UNIT 42

Hand-out 5.b:

Evaluation of the final irrigator’s council nomination

Take a look at the copy of the final nomination. It might be submitted in this form for evaluation, where it is more likely to be successful than the initial nomination, but some issues may remain problematic. This hand-out suggests some questions for discussion during the evaluation process. However, please feel free to raise other issues.

### Are the problems identified in the initial nomination resolved?

Review the problems raised in the previous session about the initial file. To guide the discussion, these include:

* Has the name of the element become more descriptive?
* Has the community concerned been correctly and consistently identified and its selection justified?
* Is the geographical range of the element adequately described?
* Is there sufficient detail in Section 1 to determine whether the element complies with the definition of ICH in the Convention?
* Will the safeguarding measures safeguard the element?
* Have the roles of youth in safeguarding the element and in its transmission been suitably strengthened?
* Has the appropriate community been sufficiently involved in developing the nomination?
* Is it clear how the element has been included in an inventory?

### Are there any remaining issues and concerns about the nomination?

* Is the name in B.1 the most descriptive name possible or could you think of a more descriptive one?
* Is there enough information in the final nomination on the traditional craftsmanship associated with the material culture of the irrigation system and how it relates to the work of the Irrigators’ Council?
* What kinds of safeguarding measures could be used to safeguard the traditional craftsmanship associated with the material culture of the irrigation system?
* Would an intersectoral approach to safeguarding bring out other issues in this case? If so, how?