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1. This document contains the summary records of the fourteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Bogotá, Colombia, from 9 to 14 December 2019.
2. Some 1441 participants registered to attend the session, among which delegations from 24 States Members of the Committee, 112 States Parties not Members of the Committee, 6 States not party to the Convention, 5 organizations of the United Nations, 6 intergovernmental organizations (other than U.N.), 6 category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO, 72 accredited non-governmental organizations to the Committee, and 78 press/media entities.
3. The full list of participants is available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/preliminary-list-of-participants-01067).
4. The session was conducted in three languages: English and French (the two working languages of the Committee) and Spanish.
5. The Living Heritage Entity of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.
6. The elected Members of the Bureau of the fourteenth session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano (Colombia)

Vice-Chairpersons: Austria, Poland, Philippines, Zambia and Palestine

Rapporteur: Mr Bernard Jankee (Jamaica)

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

**DRAFT DECISION 15.COM 5**

The Committee,

1. Having examined document LHE/20/15.COM/5,
2. Adopts the summary records of the Committee’s fourteenth session contained in this document.

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE FOURTHEENTH SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE**

*[Monday, 9 December 2019, morning session]*

**ITEM 1 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OPENING**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.1 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.1_Rev2-EN.docx)

1. The **Chairperson, Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano**, began by announcing that interpretation was available in English and French, the working languages of the Committee, and Spanish for the entire duration of the session thanks to the generous support of the Kingdom of Spain. The Chairperson welcomed the delegates to the fourteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and she recognized the presence of all the Ministers and dignitaries of States Parties to the Committee, as well as the presence of non-States Parties to the Convention, experts and representatives of accredited non-governmental organizations and civil society. The Chairperson was particularly pleased to welcome everyone to Bogotá where she assumes the function of Secretary of Culture, Recreation and Sports of the city of Bogotá, and she encouraged the delegates to visit the many cultural and historical sites in the city. The Committee would deliberate on the many issues and make important decisions on the safeguarding of living heritage, as well as on the future of the Convention. Since the agenda was heavy, she asked for cooperation in making interventions short and to the point. She would also count on the assistance of her Vice-Chairpersons from Austria, Poland, Philippines, Zambia and Palestine from time to time. Together with Colombia, and the Rapporteur, Mr Bernard Jankee from Jamaica, these countries composed the Bureau of the Committee. She then invited Mr Ernesto Ottone Ramirez, Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO, to address the meeting.
2. The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO**, Mr Ernesto Ottone, began by thanking the Colombian authorities for hosting the fourteenth session of the Committee, with particular thanks to the Ministry of Culture of the host country, the city of Bogotá, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Colombian Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO, as well as the Permanent Delegation of Colombia to UNESCO for their hard work and support. He was very pleased that the Committee was taking place for the first time in Latin America, his region of origin, whose living heritage is deeply rooted, bearing witness to a wealth of cultures that have formed multicultural and multilingual societies. This cultural, linguistic and religious diversity can be found in music, dance, social practices, rituals, skills related to traditional crafts, as well as in many other social practices transmitted from generation to generation and adapted to a constantly changing environment. Indeed, it was here in Latin America, and Mexico in particular, through the Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies in 1982, that the international community recognized for the first time that culture was not only about buildings and monuments, but that it was also a rich and dynamic living heritage. This Committee meeting was an opportunity to ask whether enough was being done for the safeguarding of living heritage, and for the respect of human dignity and diversity. The important items on the agenda would thus help reflect on this question, which included reflections on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, the reform of periodic reporting, the monitoring of the elements inscribed, the role of living heritage in emergency situations, the participation of accredited NGOs in the implementation of the Convention, as well as other essential topics for the future of the Convention. Mr Ottone then spoke of the opening ceremony to be held that evening that would be attended by the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Audrey Azoulay, who would officially open the fourteenth session of the Committee.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Ottone for his kind words of appreciation, inviting the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Colombia, Ms Carmen Inés Vásquez Camacho, to say a few welcoming remarks.
4. The **Minister of Culture of the Republic of Colombia**, Ms Carmen Inés Vásquez Camacho, warmly greeted the Chairperson, the Director-General, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Secretary to the Convention and his team, Members of the Bureau, Member States and all the delegates. She spoke about elements of identity that include dance, music, cooking, oral traditions and practices, and other cultural manifestations that people recognize as part of the history of their community, whose intangible cultural heritage is passed down from generation to generation, transcending borders. These manifestations are living traditions that form a dynamic part of our heritage. Passed down through the passage of time, they are enriched with other cultural forms without losing their essential elements. The Convention has enabled countries to devise strategies to foster and develop these cultural manifestations for bearers and practitioners, and to recognize the cultural diversity of territories so as to take measures to safeguard these practices. The Convention has enabled dialogue on how to continue strengthening projects and policies in this regard. This important Committee meets every year, with the session taking place for the first time in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean. For Colombians this represents a genuine recognition of the country’s commitment to protect intangible cultural heritage, as well as the success of its polices to safeguard Colombian intangible cultural heritage adopted in 2009, based on which guidelines and methods to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts had been established. It also recognizes Colombia’s role as a leading player in the achievement of Agenda 2030, and the development of an innovative pilot initiative concerning intangible cultural heritage in emergencies with the support of the ICH Fund as a basis for resilience, reconciliation and the construction of peace in Colombia’s post-conflict agreements. The ICH Fund also supported capacity building and management of intangible cultural heritage in two departments of the Colombian Orinoco region; the Minister’s own region. For 2020, Colombia will be in charge of the sub-commission for coordinating traditional practice and cultural expressions. This new sub-commission will be available to dialogue on various themes and will carry out work of an intersectoral nature around intellectual property. One of the main strategic lines of Colombia’s development policy for 2018–2022 concerns culture as one of the pillars in strengthening communities, as well as their cultural and social practices in the different territories. For this reason, the government has focused on implementing guidelines for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts and generating guidelines for good practices on traditional gastronomy to establish standard-setting instruments in the country; traditions that cover the production of food to the way food is produced, to utensils, and how best to handle food waste. This would strengthen the value of traditional foods, which is very much part of sustainable development and the best way to strengthen national policies that contribute to sustainable development and social inclusion. The Minister thanked the Committee for having selected Colombia as the host country for its fourteenth session, adding that she was confident that the rich debates would strengthen all countries in the field of intangible cultural heritage. The Minister concluded by inviting the delegates to visit the arts and crafts exhibition that was currently taking place, which showcased the 23 types of intangible heritage in the country. She wished all the delegates a warm welcome and hoped they would take advantage of the nation’s intangible heritage.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister of Culture for her inspiring words and officially declared the fourteenth session of the Committee open. She greeted the many Ministers for which she was particularly honoured for their presence, adding that they would have the opportunity to speak later in the session. The Chairperson then invited the Secretary to present some practical information.
6. The **Secretary** **of the Convention,** Mr Tim Curtis, welcomed all the delegates to this fourteenth session of the Committee. He noted that the list of participants was [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/preliminary-list-of-participants-01067) and that to date, more than 1,300 people had registered to participate, representing 138 different countries. It was noted that a large number of participants came from Colombia, which was encouraging and showed the country's enthusiasm for intangible heritage. On behalf of the Secretariat, he sincerely thanked the Republic of Colombia and the city of Bogotá for hosting this event, adding that the teams worked harmoniously together to make it possible for all to attend. He congratulated the Colombian colleagues for their efforts to ensure the session’s success, and thanked the Kingdom of Spain for generously financing interpretation into Spanish. He remarked that the live webcast had been available on the website of the fourteenth session of the Committee.[[1]](#footnote-1) He invited Ms Elena Constantinou of the Secretariat to provide some logistical information.
7. **Ms Elena Constantinou** informed the delegates that – as in previous years – the session was paperless with all the necessary documents published and available on the Convention [website](https://ich.unesco.org/en/14com), though USB keys were generously made available by the host for which the Secretariat was thankful. The Secretariat also distributed the 2018 edition of the Basic Texts in [English](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-EN.pdf), [French](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-FR.pdf) and [Spanish](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-SP.pdf),[[2]](#footnote-2) which was published in 2018, with its revised version to be published in 2020 following the 8th session of the General Assembly. Paper copies of the Basic Texts in [Arabic](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-AR.pdf), [Chinese](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-CH.pdf) or [Russian](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention_Basic_Texts-_2018_version-RU.pdf) were also made available by request. She then gave further information on the use of badges and the registration of participants who received financial assistance from the ICH Fund, which required signatures.
8. Thanking the Secretariat for this practical information, the **Chairperson** provided information on the shuttle bus services and the lunch arrangements, referring to the delegate handbook and background document available on the Committee’s website.

**ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA:**

**ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

**Documents:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/2 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-2_Rev.-EN.docx)

[*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.2.1 Rev 3*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.2.1_Rev.3-EN.docx)

[*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.2.2 Rev.2*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.2.2_Rev2.-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 2*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/2)

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the item on the adoption of the agenda.
2. The **Secretary** referred to the provisional agenda document [14.COM 2 Rev.](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-2_Rev.-EN.docx) that included 24 items, many of which had different sub-items, which had been prepared in accordance with Rule 9 of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure. Regarding the documents, all the documents relating to the items on the agenda, in English and French, had been posted on the Convention website on the statutory date 8 November, four weeks prior to the opening of this meeting in accordance with Rule 42 of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure. The exception was document 16 (Report of the informal ad hoc open-ended working group), which was posted online on 21 November; the report had been prepared by the informal ad hoc open-ended working group that last met in September 2019. The list of documents could be found in document 14.COM [INF.2.2. Rev.2](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.2.2_Rev2.-EN.docx). All working documents bore the reference LHE/19/14.COM, followed by a number corresponding to the item entered on the provisional agenda. For information documents, the figure is preceded by the letters ‘INF’, or ‘REV’ for subsequent revisions, ‘Add’ for addenda and ‘COR’ for corrigenda.
3. The **Secretary** then referred to the agenda, remarking that the present session of the Committee would last six days and had been adopted by the Bureau at its meeting on 3 October [2019] in Paris. The items would be examined in the order indicated in the approved agenda. The Committee would meet daily from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. and from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. with a 2-hour break every day for lunch. There would be no night sessions. The Committee was asked to adopt the agenda, but not the timetable as this was adjusted as necessary by the Bureau when it met every morning prior to the day’s sessions. Regarding [side events](https://ich.unesco.org/en/calendar-of-events-01091), it was noted that the Secretariat had prepared many events for this session, which included: i) a panel discussion on the theme, Safeguarding indigenous heritage and languages through education programmes; ii) an exhibition *Sounds of living heritage: a journey through indigenous languages*; iii) an information session on the Reform of the periodic reporting mechanism and the launch of the first regional cycle; iv) a panel discussion on Universities and ICH: challenges and opportunities in Latin America and the Caribbean (in collaboration with the category 2 centre CRESPIAL); v) an information session organized both in English and in French on funding priorities relating to I. Capacity building and II: Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in education; and vi) a panel discussion on the Heritage Emergency Fund: safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in crises. Events had also been organized by States Parties, accredited NGOs and category 2 centres. It was noted that a press conference had been held before the opening of the present session.
4. The **Chairperson** then outlined how she wished to structure the debate over the six days given the tight schedule and the number of important items for discussion. For this reason, she asked Committee Members to limit their speaking time to two minutes, encouraging them not to speak more than twice on an item if possible. Amendments to draft decisions could be written and submitted by email to the Secretariat. Once decisions had been adopted and if time permitted, Observers would be given the chance to speak. The Chairperson took the opportunity to remind the delegates that only Committee Members could speak during the debates on the draft decisions. She then explained the method of work on agenda item 10 on the inscriptions of the proposed elements, including the time dedicated to the Report of the Evaluation Body, and items 10.a, 10.b, 10.c and 10.d in particular. In all, the Committee had to review 49 files. In order to keep to the timetable, the Committee could not spend more than 12 minutes per file on average. Due to the limited time, the working method used in previous years would be employed in that all decisions relating to nominations for inscription on the lists, requests for International Assistance, and proposals for inclusion on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices would be adopted without debate, unless a member of the Committee wished to raise a specific point. Members of the Committee who wished to open a debate or propose amendments to the draft decisions were therefore invited to present their proposals prior to the day’s session. It was deemed important to submit the amendments before the Bureau meeting, as the Bureau draws up the list of files to be debated and adapts the agenda accordingly. During the discussions, Committee Members may, if they so wish, ask to speak to participate in the debate, if there is one. In accordance with Decision [11.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/8), the Chairperson would seek to build consensus by assessing the support and objections to the proposed amendments. To this end, when an amendment is proposed, the Chairperson would determine whether it received relative active support from the Committee. In the event of an objection to an amendment by a Committee Member, it would be determined whether the amendment received broad active support.
5. The **Chairperson** emphasized that the decision-making process had an impact on the credibility of the Committee’s work on the one hand, but also on the credibility of the Convention itself. After the adoption of each decision, the floor would be given to the submitting State or States wishing to speak, or to show a video. It was noted that the same working method would be used for the examination of the reports of States Parties on the current state of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List under agenda item 9.a. Should no Committee Members wish to debate or amend the individual draft decisions, the decisions would be adopted without debate. The Committee had been using this method for a number of years and it had proven to be effective in saving time, thereby allowing more time to be spent on files that required longer discussion and proposed amendments.
6. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** **declared** [**Decision 14.COM 2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/2) **adopted**.
7. The **Chairperson** then invited Ms Mary Mone, UNESCO’s events security coordinator, to say a few words.
8. Welcoming the delegates, Ms Mary Mone, **UNESCO Events Security Coordinator,** explainedthat all efforts had been deployed to assure their security and that she was in direct communication with the national police authorities, the city authorities and the United Nations system in Bogotá. She took the opportunity to salute the host country’s police authorities for their combined security efforts, wishing all the delegates a successful session.

**ITEM 3 OF THE AGENDA:**

**OBSERVERS**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/3*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-3_Rev.-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 3*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/3)

1. The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretary to introduce the next agenda item.
2. The **Secretary** remarked that thiswas an annual exercise required by the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, Rules 8.1 to 8.3. Rules 8.1 and 8.2 stipulate that the following entities may attend the sessions of the Committee as Observers: States Parties not Members of the Committee, States not party to the Convention that are Member States of UNESCO or the United Nations, Associate Members of UNESCO, Permanent Observer Missions to UNESCO, and representatives of the United Nations and organizations of the United Nations system. According to Rule 8.3, ‘Intergovernmental organizations other than those referred to in Rule 8.2, and other public or private bodies and private persons may also attend the future sessions of the Committee as Observers, upon their written request.’ Accordingly, the Committee had already authorized the following organizations to attend the current session of the Committee as Observers: i) the International Centre for Research and Documentation on African Traditions and Languages (CERDOTOLA) to the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions by its Decision [10.COM 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/3); ii) the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) to the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth sessions by its Decision [11.COM 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/3); iii) the African Trade Center to the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth sessions by its Decision [12.COM 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/3); and iv) the Centre for Black Culture and International Understanding (CBCIU) to the fourteenth session by its Decision [13.COM 3](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM/3). The Secretary added that the Secretariat had received a written request from the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO) to attend the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth sessions of the Committee as an Observer. For information, the working document under this item makes no mention of the participation of accredited NGOs as they are automatically admitted as Observers in conformity with Rule 6 of the Rules of Procedure. In summary, the Committee was asked to adopt Decision 14.COM 3 relating to the Observers authorized to attend this session of the Committee, as well as those authorized to attend future sessions upon written request received to date by the Secretariat.
3. The **Chairperson** reminded delegates that Observers would only be recognized to speak during a *general debate* or *after* a decision had been taken, i.e. not during the debates on the draft decisions. It was clarified that Observers included States Parties not members of the Committee, accredited NGOs and the four organizations just mentioned, which were authorized to participate. Participants attending the session as ‘audience’, in the sense of Rule 8.5 of the Rules of Procedure, could not address the meeting.
4. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/3) **adopted**.

**ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA**

**ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/4*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-4-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 4*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/4)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 4 on the adoption of the summary records of the thirteenth session of the Committee.
2. The **Secretary** presented the summary records of the debates of the thirteenth session of the Committee in accordance with Rule 45 of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure. These records make it possible to return to past debates and to keep track of past discussions for future sessions. During this thirteenth session, many decisions were taken that will directly affect the present discussions, hence the importance of presenting this document at the start of the session.It was recalled that recordings of the debates were also available [online](https://ich.unesco.org/fr/13com).
3. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 4**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/4) **adopted**.
4. The **Chairperson** then turned to the two scheduled oral reports: i) the Report of the Chairperson of the Committee on the Bureau’s activities; and ii) the Report of the ICH NGO Forum. She began with the presentation of the outcomes of the Bureau meetings held since the Committee’s election in Port Louis, Mauritius, in 2018. This was followed by the presentation of the report of the ICH NGO Forum. As decided by the Committee in 2018, the Bureau of the present Committee is composed of the following members: Vice-Chairpersons from Austria, Poland, Philippines, Zambia and Palestine, the Rapporteur, Mr Bernard Jankee from Jamaica, and herself as Chairperson. She first thanked all the Members of the Committee for the trust bestowed upon her as Chairperson, and she seized the opportunity to thank her colleagues of the Bureau for their active participation, hard work and spirit of cooperation throughout the year. Thanks to their help, the Bureau was able to examine and decide on numerous important issues. It was recalled that, 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. While the Committee meets only once per year, the Bureau can meet as many times as necessary, either through face-to-face meetings or through electronic consultation. This flexibility is very important for the implementation of the Convention at national and international level as it allows for the adoption of operational decisions between two Committee sessions. Concerning the tasks of the Bureau, it is first of all asked to coordinate the work, and fix the dates, times and order of business of Committee meetings. The Bureau is also responsible for examining and approving International Assistance requests up to US$100,000, as well as any other tasks the Committee assigns to it.

