultural survival of thousands of communities. For these reasons, the NGOs strongly encouraged States Parties to commit inscriptions of elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List for indigenous languages during the international year. It was considered important that these processes be initiated with the full participation of the communities concerned.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the representative of the NGO and Palestine for raising this very important issue. The draft decision proposed by Palestine was projected onto the screen.
6. The **Chairperson** noted support for the draft decision from **Cuba, Senegal, Guatemala, Togo, Djibouti, Cyprus, Jamaica, the Philippines, Zambia, Japan** and **Armenia**.
7. The **delegation of Colombia** alsosupported the proposal presented by Palestine, but wished to add the inclusion of the Representative List and the Register of Good Practices in paragraph 5.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** suggested acknowledging with satisfaction the efforts made by UNESCO in paragraph 3.
9. The **Chairperson** suggested,since the Committee was agreeable in principle and since it was a question of wording, but also taking into account the comments by Lebanon, Kazakhstan and other Members, that the Committee agree to the draft decision as a whole with the few suggested amendments, allowing the Secretary to correct the wording to have a sense of what Palestine wished to convey as a decision by this Committee.
10. The **delegation of Zambia** wondered whether ‘by the UNESCO’ was needed in paragraph 3, and ‘the’ was deleted.
11. The **delegation of Senegal** wished to present a point of information.
12. The **delegation of Colombia** proposed including mention of the action by the Secretariat to send this invitation, inviting States via their National Commissions and the Permanent Delegations to respond to this draft decision, that might bring to the forefront the Year of Indigenous Languages in 2019 among all Member States of UNESCO.
13. The **Secretary** remarked that there were house-wide actions that would be undertaken in UNESCO on the Year of Indigenous Languages, but he was happy to draw specific attention to this decision and circulate it among the delegations.
14. The **Chairperson** noted that the draft decision reaffirmed the Secretariat’s support of the Year of Indigenous Languages as a sign of encouragement.
15. The **delegation of Cyprus** wished to add a reference to NGOs in paragraph 3.
16. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that indigenous ‘languages’ should be mentioned in place of ‘peoples’ in paragraph 1.
17. The **delegation of Colombia** wished to add in paragraph 3, which acknowledged the efforts undertaken by UNESCO and the Secretariat, to also include the Member States.
18. The **Secretary** understood that the idea was to also recognize the contribution of Member States, and suggested ‘acknowledging with satisfaction the efforts made by Member States of UNESCO, the Secretariat, and non-governmental organizations’.
19. The **delegation of Colombia** supported including NGOs, as well as other interested parties or stakeholders, which implied other civil society organizations and interested associations, which was duly included.
20. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision 13.COM 20 adopted**.
21. The **delegation of Senegal** took the opportunity to inform the Committee of the forthcoming opening of the Museum of Black Civilizations on 6 December 2019 in Dakar. The museum emanated from the World Festival of Negro Arts in 1966, which had decided to establish a Museum of Black Civilizations in the future. From 1966 to the present, this project was in the making and materialized in the inauguration of this great museum, the largest heritage of its kind in sub-Saharan Africa. Senegal therefore wished to invite all UNESCO Member States, Observers and NGOs to join in this great celebration. It also wished to thank all those who had contributed to its realization. UNESCO had played an extremely important, historical role in the construction of this museum, and had also accompanied Senegal towards the end of the process, and had just returned archives in this regard. The delegation also thanked the Assistant Director-General of Culture, who was present. It thanked China for its partnership that fully financed the construction of the museum for a sum of 20 million euros, plus 2 million euros for museum equipment. Other countries had also contributed, for example Egypt had made twenty-three museum pieces available, Chad had agreed to donate the original Toumai skull, as well as other countries, such as South Africa, Cuba, Kenya, Benin, Zimbabwe, Mali, the United States of Africa, the African Union, ECOWAS, Comoros, and Mauritius, which was unfortunately unable to attend. The delegation thus invited everyone to Dakar on 6 December 2019, adding that this museum did not belong to Senegal or Africa and its diaspora, but that it was a museum with global character and reach, open to all civilizations in the context of the restitution and return of cultural property to Africa.
