UNIT 41

Hand-out 2.b:

general assessment of the initial bridges nomination

Use this hand-out together with **‘**Instructions for completing nomination forms ICH-01 and ICH-02**’** (available at the webpage <http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/forms>) to analyse the initial nomination file. These questions can guide the discussion, but feel free to raise other issues and concerns.

* Is the focus on the bridges in the name of the element (and in most of the file) appropriate?
* Is the name in B.2 a translation of B.1? Where does this name belong?
* Which communities or groups (other than the woodworking masters) might consider the bridges as part of their cultural heritage? Are such communities, in their diversity, sufficiently well-defined?
* What is the geographical location of the element? Is this different from the location of the bridges themselves?
* Has the State party acknowledged the geographical distribution of the element in a sensitive way?
* How does the element fit into the domain mentioned? Which other domains might be involved?
* What is the focus of Section 1? What should it focus on instead? Section 1 states that changes in bridge-building skills and mode of construction threatens the authenticity of the element and should therefore be reversed. Why is this idea contrary to the spirit of the Convention? Have the contemporary social functions and cultural meanings of the element been adequately defined?
* Have gender considerations been incorporated in respect to the description of the element and the nomination process?
* Does the file indicate whether the element is compliant with the criteria for human rights and sustainability, or not?
* Is the viability of the element the same as the viability of the transport infrastructure? How would one decide whether or not the element was viable?
* Which of the threats mentioned are real threats to the element? Explain why they might be, as insufficient detail is provided in the nomination file.
* Do the safeguarding measures proposed address these threats?
* Do the proposed measures sufficiently address the issue of environmental sustainability?
* Would placing the bridges in museums be a good safeguarding measure? Explain.
* Are communities sufficiently centrally placed in the proposed safeguarding measures?
* Are the proposed transmission measures cognisant of community-owned transmission mechanisms?
* What additional community participation is required in the nomination and safeguarding process? What further information is required on community participation by the bridge-building masters?
* Has the State Party adequately demonstrated the extent and nature of community consent in the nomination process?
* Is the nomination file correct to suggest there cannot be any customary restrictions on access to the element? What kinds of restrictions might there be and how would they be respected?
* What other information is needed about the inclusion of the element on an inventory?
* Have the photos and videos been well chosen? If not, what could they have done instead? How many photos and how much video material is required, and has the submission exceeded this limit?
* Is it acceptable for documentation to follow the nomination?
* Has an appropriate person signed the nomination file?