**Report of the Chairperson of the Committee on the Bureau’s activities**

1. The **Chairperson** recalled that during the past year, the Bureau had had three face-to-face meetings and one electronic consultation. Once again, the year was mostly dedicated to the examination of the 16 International Assistance requests, of which nine requests up to US$100,000 were granted to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Eswatini, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia and Uganda. The Bureau also approved one request from Albania of more than US$100,000 following the request by the thirteenth session of the Committee. It also granted two assistance requests to Mali and Timor-Leste for the preparation of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. This meant that twelve requests were approved for a total amount of US$952,450. These approved projects aim at safeguarding specific living heritage practices, developing community-based inventories, building national or local capacities for implementing the Convention, and fostering the transmission of living heritage through non-formal learning and transmission. The Chairperson congratulated the States that had been granted financial assistance in this cycle and wished them successful safeguarding of their living heritage. It was noted that, compared to last year, the percentage of requests *not* approved was lower with only four requests referred back to the submitting States. This was attributed to the positive development of efforts by the Secretariat to provide support to submitting States in finalizing their requests, as well as more generally to the results of the global capacity-building programme that the Secretariat had been undertaking since 2009.
2. The **Chairperson** also reported that aside from financial assistance requests, the Committee had – since 2017 and by its by Decision [12.COM.7](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/7) – delegated authority to its Bureau to decide upon the utilization of the funds allocated under ‘other functions of the Committee’ in the plan for the use of the resources of the Convention’s Fund. Accordingly, the Bureau this year approved a plan for the period 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2020 based on a proposal prepared by the Secretariat and corresponding to an amount of US$429,546. These resources are dedicated to support upstream and cross-cutting activities, in particular the capacity-building programme, and to encourage and monitor the implementation of the Convention. Finally, the Bureau took an important decision in asking the Secretariat to inscribe an item on the provisional agenda of this session to raise the case of the Aalst Carnival [Belgium], which was inscribed in 2010 on the Representative List. This was in response to a series of complaints received by the Secretariat from the public and third parties regarding this element, the details of which would be discussed under agenda item 12. Finally, as is the case every year, the Bureau approved the timetable of the current session, as was presented on 3 October during the information and exchange session. The Chairperson wished to underline that transparency continued to be an important guiding principle for the organization of the meetings of the Bureau. As was the case in 2018, and in accordance with Recommendation 69 of the Open-Ended Working Group on Governance,[[3]](#footnote-3) the Secretariat had asked the Bureau members to communicate the date and venue of each Bureau meeting to their respective Electoral Group. Furthermore, the agenda, documents and decisions of each Bureau meeting are published [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/14com-bureau) and are available for consultation. In addition, the Secretariat shares the decisions of the Bureau with all Committee Members through email communication. The floor was open for comments.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** asked that the timetable and the number of Bureau meetings be shown on the screen, which was duly displayed.
4. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that the timetable would be updated every day after the meetings of the Bureau.
5. The **Chairperson** then turned to the second report and invited the representative of the ICH NGO Forum, Mr Jorge Gustavo Caicedo and representative of the NGO Intangible Cultural Heritage Encyclopaedia, to briefly present the NGO Forum activities; a presentation that had first been introduced at the eighth session of the Committee in 2013.

**Report of the ICH NGO Forum**

1. The **Representative of the ICH NGO Forum, Mr Jorge Gustavo Caicedo**, spoke on behalf of the Steering Committee of the Forum that represents the 104 accredited NGOs present at the session. Culture is the dialogue between individuals and their environment that is as particular and unique as the diversity of the Earth. However, as heirs of these cultures, cultural heritage faces challenges as never before: climate change, migration and armed conflicts. The representatives of the NGOs came together as organized citizens to share their experiences so as to help find solutions to these challenges. The Forum held a capacity-building workshop on Saturday [7 December] to explain to new actors how to implement the Convention at the local, national and international levels, as well as a workshop on the advisory functions of the accredited organizations. An assessment of needs, opportunities and challenges for each region was made and the participants learned from the safeguarding experiences of three Colombian organizations working with bearers of intangible cultural heritage. A symposium was held on Sunday [8 December] to share challenges faced by intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts with six presentations of experiences from different parts of the world. Another topic discussed was how NGOs can contribute to the multiple challenges of the listing mechanism for the local bearers.
2. **Mr Jorge Gustavo Caicedo** then highlighted several of the outcomes of the capacity-building event and the symposium. The ICH NGO Steering Committee was working on a field toolkit to facilitate the work of promoters and bearers of intangible cultural heritage, and it was about to create an ethical code for tourism with regard to intangible cultural heritage. The challenges of the listing mechanism was also widely discussed and a written working proposal would be presented under agenda item 14 and made publicly available with a view to include recommendations into the global reflection process on the reform of the listing mechanism. The ICH NGO Forum sought to add all the voices of the accredited NGOs, and it was thus in the process of strengthening its governance by creating a code of conduct and operating rules that had been presented to the NGOs. Mr Caicedo invited all the delegates to participate in the events of the NGOs, adding that there was a presentation of the recently published #HeritageAlive book Traditional Food[[4]](#footnote-4) that presents 17 examples of good practices worldwide. Finally, the ICH NGO Forum thanked the governments of Sweden and Singapore for their generous support that made the capacity-building meeting and the symposium such a great success, as well as the Republic of Colombia for its hospitality.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Caicedo for updating the Committee on the important discussions and work accomplished by the ICH NGO Forum. The Committee was grateful for the Forum’s continuous efforts in the implementation of work accomplished by NGOs in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Indeed, aware that NGOs play an important role in safeguarding living heritage, the Committee initiated a discussion in 2018 to reflect on their participation in the implementation of the Convention. Consequently, a consultation meeting on the role of accredited NGOs under the Convention was organized in April 2019, which was the subject of agenda item 15. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.
4. The **delegation of the Philippines** began by warmly thanking the people and Government of Colombia for hosting this session. It appreciated the welcoming atmosphere and rich cultural heritage, expressing full confidence for fruitful and substantive outcomes under the Chairperson’s able leadership. The delegation thanked the ICH NGO Forum for its report, and – having attended the ICH NGO Forum – found the recommendations very interesting. The delegation particularly supported the observations regarding the importance of the Register of Good Practices and the need to make it more visible, accessible and more user friendly. Networking among the communities and institutions would recognize how good practises can contribute much to fulfilling the purposes of the Convention. It was thus vital for the Committee to regularly interface and have more interactive engagement with the Forum, merited by the richness of its recommendations. This could be achieved either by including the report of the Forum as a separate item on the Committee’s agenda as official documentation, or having a dialogue prior to the Committee session. The delegation urged the NGOs not to forget the States Parties. Dialogue between the Forum and the Committee and States Parties should be encouraged with a view to mutual understanding, joint action and partnerships. This is what the Philippines tried to achieve when it co-chaired the informal ad hoc working group in 2018. Noting agenda item 15 [reflection on accredited NGOs], it was hoped that the Committee shall in the future seek to strengthen its dialogue and partnership with the Forum as safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is a shared responsibility and all actors and stakeholders needed to work together in this common mission.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that there were no decision to be taken on the two reports, and moved to agenda item 5.a.

**ITEM 5.a OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON ITS ACTIVITIES (JANUARY 2018 TO JUNE 2019)**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/5.a Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-5.a_Rev-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 5.a*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/5.a)

1. The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to present agenda item 5.a.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** recalled thatin accordance with Article 30 of the Convention, the Committee is to submit a report of its activities to the General Assembly at each of its sessions. Thus, the report under examination will be submitted to the General Assembly at its eighth session in June 2020. This report will also be brought to the attention of the General Conference of UNESCO in 2021. The report [document 5.a] would be updated with two types of information: i) the decisions of the Committee or the Bureau during the present session; and ii) developments that may take place under the Convention between the time of the writing of the report in October 2019 until the end of 2019. The Secretariat proposed that this item be suspended and taken up again at the end of the session on the last day, when all the agenda items that required a decision will have been examined. This will allow the Secretariat to update the report so that the Committee may adopt an accurate report with the view to presenting it to the General Assembly [in 2020].
3. The **Chairperson** remarked that document 5.a for this item contained many sections that required additional information that would depend on the decisions taken during the present session. She therefore agreed that it was necessary to suspend this item and revisit it at the end of the session on Saturday 14 December. She would continue to work with the Bureau to update the timetable for this session to reflect this situation. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson suspended agenda item 5.a at the present time.

**ITEM 5.b OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES (JANUARY 2018 TO JUNE 2019)**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/5.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-5.b-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 5.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/5.b)