22. The **Chairperson** congratulated Senegal on its new museum, adding how delightful it was to hear that this project had been finalized with the help of several countries. With regard to Mauritius, it was only a postponement and the Chairperson would be sure to visit and honour the invitation in the very near future.

**ITEM 21 OF THE AGENDA**

**ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS**

1. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Committee had now concluded its intensive and highly productive week of work. He thanked everyone for their positive and productive contributions during the session, for their tremendous achievements, enthusiasm and willingness to work together in the spirit of consensus and cooperation. The Chairperson spoke of his work as fulfilling and rewarding thanks to the commitment shown by Committee Members, as well as by all the delegates and representatives present. Summarizing the achievements of the Committee’s work over the last six days, the Chairperson recalled the 821 registered participants who had attended, from 128 different countries. The Committee had examined forty-six files nominated for inscription, inscribed seven on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and thirty-one on the Representative List. Of course, the traditional Korean wrestling was among the elements added to the Representative List following an unprecedented joint inscription by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. It was an exceptional moment to witness in the presence of the Director-General of UNESCO. In addition, the Committee had also approved one International Assistance request and included one programme on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. It had examined thirty-two periodic reports in addition to sixteen reports on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. This high number of reports clearly demonstrated the continuous and solid engagement of the States Parties for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Further to the development of the overall results framework for the Convention, substantial progress had also been made through this session concerning the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, which would be moving towards a regional cycle of reporting from 2020 with the submission of periodic reports from States Parties from the Latin American and Caribbean region. Timely considerations on the issue of the follow-up of elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention were made, which should lead to overall reflections on the establishment of a follow-up mechanism, as well as on the nature, purposes and inscription process on the Lists.
2. In line with these reflections, the **Chairperson** recalled the stimulating and fruitful discussion reiterating the need for dialogue between the Evaluation Body and submitting States in which requests were thoroughly expressed by Committee Members and non-Committee Members alike. In response, the Committee had adopted a provisional dialogue mechanism, which would facilitate the nomination process for the files submitted for the 2019 cycle to be examined at the fourteenth session of the Committee. The Committee had equally highlighted the role of intangible cultural heritage in situations of emergency in both conflict and natural disasters. It had also continued its reflection on the advisory functions to be fulfilled by accredited NGOs of the Convention, and established a new Evaluation Body for the 2019 cycle, welcoming three new members in the coming cycle. These were just some of the key achievements. The Chairperson strongly believed that the Committee would continue to reflect on many more important issues, which were essential for guiding the operational work of the Convention. The Chairperson paid special tribute to Members of the Bureau. He was privileged to have worked with them and felt humbled with the confidence bestowed upon him throughout the year. Sincere thanks went to all of them for their extraordinary support, especially to the Vice-Chairs from Lebanon and the Philippines who had chaired the sessions in his absence. The Chairperson expressed heartfelt gratitude to the interpreters, translators, technicians and many volunteers who had worked so hard for the smooth running of this Committee. A big round of applause was given. He extended his warmest appreciation to the Secretary and his most able team for their precious assistance, adding that the Committee could not thank them enough for all their hard work and relentless support. The Chairperson invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Ernesto Ottone and the UN Resident Coordinator for Mauritius and the Seychelles, Ms Christine Umutoni, to make their closing statements.

**ITEM 22 OF THE AGENDA**

**CLOSURE**

1. The **UN Resident Coordinator for Mauritius,** **Ms Christine Umutoni**, spoke of her pleasure to be invited to say a few words at the closing of the Committee session, adding that as representative of the UN Secretary-General she was part of the land in her new home, which although it appeared small was a thriving ocean economy with a rich and diverse culture. For the UN, it had been a very busy week of activities during the UN Week in Mauritius, which marked the anniversary of the 1948 UN Charter. It was an opportunity to celebrate the partnership between Mauritius and the United Nations and to reaffirm the purpose, principles and fundamental freedoms enshrined within the charter. A range of activities had taken place, including World Aids Day, which had seen the launch of some projects with IOM on gender-based violence and capped sixteen days of activism against gender-based violence, tree planting and a visit to the Blue Bay Marine Park. As UN Resident Coordinator and the representative of the Secretary-General in Mauritius, Ms Umutoni wished to highlight the ongoing reform intended to make the UN coherent and stronger. The global 2030 Agenda required bold changes to the UN development system for the emergence of a new generation of Country Teams centred on the strategic UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). It was thus her duty to coordinate the work of the entire UN and to understand the work of each agency and be able to advocate the reforms adopted on 31 May 2018. The 2030 Agenda is a bold programme that responds to people’s needs and required a lot of coordination. Seventeen agencies were working in Mauritius, of which UNESCO was one. Some were resident, others non-resident, but the work was important and complementary, in partnership with the Government and other stakeholders to achieve the development goals.
