**CONVENTION FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE  
INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE**

**Open-ended intergovernmental working group  
in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention**

**Online**

**9.30 – 17.30 (Paris time / UTC+2)**

**9 and 10 September 2021 (Part II)**

**Item 8 of the Agenda:**

**Report to the Intergovernmental Committee**

**Introduction**

1. The Open-ended intergovernmental working group in the framework of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the 2003 Convention (hereafter ‘the working group’) was convened online in two parts: Part I on 8 and 9 July 2021 and Part II on 9 and 10 September 2021.
2. The working group expresses its gratitude to the Government of Japan for having generously supported the meeting and the expert consultation phase that preceded it. The working group also commends the expert group, which prepared a solid foundation for the work achieved through the online survey in March and April 2021 and the Category VI meeting in May 2021, as well as the Secretariat for providing a set of working documents for the working group’s deliberations. The dedication and commitment of all stakeholders made it possible to successfully hold these meetings despite the challenges posed by the ongoing global pandemic. In particular, the meetings had to be rescheduled and the format adjusted to convene fully online sessions.
3. The working group was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Atsuyuki Oike (Japan), and the following States Parties acted as Vice-Chairpersons, who also assumed the role of Rapporteurs: Germany, Poland, Peru, Côte d’Ivoire and Kuwait. The same roles will apply to Part II of the meeting.

**Report to the sixteenth session of the Committee**

1. The working group will present summary records and the results of the deliberations, which cover the debates from Part I and Part II of the meeting (see draft recommendations from page 3 of the present document), to the Committee during its sixteenth session in Colombo, Sri Lanka from 13 to 18 December 2021.
2. The working group requests that the Secretariat prepare a set of draft amendments to the Operational Directives based on the recommendations of the working group, for examination by the Committee at its sixteenth session.

**Ways forward**

1. If the Committee agrees, the amendments may be presented for examination and possible adoption by the General Assembly at its ninth session in mid-2022. The recommendations of the working group might also lead to proposed amendments of the Rules of Procedure of the Intergovernmental Committee and the revision of nomination forms.
2. According to the outcomes of Part II of the meeting and taking into account the high number and complex nature of the issues pending discussion, the working group may think it necessary to meet again using an online format. In light of the dates set for the 212th session of the Executive Board and the 41st session of the General Conference, there are limited possibilities for such a meeting to take place before the Committee’s sixteenth session. Should the working group wish to meet again, a meeting could be scheduled in the first semester of 2022. If this is the wish of the working group as well as of the Intergovernmental Committee at its sixteenth session, any other recommendations and subsequent corresponding proposals for revisions to the Operational Directives made after that session could either: (a) be circulated electronically to Committee members for their endorsement to forward to the General Assembly, or (b) be presented at an extraordinary session of the Intergovernmental Committee prior to the ninth session of the General Assembly in 2022 in order to present potential revisions to the Operational Directives to the General Assembly. This would have to be decided by the Committee at its sixteenth session in December 2021.
3. Based on its debates, the working group will adopt the recommendations of its meeting. The draft recommendations below will be revised during the session:

**[Draft] recommendations of the Open-ended intergovernmental working group**

1. The reformed listing system should strive to place communities, groups and individuals (if applicable) at the centre of safeguarding efforts and seek their broader and more active participation in all steps of the listing mechanisms [adopted by Part I].

Issues related to the inscription criteria

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

Issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements

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

xxx [as adopted under item 6.a]

1. In addition to the procedure described in the paragraph above, the following recommendations are could be made:

xxx [as adopted under item 6.a]

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

xxx [as adopted under item 6.b]

1. In addition to the procedure described above, the following recommendations could be made:

xxx [as adopted under item 6.b]

Issues related to the methodology for evaluating nominations

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

xxx [as adopted under item 6.c]

1. In addition to the procedure described above, the following recommendations could be made:

xxx [as adopted under item 6.c]

Article 18 of the Convention

1. The working group recommends to initiate a reflection for a broader implementation of Article 18 of the Convention [adopted by Part I].

Other issues

1. On the proposals to ensure a broader involvement of communities, groups and where applicable individuals in the listing system, the working group further recommends [adopted by Part I]:
2. *The use of the community’s language (or a language(s) that is accessible to them) in the preparation and submission of nominations;*
3. *The use of technology, such as audio-visual tools, where possible, for providing information requested in the nomination forms as well as for communicating any concerns.*
4. The working group recommends using gender-neutral and inclusive language within all aspects of the implementation of the Convention, including, for example, avoiding such terms as ‘gentleman’s agreement’ [adopted by Part I].
5. xxx [as adopted under item 7]