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the report of the Secretariat on its activities, recognizing that the Secretariat plays an essential role for the Convention.
2. The **Secretary** was pleased to share the activities of the Secretariat during the 18-month period from January 2018 to June 2019. As could be seen from the document, the Secretariat had advanced in many important areas in the life of the Convention, and he wished to highlight some of the key issues of work, as well as provide some updates in areas that had progressed since June 2019, i.e. the end of the official reporting period. The Secretary began with a key achievement for the reporting period following the adoption of the overall results framework for the Convention[[5]](#footnote-5) at the seventh session of the General Assembly in 2018. The framework is forward looking and unprecedented for an international instrument such as the 2003 Convention. The Secretariat had worked to incorporate the indicators of the overall results framework into a new periodic reporting form; an ambitious undertaking which the Secretariat was able to achieve in time for the launch of the new regional cycles in 2020. The importance of this new way of monitoring the implementation of the Convention should not be underestimated. These indicators were designed to address issues at the local, national and international levels, and the new form includes the commitments of States for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Secretariat had also worked hard to develop a specifically designed capacity-building approach on periodic reporting which is ready to start in early 2020 in Latin America and the Caribbean as the first region for the new reporting cycle. Merging the indicators of the overall results framework with periodic reporting would provide a greater understanding [of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage] and thus greater visibility to what is surely the most significant achievement of the Convention. It was recalled that 15 years ago only a handful of States had policies, programmes and institutions dedicated to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, whereas today most of the 178 States Parties to the Convention had established policies in some form or another. Indeed, while the international listing mechanisms have achieved a lot in raising awareness of the importance of living heritage, the real nitty-gritty business of safeguarding living heritage occurs at the community, local and country levels. There was no doubt that the Convention has had a major impact globally in this regard and it was hoped that the new reporting system will tell the story more forcefully.
3. The **Secretary** then spoke of the Secretariat’s work to support the statutory side of the Convention, assisting the governing bodies in their work and implementing their decisions, while at the same time making efforts to operationalize key thematic areas that contribute to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. The first thematic area he wished to mention was the work on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education. For this, the Secretariat’s focus has been on strengthening transmission; a key safeguarding measure as mentioned in Article 2 of the Convention. Following the approved priority on intangible cultural heritage in education in 2017, the Secretariat integrated this new thematic area into the 39 C/5; the planning tool of UNESCO. The Secretariat was surprised by the immediate enthusiasm coming from field offices with 15 offices from all regions undertaking related activities during the biennium. Another surprise was the strong interest for cooperation from colleagues in the Education Sector. In October 2019, a second intersectoral meeting was held that brought together more than 50 colleagues from both Sectors. Together, concrete areas of work that naturally converged were identified on teacher development, global citizenship education, education for sustainable development, as well as technical and vocational education and training. This had truly become a joint initiative and one that provides a clear contribution to the SDGs through SDG 4[[6]](#footnote-6) in particular. It was also very pleasing to note that the global capacity-building programme continues to move forward. The reporting period saw the overall number of countries having benefitted from the programme reach 92, as well as the expansion of the global facilitators’ network[[7]](#footnote-7) through three trainings of trainer workshops in cooperation with category 2 centres for the regions of Central Asia, Asia and the Pacific and Europe. Moreover, since June 2019 (outside of the reporting period), the Secretariat had been able to hold two additional regional trainings of facilitators; one for Africa and one for the Arab States, for a total of 56 new facilitators trained in two years. Beyond the training workshops the network of facilitators has continued to develop through the establishment of an interregional working group.
4. The **Secretary** explained that as an extension of the work on capacity building, the Secretariat continued networking with universities to foster more postgraduate degrees, and encourage more training for professionals in the field of safeguarding intangible heritage. The Secretariat had established contact with a further 66 universities during the reporting period. And finally, nearly a decade since its inception, the time had come to reflect on how to sustain the capacity-building programme going forward. For this purpose, the Secretariat commissioned a feasibility study that outlined possibilities for future partnerships. It had also taken significant steps towards addressing current global challenges through its work on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The past three years has culminated in the elaboration of operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The plan was now to shift towards operational activities, institutional cooperation, capacity building and awareness raising for both conflicts and natural disasters (which would be further discussed under agenda item 13). The Secretariat was also starting to see the fruits of its work over the last couple of years in the area of communication and outreach. It has developed key messages and targeted new audiences such as youth and indigenous peoples. Some evidence of this can be seen at the present Committee session with 15 side events, of which seven are organized by UNESCO; the highest number experienced during a Committee session. The Secretary encouraged delegates to take advantage of these events and witness first-hand how focus on communication and outreach can make the work of the Convention meaningful to all stakeholders.
5. The **Secretary** also drew the delegates’ attention to the present financial situation, as some developments deserved reflection. The Secretariat had made significant efforts to better operationalize the International Assistance mechanism with the Fund closer to being fully operational. This was especially good news as it meant that States had been able to undertake more projects than ever to safeguard intangible cultural heritage (which would be further discussed under agenda item 6). The Secretary extended its thanks to the Committee for reinforcing the human resources of the Secretariat. The recruitment process had been completed with the establishment of the new safeguarding and implementation team. This would make it possible to ensure that the International Assistance mechanism is indeed reaching its potential through continued high implementation and ongoing monitoring, contributing to the overall effectiveness of States’ safeguarding efforts. Nevertheless, despite this good news, the situation with the two funding priorities was not so encouraging. During the reporting period, no voluntary contributions for either priority had been received. However, since publishing its report, the Secretariat had received a number of voluntary contributions. It was hoped that these contributions represented a positive trend that will continue over the coming years, which was needed to reinforce and expand the work undertaken. Tracing back over the last four years there have been many important developments in the life of the Convention, as conveyed in the report. The Secretariat had reformed the periodic reporting mechanisms to improve reporting through regional cycles, it had increased the implementation of International Assistance from the ICH Fund, allowing more communities than ever to benefit from these projects, while the new team will soon be monitoring and gathering lessons learned to further improve this mechanism.
6. Building on this progress, the **Secretary** spoke of how the time was ripe, as stakeholders in the Convention, to reflect on the listing mechanisms. As part of this, the Secretariat had taken a first step to make the inscription process respond better to the needs of States Parties with the introduction of the upstream dialogue process for the 2019 cycle on an experimental basis. This reflection would continue with a preliminary meeting of experts in March 2020 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris; a step-by-step process to see how the listing mechanisms could be improved by reviewing these issues over the coming two years. Having presented some of the important work undertaken during the reporting period, the Secretary wished to end the presentation by offering a series of quick highlights of the Secretariat’s many other achievements. During the reporting period, the Secretariat had organized 16 statutory meetings for the General Assembly, the Committee and its Bureau. It had administered 35 requests for International Assistance of which 23 were approved. It had launched the initiative ‘Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage’[[8]](#footnote-8) to visualize living heritage elements, reaching almost 1 million page views over the first semester of 2019. It had organized 32 workshops as part of the global capacity-building programme. It had held an expert meeting on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, bringing together 21 experts from the six UNESCO electoral groups. It had received 225 responses to its survey on lighter ways of sharing safeguarding practices. It had released on [online](https://ich.unesco.org/en/sustainable-development-toolbox-00987) tool collating more than 30 examples on the links between intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development. It had held a virtual conference on intangible cultural heritage in technical and vocational education and training with 302 participants from 83 countries. It had conducted the pilot phase of a project on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts in three cities: Kingston, (Jamaica), Georgetown (Malaysia), and Harare (Zimbabwe).[[9]](#footnote-9) It had organized a panel discussion at the 18th session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. It had launched the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention research bibliography with more than 1,200 research references,[[10]](#footnote-10) and produced audiovisual stories of four young people talking about their living heritage experiences. The Secretary concluded by welcoming questions.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the detailed report and overview of the activities undertaken by the Secretariat, opening the floor for comments.
8. The **delegation of Palestine** began by thanking Colombia for the warm welcome, commenting on the Secretariat’s rich report that demonstrated its essential role and its commitment to hard work. It thanked the Secretariat for the new system of periodic reporting, which was an excellent idea and it looked forward to its implementation. It also thanked the Secretariat for the capacity-building workshops that had been widely organized, which had also benefitted Palestine for which it was grateful. The delegation took the occasion to also thank the UNESCO Ramallah Office for the important role it plays in this regard. It reiterated its thanks to the Secretariat for the large number of activities that had been conducted. The dialogue process implemented in the current cycle in a pilot phase was a real success. In this regard, the Committee Members will respect as much as possible the recommendations of the Evaluation Body, knowing that the Evaluation Body strictly examines only the content of the file. Another aspect of the Secretariat’s work that was appreciated concerned the relations it undertakes with the NGOs, encouraging their participation which shows the Secretariat is aware of the important role NGOs play on the ground. Finally, the role of education and the implementation of activities by UNESCO Regional Offices, as mentioned by the Secretariat in its report, also involved Palestine. The delegation thus appreciated the excellent way in which the Secretariat carried out its work despite the enormous work load.
9. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** offered the Chairperson its sincere congratulations on assuming her post, and the Government of Colombia for successfully hosting the first ever session of the Committee in the region and for its warm hospitality. The delegation was very thankful for the Secretariat’s detailed report. It welcomed the progress made since the last session of the Committee in such areas as periodic reporting reform, capacity building, intangible heritage and education, intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, the reflection of the role of the NGOs, as well as knowledge management. It took note of the establishment of the implementation and monitoring team within the Living Heritage Entity following the decision of the General Assembly in 2018 on the creation of three extrabudgetary posts, adding that it was really happy with this decision. It was also encouraged by the higher expenditure on International Assistance from the ICH Fund, which surpassed US$40M during the current biennium. It was hoped that further actions will be pursued by the Culture Sector to reinforce the Secretariat knowing that the workload continued to increase. The delegation also appreciated the progress made in developing the knowledge management of the Convention, particularly the new navigation system ‘Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage’ and the Convention Research Bibliography, which will be instrumental in accompanying the efforts of public institutions, communities and researchers to enhance the capacities, raise awareness and strengthen the implementation of the Convention at country and regional levels. In terms of capacity building, the delegation commended the Secretariat for its efforts in supporting countries worldwide to enhance the implementation of the Convention and bring its provisions and mechanisms to the national context. It particularly noted the importance of the implementation of this programme in Africa and the Small Islands Developing States, especially in the context of intangible cultural heritage in conflict and natural disasters, which affected these regions in particular. It was noted that there were six nominations from these regions in the current cycle with the majority receiving a negative evaluation by the Evaluation Body, which indeed demonstrated the need to increase capacity building in these regions. It also appreciated the progress made by the Secretariat on the new priority on intangible cultural heritage and education. Indeed, it welcomed the collaboration with the Education Sector. However, it noted an absence of voluntary contributions to the Fund to this new programme during the current biennium. This programme priority represents an opportunity for strong intersectoral cooperation, which it encouraged at UNESCO. Thus, it wished to know whether any efforts were foreseen to make use of the funding mechanisms available to the Education Sector within UNESCO to be channelled to the educational activities within intangible cultural heritage, which could bring in additional funding from the Education Sector.
10. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Colombian authorities for hosting the fourteenth session of the Committee and Colombia for the very warm welcome. It also thanked the Secretariat for its very comprehensive and detailed report on its activities from January 2018 to June 2019 and for the hard work carried out in coordinating the many activities for the benefit of the Convention and its States Parties, such as coordinating meetings on the reflection of the role of NGOs or the mechanisms of inscription to the Lists, among many other initiatives. The delegation acknowledged the major efforts made by the Secretariat to lay the basis for a new dialogue that Guatemala had promoted since it became a Committee Member in 2016. It was pleased that the mechanism had been implemented, though it was not certain that all the States that had proposed files in this cycle and that had issues with certain criteria may have benefitted from the mechanism. Nevertheless, the mechanism needed to be strengthened. With regard to the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, the delegation believed that the system was indeed better adapted to the reality of each region and that flexibility should help facilitate the exercise and inform on the results obtained by the different countries when implementing the Convention. With regard to the capacity-building strategy, it took note that a training session had been held in Antigua, Guatemala, in 2019 that was devoted to training trainers and organized by the technical division of the Ministry of Culture of Guatemala in coordination with the Regional Centre for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Latin America (CRESPIAL), involving representatives from Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, El Salvador, Paraguay, Guatemala, Peru, Uruguay and others. The delegation asked that the Secretariat continue in its efforts with the category 2 centres for the promotion of the Convention.
11. The **delegation of Djibouti** began by expressing thanks to the Government of Colombia for the warm welcome in this beautiful city of Bogotá, a city replete with dance, music, culture and crafts. Moreover, it was the first time that the Committee meeting was being held in South America and the delegation was pleased that Colombia was chosen as it bore witness to the role played by Colombia in intangible cultural heritage. The delegation also extended thanks to the Assistant Director-General of Culture and the Secretary of the Convention, congratulating him on the detailed and very rich report. It hoped that the Secretariat would continue its work on operational issues and capacity building through education. The delegation asked that more support be provided to countries from the South, like Djibouti, in the presentation of their nominations, noting a number of imbalances in their nomination files, as mentioned by Azerbaijan, adding that more importance should be granted to this subject in the future.
12. The **delegation of Armenia** congratulated the Chairperson on the presidency of the session, and extended thanks and gratitude to the Colombian authorities for the warmth of their hospitality and for the organization of the session. It also thanked the Secretariat for its substantive report on its work during the period concerned. The delegation was pleased to note how these activities contributed to better implementation of the objectives of the Convention. The delegation affirmed its full commitment to the protection of intangible cultural heritage and in developing a constructive spirit and fruitful cooperation with States Parties, aware of the great potential that the Convention holds for enhancing common heritage, while preserving its rich cultural diversity. It expressed its appreciation for the support work carried out by the Secretariat with the governing bodies and in developing the Convention. New projects had been initiated, which deserved support, whether it involved the ongoing reflection on the inscription mechanisms, the necessary strengthening of national capacities for safeguarding heritage intangible cultural heritage, or initiatives such as intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations, education and in urban contexts, as well as making International Assistance mechanisms more operational. The delegation also paid particular attention to the implementation of the upstream dialogue process, which appeared to give positive results. It concluded by stating the importance Armenia attaches to further reflection to improve the participation of NGOs in the framework of the Convention.
13. The **delegation of Colombia** congratulated the Chairperson on her work accomplished over the last year in the Bureau, wishing her success in managing the present session. It thanked the Government of Spain for providing financial assistance for simultaneous interpretation in Spanish, as well as the kind words expressed by the delegations towards Colombia. The Secretariat’s report shows that the Convention has made important strides in different scenarios of dialogue, in strengthening processes of International Assistance and cooperation with concrete projects receiving resources from the ICH Fund, as well as more visible and flexible communication strategies that allow for better global awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation wished to emphasize two points in particular. First, the focus on activities to promote the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education for which greater attention should be paid to training and tertiary education as a way of safeguarding technical knowledge and traditional crafts that constitute intangible cultural heritage, particularly as safeguarding is linked to sustainable development. In this regard, the delegation wished to acknowledge work alongside UNEVOC[[11]](#footnote-11) in strengthening relations between intangible cultural heritage and technical and vocational training. It was thus fundamental to take into account the frameworks and qualification systems that certify and recognize the empirical knowledge held by teachers and practitioners of intangible cultural heritage in order to generate greater employment opportunities. The delegation also expressed strong interest in participating in the global reflection of intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts. In this regard, it thanked the donors from China for their valuable contribution, adding that a reflection on subjects of public policy in this field that integrate urban planning and masterplans that have an impact on current and future integration of cities is fundamental. The different stakeholders in safeguarding should thus work together to generate greater methodological capacity so as to have an impact on urban planning which will determine the future of cities. Finally, it was important to keep in mind that there should be a dialogue on urban areas in order to strengthen the management plans of historic areas of cities with more integral visions of cultural heritage in planning for cities that have a rich cultural heritage. The delegation concluded by inviting the delegates to the side event on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts proposed by the Ministry of Culture of Colombia where it will present approaches and the progress made in that area.
14. The **delegation of the Netherlands** congratulated the Chairperson on her presidency, adding that the Committee will have fruitful and interesting discussions under her leadership. It thanked the Government of Colombia for its hospitality and warm welcome, and congratulated the Secretariat for the excellent report and its commitment. The Convention is evolving broadly in scope with new significant areas becoming increasingly important and concrete, as shown in the agenda. The delegation welcomed the Secretariat’s efforts in these areas, such as intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts; pressing issues faced by many of the States Parties. For communities, it is important that there are physical spaces to practise their intangible cultural heritage and to have intercultural dialogue and cooperation in their multicultural cities, which was a central theme of the ICH NGO Forum. Important issues were discussed there and experiences were shared, such as from Colombia on urban planning and community practices and lifestyles and the development of a tool kit. There were also examples from Nepal, India, Burkina Faso and the Netherlands. The delegation welcomed the pilot project to identify and create a better understanding of the key issues of intangible heritage and safeguarding in cities. Another important topic is intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education. Reading the reports and elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List for instance, or the nomination files, it can be seen that education in school curricula is key in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage by involving youth, and sharing good practices and good examples in education is thus essential. The delegation not only saw the challenges of these new thematic areas, but also their potential to broaden the approach to safeguarding and the Convention.
15. The **Chairperson** first gave the floor to the Secretary to respond.
16. The **Secretary** thanked the Members for their interventions and their encouraging remarks, adding that it was very important for the Secretariat to know that the efforts made were indeed in line with the efforts expected of the Secretariat. With regard to the question from Azerbaijan on efforts to include funding within the priority of intangible cultural heritage in education, he explained that the Secretariat had been working very closely with field offices, and while the Secretariat had not received direct funding or budget transfers [from the Education Sector] it had very positive experiences in co-funding. Examples include integrating intangible cultural heritage into an education sector project at the UNESCO Harare Office, and co-organizing and co-financing both sectors stakeholders’ meeting at the UNESCO Dakar Office, as well as co-financed work on a concept paper on intangible cultural heritage and global citizenship education with the Education Sector. Responding to Colombia’s question on technical and vocational education, the Secretariat had indeed worked closely with UNEVOC with a proposal developed on this issue for which funding was being sought. Djibouti raised the question of capacity building to assist States in developing nominations on the List, which the Secretariat was well aware of and it had already developed the capacity-building materials to do so. The Secretariat now needed the funds to roll out the materials; points that would be addressed under agenda item 14 on the reform of the listing mechanisms. The Secretary took note of Armenia’s enthusiasm to work with NGOs with a dedicated agenda item 15 on that topic. Finally, the Secretary took note of the important areas of work mentioned by the Netherlands and Guatemala, adding that the Secretariat will continue working in those areas.
17. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for its report, which shows that the Convention is evolving with a growing number of States Parties with inscriptions on its Lists. There is now a substantial body of intangible cultural heritage from across the globe recognized under the mechanisms of the Convention. Hence, the responsibilities and expectations of the Committee and the General Assembly were also growing. After serving four years on the Committee, and deeply engaged in its processes and debates, the Philippines believes that the intangible heritage system is now at a crucial stage of its development. Initial thoughts included: i) the stakeholders of the intangible cultural heritage system (States Parties, communities, the Secretariat, NGOs and experts) need to avoid falling into the World Heritage paradigm in which the Lists dominate the discourse; ii) more diversified voices and inputs are needed to reflect on the reforms of the system so as to move away from a top-down approach led by the Secretariat and States Parties, and try to improve the system catering to the needs of the communities and intangible cultural heritage elements themselves; iii) in addition to the statutory meetings and processing of files and reports, norm-setting work is becoming ever more important with the development of guidelines on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and intangible cultural heritage in education, which required a more balanced appropriation of resources between these functions; iv) the youth and key policymakers should be targeted in order to raise greater awareness of intangible heritage with specific programmes formulated in this regard. The delegation also sought more information on the nature and scope of the extrabudgetary project on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts. How were the cities selected? What is the budget and expected outputs? It also wished to know the total number of staff working in the [Living Heritage] section and how many were secondments? Do donor countries set the parameters for work of the seconded staff? How do the Secretariat and States Parties ensure that actual or potential conflicts of interest are prevented? Are there any mechanisms or safeguards in place through the ethics advisory Office of Internal Oversight Services?
18. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the host country for the perfect organization of the meeting and for its warm welcome, congratulating the Secretariat for the excellent report. It appreciated all the achievements, considering the high workload, and it particularly recognized the dedication and commitment of the Secretary and his team. It was a pleasure to note that 178 States Parties were committed to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage on their territories, which is nearly universal ratification. It was noted that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and sustainable development had become a major topic. During the Forum of Ministers at the recent General Conference, a number of ministers confirmed the importance of issues like climate change, urban development and health for culture in their countries, including intangible cultural heritage. Clearly intangible cultural heritage can considerably contribute to the implementation of SDGs, particularly SDG 4 on education. The delegation welcomed the recent activities on intangible cultural heritage and education, particularly the successful European Young Heritage Professionals Forum[[12]](#footnote-12) held in Zadar, Croatia [in May 2019], and the recently launched project in Vienna with UNESCO Associated Schools on engaging youth for an inclusive and sustainable Europe,[[13]](#footnote-13) which will bring intangible cultural heritage closer to school communities across the European Union. The delegation also continued to support the focus on capacity building and it appreciated the expansion of the facilitators’ network, adding that it was satisfying to hear about the number of activities and the new training materials available online.[[14]](#footnote-14) For networking with other actors, it welcomed the cooperation with 66 universities. Furthermore, it agreed with strengthening the partnership with category 2 centres, governments, museums and heritage institutions for regionalizing capacity-building. However, the potential of UNESCO National Commissions for reaching these goals should not be overlooked. The delegation was also in favour of exploring new ideas for lighter ways of sharing safeguarding practices, which can help share good practices at local or regional levels. A recurring topic that is important for Austria in the next years will be the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism in emergency situations such as armed conflicts, natural or human-induced hazards. The delegation welcomed the contribution of the 2003 Convention to this important topic for preparedness, resilience and reconciliation, as well as intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts. Moreover, it found the pilot project for community-based inventorying in urban areas very interesting. With regard to the monitoring of the Convention, it very much looked forward to the new reporting system based on regions aligned with the overall results framework and facilitated by regional workshops, capacity building and peer learning. Finally, the delegation congratulated the Secretariat for the new outreach and communications strategy, particularly the project, Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage.
19. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Chairperson on her leadership and thanked the Government of Colombia for its warm welcome and the perfect organization of this fourteenth session. It congratulated the Secretary and the Secretariat for the detailed and informative report. The delegation spoke of its particular interest in the thematic topic of intangible cultural heritage and education, adding that [on a personal level] he had the privilege to attend an excellent sub-regional workshop at the UNESCO Dakar Office on this topic. Moreover, it was widely recognized that education will be an extremely important vehicle in the implementation of the Convention, helping to promote the values that intangible cultural heritage conveys. It was noted that during its last inventory, Senegal had developed some educational modules on inventoried elements that it wished to test in at least three elementary schools with the Ministry of National Education in collaboration with the UNESCO Dakar Office. It was convinced that this pilot teaching experience around these modules, which included a choice of tales (an extremely important vehicle for intangible heritage in Africa) would serve as a good practice that could be shared with other States. The delegation emphasized the importance of capacity-building, an essential element for the implementation of the Convention. Moreover, Senegal had benefited from capacity-building, resulting in well-established national expertise comprising a range of cultural and institutional actors, including NGOs, working on the implementation of the Convention through a national commission for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage established by presidential decree.
20. The **delegation of Poland** commended the Government of Colombia and its people for their hospitality and the excellent organization of the meeting, personally thanking the Chairperson for her work. It thanked the Secretariat for its very rich report on its activities for the benefit of the Convention, and it joined the many States Parties in drawing attention to the initiatives undertaken by the Secretariat in the field of education, which plays a key role in the implementation and promotion of the ideals of intangible cultural heritage among local communities and youth, and which underlined the role of youth as the most important element in safeguarding intangible heritage. The delegation particularly appreciated the intersectoral approach in tackling sustainable development, though monitoring methods to be developed should not be overlooked. It also welcomed with satisfaction the Secretariat’s efforts regarding the important timely topic on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
21. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** began by congratulating the Chairperson on her excellent chairpersonship, and the warm hospitality of the Colombian people and Government, wishing all the delegates fruitful work during the days ahead in a spirit of cooperation and consensus. It commended the Secretariat for its work, skilfully led by Mr Tim Curtis, as well as the quality of the report presented. At the request of experts of Kazakhstan’s National Committee for intangible cultural heritage, the delegation wished to highlight the recent activities of the Cluster Office for Central Asian countries on promoting intangible cultural heritage that took place after the Secretariat’s report had been finalized and distributed. On 18–20 November 2019 in Almaty, a sub-regional meeting on the promotion of intangible cultural heritage on technical and vocational education and training in Central Asia[[15]](#footnote-15) was conducted in cooperation with ICHCAP,[[16]](#footnote-16) a category 2 centre based in the Republic of Korea. The priority topic of this meeting was the safeguarding and integration of intangible cultural heritage into formal and non-formal education. The main goal was to raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage among the representatives of the TVET[[17]](#footnote-17) system, to expand national, regional and international networks of TVET institutions, and to ensure cooperation and networking among culture experts. Another event concerned the communication and outreach section of the report, namely, the Central Asian Intangible Cultural Heritage Film Festival and Photo Exhibition,[[18]](#footnote-18) which was held on the same date by ICHCAP and the National Committee on Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage of Kazakhstan. This event presented video and photo documentation of intangible cultural heritage from five Central Asian States, namely, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Mongolia that have cooperated with ICHCAP since 2015. The delegation wondered whether these meetings could be added to the draft decision, namely in paragraphs 14 and 18 for which a short text had been prepared. Alternatively, they could be reflected in the summary records of the present session.
22. The **delegation of Cuba** thanked the Colombian hosts for their warm welcome and the excellent organization of the meeting. It thanked the Secretary for his presentation of the excellent report. Based on this experience of intersectoral work and learning as a member of CRESPIAL, the delegation supported the call to focus on education for the safeguarding, protection and promotion of intangible cultural heritage. As such, it had seen the added value that it provides when working with the Associated Schools Network and UNESCO’s Chairs, as well as the network of MOST Schools.[[19]](#footnote-19) This is essential work carried out in a creative and inclusive way with young people who are one of the focus areas of UNESCO, and with communities in an integral approach based on local and national needs. Alternative channels include UNESCO scholarships for intercultural dialogue that enable the submission of projects through which young people and communities can become involved. Moreover, the delegation was delighted to be a part of the wealth of UNESCO’s many mandates, which provide tremendous opportunities to support initiatives and activities, presenting both challenges and opportunities.
23. The **delegation of China** introduced the Vice-Minister who would give his speech in Chinese, which was subsequently interpreted in English. The **Vice-Minister**, **Mr Zhang Xu**, began by commending the Chairperson on her excellent chairpersonship and expressed sincere gratitude to the host country for its excellent organization and warm hospitality. The Minister thanked the Secretariat for its report, acknowledging the commitment and efforts of both the Committee and the Secretariat in their work on the ratification process, periodic reporting reform, reflection on the listing mechanisms, stronger International Assistance, as well as work on intangible cultural heritage through education, and capacity building, which contributes greatly to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at the global level. China was happy to see the visibility of intangible cultural heritage further improved and the ideas of mutual respect, dialogue and respect for diversity and international cooperation, as stated in the Convention, more widely promoted. The Minister was also happy to learn from the Secretariat’s report that a new team of three fixed posts had been established since it was approved by the General Assembly in 2018. As a Committee Member, China attaches great importance to the capacity-building strategy, and it continues to support the CRIHAP[[20]](#footnote-20) Category 2 centre in Beijing to organize workshops for States Parties in the Asia Pacific region. China was also happy to learn that one new category 2 centre was approved at the General Conference [in November 2019] in the United Arab Emirates, and it was hoped that stronger cooperation and interaction between all the category 2 centres will be further enhanced under the framework of the capacity-building strategy. At the national level, China also conducted workshops on intangible cultural heritage training to more than 7,000 people in 2019. It also worked hard to implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, carrying out the intangible cultural heritage and poverty alleviation activities to empower vulnerable people and improve their livelihoods through intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, China also organized the 7th International Festival of the Intangible Cultural Heritage under the patronage of UNESCO to share best practices and to cooperate on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding at bilateral and multilateral levels. China is always committed and ready to join hands with other Members to make the Committee fully functional and to ensure the health and sustainable development of the Convention.
24. The **delegation of Jamaica** expressed deep gratitude to the Colombian authorities for the warm welcome received and also to UNESCO for facilitating its participation. It congratulated the Secretariat for having achieved so much despite the less than ideal circumstances. The delegation also expressed gratitude for the support of UNESCO with intangible cultural heritage projects in Jamaica, such as the workshop that took place in Kingston as part of the pilot project on intangible cultural heritage and creativity for sustainable cities, which was conducted over the course of several months in 2019 and is ongoing. It was also grateful for the assistance received from China for its participation in the workshop in Meishan (China) at the International Conference Culture 2030 Rural-Urban Development: The Future of Historic Villages and Towns[[21]](#footnote-21) [in June 2019]. These initiatives had allowed Jamaica to continue its work on strengthening and developing capacity, particularly among stakeholder communities that are involved in protecting and safeguarding their own intangible cultural heritage within the context of Jamaica, for which it was grateful.
25. The **delegation of Kuwait** congratulated the Chairperson for her chairing of the fourteenth session and for the amazing welcome received in a country that is full of intangible cultural heritage, which was beautifully displayed in a nearby exhibition of hundreds of traditional crafts. It also thanked the Secretariat for its professional efforts and its report, adding that dialogue had been improved between all stakeholders and non-governmental bodies, albeit more was needed due to its positive outcome. The delegation encouraged the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts, and it believed that the use of technology should be better utilized in capacity building compared to the conventional methods currently used. In this way, more people and stakeholders could be reached, especially as open access to science and information are UNESCO priorities.
26. The **delegation of Lebanon** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked Colombia for its hospitality. It also congratulated the Secretary and his team for the work carried out during the year; work that involved Lebanon on numerous occasions. Despite the recurrent crises in Lebanon, the implementation of the Convention is on the right track. It had benefited from the regional capacity-building programme in 2019 and a national capacity-building programme funded by Japan, for which it was grateful. The implementation of a pilot project on education and intangible cultural heritage had had a positive impact, which saw the integration of intangible heritage into school curricula that impacted positively on the students in terms of identity. Students identified with intangible cultural heritage through these programmes, which was noted in a measurable way in the qualitative shift from the denigration of identity, both local and national, to a sense of pride, further emphasizing the importance of this programme in the implementation of the Convention.
27. The **delegation of Japan** joined the other delegations to thank the Chairperson and Colombia for organizing this meeting in this beautiful city. It also congratulated the Secretary and his team for the efforts made in favour of intangible cultural heritage, and for the well summarized report. The delegation wished to emphasize two points, namely, the importance of capacity building, especially intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, which will be crucial in the future and it was hoped that these efforts would continue. Second, the general reflection of the Convention’s inscription mechanisms, which Japan supported through its voluntary contribution, starting with a preliminary meeting of experts in March 2020, adding that it will remain active on this subject.
28. The **delegation of Cameroon** thanked Colombia for the organization of this session and for the welcome given to the delegates. It also congratulated the Secretariat on its work and for its report on its activities, particularly those undertaken in the field of capacity-building for the promotion of the Convention, and it appreciated its close collaboration with the Secretariat. The delegation took the opportunity to inform the Committee that contrary to an earlier announcement its Minister was unable to travel to Bogotá due to national emergencies and reasons beyond his control, for which he sincerely apologized to organizers and delegates.
29. The **Minister of Arts and Cultural Heritage, Mr Avinash Teeluck**, **delegation of Mauritius**, reminded that the thirteenth session of the Committee was held in Mauritius in 2018, adding that he hoped that the Mauritius experience had been fruitful for all. Landmarks of the thirteenth session included the inscription of reggae music of Jamaica and the joint inscription of traditional Korean wrestling by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, which were openly acclaimed in Mauritius. The Minister congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the people and the Government of Colombia for hosting the fourteenth session. He also congratulated the Secretariat for its report on its activities, which translates the enormous work being done. It was noted that there had been a considerable increase in the adoption and implementation of the Convention, emphasizing the importance of intangible cultural heritage as a springboard of cultural diversity and sustainable development. It also strengthens the invaluable role of intangible cultural heritage in bringing people together to ensure greater understanding, sharing and exchange in a spirit of cooperation and mutual enrichment. Mauritius, as a Member of the Committee, has spared no efforts to protect intangible cultural heritage and share common experiences and values. To date, Mauritius has successfully inscribed three elements on the Representative List, and this year its first nomination for Sega tambour Chagos will be examined for the Urgent Safeguarding List, and it looked forward to the support of the Committee in this regard. On behalf of the delegation and the Mauritian Government, the Minister wished the delegations success and fruitful deliberations.
30. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary to respond to the questions.
31. The **Secretary** began by thanking the Members who had intervened for their encouraging remarks. With regard to the questions from the Philippines, the Secretary took good note of the four priorities that the Secretariat believed were largely reflected in the work currently undertaken. He also noticed the questions on budgeting, particularly on the extrabudgetary projects and how the cities were chosen [in the pilot project on urban areas]. The Secretary explained that the extrabudgetary project is reported under the financial reporting of UNESCO and that it is part of a larger project that touches other entities within the Culture Sector, though the Secretariat was managing only one part of that project. The cities were chosen in close consultation with the countries themselves and with the UNESCO Field Offices concerned, with three cities to be chosen over three yearly periods, i.e. nine cities. With regard to secondments, during the year the Secretariat had received secondments from Singapore and China, as reported, and all human resources procedures had been followed. In this regard, the broader question on oversight on secondment processes could probably best be answered by the Executive Board and the General Conference of UNESCO rather than this Committee. Concerning the comments by Austria, the Secretariat had taken note of the importance of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and in urban contexts, and it appreciated the collaboration on intangible heritage in education, particularly with ASPnet in Europe. Responding to Senegal, the Secretary remarked on the very good experiences it enjoys with the UNESCO Dakar Office on intangible cultural heritage in education in Senegal, which was promising and it was hoped that this model could be replicated elsewhere as there was real buy-in by the Ministry of Education whose approach might have multiplier effects.
32. The **Secretary** then thanked Poland for its comments and he took note of the importance of education and culture, adding that the Secretariat would continue moving in that direction. Responding to Kazakhstan, he noted of all the work [carried out in the region], though he was unsure whether the activities cited could be included in the draft decision because they would have to have taken place during the reporting period and undertaken by the Secretariat. Otherwise, they would come into the next reporting period, but they would certainly be noted in the summary records. The Secretariat also took note of the comments made by Cuba, particularly as regards the work carried out by the Secretariat in collaboration with the UNESCO Havana Office and ASPnet. The MOST Schools network had not been considered but may indeed, especially as there were interesting advancements in Cuba and with the regional UNESCO Santiago Office on regional approaches of intangible cultural heritage in education. The Secretary also took note of the comments made by China, and he particularly thanked the really strong efforts by CRIHAP, the category 2 centre in China, a very important partner for the Secretariat in the Asia-Pacific region that has undertaken a significant amount of capacity-building work and contributed greatly to capacity building in the region. He then thanked Jamaica for its comments, adding that he was very happy with the progress made, with Jamaica leading some of the way not only with the inscription of reggae music but with the development of inventorying in urban contexts, which it was hoped could become a pilot activity that could be replicated elsewhere. Kuwait raised some very important issues regarding intangible cultural heritage in cities, which the Secretariat had begun to tackle by undertaking some background work, for example, on the use of new technologies such as a MOOC (a massive open online course) that it had hoped to develop and launch soon. The Secretariat was in contact with a number of universities in this regard so that it might broaden the scope of the capacity-building programme. Although the work had started, it had yet to be completed, but the Secretariat was aware of those issues. The Secretary then thanked Lebanon for its comments, noting the very interesting and intense work being carried out in Lebanon despite these difficult times such as the merging of new themes on education and intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, which was pushing important boundaries. The Secretary also took note of Japan’s interest in the areas of capacity building and emergencies and he looked forward to the discussion under agenda item 13 in this regard. Indeed, Japan is an important contributor under agenda item 14 on the reflection on the listing mechanisms and the Secretary welcomed the debates. The Secretary thanked Cameroon for its intervention, and lastly, he was happy to recall the warm memories of the thirteenth session in Mauritius and looked forward to continue working with Mauritius.
33. Thanking the Secretary, the **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
34. The **delegation of Czechia**thanked Colombia for its warm hospitality and congratulated the Secretariat for the quality of its report, rich in information and summarizing the impressive number of activities, progress and projects undertaken since January 2018. It appreciated the Secretariat’s commitment given the high workload and limited resources. The Convention has not stopped evolving since its adoption in 2003, which is reflected in the necessary developments, among other things. As a result, there are issues that require further work, such as the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism and alignment with the overall results framework. The delegation expressed good wishes to the States concerned in the first cycle, as well as the Secretariat in the face of this challenge. It also welcomed the emphasis placed on the reflection of the mechanism for inscription on the lists of the Convention, and other issues such as the best means of safeguarding, formal and non-formal education, and intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts and in emergency situations. These issues must be considered from the point of view of both safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and the communities’ awareness of the value of intangible cultural heritage. Finally, the delegation wished to thank all the States that had contributed financially or by other means to the various activities for the implementation of the Convention.
35. The **delegation of Sweden**thanked the Colombian hosts for their hospitality and for organizing this meeting. It thanked the Secretariat for this elaborate and well-presented report and for the results achieved. The Secretariat’s activities are a cornerstone for the implementation of the Convention on national as well as international levels and thus it was important that the Secretariat had the resources necessary to continue and develop its work. In addition to the regular budget, voluntary resources are needed to strengthen the implementation of the Convention. Sweden was able to contribute in 2019 with voluntary funds to enhance the human capacity of the Secretariat. It encouraged other States Parties that had the capacity to support the Convention with voluntary funding, adding that safeguarding intangible cultural heritage for coming generations required States to work together. In particular, there was a need to promote and strengthen the participation and engagement of the practitioners and civil society who are the drivers of this work because there can be no intangible cultural heritage without them. Sweden was therefore happy for the constructive dialogue that had already begun, and it was committed to contributing to the further work on how NGOs can be more actively involved in the work of the Convention. Another important aspect is the exchange of experiences between countries on methods for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. This is why Sweden had contributed to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices in 2018, hoping that more countries will do the same so as to increase the rich knowledge that exists in all parts of the world. Finally, Sweden remains committed to working closely with the Secretariat and all States Parties in order to strengthen the implementation of the Convention.
36. The **delegation of Togo** congratulated Colombia for its warm welcome and thanked the Secretariat for all its activities. It took the opportunity to thank UNESCO for its support in carrying out certain activities, particularly on inventorying musical instruments, now in its second phase, and for the support it provided Togo through its Field Office on awareness raising and the implementation of intangible cultural heritage, as well as for the opportunity to participate in these meetings.
37. The **delegation of Mauritania**expressed thanks to the Colombian authorities for the generous facilities, and congratulated the Secretariat for the generous support it provides. Mauritania had established a national system of living human treasures and it also had several accredited NGOs with several experts working with UNESCO around the world. It has developed and implemented a national programme to strengthen national capacities in the field of intangible cultural heritage, and it was launching a programme to strengthen the capacities of NGOs active in the field of intangible cultural heritage. Moreover, the Ministry of Culture was now involved in inventorying, and the management and promotion of intangible cultural heritage at the service of social cohesion and understanding among communities. Mauritania is currently developing an intelligent programme aimed at promoting heritage values that were passed on from generation to generation, making them available to new generations to enhance understanding and the search for social peace, while combating damaging practices, particularly corruption, mismanagement and terrorism. The delegation invited States Parties through UNESCO to join Mauritania in working on this programme, adding that the tools for implementing the programme had already been developed in Arabic, English and French. The delegation concluded by thanking the UNESCO Office in Rabat for its support, as well as the States Parties that have financially supported intangible cultural heritage activities in Mauritania, notably Norway and Spain.
38. The **delegation of Finland** warmly thanked the host country for welcoming the delegates to Bogotá, the Secretariat for the excellent work undertaken, and the ICH NGO Forum. It wished to highlight the crucial issue of sustainable development to encourage all States Parties to share their ideas on what sustainable development means in this common work. At the same time, the delegation spoke of the concrete tool Finland has developed, namely the wheel chart of sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage, which is accessible to all. It was hoped that discussions would continue on how organizations, institutions and NGOs can work towards sustainability.
39. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to make some practical announcements.
40. The **Secretary** asked that delegates receiving financial assistance register their participation, and that States Parties holding performances and/or presenting audiovisual material should inform the Secretariat and provide the relevant electronic files as necessary. Various side events[[22]](#footnote-22) were also taking place throughout the sessions. The official opening ceremony would take place later that evening and the Colombian Government was hosting a welcoming reception. Other events included a seminar presentation of a new book, *Traditional Food, Sharing of Experiences from the Field* (ICH NGO Forum) and a food tasting. The exhibitions, ‘Companions for Safeguarding ICH: Category 2 centres in Asia and the Pacific’, and ‘Weaving bridges for ICH safeguarding’ organized by CRESPIAL was also taking place, as well as the ‘Second International Photo Exhibition: Intangible Cultural Heritage in Youth’, organized by the Category 2 centre in Tehran.