2. The **UN Resident Coordinator for Mauritius** explained that the UN development goals included culture and recognized the role of culture as an intrinsic part of the human experience and as a driver of sustainable development. Living in Mauritius, she was reminded of how important and true the principle was. These development goals acknowledge the power of culture for creating work and economic growth, reducing inequalities, protecting the environment, promoting gender equality and building peaceful and inclusive societies. In doing so, the 2030 Agenda opened up new possibilities and fully brought in UNESCO’s international Convention and recommendations aimed at preserving heritage and promoting culture. Working together towards achieving the SDGs also contributed to the vision of the Africa Union’s 2063 Agenda, which provides a strategic framework for the socio-economic transformation of the continent over the next fifty years. Countries across Africa and around the globe were recognizing the vast scope of culture’s contribution to development. The Committee session was an opportunity to see first-hand how culture can directly contribute to peace building, solidarity and reconciliation, for example through the historical nomination of traditional Korean wrestling on the Representative List. Throughout the deliberations, the Committee had highlighted how cultural heritage contributes to the social and culture being of communities throughout the world. It had witnessed how the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage was not an end in itself, but a vector for innovative and culturally appropriate responses to various development challenges in the world today. Knowledge and practices transmitted from generation to generation promote well-being, dignity and creativity, and contribute to attaining these development goals in many different areas, whether related to food and nutrition security, to biodiversity conservation, sustainable natural resource management, or natural disaster preparedness and response. Intangible cultural heritage therefore had an important role to play with regards to environmental sustainability. Celebrations, rituals and knowledge transmission systems are also important for communities to achieve inclusive social development, regain peace and resolve conflicts, as well as educate new generations. The Committee had thus moved one step forward in the programme of work that the 178 States Parties to the Convention had set out to accomplish. Each step, each decision contributed to improving the lives of people, communities and societies. Whether it concerned decisions on inscription, the inclusion on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices or the funding of community-based projects, it was a common task for countries and the UN development system as a whole to ensure the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and to increase the recognition of the importance of safeguarding living heritage, steering the future towards a path of sustainability. Ms Umutonithanked everyone, wishing all the delegates a safe journey home.
3. The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO**, **Mr Ernesto Ottone**,expressed sincere gratitude to the Chairperson for his excellent leadership and for the effective and constructive deliberations, allowing the Committee to consider a number of crucial issues related to the implementation of the Convention. Warmest thanks went to the authorities of Mauritius for the extraordinary organization; their hospitality would stay in the delegates’ hearts. Mr Ottone was particularly impressed by the level of debate during these six days, as well as by the commitment of all States Parties to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. Together, the work of the Convention was said to be immensely relevant to UNESCO’s broader commitment to peace; the unprecedented joint inscription of the two Korean nations was a historic moment that marked a symbolic step towards inter-Korean reconciliation. To this end, UNESCO strives to inspire peace in the minds of men and women and, in Mauritius, events necessarily reminded everyone that culture can be at the forefront of this consolidation of peace. Intangible cultural heritage is first and foremost about communities, giving them a voice that includes the bearers, practitioners, elders, women and young people from all parts of the world. This living heritage clearly held the power to carry out actions for diversity and dialogue, to promote unity and harmony between peoples, as well as for inclusive and peaceful societies. No society can flourish without culture, without identity, without people. Living intangible cultural heritage, which has the best interests of its communities at heart and a rich source of knowledge and creative practices, provides the means to meet the challenges of a complex and rapidly changing world. It undoubtedly plays a decisive role in shaping a better and sustainable future for all, in addition to promoting a significant transformation for future generations. Mr Ottone firmly believed that the Committee’s work would have a significant and lasting impact, well beyond this session. As it moved forward together in a spirit of collaboration and solidarity to achieve common goals, the Convention would continue to serve as a valuable platform for international cooperation, as well as for reflection and engagement on key issues of concern. Mr Ottone remarked that the commitment and dedication to living heritage and the Convention shown by all would remain a source of inspiration, shedding significant light on the future of the Convention, but also of UNESCO's Culture Sector, citing three key words spoken at this session: ‘dialogue’, ‘follow-up’ and ‘safeguarding’. Mr Ottone recognized all the exceptional work being done, not only within the Secretariat but by everyone that contributed towards safeguarding living heritage. A round of applause was given to the interpreters, technicians and translators. Mr Ottone concluded with some words in Spanish to congratulate the Chairperson on the extraordinary week, as well as the members of GRULAC for the upcoming Committee session in Bogotá.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Assistant Director-General for his words of appreciation, opening the floor for final closing statements.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** warmly thanked all those who had contributed to the success of the Committee session, the Assistant Director-General, and all the staff at the Secretariat who were asked to stand and received a warm round of applause.
