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Lesson plan

Duration:

3 hours 30 minutes

Objective(s):

Develop an understanding of what makes a successful nomination by critically analyzing the quality of a full sample nomination file against the criteria established in the Operational Directives (ODs) and further detailed in the nomination forms.

Description:

This unit provides participants with the opportunity to evaluate sample nomination files, thereby putting themselves in the place of the Evaluation Body. Participants are provided with some guidance to evaluate the sample nominations to eventually formulate a mock recommendation regarding their possible inscription or non-inscription on one of the Lists or referral.

*Proposed sequence:*

* Participants continue working in the same groups from Unit 41. This time, they discuss the final versions of the sample nominations (Unit 42 Hand-outs 1.a to 7.a) already introduced in their initial versions in Unit 41. They use the guidance provided (Unit 42 Hand-outs 1.b to 7.b) to comment on how the nomination file could be improved and whether there are remaining substantive issues. They then decide whether to recommend their sample file for inscription, non-inscription or referral.
* In plenary, the groups share two or three examples of suggestions they made to improve the final sample nominations and explain their recommendations to the plenary.

Supporting documents:

* Facilitator’s narrative Unit 42
* Unit 42 Hand-outs: Final versions of sample nominations (Unit 42 Hand-outs 1.a, 2.a, 3.a, 4.a, 5.a, 6.a, 7.a) and their evaluations (Unit 42 Hand-outs 1.b, 2.b, 3.b, 4.b, 5.b, 6.b, 7b)
* Unit 42 Hand-out 7: Example of inscription decision
* UNESCO, *Basic Texts of the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (referred to in this unit as Basic Texts), Paris, UNESCO. Available at <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00503>.

Notes and suggestions

This session builds on the experience of participants in conducting a general assessment of initial versions of the sample nominations. The facilitator should organize participants into the same groups from Unit 41 on doing the general assessment of initial versions of nomination files.

This time, each group will work on the final versions of one of the sample nominations. The final nomination files are all technically compliant and thus ready for evaluation. The main purpose of the session is to take a critical look at a final sample nomination and decide whether they comply with the substantive criteria for inscription.

The groups will evaluate final nominations. The facilitator should ask each group to comment on the compliance of the file with the criteria using the evaluation hand-outs (Unit 42 Hand-outs 1.b, 2.b, 3.b, 4.b, 5.b, 6.b and 7.b). Some of the hand-outs raise difficult questions that have no straightforward answers; participants can raise issues for the Committee to take into consideration in their comments.

Groups should each elect a chair to guide the discussion and a rapporteur to assist in recording their comments and presenting their recommendation to the plenary session. The rapporteur should take notes based on the group’s discussion. All the final nomination files can potentially qualify for inscription, but if a group gives valid reasons then they should be able to recommend another course of action (such as referral or rejection). In the normal course of events, any negative decisions would be communicated to the States Parties concerned. They can then withdraw the nomination file if they wish.

The example inscription decision for the Cantu in Paghjella (Unit 42 Hand-out 7) gives an indication of how the Committee words its decisions.
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Facilitator’s narrative

Facilitators may need to remind participants of the process of examination and inscription discussed in Unit 11 Nominations: overview and Unit 40 Introducing the nomination forms. See the Participant’s text Unit 11 for a discussion of the process of evaluation, examination and inscription of nominations to the Lists of the Convention, and of the Evaluation Body.

#### Note on inscription of an element

Inscription of elements on the Lists of the Convention takes place during Intergovernmental Committee sessions. The inscription of an element is the culmination of an evaluation and examination process for the nomination files (discussed in Unit 11) that takes at least 18 months.

Before the beginning of the inscription process, the Evaluation Body presents its report. Reports from the Evaluation Body summarize its discussions and reflections on the files evaluated. These reports, which are available on the websites of the Committee meetings in question, are important documents and may provoke substantial discussion in the sessions of the Committee.

The Evaluation Body prepares an inscription decision for each file based on its evaluations. It is sent to the Committee members one month before the beginning of the session and is simultaneously published on the ICH website. At the Committee meeting, the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body reads out the inscription decisions. The Committee then examines the nomination files and makes its decision. The selected elements are inscribed on the appropriate Lists. A representative of the State Party concerned, and perhaps also of the community or group concerned, may give a word of thanks. They may not ask for the floor during the examination of the element proposed by them for inscription (according to Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee: see the Basic Texts and the ICH website).

Inscription of nominated elements is a ceremonial affair: most nominated elements are inscribed, and unsatisfactory files are usually withdrawn before the Committee meeting.

Sometimes civil society members write letters objecting to the inscription of elements presented to the Committee. Correspondence about the files, and the responses of submitting States are made available on the ICH website during the examination period but are then removed after inscription. The availability of this information can enable greater dialogue regarding nomination files. See a sample decision in Hand-out 7 of this unit and go to the webpage on the Intergovernmental Committee for more examples.

See: http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/index.php?lg=en&pg=00009