*[Monday, 9 December 2019, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 5.b OF THE AGENDA (CONT.)**

**REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT ON ITS ACTIVITIES (JANUARY 2018 TO JUNE 2019)**

1. The **Chairperson** noted that Observers had already been given the chance to speak, and with no forthcoming questions or comments from the Committee, proposed to move to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no amendments received, paragraphs 1–7 were duly adopted.
2. The **delegation of Colombia** remarked that the paragraphs cited did not correspond to the written paragraphs.
3. The **Chairperson** explained that she was providing a quick summary of the content of each paragraph. She then noted a new paragraph 8 proposed by Azerbaijan, which would read, ‘Invites the Secretariat to pursue its efforts in enhancing national capacities in Africa and Small Islands Developing States, including in the context of intangible cultural heritage and emergencies’, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 9–14 were unchanged and were duly adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 5.b**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/5.b) **adopted**.

**ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/6*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-6-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 6*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/6)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 6 on the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund: voluntary supplementary contributions and other issues.She beganby reminding the Committee that in accordance with Articles 25.5 and 27 of the Convention, it is the Committee’s responsibility to approve the voluntary supplementary contributions to the ICH Fund provided by States Parties over and above their annual assessed contributions. The Chairperson recalled that at its twelfth session in 2017, 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 programme; and ii) Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education to spearhead efforts promoting learning and teaching through and about intangible cultural heritage in education programmes. Voluntary contributions were intended mainly for the implementation of these priorities, but also other activities that cannot be supported with the limited resources of UNESCO’s regular budget. The Secretary was invited to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained that in accordance with Decision [13.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM/6), the Secretariat was requested to report on the progress in the implementation of any voluntary supplementary contribution to the ICH Fund it may have received since its last session. Furthermore, in accordance with Decision [7.COM 20](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/7.COM/20.1) the Secretariat was requested to report at each session on all forms of voluntary contributions received since the Committee’s previous session, as provided by document 6. The document also brings the Committee’s attention to the decision of the 204th session of the Executive Board in relation to the new set of Management Cost Rates for Special Accounts. The present Committee was thus asked to decide whether to maintain the special derogation rate of 0% or apply a 7% rate. The Secretary invited Ms Elena Constantinou of the Secretariat to present the details.
3. **Ms Elena Constantinou** explained that working document 6 covered the period from December 2018 to September 2019. During this reporting period, no new voluntary supplementary contributions to the Fund had been received for earmarked activities in either of the two funding priorities approved by the Committee for the period 2018–2021. However, since September 2019, several States expressed their intent to provide such contributions. However, some voluntary supplementary contributions to the Fund were received to support activities other than those related to the two funding priorities: one contribution was received from Japan in 2019 to support the global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, which was approved by the Committee in 2018 in Decision [13.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM/6); in-kind support was provided by China and Singapore; and two contributions from Monaco and Montenegro were made to the sub-fund to enhance the human resources of the Secretariat.
4. **Ms Elena Constantinou** then turned to the issue regarding the Management Cost rate of the ICH Fund, recalling that the Fund had benefitted from a special Management Cost rate derogation of 0% for all assessed contributions, while 10% was applied to voluntary supplementary contributions. In 2018, UNESCO’s Executive Board decided that multi-donor special accounts should be subject to a new rate of 7% instead of the previous standard rate of 10%. It also stated that ‘necessary consultations with the Governing Bodies of States Parties to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Convention and to the World Heritage Convention’ should take place to discuss how to apply this decision to assessed contributions to the Fund. Following the Executive Board’s decision, the World Heritage Committee decided to ‘recommend strongly that the current Management Cost rate of 0% continues to apply to the special account of the World Heritage Fund’. The Committee was therefore asked at the present session to decide on which Management Cost rate to recommend to the General Assembly for application to all assessed contributions. The draft decision proposed two options: i) the continued application of a 0% Management Cost rate for all assessed contributions, which would be consistent with the practice applied for assessed contributions to the World Heritage Fund; and ii) the application of a 7% Management Cost rate for all contributions, including assessed contributions, which would have important consequences for the future of the Fund, as 7% of all assessed contributions would not go towards supporting States’ initiatives for the implementation of the Convention. In all cases, the Management Cost rate will remain at 7% for voluntary contributions, as was currently the case. As the reporting period covered by the working document ends in September 2019, the Secretary wished to present some recent updates on voluntary contributions.
5. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Constantinou for the clear explanation, inviting the Secretary to update the Committee on recent contributions and expressions of interest contributing to the Fund.
6. The **Secretary** was pleased to inform the Committee of several recent positive developments regarding voluntary supplementary contributions. In November 2019, three States Parties expressed intent to support the Convention with contributions to the Fund. The Netherlands contributed €100,000 to support the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage through formal and non-formal education in Latin America and the Caribbean, which was the first voluntary contribution entirely dedicated to the funding priority ‘Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in formal and non-formal education’ approved by the Committee in 2017. Sweden committed to support the human capacities of the Secretariat with a contribution of 500,000 Swedish Krona (approximately US$51,000) to the sub-fund dedicated to enhancing the human resources of the Secretariat. Switzerland committed to a contribution of US$100,000 to support capacity-building initiatives for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in situations of natural disasters. In addition, Azerbaijan expressed its intent, through a letter dated 26 November 2019, to provide a contribution (in an amount to be confirmed) to support capacity-building activities relating to the safeguarding of living heritage in emergency situations. The Secretariat was very grateful to all four States Parties for their generous commitment in support of the Secretariat’s work. Given these developments, the Secretariat proposed some amendments to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft decision.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat and opened the floor for comments.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the report, and commended the States that had already provided support to the implementation of the Convention through the ICH Fund during this current biennium, either through the earmarked contributions to specific country projects or to support the sub-Fund for enhancing the human capacity of the Secretariat. The delegation was very proud that through this mechanism Azerbaijan had supported capacity-building projects in Bangladesh and Guatemala, which allowed these countries to address the needs of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, highlighting the role of heritage for the broader context of sustainable development. However, it noted the worrying decline of voluntary contributions that directly impacted on the operational activities of the Convention, as well as the support provided to the two programme priorities of the Convention in the context of the current and expected increase of expenditure of the ICH Fund due to the International Assistance mechanism. Moreover, this situation will have to be dealt with more in the future as the impact and recognition of the Convention continues to grow. The delegation believed that opportunities to involve more private donors should be further explored. With regard to the Management Cost Rate for multi-donor special accounts, and mindful of the decision taken by the World Heritage Committee, the delegation was in favour of keeping 0% for the Management Cost of the ICH Fund. It believed that the present measure will contribute to increasing the competitiveness of the Convention in terms of resource mobilization in the form of voluntary contributions, and therefore favoured option A.
9. The **delegation of the Philippines** wished to hear from the Secretariat the implications of both options as outlined in the draft decision. However, listening to the explanation, it preferred option A, as indicated by Azerbaijan. Also, looking at the importance of voluntary contributions, the delegation wished to know which measures were also being put in place to raise extrabudgetary contributions. Referring to its experiences with the World Heritage Committee, when the Philippines was a Member from 2014–2017, the Committee had piloted a Partners’ Forum on the side-lines of the Committee session in Turkey [in 2016] and Poland [in 2017] in which projects requiring extrabudgetary funding were presented to donors. The World Heritage Committee was also developing a comprehensive resource mobilization strategy. The delegation thus recommended that the Secretariat explore these two tracks as concrete initiatives for future Committee sessions. Perhaps a core group of States Parties or the Bureau might want to develop this in the intersessional period.
10. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
11. Responding to the questions posed by the Philippines, the **Secretary** explained that the Management Cost Rate under the current system applied 0% to all the voluntary assessed contributions, i.e. the 1% of contributions that States, Members of the Convention, contribute into the Fund. These funds are called ‘voluntary assessed’ because they are voluntary in relation to UNESCO membership, but they are also ‘assessed’ in terms of the relationship of States’ membership to the Convention. Up until now, the Management Cost Rate for voluntary *assessed* contributions has been 0%, whereas the Management Cost Rate for voluntary *supplementary* contributions up until now has been 10%. The Executive Board decided to apply a 7% rate across all such special accounts because different accounts had different rates. Option A means that States would have 0% applied to their assessed voluntary contributions, meaning the 1% State Parties pay to the Convention, and the rate applied to voluntary supplementary contributions would go down from 10% to 7%. Option B means that both contributions would apply a Management Cost Rate of 7%. Concerning the question on fundraising for the voluntary contributions for the Fund, the Secretariat was very aware, particularly over the last couple of years, to implement the leftover money that was accumulating in the ICH Fund. He recalled that the decisions of the General Assembly to increase the amount [of International Assistance requests] to be approved by the Bureau and the number of requests processed through the Bureau meant that the Fund is being implemented and is now in a healthier state. This in turn means that the Secretariat is in a much better position to start approaching donors and other States, which is indeed the intention. The Secretary conceded that the focus over the last two years had been on implementing the excessive funds in the ICH Fund, but that now the focus could be directed at fundraising, particularly with the new team in place.
12. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines for its questions to the Secretariat, which clarified the options. Thus, in Option A, did this imply that the rate for assessed contributions would be 0% but for other contributions it would remain at 10%?
13. The **Secretary** explained that other contributions would be reduced to 7%.
14. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that Option A [in the draft decision] indicated a rate of 0% for assessed contribution, but that the 7% rate was not mentioned. The delegation thus suggested that the 7% rate that would be applied to all contributions be clearly indicated in the draft decision under Option A, thus showing the two applicable rates.
15. The **Secretary** remarked that thedraft decision was in fact correct in that Option A states ‘for all assessed contributions’, whereas Option B states ‘for all contributions, including assessed contributions’. Nevertheless, the Secretary understood the ambiguity and suggested that a Member of the Committee or the Secretariat propose appropriate wording.
16. Following the explanation, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–4 were unchanged and were duly adopted. Paragraph 5, expressing appreciation for the generous contributions received, had been amended in light of the recent contributions from the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland, and was duly adopted. Paragraph 6 was also amended to reflect the new voluntary contributions recently received, which was duly adopted. Paragraphs 7 and 8 were also adopted. Paragraph 9 had two options related to the recommendation to the General Assembly on the Management Cost Rate to be applied to contributions to the Fund. Option A for the continued application of the 0% rate, and Option B for the application of the 7% rate.
17. The **delegation of Austria** was of the understanding that some Committee Members had already voiced their preference for Option A and the application of a Management Cost Rate of 0%. The delegation therefore proposed to delete Option B and retain only Option A.
18. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed with Austria’s suggestion, and echoed the comments made by other delegations to add a sentence at the end of Option A, which would read, ‘and keep the rate of 7%’, which would clarify the budget rates.
19. The **Secretary** explained thatthe text should read ‘apply’ as the rate was not currently at 7%.
20. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Secretary for the English clarification, adding that it agreed with the proposal, unless there was better wording proposed by other Members.
21. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Colombia for the proposed language and suggested a minor addition to read, ‘apply a rate of 7% for all other contributions’, adding that it supported Option A.
22. The **delegation of Zambia** congratulated the Chairperson for her chairing of the session and expressed gratitude to Colombia for its hospitality and welcome. The delegation realized that the contribution from the non-assessed contributions was 10%, but it did not understand why it was reduced from 10% to 7%. Thus, if there is no substantive reason for the reduction, the delegation recommended to maintain the 0% rate for assessed contributions and retain the 10% for all other voluntary contributions.
23. The **Secretary** remarked that theworkingdocument had explained that it was an Executive Board decision to harmonize all special account rates across the board. Therefore, it was not for the Committee to decide, as it is a UNESCO-wide practice to apply a 7% rate across all special accounts. However, in that decision, the Board recognized that for two special accounts, the World Heritage Fund and the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund, that there are assessed contributions as well, and that it was up to the governing bodies of those Conventions to make a decision concerning those contributions. Therefore, the reduction from 10% to 7% is not a decision for the Committee to make because it had been made by the Executive Board for UNESCO as a whole. However, it granted the Committee flexibility to decide on the assessed contributions, i.e. whether to apply 7% or 0%.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the explanation.
25. The **delegation of Armenia** favoured Option A and suggested deleting Option B, as suggested by Austria.
26. The **Chairperson** noted a consensus towards Option A.
27. The **Secretary** proposed tospecify that the rate referred to a Management Cost Rate. Thus, the text should read, ‘apply a Management Cost Rate of 7% for all other contributions’, which was duly amended.
28. The **delegation of Zambia** expressed concern that the Executive Board had decided to reduce the rate from 10% to 7% thereby reducing the funds available to the Secretariat. At the same time, it was concerned about the funds needed to support the human resources of the Secretariat. Option A therefore appeared to reduce the amount of money available to the Secretariat for its operations from a rate of 10% to 7%. It therefore suggested to examine Option B so as to better understand the implications for the operations of the Secretariat.
29. The **Secretary** understood the concerns expressed by Zambia. However, while it may indeed look like it was reducing the rate, it is intended to improve the ability of the Secretariat to raise further supplementary contributions and to be more competitive with other agencies, funds and programmes, as well as to introduce one harmonized rate. Option B did not retain 10%; the 10% would be directed towards a special account of UNESCO. The Secretariat hoped that by reducing the rate from 10% to 7% it would allow it to raise more money, and therefore the overall funds for the management cost of the Secretariat should still increase to make it more competitive.
30. The **Chairperson** then turned back to paragraph 9 as amended, which read, ‘Recommends that the General Assembly endorse the continued application of a Management Cost rate of 0% for all assessed contributions to the special account of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund and apply a Management Cost Rate of 7% for all other contributions’.
31. The **delegation of** **Austria** remarked that since there was agreement on Option A, then the mention of ‘Option A’ should also be deleted.
32. The **Chairperson** agreed that Option A could be deleted as Option B had also been deleted. Paragraph 9 was thus duly adopted as amended. Paragraph 10 was also adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 6**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/6) **adopted**.