6. The **delegation of China** congratulated the Committee for having completed all the agenda items under the Chairperson’s leadership. It also congratulated the States Parties with their elements inscribed, selected and approved at the session, extending sincere gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its professional work, welcoming the new members and thanking the Secretariat for its tremendous efforts. The delegation had engaged in and followed closely the lively discussions, which had covered various interesting issues and resulted in creative proposals throughout the whole week of brainstorming. Such issues concerned the follow-up of inscribed elements reflected in intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, as well as multiple submissions of International Assistance requests. It also wished to recall, in particular, that the seventh session of the General Assembly in 2018 had adopted the proposal for the creation of three new extrabudgetary fixed-term posts to enhance the International Assistance mechanisms for the ICH Fund. It wished to remain informed of the recruitment of this team by the Secretariat and hoped that it would become operational at an early date. The delegation deeply appreciated the very enlightened contributions and inputs of the Committee Members and reiterated its commitment to participating in joint efforts in order to better enhance the implementation and development of the Convention. It thanked Colombia for its generous offer to host the next session and congratulated Latin America for holding its first Committee meeting. Finally, the delegation thanked the Chairperson and the Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts of Mauritius for the hard-working teams involved in the preparation of the session. It looked forward to the next session in Colombia in 2019.
7. As a member of the Bureau, the **delegation of the Philippines** expressedthanks to the Chairperson for his leadership, and the Government and people of Mauritius for the excellent hosting of this successful session. It thanked the Secretariat, the interpreters, and everyone who had helped make this session a success, adding that it looked forward to Colombia and congratulating the GRULAC countries for the forthcoming 2019 session. The delegation gave thanks to the spirit of dialogue that had permeated the whole session.
8. The **delegation of Armenia** extended its warmest congratulations to the Chairperson for the successful session, the Assistant Director-General and the entire Secretariat. It noted that the Ministry of Culture had done a tremendous amount of work and it extended sincere gratitude to the team who had worked with its own delegation, adding that Mauritius was a small island but with big, kind hearts.
9. The **delegation of Lebanon** expressedappreciation and thanks to the Chairperson and Mauritius, to the Assistant Director, and to the Secretary and the Secretariat. As a member of the Bureau, it thanked all the colleagues for their cooperation and for the unforgettable experience. The delegation wished the new Members the best of luck, until they met again in Colombia in 2019.
10. The **delegation of Japan** expressed thanks to the Chairperson and Mauritius for the excellent management and arrangements, which had contributed to the success of the meetings. As it was his first experience participating in this session [speaking on a personal note], the delegation recognized and acknowledged the great value and significance of intangible cultural heritage and the commitment and zeal of everyone who were impressively trying to safeguard intangible heritage. It expressed Japan’s willingness to remain firm together, not only among those present but with everyone in the world who loves intangible cultural heritage and was working towards preserving and safeguarding it. Japan remained firm in promoting and furthering the credibility and sustainability of intangible cultural heritage.
11. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Government of Mauritius, the Chairperson, the Secretariat, the Committee Members and everyone who had worked to make this a successful meeting, adding that it was looking forward to Colombia.
12. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Chairperson, thanking him for the quality, brilliance and efficiency with which he had conducted the Committee’s work. It warmly congratulated and thanked the Government and people of Mauritius for their generous hospitality. The delegation thanked the entire Secretariat for its outstanding work, and of course the Evaluation Body, which it warmly congratulated. It also congratulated all the States, Members of the Committee, Observers and NGOs for the calm and friendly atmosphere in which the deliberations had been conducted. Finally, the delegation congratulated and thanked Colombia for welcoming the Committee in 2019.
13. The **delegation of Poland** thanked the Chairperson for his wise leadership, the host country for its hospitality, and the entire Secretariat for the work well done. It congratulated the new members of the Evaluation Body, the NGO steering committee, and Colombia.
14. The **delegation of Cuba** echoed the words expressed by others and congratulated the Chairperson for the excellent way in which he had led the Committee’s work, thanking the Government of Mauritius and the authorities for the welcome. It thanked the Secretariat, the interpreters, the Legal Adviser and everyone in the convention centre who had worked so hard to make sure the conference ran smoothly. The delegation also spoke of the importance of culture for dialogue and peace, of which the meeting was an excellent example, with UNESCO playing an essential role in defending those values within the UN system where culture is an important tool for sustainable development. It was happy to welcome the next session of the Committee to Latin America in Colombia in 2019.
15. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Chairperson and the entire Secretariat, extending thanks to Mauritius for the wonderful hospitality and for the organized visits. On behalf of the main cultures of Guatemala, the Maya, Q’eqchi’ and the Mestizo cultures, the delegation extended its thanks to UNESCO, the Committee and its Members, and the Observers. Everyone had been happy to join this assembly. Having learned a lot, Guatemala would return to the enormous amount of work that still remained in the country to benefit its people to safeguard its diverse intangible cultural heritage. Speaking in his native language (Kaqchikel), he thanked the Chairperson and everyone for having shared their time.
16. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** had participated in this session as a Member of the Committee for the first time and therefore this session had been more like a learning than a contributing experience. It congratulated the Secretariat for the amazing work done, and Mauritius for its contribution as host country. The delegation was grateful to the Evaluation Body and all those involved in this exercise, and it looked forward to seeing everyone again in Colombia in 2019.
17. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Government and the people of Mauritius for their warm hospitality, the Chairperson for his wise guidance, and the Secretariat for all the work done. It had been a learning experience to be in the Committee for the first time and there had been some challenging discussions, which would no doubt continue in the coming year. The delegation also thanked the Evaluation Body for its intelligent remarks and congratulated all the communities for their inscriptions. It looked forward to seeing everyone in Colombia.
18. The **delegation of Zambia** thankedthe Chairperson for the efficient way he had chaired the session, recognizing that it was a very tight programme but he had still managed to keep everyone engaged, allowing everyone to speak. On behalf of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the delegation thanked the Government and the people of Mauritius for ably representing the true spirit of hospitality. It thanked Group V(a) for its confidence in Zambia as representative of the group, and congratulated Colombia for its generosity in hosting the next session, adding that it looked forward to interacting with everyone again.
19. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated the Chairperson on the way he had conducted the debate, and Mauritius for its warm welcome. It also congratulated the Secretariat for the work done and Colombia for hosting the next Committee session.
20. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Chairperson and the Government of Mauritius for its organization of the meeting and warm hospitality. It thanked the interpreters, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their hard work. As the Rapporteur of this session, the delegation had been able to look behind the curtain and see the truly amazing work carried out. It thanked the team in charge of transportation for their joyful spirit, adding that it would forever remember Mauritius as a country of big and warm smiles.
21. The **delegation of Cameroon** thanked the Chairperson and the authorities of Mauritius for the welcome received, and all the other delegations. It thanked the hostesses for their kindness and the Secretariat for its support. As a first-time Member of the Committee, the delegation would return home with truly memorable impressions of the Committee.
22. The **delegation of Togo** thanked the Chairperson**,** wishing toadd to those who had already thanked everyone. As it was the first time that Togo had participated in a Committee, it had learned and exchanged a lot, and with the experience gleaned it would be able to continue this work. The delegation thanked the host country and colleagues for all their efforts. It would return with happy memories of Mauritius and it hoped it would be the same in Colombia.
23. The **delegation of Jamaica** thanked the Government and people of Mauritius for the warmth, hospitality and love shown to all the delegates, extending gratitude to the Secretariat for the support that had allowed Jamaica to participate in the meeting. Jamaica had been on the Committee for the first time and it looked forward to not only learning but being able to make a significant contribution to the Committee’s work. It was also grateful for the work behind the scenes—all the technical personnel who had made the meeting comfortable throughout the session. It looked forward to the fourteenth session of the Committee in Colombia.
24. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked thehost country, especially the Chairperson for his leadership, and the Secretariat for its hard work, always starting early and ending late, as well as the Members of the Committee.
25. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked the Government and people of Mauritius for their warm hospitality, and the Secretariat and Evaluation Body for the tremendous amount of work accomplished prior to the meeting. It thanked the organizers, congratulated the countries that had inscribed their elements, and looked forward to Colombia.
26. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the people and Government of Mauritius, especially the Chairperson for his excellent leadership, and the Secretariat for their hard work.
27. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson for his chairmanship and the excellent team that had worked with him and had provided support with smiles and generosity from 6 a.m. until the last hour of the day. Mauritius is close to the sea, but Bogotá is close to the stars and although it is cold in Bogotá in December, it is still an excellent time to be there around Christmas when the streets are filled with people, with a lot of salsa to dance to, as well as reggae. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its excellent and tireless work with colleagues from the Ministry, which was obviously going to increase in the future, particularly Ms Caroline Munier and Ms Lisa Gisbert who oversee Latin America and the Caribbean region and who offer such excellent support. The delegation would ensure that Bogotá would be a landmark in improving and perfecting dialogue. It spoke of the Committee as an excellent place with different ways of thinking that can sometimes be contradictory but can come together to offer much in terms of a strong and stable route. It was very satisfied with the work of the Evaluation Body. In addition to the work of the Committee, Colombia had also held a meeting [during the Committee session] on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts in which 102 people had participated, showing the importance of the subject to the Convention; an aspect that would be visible in Bogotá where intangible heritage was seen in an urban environment. A meeting had also been held to talk about the project ‘African Diaspora’, involving Latin American, Caribbean and African projects, and driven by the Ministry of Culture. In this way, Africa was in Colombia, as well as in the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean, and this Convention brought everyone together in a wonderful way. The delegation spoke of Bogotá as a creative city, a city of music, and noted that its participation in UNESCO’s Creative Cities Network[[39]](#footnote-39) and its very close connection to intangible cultural heritage meant it would focus on this connection when the Committee went to Bogotá. The delegation thanked everyone for their support, adding that there were a lot of tutorials on YouTube on salsa and other dances from the Pacific region to start practising.
28. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked everyone once again for their contributions, with a special thanks to the Rapporteur, Ms Gabriele Detschmann, for her work behind the scenes.
29. The **Chairperson** concluded by wishing everyone a happy stay and a safe journey home. A short clip prepared by the Secretariat of the memorable moments shared during the session was projected onto the screen. The Chairperson declared the thirteenth session of the Committee closed.