**ITEM 7 OF THE AGENDA**

**DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE RESOURCES OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2020–2021**

**Documents:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/7 Rev.2*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-7-EN_Rev.2.docx)

[*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.7*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.7-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 7*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/7)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of agenda item 7 on the Draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2020–2021. It was recalled that the Committee’s functions are laid down in Article 7 of the Convention, one of which was to propose to the General Assembly of States Parties a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund. As the present Committee was meeting before the next General Assembly, it was being asked to examine the spending plan for the next two years, as proposed by the Secretariat. This was important for the Committee and for the Convention as a whole as many of the achievements by the Committee and the Secretariat over the past two years had been made possible thanks to the ICH Fund to which States Parties contribute year after year. The Chairperson invited the Secretary to present this item.
2. The **Secretary** introduced the two documents under agenda item 7. Information document [14.COM INF.7](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.7-EN.docx) reports on the implementation of the Fund from 1 January 2018 until 30 June 2019 and contains an annex of the financial statement on the use of the Fund issued by the Bureau of Financial Management. For the sake of time and efficiency, the Secretary did not present the document in detail, but was ready to answer any questions on the document. The other working document [14.COM 7 Rev.2](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-7-EN_Rev.2.docx) was made up of two main sections. Section I on the status and trends, presenting the recent trends in the implementation of the Fund with a detailed analysis of the evolution of expenditures and incomes up to the current biennium, and Section II, presenting the ‘future’ by proposing a draft plan for the use of resources of the Fund for the next biennium and the first six months of 2022. To this end, a draft plan for the use of the resources of the Fund was annexed to the working document.
3. The **Secretary** began by first presenting the recent trends. During the 39 C/5 biennium, the total income of the Fund diminished by 4.6% compared to the previous biennium, reaching around US$ 4.44 million. This confirmed the decreasing trend of the previous biennium in which a 15.6% decrease had already been witnessed. The decline was the result of the reduction in the amount of voluntary supplementary contributions received despite the generous contributions recently pledged by several States Parties in November 2019, as previously mentioned under agenda item 6.The largest source of income for the Fund comes from assessed contributions representing 91% of the total income for the period 1 January 2018 to 30 June 2019. Regarding the status of assessed contributions based on the latest statement issued by the Bureau of Financial Management, as of 30 November 2019, the arrears amounted to US$463,095, of which US$212,538 correspond to unpaid contributions of previous years. In this regard, as of 30 November 2019, 44 States Parties had not paid their contributions for 2018 and 2019, representing one quarter of all States Parties.Meanwhile, the expenditure rate of the latest plan approved by the General Assembly was on the increase, reaching 47.2% on 30 June 2019. According to the latest forecast, the expenditure rate at the end of the biennium may exceed 60%, which would represent the highest expenditure rate of the Fund since 2010 shortly after it became operational in 2008. From Figure 1 in document 7, expenditures [in orange] had for the first time surpassed US$4 million, representing 112% of the compulsory assessed contributions due for 2018–2019 [shown by the dark blue line]. The increase in expenditure was directly linked to the significantly increased implementation of the International Assistance mechanism. As a result, the overall approved budget [indicated by the light blue line], which had been rising until the current biennium, was expected to decrease for the 40 C/5 biennium (2020–2021) from US$ 8.6 million to approximately US$ 7 million.
4. The **Secretary** further explained that during the 2018–2019 biennium, expenditures increased by 78% compared to the previous biennium, bringing the expenditure rate to 49% as of 30 June 2019. This meant that States Parties had made significantly better use of the International Assistance mechanism, corresponding to budget lines 1 and 2 of the Fund. Overall, the financial situation of the Fund was sound from an operational point of view, i.e. States had an increased capacity to access funds. The Secretariat was also better equipped to respond to their requests, also thanks to the newly created Safeguarding Implementation and Monitoring team (SIM). What did this positive trend mean for the future? Since expenditures were on the increase, it was foreseen that the total budget of the Fund, i.e. the amount of financial resources available to support State efforts, would gradually diminish in the future. This was not an immediate concern – and indeed the Committee should aim at having the Fund fully implemented in each cycle – but this reality did indicate that voluntary contributions will become even more important in the future to support the implementation of the Convention at the national level. Now that the Fund is in a healthier operational situation, the Secretariat was in a better position to pursue voluntary supplementary contributions. Some promising signs had been observed as several donors had recently committed to making voluntary supplementary contributions to the Fund.
5. The **Secretary** then turned to the future plan for the implementation of the Fund, as summarized in Annex I of document [14.COM 7 Rev.2](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-7-EN_Rev.2.docx). The draft plan covers a period of 24 months (2020–2021), as well as the first six months of 2022. The proposed budget for the first six months of 2022 corresponds to one-quarter of the total budget approved for the period 2020–2021. Should the draft plan be endorsed by the Committee at the present session, it will be submitted for the approval of the General Assembly at its eighth session in June 2020. For the period from 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2021, the amount of the spending plan to be submitted to the General Assembly was estimated to be approximately US$7 million. In line with the priorities of the Fund (as set out in Chapter II.1 of the Operational Directives), it was proposed that the majority of the resources be allocated to providing International Assistance to States Parties (budget lines 1, 1.1 and 2). The combined percentage of these three lines (64.75%) remained the same as during the previous biennium. Budget line 1 (International Assistance) will be assigned the majority of the allocation of the Fund (51.96%). Budget line 1.1 (SIM team) will be assigned 10.79%. Budget line 2 (Preparatory/Technical Assistance) will decrease from 4.5% to 2%, which reflected the actual expenditure experienced in the current biennium. The slight decrease proposed for budget line 1 (–0.59%) and Budget Line 2 (–2%) will offset the necessary increase of budget line 1.1, which was required to maintain the nominal amount needed to cover the costs of three extra-budgetary fixed-term posts created in 2018. Budget line 3 (other functions of the Committee) will be maintained at 20% of the total budget approved, which is dedicated to upstream work at the global level and thus the implementation of projects and programmes at national and regional levels through voluntary contributions.
6. The **Secretary** further explained that the funds allocated to budget line 3 will be specifically dedicated to: i) the capacity-building programme; ii) the integration of intangible cultural heritage into development plans, policies and programmes, with a particular focus on education and on the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations; iii) the improvement in the management of knowledge, information and monitoring of the Convention; and iv) the promotion of the objectives of the Convention through awareness raising and outreach. As in preceding plans, the present draft decision proposed that the Committee authorizes the Secretariat to make transfers between activities within budget line 3. In previous biennia the Committee authorized such transfers up to a cumulative amount equivalent to 2% of the initial total allocation. However, the proposed draft decision took into consideration the recent Appropriation Resolution adopted in November 2019 by UNESCO’s General Conference. It was therefore proposed that such transfers between activities be authorized up to 5% of the initial total allocation (for the 40 C/5 it will mean up to US$70,000). Budget lines 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be maintained in general at their respective percentages with slight adjustments based on the experience of the current biennium. As was the case in the current biennium, the present draft decision proposes that the Committee continue to authorize the Secretariat to operate transfers between budget lines 4, 5 and 6, up to 30% of their initial total allocation. This flexibility would allow the Secretariat to respond to as many requests for financial assistance as possible across the different categories of participants. The draft decision also proposes to extend this flexibility to transfers between budget line 7 and budget lines 4, 5 and 6, as it had been observed that the use of the funds allocated to budget line 7 [the costs of advisory services] can significantly vary from one year to another depending on the country of residence of Members of the Evaluation Body.
7. The **Secretary** remarked that the Secretariat had been able to respond to most of the requests received for financial assistance to participate in the thirteenth and fourteenth sessions of the Committee thanks to the flexibility granted by the General Assembly and the Committee this biennium. As per Resolution [7.GA 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/7.GA/8), the Secretariat will inform the General Assembly and the Committee of the exact amount transferred between budget lines 4, 5 and 6. The Reserve Fund [budget line 8], having already reached the target of US$1 million at the end of the previous biennium, had no proposed allocation. The Secretary wished to bring to the Committee’s attention two decisions of UNESCO’s Executive Board in 2016 (200 EX/Decision 19) and in 2017 (201 EX/Decision 24). These decisions affect the Financial Regulations of all Special Accounts, including the Fund of the 2003 Convention, as they call for the alignment of the Financial Regulations of all Special Accounts. In conformity with both decisions, the Secretariat will prepare draft revisions to the Financial Regulations of the Fund, which will be submitted for approval to the next General Assembly. Based on initial assessment, revisions were not expected to bring major changes to the functioning of the Fund as it already operates under comprehensive Financial Regulations. It was hoped that all the information provided would help the Committee examine this important item.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the detailed presentation of the Plan for the use of its resources for the next period 2020–2021, opening the floor for a general debate on the proposed plan.
9. The **delegation of** **Austria** renewed its appreciation of the Secretariat’s work whose efforts were clearly reflected in the figures, notably for instance in the utilization of the ICH Fund under budget lines 1 and 2 which have increased in the biennium by 78%. It was known that the main reason was due to the increase in the International Assistance mechanism, which implied an additional workload for the Secretariat, and it was highly likely that this trend will continue in future cycles. However, it agreed that the Committee should start thinking about ensuring equitable access to the Fund in the future. For instance, by determining priorities or maximum amounts per country in a given timeframe. The delegation felt that special attention should be paid to budget line 3 (other functions of the Committee). Given the sad reality in the decrease in voluntary contributions, the funds from this budget line will help achieve the objectives set under the two priorities: capacity-building and intangible cultural heritage in education. Beyond that, the budget line has to cover a number of other very important tasks, such as the management of knowledge information and monitoring, including the website. In general, the budget presented was balanced, although the biggest budget shift (2.59%) had to go towards staff costs rather than directly to assistance of safeguarding measures.
10. Thanking the Secretariat for the working document, the **delegation of** the **Philippines** sought clarification in paragraph 18 in reference to ‘educational institutions’ as to what institutions were alluded to in this case. Secondly, it noted that the 20% budget line dedicated to ‘other functions of the Committee’ was an important sum. It therefore requested to receive a more detailed breakdown of the envisioned activities and amounts concerned, which could be provided in a supplemental information document. For the purposes here and for the next two years, it would therefore be good to know to what the 20% would primarily be attributed.
11. The **delegation of** **Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the report, noting that it mentioned a decline in assessed contributions to the ICH Fund due to 44 countries not having paid their assessed contributions amounting to more than $1.4M to the ICH Fund and creating additional problems for the proper implementation of the Convention. The delegation asked whether the Secretariat had envisaged any measures related to unpaid contributions in the near future, i.e. what measures could be linked for instance to access by the unpaid States to the international mechanisms?
12. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
13. The **Secretary** remarked that perhaps the situation was not as bad at present, as the amount referred to years 2018 and 2019 and indeed some countries pay later in the financial year. It is however a concern. At this stage, the only restrictive provision in the regulations is that Member States are unable to become a Member of the Committee if their assessed contributions are in arrears. Other restrictions or measures would require a new debate, which may take place at a later date perhaps in relation to the listing mechanisms. Currently, this was not a proposal. Concerning the question from the Philippines on paragraph 18, the Secretary explained that the Secretariat had been undertaking a series of regional networking among higher education institutions in order to get more universities interested in creating postgraduate courses in the field of intangible cultural heritage. In the Asia-Pacific region, the UNESCO Bangkok Office was principally involved, and now with ICHCAP there are some 20-30 universities now cooperating in the network from across the region. There are similar numbers of universities involved in Latin America through the UNESCO Montevideo Office, as well as with the UNESCO Harare Office in Africa so this budget pertains to helping sustain these networks and providing seed money to ultimately look for partners to sustain the networks. The issue at this stage was that there are few universities actually doing integrated intangible cultural heritage coursework at the postgraduate level. The Secretary surmised that at some stage, the Secretariat could report on this work and provide a list of universities. With regard to budget line 3 pertaining to the ‘other functions of the Committee’, it was indeed possible [to obtain a more detailed breakdown of the 20% of the budget], as presented to the Bureau following the General Assembly for example, with projections over the subsequent six months. The data was thus accessible and could be made available.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the additional information, and having given this issue careful consideration wished to move to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. The Chairperson first gave the floor to the ICH NGO Forum.
15. A **Representative of the ICH NGO Forum** appreciated the support provided out of the ICH Fund to support the participation of NGOs from developing countries, which had a direct and strengthened impact on collaboration between NGOs that reflected positively on the current and potential advisory functions that accredited NGOs provide to the Committee. Since the twelfth session in Jeju, Republic of Korea, the ICH NGO Forum had established a framework for its annual meetings, which are held prior to the kick-off of the Committee sessions and continue during the course of these sessions. Thus, during the official Committee sessions, the ICH NGO Forum continues to hold successful capacity-building and concept-developing meetings that directly focus on the current and potential advisory functions that NGOs provide under the Convention in terms of regional needs, opportunities and challenges. On Sunday [8 December] the Forum held a symposium to address relative and significant topics. The ICH NGO Forum considers these activities necessary for the work of NGOs and their development under the Convention and therefore it kindly requested that the assistance provided to NGOs from developing countries be extended to cover both days of the Forum’s activities, i.e. the weekend before the beginning of the Committee sessions, and not only one day as was currently the case. At the same time, the Forum recommended that NGOs benefitting from the Fund be formally requested to not only be present during the Committee sessions, as they are currently requested to be, but also during the Forum’s activities. Furthermore, the ICH NGO Forum continues to strengthen its organizational framework and, with its Steering Committee, takes on an increasing scope of activities and responsibilities in pursuit of a stronger Forum in support of the Committee. Therefore, the ICH NGO Forum kindly requested that support from the Fund be also extended to the seven elected Steering Committee members to ensure their active and full participation in the Committee and General Assembly sessions regardless of whether their NGOs belong to developing countries or not. Lastly, to help counter the challenge of regional imbalance within the Forum, it recommended to the Committee to make increased use of funds to support capacity-building activities aimed at sustaining and developing NGOs in underrepresented regions.
16. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
17. The **Secretary** thanked the representative of the NGOs. Indeed, the work of the ICH NGO Forum was becoming increasingly important and, in many ways, more in line with the work of the Committee. Moreover, the discussions in the ICH NGO Forum seem to be moving in greater synergy with the discussions of the Committee. However, some of these requests have financial consequences on the ICH Fund and any authorization of these kinds of changes would ultimately be decided by the General Assembly. Nevertheless, regarding the first request to extend a day of deliberations to allow participation in the preliminary work of the Forum, the Committee could decide if it so wished to absorb those costs through the 30% flexibility already afforded. However, the more days that are covered, the fewer numbers of people who can attend, as the Fund does not increase in equal rapport. Thus, it was a decision that had to be made. With regard to the second request concerning Steering Committee members coming even from developing countries, it was somewhat problematic as this provision does not exist elsewhere in the Convention. Moreover, Committee Members from developing States receive support to participate, but developed States do not, and thus there was a question of consistency with the various operations of the Committee. With regard to using the Fund for capacity building, the recognized mechanism under the Fund would refer to the section under International Assistance, which was reserved for States Parties. However, some NGOs could perhaps contact various institutions such as UNESCO National Commissions to request International Assistance, but that would involve a significant re-appropriation or redirection of the funds under the current system. Ultimately, funds given for something would involve taking funds from somewhere else.
18. The **delegation of Armenia** believed that this issue was an emerging concern and should be examined under agenda item 15 on the reflection on the participation of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention. The representative could thus reiterate these concerns as they were indeed issues that should form part of that reflection.
19. Thanking Armenia, the **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision, and paragraphs 1–8 were duly adopted.
20. The **delegation of Kuwait** sought to verify that paragraph 9 pertained to the eighth General Assembly, which was duly confirmed by the Chairperson.
21. The **delegation of the Philippines** returned to its earlier question concerning the 20% budget line 3, adding that the activities under this budget line are important as it benefits all States Parties. Thus, it wondered whether the Bureau should be the sole entity deciding on the 20% when either the Committee or the General Assembly should be involved in the decision-making in a spirit of transparency and inclusiveness. Thus, should the Committee agree, these allocations could be examined by the Committee or the General Assembly, in which case the delegation would propose an amendment requesting these entities to do so at their next session.
22. **The Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
23. The **Secretary** remarkedthat there was a calendar issue in relation to the budget, which is different to other bodies particularly World Heritage, simply because the General Assembly is held in June and the budget year starts in January. Consequently, the budget is proposed in terms of percentages; it is only at the General Assembly that the actual amounts are known. This did not imply that the 20% could not be scrutinized, but that it would be difficult to have a breakdown beyond percentages. This was simply a practical impediment. The alternative would be to have the Committee sessions moved to June and the General Assembly moved to December, as this schedule would be more in line with such a request.
24. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked on the scheduling issue concerning next year’s budget and sought clarity on *when* the 20% allocation would be presented to the Bureau given that the Committee was being asked to approve a budget well in advance of knowing to what the budget pertained to specifically. The delegation was of the principle that the Secretariat should provide more information and feedback on the budget before the Committee could approve the 20% in general. It therefore sought language in paragraph 9 that addressed this preoccupation.
25. The **delegation of Palestine** took note of the Secretariat’s explanation that this was a scheduling problem. The Secretariat had raised the possibility of changing the dates of the Committee and the General Assembly, but the delegation wondered whether the Secretariat could provide a more creative solution.
26. The **Secretary** explained thatthe fact the General Assembly is held in June and the Committee is held in December was in fact problematic for the Secretariat in terms of budget as it meant that it had to foresee expenditures six months in advance every two years and then reabsorb funds into the budget once the amounts were known. The Secretary recalled that – for historical reasons – Member States wanted to have some elapsed time between the World Heritage Committee and the ICH Committee for scheduling purposes, which means that the Secretariat is unable to provide exact budget allocations until the decision by the General Assembly. However, it can accommodate percentages, as currently provided. The Secretariat could not give precise amounts because this would depend on how many States paid their contributions and how much was left in the Fund when the General Assembly takes its decision in June the following year. However, the Secretariat needs to operate over the next six months and cannot wait from January until June when the General Assembly meets.
27. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred that the question of calendar for the different organs and conventions was indeed problematic. For example, the General Conference every two years is particularly heavy for delegations as it follows the committees for the 1972 Convention, the 1954 Convention and the Second Protocol, as well as this Committee, which overloads December. The delegation remarked that the 2005 Convention had changed the date [of its Committee session] so that it is more manageable for the delegations. Thus, the suggestion of changing the dates of the General Assembly and having the Committee in early June or at the end of May could be a solution. The delegation thus asked that a change of calendar for the Committee and General Assembly be considered.
28. The **delegation of the Philippines** felt that Palestine’s statement could be discussed as a separate item. However, addressing the principle that the Bureau should not be the ultimate deciding power on the budget as it is a core function of the Committee, the delegation wished to propose an amendment to paragraph 9, which would read, ‘Decides that the utilization of the funds allotted under budget line 3 of the plan ‘other functions of the Committee’ shall be considered by the next session of the Committee based on proposals prepared by the Secretariat’. Thus, the budget would be considered after the General Assembly has made its decision in June for the next session of the Committee in November or December.
29. The **Secretary** askedthe Philippineshow the Secretariat would operate between the General Assembly and the Committee.
30. The **delegation of the Philippines** asked the Secretariat to clarify when specifically the Bureau decides on the 20% allocation.
31. The **Secretary** explainedthat the Bureau decides on the 20% allocation the day after the General Assembly when it knows the actual amounts involved. At the same time, the amounts of the past six months that were not yet fully approved are absorbed back into the budget.
32. The **delegation of the Philippines** felt that the General Assembly should decide on the allocation since the Bureau meets right after the General Assembly.
33. The **delegation of Armenia** remarked that this was not an issue of timing, but rather whether the Committee entrusted the Bureau to decide, adding that it had no issue with delegating this task to the Bureau.
34. The **delegation of** **Palestine** returned to the proposal by the Philippines, inquiring whether there was an impediment in proposing the budget to the General Assembly given that the Bureau decides on it one day after the General Assembly.
35. The **Secretary** explained thatshould the Committee wish to have that level of detailed discussion among all 178 States Parties at the General Assembly then it would indeed be possible, though there were other items to discuss [at the General Assembly]. This was therefore a question for the Member States.
36. The **delegation of Djibouti** remarked that it was a question of simplicity. The General Assembly was one entity and the Committee was another, and it is the Committee that delegates this task to the Secretariat, making it unnecessary to return to the General Assembly. As mentioned by Armenia, the Committee delegates this power to the Bureau for which Djibouti had no issue. However, it could be added that the Bureau should report.
37. The **Secretary** reiterated thatall these expenditures were indeed reported and that the Fund is transparent.
38. The **delegation of Kuwait** could agree with the Philippines regarding efforts [to report the budget] immediately after the General Assembly, although it acknowledged the scheduling issues. Nevertheless, there is a difference between reporting on the utilization of the Fund and deciding how the Fund is used. Clearly, the money used in the Fund is reported at the General Assembly, while the Committee was currently discussing how this 20% will be utilized, which is a different matter. Having more States Parties deciding on the Fund’s use was thus a wise decision.
39. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred that the Committee has full confidence in the Secretariat and the Bureau. However, this was not a question of trust. Speaking both as a current and past member of the Bureau, the Bureau already has the responsibility and trust to make decisions concerning International Assistance of less than US$100,000. However, in this case, it is a matter of formality and transparency, as with everything in this Convention thanks to the work of the Secretariat. The Bureau does not have time to enter into details and, in any case, it has never opposed a proposal from the Secretariat. Generally speaking, in budget matters, the Bureau trusts the Secretariat. Moreover, it was recalled that the Committee had given the Secretariat a mandate to use extrabudgetary funds for staff, so the Committee shows flexibility. This issue was therefore one of simplicity, inclusivity and transparency, which supports the recommendation of the Working Group on Governance.
40. The **delegation of the Philippines** echoed the remarks made by Kuwait and Palestine. Speaking as a past member of the Bureau, the issue was not about trust. The delegation explained that such an important decision concerning large sums affects many States, and the communities behind the elements deserve a richer discussion and would benefit from the feedback and inputs from States Parties. This was the motivation behind the question. The delegation agreed that the Bureau does not have much time to discuss or consult with the Electoral Groups, especially as there is determination to adopt decisions quickly. In this regard, the delegation proposed a simple amendment to paragraph 9 in the draft decision. Of course, the Bureau could be delegated to further discuss [budgetary matters], but the principle is based on the understanding that the General Assembly is the supreme body of the Convention and the Committee is answerable to the General Assembly under the Convention. The amendment would thus replace ‘delegates to its Bureau the authority to decide’, with, ‘invites the General Assembly to decide upon the utilization […]’. This would cover the concern and the transition for the next General Assembly as it evolves. It might actually benefit the budget to have the full force of the General Assembly approving the 20%. Thus, the amendment would be formulated as ‘invites the General Assembly to decide upon’.
41. The **Secretary** understood the spirit of the proposal but the general way of presenting budgets was that the Committee examines the budget and presents its recommendation. In this case, the Committee is telling its Bureau to decide. Thus, it would be more consistent if the 20% allocation was part of the overall budget that the Committee discusses and then presents as a whole to the General Assembly, which adopts the budget. In any case, the breakdown has to go to the General Assembly – it is not the Committee that decides on the budget. The Secretary reiterated that it would be unusual procedurally to have a separate budget for the 20% allocation, which is only done by the General Assembly. He therefore suggested to approach the draft decision with caution in that it would make more sense for the breakdown of the 20% allocation to be first shown in percentage forms to the Committee and then for a Committee to put that forward to the General Assembly. In any case, any change would entail a year of adaptation to catch up with the system should the Committee decide to go along with the proposal.
42. The **delegation of the Philippines** sought clarification and whether it was therefore possible to have received that breakdown in the document for this Committee, and if so, why was it not provided?
43. The **Secretary** conceded that it wasindeedpossible but it had never been done, though he did not know why this was so, and it had never previously been proposed in this way. Should the Committee however wish to change the procedure, then it would have to follow the cycles. Moreover, an amendment as proposed would result in documents that would not concord, thus it was better to harmonize the documents then to have the system harmonize them.
44. The **Chairperson** asked how would that work should the Committee wish to harmonize.
45. The **Secretary** wished to have timeto reflect on the issue as he did not want the Committee to take a decision that the Secretariat could not implement.
46. Listening to the explanation by the Secretary, the **delegation of Austria** agreed that it made sense to suspend the debate at this point so as to reflect on the ramifications these changes would bring, as they appeared quite far-reaching.
47. The **delegation of Kuwait** agreed with the Secretariat to suspend the debate and come back with a roadmap to clarify the whole budget for presentation to the Committee, as well as how to overcome this transition period.
48. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed to suspend the debate and wait for the Secretariat’s proposal.
49. The **Secretary** understood thatthe Committee wished to have a broader discussion on the utilization of the 20%, meaning that it should be presented in the Committee’s document with the Committee then recommending it to the General Assembly. Currently, the Committee’s budget is given in percentages that would now incorporate sub-percentages for the 20%. Thus, there would be four domains, four expected results aligned to the C/5. This work had already been done for the Bureau. The question was how to present that information in a percentage form to the Committee as part of the overall budget package, which would in any case be presented to the General Assembly for its decision. He would now consider how that would work procedurally and how to make the transition, for which he needed some time.
50. Having listened closely, the **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretary and the Committee Members for their interventions. It agreed that the best thing would be to suspend the debate on this item for the time being. The delegation understood that the Secretary would return with a breakdown on the 20% allocation to share with the Committee for its consideration during this session so that it can appropriately reflect and consider the 20% breakdown in the draft decision and submit it to the General Assembly.
51. The **delegation of Armenia** believed that it was enough that the problem had been stated and therefore the Committee could live with the original wording and possibly examine this issue at some point in the future. Noting the situation and given the relevant comments and observations, the delegation wondered whether the Secretariat was in fact able find a solution that would be immediately operational. The Philippines was correct in highlighting the issue, but perhaps the question could be posed and resolved in the future. The delegation thus proposed to adopt the original paragraph now and to return to this reflection in the future.
52. The **Chairperson** noted two positions. One was to adopt paragraph 9 as it currently stood and the other one was to suspend the debate so as to reflect on and return to this item later.
53. The **delegation of the Philippines** took note of Armenia’s proposal and suggested to perhaps adopt the other paragraphs that were not related to budget line 3, adding that the Committee still needed time to reflect on these procedural issues regarding the 20% so as to have a better discussion and thus to improve the governance of the Committee and the Fund. The delegation thus proposed a compromise, which was to suspend paragraphs 9 and 10 (as paragraph 10 was also related to budget line 3) and to continue with paragraphs 11 and 12, suspending the overall decision until there was more clarity on the procedure.
54. The **delegation of Jamaica** wondered about the feasibility of the position put forward by the Philippines and whether the Committee could deal with it at the present session.
55. The **Secretary** reiterated thathe was unable to provide an immediate breakdown of the budget as it requires the Secretariat to liaise with partners and Field Offices to understand who is able to implement the activities and where. The Secretariat could only provide broad strokes—as much work goes into drafting the budget to propose the 20% breakdown—and the Secretary was concerned that a cut and paste approach from the previous biennium budget was not realistic at this stage.
56. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked on the valid points raised by the Philippines and Palestine on these important issues, adding that they had been members of the Bureau for several years so they had experienced this issue from a close perspective. In that sense, the delegation believed that the issue required further reflection and it concurred with the comments made in this regard. It could therefore go along with the adoption of the other paragraphs, while further reflecting on paragraphs 9 and 10 to allow the Secretariat to find an acceptable solution with regard to the concerns raised by the Secretariat and also the issues raised by Palestine and the Philippines.
57. The **delegation of Palestine** noted that the Secretary was willing to suspend the decision and to return to it later, and therefore suggested to follow the proposal by the Philippines and suspend paragraphs 9 and 10. In the meantime, the Committee could adopt the other paragraphs until the Secretariat was ready to propose a change in the practice. The delegation understood that this was not a mistake of the current Secretariat and that it had been the practice for a long time, but it was now time for the Committee to try and change it. The delegation thanked the Secretariat for its willingness to seek a solution.
58. The **delegation of Armenia** proposed to take note of the problem and the intention to find a solution. Consequently, it proposed an amendment to paragraph 9, which would read, ‘invites the Committee to reflect on the use of the funds allocated under budget line 3 at a subsequent meeting’. This would allow the Committee time to reflect on a solution rather than placing undue pressure right now, especially given the complexity of the problem, as explained by the Secretary.
59. Responding to Armenia, the **delegation of Palestine** found that its proposal only deferred the problem for another time. As the Secretariat had already agreed to return to the issue, the simplest option was to suspend paragraphs 9 and 10 and adopt the other paragraphs.
60. The **Secretary** proposed thatthe Secretariat work out a feasible solution at this stage given that this was the first time this issue had been brought to light and it had not come prepared; the Secretariat had to envision how to transit from the current system to a new system. What was not feasible at this time was to propose a meaningful and well thought out budget breakdown of the current proposal for this present Committee.
61. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that 20% of the budget was quite a substantial sum, amounting to one-fifth of the entire Fund. From experience in the Bureau, as mentioned by Azerbaijan, it did not feel comfortable making such important decisions without first fully consulting with its Electoral Group and without thoroughly reflecting [on the budget], especially when the Bureau is asked to make such important decisions on a document viewed perhaps only one day beforehand. Thus, this issue was one of good governance on how to allocate funds knowing full well that – as a member of the Bureau – you have fully consulted with your constituencies, so it is more than just a procedural issue. The delegation noted that the Secretariat appeared to be saying that it would be ready to present specific proposal in six months’ time on the use of the 20% allocation, i.e. right after the General Assembly. Given that six months was not a long time away, the delegation wondered whether the Secretariat could at least provide a tentative breakdown at this stage to share with the Committee so that it could be more comfortable sending the draft plan to the General Assembly, while also delegating a more precise framework to the Bureau instead of a very open-ended 20% envelope. The delegation assured the Chairperson that it did not wish to delay proceedings but rather to improve decision-making.
62. The **Secretary** reiterated that the Secretariat was very open to look at changing the system towards the preferred direction. However, it would require time as the budget cannot be prepared in one day. Typically, the budget is prepared for the Bureau to decide before it goes to the General Assembly, though the Secretary conceded that this did not address the issue of broader consultation. Nevertheless, the Secretariat was not ready right now [to present a detailed budget] as this takes time to develop, precisely because it is an important budget that involves partners with whom the Secretariat implements the budget. The Secretariat would be ready by the General Assembly, but the General Assembly also needs to have a budget put forward by the Committee. The question now was to reflect on how the Secretariat could operate towards a transition to a system in which the Committee would present a more detailed budget for decision by the General Assembly.
63. The **delegation of Palestine** understood that the Secretariat was unable to provide the Committee with a definitive breakdown of the 20%, while at the same time everybody understood that the system needs to change. The Secretariat had explained that it was also willing to reflect on this issue and to return to the Committee with a solution. The delegation therefore asked the Members of the Committee to show flexibility in this present session and suspend the discussion to allow the Secretariat to return with wording that would address the issue for the next session. Thus, the debate on these two paragraphs could be suspended and the Committee could proceed to adopt the other paragraphs.
64. The **Secretary** proposed to prepare a decision that would move towards having the next Committee examine the breakdown of the 20% in percentage terms. He recalled the current system in which the Bureau received the budget the day after the General Assembly adopts the final budget, after which the Bureau has two weeks to reflect and approve the budget. It was in fact an oddity to have the General Assembly discuss a budget that had not gone through and been recommended by the Committee. Nevertheless, in an effort to move the amendment forward, the Secretary proposed to make a breakdown of the budget available to the Bureau two weeks prior the General Assembly. Then in the following year, the budget would go to the Committee, thereby in phase with the normal cycle.
65. The **Chairperson** was keen tomove forward, suspending paragraphs 9 and 10 and moving to paragraph 11, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 12 was also adopted. The Committee would therefore return to paragraphs 9 and 10.

**ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA**

**REFORM OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING MECHANISM**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/8*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-8-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 8*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/8)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned toagenda item 8 on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, adding that a major reform was ongoing since 2017 and that the Secretariat would present the latest updates. The Chairperson was pleased to note that this would set the scene for the first regional reporting cycle involving all the States Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean in 2020. She invited the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** remarked that the reform had started with the two-year long elaboration of the overall results framework for the 2003 Convention that was approved by the General Assembly in June 2018. The main objectives of the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism was to enhance its usefulness and to allow for an increased submission of reports by States Parties. The General Assembly and the Committee had given the Secretariat clear guidance to undertake the reform in two main directions. Firstly, on initiatives on the substance and methods of reporting. Without imposing additional reporting burdens on States Parties, the reporting Form ICH-10 was now fully aligned to the overall results framework. The new reporting mechanism was therefore a direct outcome of the adoption of the framework and implied a move towards results-based rather than activities-based reporting. This will in turn be an opportunity for States not only to monitor their achievements in implementing the Convention, but also to give visibility to their efforts in adopting and revising their policies and safeguarding approaches. The set of guidance notes[[23]](#footnote-23) prepared to accompany States in their use of the overall results framework and in the monitoring of and reporting on their achievements was also an important step forward of the reform. Secondly, the move to a regional cycle of reporting.As mentioned under agenda item 5.b, a specifically designed capacity-building approach was developed whose main aim is to strengthen monitoring processes under the 2003 Convention in line with the overall results framework. It also supports States in their reporting exercise, while providing opportunities for peer-to-peer exchanges and facilitating cooperation and dialogue among States from the same region. The Chairperson recalled that in 2018 the Committee had adopted the calendar for the first regional cycle of reporting. States Parties from Latin America and the Caribbean will be the first to submit their periodic reports by 15 December 2020 for examination by the Committee in 2021. They will be followed by Europe (2021), the Arab States (2022), Africa (2023), and Asia and the Pacific (2024). The first cycle will end with a reflection year in 2025.
3. The **Secretary** then highlighted that reporting on elements inscribed on the Representative List remained unchanged as with the reporting on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The reason being that the Secretariat expects the ongoing reflection on the listing mechanisms and on related procedures to guide the revision of the reporting mechanism for all elements inscribed. In this regard, the Secretary appreciated the financial contributions made by the Republic of Korea to support the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism. It was recalled that States can set their own targets and plan their own actions under the overall results framework. He then invited Mr Giovanni Scepi of the Secretariat to provide more details on the recent steps undertaken on the reform.
4. **Mr Giovanni Scepi** was pleased to inform the Committee that the reform of periodic reporting was nearing completion. According to the guidance provided by the governing bodies, the main actions undertaken were along three main axes, axis one: the revision of Form ICH-10, was now complete and a demo [reporting tool](https://ich.unesco.org/en/perioding-reporting-ich-10-2020-01081?edit_form=764#1) was now available for test purposes. Mr Scepi explained how the online test version works, noting that the form is still divided into four main sections. Section A provides general information on the reporting State, including an executive summary, the elements inscribed, accredited non-governmental organizations, ICH inventories and synergies with other international frameworks that contributed to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, among others. Section B reflects the same structure of the overall results framework with its 26 core indicators and corresponding assessment factors, which were translated into questions that will possibly trigger results-based reporting. Section C was on elements inscribed on the Representative List, which remained the same as in the previous version. As explained, the reflection on the listing mechanisms and on related procedures will provide the basis for a future revision of the reporting procedure on elements inscribed on any Lists. Section D will allow States to upload a signed version of the report. The first tab on the left [of the online tool] allowed States to have a 1-page overview of their report, including baselines and targets for each indicator.
5. **Mr Giovanni Scepi** then explained axis two: a set of 26 guidance notes, which had been prepared (one for each of the core indicators) to help the diverse stakeholders involved in monitoring to interpret the indicators and to provide answers in their reports in a comparable way. They are structured around two main parts. The first part sets out the larger context, including possible connections with the Sustainable Development Goals. The second part provides specific guidance on monitoring and gives an idea on the benefits of monitoring and the possible sources of information and methodologies for collecting data. Axis 3 a capacity-building approach and related materials were developed to assist States with the reporting exercise. The primary objective is to build institutional and professional capacities for the preparation of periodic reports and to strengthen monitoring processes. This approach mainly consists of a three-day capacity-building workshop directed at focal points responsible for completing the reports for their respective countries. It explains also possible participatory methodologies and offers [practical guidance](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=2ahUKEwix_--v58nnAhWqw4sKHWTrDrkQFjACegQIBRAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fich.unesco.org%2Fdoc%2Fsrc%2FICH-10-2017-additional_guidance-EN.docx&usg=AOvVaw2zx63Qz79NwAgAhbjbh8n0) on how to fill out the online version of Form ICH- 10. Concerning the rationale for the reform and the tools developed, it was noted that the overarching principle of the overall results framework and the reporting exercise is that not all indicators will be equally applicable to the situations found in the different States. The degree to which each indicator is satisfied will likely vary from indicator to indicator, as well as from State to State. The questions of the new form are often optional and not intended to include all the responsibilities of a State, nor are they equally relevant for all States Parties. The online tool will use the answers provided to assess the extent to which an indicator is satisfied, representing its baseline. States will also have the possibility of establishing targets and to create their own benchmarks against which progress can be measured in future reporting, six years later. The new reporting tool is therefore intended to provide States with a useful methodology for monitoring their own achievements, provide visibility and an occasion to review and revise their safeguarding policies, if required. Thanks to this new mechanism, the Committee and the General Assembly will be able to better monitor the implementation of the 2003 Convention at different levels. Mr Scepi concluded by underlining that even though the reform is quite advanced, it is not yet complete. The Secretariat will continue addressing possible shortcomings based on the reporting experience in the first region in 2020 and on lessons learned. In 2025 (the reflection year at the end of the first cycle), the functioning of the entire new reporting mechanism will be fully reviewed.
6. The **Secretary** concluded by inviting all the States Parties, particularly from Latin America and the Caribbean, to an information session, which was held during the Committee session, on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism that was also the occasion to officially launch the first regional cycle.
7. The **Chairperson** added that the information session was indeed the right occasion to ask questions, especially on the technical aspects of the reform, including the newly designed online tool. The floor was opened for a general discussion.
8. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Secretariat for the presentation of the new form and for preparing the guidance notes in three languages, adding that the form was both impressive as well as a bit daunting. Speaking from experience with online reporting tools, the delegation asked whether the reporting form would be accessible at any time and to anyone, even for those countries who are not reporting. Would the online form be available in another format such as PDF or Word? Will it be possible to back-up the data that has already been uploaded, because several steps were required to complete the form. Will the State Party after submitting the content receive a confirmation or email? These points, although basic, can save time and have a positive impact on the overall experience. It was noted that capacity-building approaches had been developed to assist States Parties with the new reporting, as mentioned in previous meetings, and the delegation sought to hear more about these approaches, i.e. ideally, how and to whom these workshops should be organized, and when and where they should be implemented with a view to future cycles.
9. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat and especially the working group for its work on this mechanism which, since China, had worked on this important issue of reform as part of the overall results framework. The delegation highlighted in particular the 26 guidance notes that allow for better use of the indicators, which already represented a big step. The form, as presented, was also appropriate, adapted to its purpose and very informative, and could actually be downloaded at the end. In short, the issues raised during the working group in China had been addressed and more or less resolved, at least upstream. With regard to capacity building, the periodic reporting in this new regional mechanism will allow several countries to convene with three-day workshops already announced. These workshops allow for greater mastery of certain tools, which will enable institutional actors, NGOs and others to work in resolving the problems of periodic reports. More importantly, the tools that accompany the reports will help in the implementation of the Convention in the different countries, particularly for inter-country exchange at the regional level. Moreover, there are some minor synergies with other periodic reports, such as with the 1972 Convention, and the questions are very clear and specific, particularly the 26 guidance notes. The delegation reiterated its congratulations for the work accomplished.
10. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretariat for its work in carrying out the reform of the mechanism for the submission of periodic reports in accordance with the guidance provided by the General Assembly and the Committee during the various debates. The simplification of the reporting form and the availability of guidance notes, aimed at better informing States Parties, will certainly ensure more effective monitoring of the implementation of the Convention in the future. The delegation welcomed the measures taken to strengthen the institutional and professional capacities of States Parties in the preparation of periodic reports and it also supported the transition to a regional reporting cycle that supports the implementation of capacity-building activities in Latin America and the Caribbean [in the first cycle] in the preparation of their periodic reports. However, it wished to hear more about the means available to reinforce the institutional and professional capacities of the States in the preparation of their periodic reports, along the lines of the question posed by Austria.
11. The **delegation of Poland** expressed its sincere appreciation for the work done by the Secretariat regarding the improvement of the periodic reporting mechanism. It recognized with satisfaction that the Convention is seen from the perspective of intangible cultural heritage, adding that this synergy was a step towards a brighter future for an improved functioning of the Convention. The delegation hoped that this new reform will help States Parties better manage their obligations regarding the reporting on the implementation of the Convention. It was convinced that this will provide better visibility for periodic reporting and serve as a useful instrument and methodology for the monitoring of States’ achievements and their safeguarding approaches to intangible cultural heritage. In its view, the capacity-building approach, together with the workshop dedicated to better understanding the complexity of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, was essential. It was hoped that thanks to this approach, the monitoring processes of elements already inscribed and inscribed in the future on the Representative List will gradually but significantly improve. This mechanism is crucial for the comprehensive and sustainable implementation of the Convention. The new regional periodic reporting will thus be helpful to recognize common issues and challenges in the field of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Thus, it might potentially result in intensified cooperation between States Parties, thereby strengthening regional cooperation and even possibly transboundary and international nominations in the future. The delegation looked forward to an optimistic future, and the reflection of the first regional cycle in 2025 will show how this new periodic reporting mechanism is functioning. Lastly, regarding upcoming potential difficulties with complex reports, the delegation asked the Secretariat whether it could clarify the extent and the number of questions that have to be answered in the form for it to be considered complete.
12. The **delegation of Netherlands** appreciated the enormous work carried out on the new reporting system, adding that it believed the overall results framework to be a very important instrument, not only for reporting but also for setting targets by States. The delegation then made reference to the text in the working document 8, which reads, ‘The indicators included in the framework and the questions in the reports will not all be equally applicable to the situations of different States, and the level of satisfaction is expected to vary from indicator to indicator and from one State to another’. It wondered whether this implied that States Parties have the possibility to select the indicators and questions on which they wish to report and therefore have the possibility to focus on the main targets of their own implementation process, or even better, in cooperation with other Members States in their region. In which case, would it not be necessary to fulfil all the indicators, and how will this be assessed in the totality of the reports? Regarding the capacity-building workshops, the delegation asked when and where in the process will they take place because time will be limited. Are there going to be capacity-building workshops in all the regions? Will there be enough resources? It was understood that this was dependent on voluntary contributions.
13. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
14. The **Secretary** noted emerging clusters of questions that were raised. The first concerned whether the form can be distributed in PDF format, which it can, and the information can indeed be saved. Technically, the idea is that the online reporting form remains stored in the system and can be accessed even six years later. It was foreseen to address these details at the planned information session side event. Regarding whether all indicators have to be answered, the Secretary explained that not all indicators will be relevant and therefore not all indicators will necessarily need to be answered because a State may find that a particular indicator is not relevant to its situation. Overall, the core obligations set out in the text of the Operational Directives will remain and States would still have to make lists, as was the case with the old form for example, listing certain institutions related to intangible cultural heritage, but the indicators of the overall results framework were not all compulsory for all States. Those sections on the Lists were left untouched, either on the Urgent Safeguarding List or that part of the periodic reporting form related to elements on the Representative List, as it was felt that there was no reason to carry out that work now when the Committee was to embark on a reflection on the reform of the listing mechanisms. Moreover, this would become the baseline for monitoring the Convention, with States given the option, if they so wished, to set their own targets for six years. This tool should therefore help States define where they want to go in six years, though it was not compulsory. In short, this tool will help States at the national level, but also allows data gathering at the international level.
15. Concerning capacity building, the **Secretary** explained that approaches have been developed and the Secretariat had foreseen three-day workshops on a region-by-region basis. Indeed, it is dependent on available funding. The work was planned to begin early in 2020 with the Secretariat still speaking to some States in the region. Some of the funds for this upstream work will come from the 20% allocation of the Fund, which is foreseen to develop materials and conduct the training of trainers. The rollout will involve training the facilitators who would then be able to train others gathered on a regional level within the country who are the focal points responsible for the periodic reporting. Indeed, the Secretariat will be juggling with funding as the approach is implemented, but it was currently more concerned with how to specifically implement the new reporting mechanism in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2020, ahead of its rollout to the other regions [in subsequent years]. It was noted that an informal offer had already been received from Malta to host a meeting of trainers on Europe. Finally, to answer the question whether States will be able to access the form ahead of the reporting cycle for their region, the Secretary replied that States would indeed have access to the form but the data would not be processed.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for his answers and for providing more detailed information on this important item.
17. The **delegation of Cyprus** thanked the Secretariat for the enormous work invested in revising the Form ICH-10 and the guidance notes, noting the colossal work involved in putting together a periodic report, and it was thus grateful for the work. Most importantly, these reforms provide States Parties with useful tools that will enable them to monitor and evaluate their own safeguarding measures.
18. The **delegation of the Philippines** believed that it was a very good and practical approach to move towards a regional periodic reporting system, and it recognized the tremendous work carried out by the Secretariat, including on the guidance notes. Looking ahead, would the Secretariat summarize the submitted reports and synthesize cross-cutting issues as it had done in the past? In future Committee sessions, will the same approach be adopted in the draft decision on States Parties’ reports from a particular region and a particular year? Would the decision have recommendations and/or observations? This understanding would help get a sense of how much has changed in the system and what elements would remain. The delegation believed that to have a meaningful periodic reporting system, it should consider how to involve other actors, regional mechanisms and also accredited NGOs. It saw many opportunities in this new cycle that could broaden the spectrum of cooperation and dialogue between stakeholders in terms of provision of information, assessment of reports, and follow up. Since the periodic reporting system is quite complex with the new online tool, the delegation felt the same way as others that capacity building is essential to the success of its outputs. As previously mentioned by the Secretary about the online MOOC, the delegation believed online tools would very much help to acquaint States Parties and actors with the new system. Lastly, the Secretariat (Mr Giovanni Scepi) mentioned the database of indicators and baselines, this would of course be a rich database for living heritage as it is now across the world. One concern the delegation voiced in the development of this system before, and again looking ahead, is that it was hoped that these baselines would not be used to compare States Parties, considering that each State Party is very different in its level of development. Reiterating this concern, it was hoped that this approach did not move towards a comparative or rating system through this periodic reporting mechanism.
19. The **delegation of** **Jamaica** remarked that much that had been said was in line with its own position. In that regard, it congratulated and thanked the Secretariat for the work that had gone into these proposed changes. As one of the group of States initiating the reporting system, Jamaica was excited and at the same time approaching it with some trepidation. It was looking forward to taking part in this process and to see how it will work. The delegation understood that it is still a work in progress and it was happy to be a part of that process and to engage further in the information session later that week.
20. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
21. The **Secretary** wishedto address some of the questions posed by the Philippines on whether there will be synthetic reports, adding that this was the intention, and that for some indicators they would almost be automatically generated, but some substantive and written analysis would also be carried out. The question of comparison is always a concern as soon as monitoring includes numerical indicators, and the Secretariat was aware of this concern. It depends also on how people read those numbers and how they decide to use them. The Secretariat was mindful of that aspect and that is why it was careful to state that not all indicators have the same implication for the same States, which may not be at the development level. It was thus important to exercise care on how these numbers are presented when they are generated. Turning to the remarks by Jamaica, the Secretariat did indeed see the system as evolving in that it was not expected to be perfect from the outset. However, the Secretariat was determined to have the tool ready for the region in 2020, albeit some fine tuning and improvements would likely be required over the years to come.
22. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for presenting the details on the main points of the reform, adding that it was indeed a remarkable moment in the evolution of the Convention and it looked forward to considering the revised Form ICH-10. It also joined the previous speakers in highlighting the importance of the periodic reporting mechanism in strengthening the monitoring of the implementation of the Convention as it believed in the importance of the tool for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, reflected in the spirit of the Convention. The delegation considered it to be of utmost importance to make the reports available online once they are received to ensure greater transparency of the reformed periodic reporting mechanism. In this regard, it reminded the Secretariat of Decision [9.COM 5.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/9.COM/5.A), which called upon States to work with the Secretariat in order to avoid any language inconsistent with the United Nations Charter as well as the relevant provisions of the Convention in the periodic reports. The delegation requested the Secretariat to meticulously pursue this principle when applying the reformed periodic reporting mechanism.
23. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Secretariat for the work accomplished on the evaluation mechanism. Latin America has a common history from the 16th to the 18th centuries and the examination of the reports could thus become a very valuable tool to help better understand this shared history. Guatemala, as a member of CRESPIAL, has supported the activity of training trainers that will be carried out in Latin America, and it concluded by acknowledging this fascinating and valuable work.
24. The **delegation of China** congratulated the Secretariat on the great progress made on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism. It recalled that the open-ended working group in 2017 was held in Chengdu, China, during which experts discussed and worked out the preliminary overall results framework that was submitted to the seventh General Assembly in 2018 where it was finally approved. Now at this present session, the Secretary had informed the Committee that this reformed mechanism is in its finalized stage. The delegation believed this to be a very important step in the development of the periodic reporting mechanism, commending the Secretariat for its tremendous efforts in this regard. Nevertheless, the delegation believed that there were still questions to be answered regarding the real use of this mechanism. It was obvious from the presentation by the Secretariat that it is quite a complex online system, which it believed will be very complicated. Thus, to what extent will there be easy access or be user friendly? How could various actors be involved in this process? The delegation looked forward to obtaining more information and learning more from reporting States when they are involved in this periodic reporting system. The delegation concluded by reiterating its thanks to the Secretariat for its great efforts.
25. The **delegation of Colombia,** speaking asa State Party participating in this first reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, shared Jamaica’s remarks on its excitement but also its apprehension as it gets to understand better the entire procedure. The delegation was grateful for the detailed report and it particularly wished to thank the Secretariat for the information session to be held later that week, which would be especially useful for the Latin America and Caribbean group. It also asked that the Secretariat take note of the issues raised on the issue of transparency of information as they appear in these new reports as this will be important in developing a more comprehensive results framework for the Convention. Of course, the three-day capacity-building workshops are also important in getting stakeholders and actors involved beyond the role of States Parties, such as category 2 centres that are participating and taking into consideration these regional periodic reports.
26. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary to respond to the questions.
27. The **Secretary** referred to theimportant points raised by Colombia and China, adding that the Secretariat was indeed aware of the complexities of reporting and therefore it has tried to make the tool as user friendly as possible. Many of the questions will be simple, requiring yes/no answers, to what degree, i.e. maybe/partially, and so on, so that information can be correlated. Nevertheless, in every case there will be boxes for States who wish to develop a more substantive description of what is going on, which are not necessarily compulsory. The Secretary had no doubt that the Secretariat and the States Parties will learn more as the tool is used as it looks into improving the system over the years.
28. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Bureau will meet every morning, inviting the Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur to arrive promptly, adding that the Bureau was open to Observers. She also reminded Members of the Committee to send any requests for amendments to draft decisions concerning the nominations ahead of the sessions, which would allow the Bureau to better organize the time available for debating those items.
29. The **Secretary** announced a welcoming reception hosted by the Colombian Government before the official opening ceremony planned that evening.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and the Committee, and adjourned the session.

*[Tuesday, 10 December 2019, morning session]*

1. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had successfully concluded agenda items 1–4, and items 5.b and 6. However, it did not manage to entirely complete the examination of agenda items 7 and 8 as foreseen in the provisional timetable. The Bureau met that morning for the first time to discuss several issues, namely the revision of the timetable of the Committee’s work, which had been published on the meeting’s website, and proposed to first discuss agenda item 5.a, Report by the Committee on its activities, and the rest of the timetable up to agenda item 23. This was to enable the Committee to update its report with the decisions taken during the present session. It was recalled that agenda item 7 on the draft plan for the use of the resources of the ICH Fund in 2020–2021 had also been suspended while waiting for the Secretariat to present its proposal concerning the utilization of the funds allocated under ‘other functions of the Committee’. The day’s session would thus continue with the examination of agenda item 8 on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism followed by agenda items 9.a and 9.b and the reports of States Parties. The afternoon session would proceed with agenda items 10, Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2019 and agenda item 10.a, Examination of nominations for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Taking into consideration our heavy agenda, the Chairperson asked the Members to be brief and concise in their interventions. Requests for debates or amendments to specific draft decisions should be presented to the Secretariat, although nothing prevented any Committee Member from taking the floor on any decision if it so wished.
2. The **Secretary** remarked on the technical issues experienced with the microphones and asked speakers to handle the microphones delicately.