*[Closing of the thirteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee   
for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage]*

1. . The 2018 copy of the Basic Texts is available [here](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-EN.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . See list of participants [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/preliminary-list-of-participants-01011). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. . The calendar of side events can be consulted [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/calendar-of-events-01026). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. . Read more on the Habitat III conference [here](http://habitat3.org/the-conference/about-habitat-3). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. . Read more about the project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/dive&display=threat), and access the Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage Constellation [here](https://ich.unesco.org/dive/constellation/). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. . The Panmunjom Declaration for Peace, Prosperity and Unification of the Korean Peninsula was signed 27 April 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. . The Pyongyang Joint Declaration was signed 19 September 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. . ICHCAP: International Information and Networking Centre for Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific Region works under the auspices of UNESCO. For more information: <http://www.ichcap.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. . On issues concerning the follow-up of inscribed elements on the Lists of the Convention. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. . Read more on the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Exit Strategy [here](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/SC/pdf/SC-17_CONF_229_6_Annex-2_en.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. . Read more about Colombia’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/safeguarding-of-the-traditional-knowledge-for-the-protection-of-sacred-natural-sites-in-the-territory-of-the-jaguars-of-yurupari-vaupes-province-colombia-01224). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. . Read more about Botswana’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/promotion-of-earthen-ware-pottery-making-skills-in-kgatleng-district-01153). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. . Read more about El Salvador’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/titajtakezakan-speaking-across-time-oral-tradition-and-use-of-information-and-communication-technologies-01249). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. . Read more about Kenya’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/promotion-of-traditional-pottery-making-practices-in-eastern-kenya-01021). [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. . Read more about Lesotho’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/inventorying-of-intangible-cultural-heritage-elements-in-thaba-bosiu-in-lesotho-01118). [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. . Read more about Malawi’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/safeguarding-of-nkhonde-tumbuka-and-chewa-proverbs-and-folktales-01060). [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. . Read more about Zambia’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/inventorying-of-proverbs-of-lala-community-of-luano-district-of-zambia-01216). [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. . Read more about Côte d’Ivoire’s project [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/assistances/inventory-of-the-intangible-cultural-heritage-present-in-cote-d-ivoire-in-view-of-its-urgent-safeguarding-01051). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. . Appendix 2 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Conference. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. . For the classification of States as per Electoral Groups, refer to Annex I of document 13.COM 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. . Refer to paragraph 331 of the 12.COM summary records for the intervention by Committee Member from Hungary. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. . For the classification of the States along the five regions, refer to Annex II of document 13.COM 8. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. . The gap between their reports will be of three years [15 December 2017–15 December 2020]. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. . Paragraph 13 in full: Invites States Parties to ensure that, in the elaboration of periodic reports containing references to war or conflict or specific historical events, the report should be elaborated with utmost care, in order to avoid provoking misunderstanding among communities in any way, with a view to encouraging dialogue and mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals, and to avoid any language inconsistent with the UN Charter as well as the 2003 Convention, and encourages them to meticulously pursue this principle in their future work. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. . Ethical Principle 4: All interactions with the communities, groups and, where applicable, individuals who create, safeguard, maintain and transmit intangible cultural heritage should be characterized by **transparent collaboration**, dialogue, negotiation and consultation, and contingent upon their **free, prior, sustained and informed consent**. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. . Presented in the Report of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Informal Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee (Annex of Document ITH/18/13.COM/16). [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. . The Guidance Note is available both in [English](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/Guidance_note_on_inventorying_EN.pdf) and [French](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/Guidance_note_on_inventorying_FR.pdf) language versions. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. . Read more information on the key references for forms for nominations, proposals and requests [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/forms). [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. . Read more about the conference [here](https://www.ica.org/en/resolutions-from-the-working-conference-on-regional-approaches-on-disaster-recovery-and-heritage). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. . Read the UNESCO-World Bank Position Paper [here](http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/708271541534427317/pdf/131856-WP-REVISED-II-PUBLIC.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. . Read more about the Paris Peace Forum [here](https://parispeaceforum.org/). [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. . Read more about the Ethical Principles and Intangible Cultural Heritage [here](https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866). [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. . Read more about the ‘Revive the spirit of Mosul’ Initative [here](https://en.unesco.org/projects/the-spirit-of-mosul). [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. . Under paragraph 12: A.7 The beneficiary State Party has implemented previously financed activities, if any, in line with all the regulations and any conditions applied thereto. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. . Paragraph 10(a) the request implies cooperation at the bilateral, regional or international levels; and/or Paragraph 10(b) the assistance may have a multiplier effect and may stimulate financial and technical contributions from other sources. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. . The proposal in full: ‘Reaffirms Decision 7.GA 6 and decides to request the Secretariat to transmit any questions of the Evaluation Body on files submitted for the 2019 cycle to States Parties concerned after the second meeting of the Evaluation Body in 2019’. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. . CRESPIAL, Centro Regional para la Sauvegarde del Patrimonio Cultural Immaterial de América Latina. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. . Consult the interactive Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger [here](http://www.unesco.org/languages-atlas/). [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. . Read more about the Network [here](https://en.unesco.org/creative-cities/home). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)