**ITEM 8 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**REFORM OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING MECHANISM**

1. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee had completed its debate on item 8 and therefore turned directly to the adoption of draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–10 were duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 8**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/8) **adopted**.
2. The **Chairperson** noted a request to speak by the Minister of Culture of Montenegro, inviting him to take the floor.
3. The **delegation of Montenegro,** the **Minister of Culture, Mr Aleksandar Bogdanović**, spoke of his honour to address the delegates in Bogotá at this important event that once a year celebrates cultural diversity throughout the world. The Convention under the UNESCO umbrella reminds us of the important role that intangible cultural heritage has, not only for cultural identities all over the world but also in its role as a platform to strengthen social cohesion, mutual understanding and multiculturalism as universal values of the modern world. Since these values are deeply cherished in Montenegrin society, which has been recognized for its multiculturalism, the implementation of this Convention led the country to an important process started in 2009. The Minister particularly wished to use this opportunity to address one matter of great importance for Montenegro. As a country that pays significant attention to multilateral cooperation, it had carefully read all the conclusions of the Evaluation Body. He fully understood the complexity of its position and the burden of examining 42 nominations to the Representative List. However, he addressed his concern and would explain Montenegro’s position and approach to this particular file [10.b 25 on Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization]. It was his impression that the Boka Navy file deserved greater sensibility and a more thorough approach to completely understand the complexity of this element. Therefore, it was his utmost privilege to once again introduce the nomination of Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization which for 12 centuries already celebrated the particular values that are promoted in the 2003 Convention. This organization has never been political and is exclusively cultural. It is an association of seafarers, sailors, captains, their families and all other interested individuals who identify with its basic principles. It is an open organization that accepts all interested individuals regardless of their national, religious, ethnic, gender or any other orientation. The Minister reminded the Committee that this was the very first file submitted by Montenegro to the Representative List. As all ICH policies support States that submit their first file, it was felt that it could have been better supported in the process, especially through the mechanism of experimental dialogue, which unfortunately was not considered in this case. Comments of the Evaluation Body stressed unclear bonds with local communities, which to some extent is a paradox as the entire nomination is based on the request of the community with more than 300 signatures of the different individuals who represent the consent of the community. As stated, the nomination was initiated by the Boka Navy itself and the nomination file was carried out by six experts from national and local institutions, and three members of the Boka Navy. With all due respect to UNESCO’s experience in this matter and its work and analysis, the Minister emphasized that in cases of such complex cultural practices, as in the many elements of a 12th century tradition that Boka Navy represents, it should have been borne in mind that it is almost impossible to present every single practise. The Minister urged the Committee to take a closer look at the Boka Navy case, adding that once inscribed, and because of the timeless human values deeply rooted in the Boka Navy tradition, Montenegro will open its file to possible extension to other States that cherish the same values.

**ITEM 9.a OF THE AGENDA**

**EXAMINATION OF THE REPORTS OF STATES PARTIES ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF ELEMENTS ON THE LIST OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN NEED OF URGENT SAFEGUARDING**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/9.a Rev.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-9.a_Rev.-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 9.a*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/9.a)

1. The **Chairperson** then moved to the next agenda item 9.a and the examination of the four reports of States Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, inviting the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that this was the sixth cycle of reporting, with the Committee tasked with the examination of four reports submitted by States Parties on the status of four elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. He recalled that this item remained on the agenda as the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism did not concern reporting on the status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, this might change in the near future depending on the upcoming reflection on the listing mechanisms that might lead to decisions by the Committee on this particular reporting mechanism. For instance, it may decide to harmonize this reporting mechanism with the regional calendar of reporting on elements inscribed on the Representative List, to keep it as a separate mechanism on a quadrennial and inscription year-based schedule, or to integrate it in the overall reporting on the implementation of the Convention. Returning to the examination of the four reports, the Secretary invited Ms Fumiko Ohinata of the Secretariat to present an overview.
3. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** recalled that the Committee was asked to examine four reports submitted by Croatia, Kenya, Uganda and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. A summary of these reports will also be submitted to the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. The table in paragraph 5 of the working document shows the list of the four reports and the year in which the elements were inscribed. Among the four reports, three elements were inscribed in 2014, and one in 2010. Thanks to the generous voluntary contribution from the Republic of Korea, approved by the Committee in 2016, an online reporting tool was developed by the Secretariat for States to submit their reports on the status of the elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, the four reports that had been presented had been submitted using the physical version of the form. Ms Ohinata stressed the importance of using the online tool for future cycles as this will help in treating the reports. It was noted that the Secretariat had not provided general observations on transversal issues as had been done in past cycles as only four reports had been received from States in three different regions. Nevertheless, as a common point in this cycle, there was a need for States to engage with stakeholders working in sectors other than culture, be they public or private bodies, to ensure States’ engagement in the activities foreseen in the safeguarding plan.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat, inviting Committee Members to comment before the examination of the four reports and corresponding draft decisions. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson turned to the first of the four reports submitted by Croatia.
5. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that the assessments of the four reports presented the same structure around three main topics: i) the effectiveness of the safeguarding plan; ii) community participation; and iii) viability and current risks. The draft decisions presented on the four reports also followed a similar structure: a few standard paragraphs and specific ones to address the needs, to welcome the achievements, and to underline the challenges for each inscribed element. The last paragraph referred to the next submission deadline.
6. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** presented the first report on **Ojkanje singing** [draft decision14.COM 9.a.1]submitted by **Croatia** and inscribed in 2010. It is the second periodic report on this element. The report describes that the ongoing safeguarding activities led to the enhanced viability of the element, making it better known at the local and national levels. Increased interest among communities, in particular youth and women, had also resulted in knowledge sharing among them and local folklore societies, who in turn organize performances and workshops for knowledge transmission. The report mentions two main challenges: i) the loss of particular styles and genres of the vibrato technique and ii) the lack of financial support for cultural associations and folklore societies. The draft decision includes paragraphs to take note of Croatia’s continued efforts in safeguarding Ojkanje singing, particularly through involving cultural associations and folklore societies in capacity-building workshops and supporting the organization of festivals. The State is also invited to undertake specific measures such as the promotion of direct traditional learning and the ongoing establishment of an Ojkanje singing centre. Paragraph 8 recalls the importance of assessing the role of tourism entities in order to avoid the potential commodification or denaturation of the element.
7. The **Chairperson** then turned to the draft decision and suggested that unless the Committee wished to propose amendments, the draft decision could be adopted as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 9.a.1**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/9.a.1) **adopted**.
8. The **delegation of Croatia** thanked the Chairperson for her excellent chairpersonship and Colombia for its warm welcome and hospitality. As one of the first States to sign the Convention, and speaking from experience both as a Member of the Committee and the Evaluation Body, it cannot but praise the Culture Sector, the Committee Members and the Evolution Body for their hard work. The delegation announced that Croatia would like to give its contribution to two priorities: Africa and Small Islands Developing States, as had been the case with other Conventions. A colleague was invited to speak on the Ojkanje experience.
9. The **delegation of Croatia** [second speaker] remarked that thanks to greater exposure resulting from inscription on the Representative List, Ojkanje has grown from an unknown, nearly abandoned way of making music into a current style within its own local and regional community. The bearers of the tradition are solo individual singers who gain their knowledge through direct learning. The knowledge is now more valuable owing to the ever-present modern lifestyle, which has completely replaced the traditional way of life over the past few decades but has nonetheless left a great trace in the development of traditional culture, as well as older layers of traditional singing such as Ojkanje. In this sense, the general approach to Ojkanje is more positive today, even though there have been situations in which Ojkanje has been used to send sarcastic messages regarding its own backwardness and primitiveness. A break in tradition of direct learning led to the almost complete disappearance of the particular styles and genres in which their special vibrato techniques is the central characteristic. As a result of inscription, some previously unknown skilled singers suddenly began to perform. Inscription inspired them to share their knowledge with members of their local communities, performing together with members of the local folklore societies and thus demonstrating their invaluable singing skills beyond country borders.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Croatia for sharing its experience, then turned to the next file.
11. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** presented the second report on **Isukuti dance of Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya** [draft decision14.COM 9.a.2]submitted by **Kenya** and inscribed in 2014. The Isukuti dance is a traditional dance expression practised among the Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya that still requires urgent safeguarding to ensure the transmission of the practice. Its inscription and the implementation of the safeguarding plan has made it possible to significantly raise awareness about the need to safeguard its importance as a symbol of identity for the two communities. The draft decision acknowledges the safeguarding efforts undertaken by Kenya, invites the State Party to continue implementing the safeguarding plan paying attention to the integration of the element’s practice into school curricula as well as to establish a cultural centre in Kakamega as initially foreseen in the safeguarding plan. Finally, the State is encouraged to monitor, together with the communities, the possible negative effects connected with the commercialization of and decline in the livelihood of bearers and to identify the resources needed for the effective implementation of the safeguarding plan.
12. With no comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. The **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 9.a.2 adopted**.
13. The **delegation of** **Kenya** congratulated the Chairperson and spoke of its appreciation of the warm reception received in this beautiful country, and the Secretariat for organizing a very successful meeting. The Isukuti dance is a traditional dance expression practised among the Isukha and Idakho communities of Western Kenya. It is performed in most occasions in the life cycle of the Isukha and Idakho communities, including childbirth, initiation, marriage, installation of leaders, religious functions, sporting events and other public congregations. During the period under review, the State Party and the concerned communities implemented various safeguarding measures to ensure sustainability, vitality and transmission of the element. Since the element was inscribed, Kenya has ensured that the community is involved in the process of preserving the element. Some measures undertaken include empowerment of consent in Isukuti communities with knowledge and skills to safeguard the element. Kenya continues to document performances of the Isukuti dance during the annual Isukha and Idakho community cultural festivals; update and enhance the Isukuti dance and its associated practices on the national inventory; and mentor the youth on the various cultural practices associated with the element by introducing a category at the annual Kenya music festival where school children are judged on Isukuti dances. This has ensured its continued practice and transmission. It has also encouraged the community to continue planting tree species associated with the making of the Isukuti drum. This ensures that the community has access to the raw materials for the production of the drums including the associated practices. The activities so far initiated have enhanced the safeguarding measures and supported the viability of the element. The delegation thanked everyone for their continued support.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked Kenya for its intervention, and then turned to the next file.
15. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** presented the third report on **Male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango of central northern Uganda** [draft decision14.COM 9.a.3]submitted by **Uganda** and inscribed in 2014. The Male-child cleansing ceremony of the Lango of central northern Uganda is a healing ritual for a male child believed to have lost his manhood as a result of the non-observance of certain norms and procedures during the first three days after his birth. Its inscription in 2014 and the safeguarding measures implemented so far have resulted in the mass mobilization of the people of Lango to embrace the ceremony, including the active participation of young girls in learning and participating in the rituals. Awareness has also been raised by training media stakeholders on the ceremony. Even though the viability of the element is improving, one of the major threats reported is still its limited practice as well as the lack of resources for implementing the safeguarding plan. The draft decision acknowledges the continued efforts of Uganda to safeguard this element and invites it to improve the planning and financing associated with the safeguarding activities. Furthermore, the State is encouraged to actively involve community members in the implementation of the safeguarding measures and the identification of the resources needed in the long-term.
16. With no comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 9.a.3 adopted**.
17. The **Chairperson** noted that Uganda was not present in the room, inviting Ms Ohinata to present the next report.
18. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** presented the final report on **Mapoyo oral tradition and its symbolic reference points within their ancestral territory** [draft decision14.COM 9.a.4]submitted by the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** and inscribed in 2014. The oral tradition of the Mapoyo and its symbolic points of reference within their ancestral territory includes a series of stories and tales that comprises the collective memory of the Mapoyo people. The implementation of the safeguarding plan has strengthened the viability of the element, and the updated plan encompasses an integral and sustained community development to ensure an increased viability of the oral traditions. Even though the viability of Mapoyo oral traditions has improved thanks to Mapoyo bearers’ involvement in transmitting their knowledge, the element is still facing some threats, which include the environmental degradation of the traditional habitat of the community and bearers. Through the proposed draft decision, the Committee may take note of the efforts of Venezuela in safeguarding this element since its inscription in 2014. The State is invited to strengthen its transmission through formal and non-formal education and to strengthen cooperation with public and non-governmental institutions to facilitate this transmission. The Secretariat issued a revised version to this working document to reflect (in paragraph 7) the request made by the reporting State to recognize that it has been in dialogue with private institutions, in particular mining companies to ensure their commitment to the effective implementation of the safeguarding plan in order to address environmental degradation and pollution.
19. With no comments or amendments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 9.a.4 adopted**.
20. The **delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** warmly greetedthe Chairperson and the Secretariat, extending thanks for the meeting’s arrangements, particularly to the people of Colombia and to all the different bodies that have taken part in this process of safeguarding its living heritage. In the words of the Director-General of UNESCO in her speech the previous day, the idea was not only to protect intangible cultural heritage as a memory of yesterday but also to demonstrate the links between intangible cultural heritage and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as in the case of the Mapoyo people. The first step that the Government made in this effort was to enact laws to ensure the continued safeguarding of the Mapoyo, recalling that there are only some 400 individuals of millennia-old Mapoyo living in Guayana across in the Amazon region. Now, community ownership is enshrined in law with some 250,000 hectares under their ownership, as it should have been originally, and they are now free to continue their ancestral practices. Venezuela is tremendously proud that the Convention is honouring this element as an example of intergenerational educational policy, not least because intergenerational transmission of living heritage is of vital importance and the Mapoyo peoples’ heritage demonstrates a different way of looking at the world and the way that they fit within it. The delegation thanked the Committee again for its assistance and favourable decision, and the openness with which it received this very first report concerning the Mapoyo peoples’ tradition inscribed in 2014.
21. The **Chairperson** thanked Venezuela and turned to the adoption of the chapeau decision of item 9.a and its eight paragraphs, proceeding paragraph-by-paragraph. Paragraphs 1–8 were duly adopted and the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 9.a adopted.**

**ITEM 9.b OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Documents:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/9.b Rev.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-9.b_Rev.-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 9.b*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/9.b)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the second sub-item under item 9 andtheReports 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. She invited the Secretary to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** recalled 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 17reports submitted between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019. It was noted that the reports were available in their submitted language, in either English or French, and were available through the hyperlinks in the first table of the working document. These final reports were for completed projects, and there were also progress reports for those still under implementation. The second table in the document includes a list of all ongoing projects for the reporting period, making a total of 36 projects in 30 States Parties supported with International Assistance for a total amount of US$4.18 million. The Secretary remarked on the many efforts that were devoted to intensifying the implementation of International Assistance in the current biennium, resulting in a sharp increase of the expenditure rate of the ICH Fund, which had been systematically underutilized in the past. Figure 2 in the working document outlines the increased number of requests examined by the Bureau, as well as the rising amounts granted to International Assistance projects since the establishment of the mechanism in 2008 and up to 30 June 2019. It could thus be concluded that International Assistance has significantly become an important source of resources for supporting safeguarding efforts by States Parties. Finally, he stressed the importance of monitoring projects, which provides stakeholders with more learning opportunities on the operational aspects and experiences of implementing projects in different contexts. This is why the focus of the Secretariat will shift to systematic monitoring, lesson learning, and assessing the outcomes of funded projects, supported by the newly established Safeguarding Implementation and Monitoring team within the Secretariat. The Secretary invited Ms Doyun Lee of the Secretariat to present a more detailed overview on the status of implementation of the International Assistance mechanism.
3. **Ms Doyun Lee** began by highlighting that between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, 17 International Assistance requests had been submitted to the Bureau for examination, of which 11 were granted assistance by the Bureau. During this period, the Committee at its thirteenth session granted assistance to only one request for an amount greater than US$100,000 [submitted by Albania]. Accordingly, 92% of the approved projects were examined by the Bureau and not the Committee. In line with UNESCO’s global priority for Africa, 58% of the overall amount granted for International Assistance went to States Parties from Electoral Group V(a), representing a total amount of US$2.2 million for 17 projects. As in the previous year, the current reporting period also saw a promising expansion of the geographical outreach of the mechanism. Six States Parties (Djibouti, Eswatini, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Ukraine) are benefiting from International Assistance for the first time. It was also observed that States Parties had made good use of the *technical* assistance provided by the Secretariat to improve the quality of their requests, with seven countries having benefitted during this period through the provision of experts. Ms Lee then spoke of the interesting trends to the scope and modalities of the current International Assistance projects, which continued to showcase a broadened scope of projects. While inventorying continues to be an important thematic focus (covering up to 50 per cent of the recently approved requests), the projects were increasingly comprehensive covering a wide range of safeguarding actions, including awareness raising, transmission, capacity-building and revitalization. Capacity building remained the most common focus, while the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in education was also becoming more prominent. Some projects approach education as a means to achieve transmission and safeguarding, while others focus on the training of professionals through university networking or the integration of living heritage into university courses and degrees. Throughout this period, emergency assistance also proved to be an effective way for States Parties to focus on safeguarding measures, especially directed at the recovery and maintenance of peace in their territories. Three ongoing projects in Colombia, Niger and Côte d’Ivoire contribute to ensuring the viability of living heritage of vulnerable populations in different contexts of emergency situations. Ms Lee remarked on the 36 ongoing and active projects during this reporting period, and how there was much to learn from the diversity of the safeguarding actions of these projects.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for the presentation, opening the floor for comment.
5. The **delegation of Colombia** began by commending the Evaluation Body for its thorough report that highlighted some of the key elements for reflection of the Convention and its aims. The delegation drew attention to the recommendation from the Body to consider the social, symbolic and cultural aspects of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and not to reduce them to products or elements for consumption. This would do much to ensure the supporting aspects of intangible cultural heritage as it is important for intangible cultural heritage to be associated with other aspects and not something that can be fossilized in time. It is important to think of the projects’ effect on people and bearers and thus it is important to reflect on the listing mechanisms and how to strike a balance between the symbolic and cultural aspects of intangible cultural heritage on the one hand and that bearers and practitioners should be able to make a living in the future. In particular, it is important to note what the effects of tourism could have on safeguarding measures, as mentioned in the Evaluation Body’s report. Moreover, the delegation wished to see more discussions on the important issue of tourism and listed intangible cultural heritage.
6. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked on the higher usage rate of the International Assistance mechanism of the ICH Fund, which is one of the recent success stories of the Convention. Based on the results of the report, it was glad to see that this is in line with UNESCO’s Global Priority on Africa. Having said this, it was also hoped that the benefits of International Assistance shall accrue to other regions as the needs are likewise diverse and urgent. In this spirit, the delegation saw merit in a more targeted approach with priorities granted to States Parties that do not have any or few elements inscribed, as well as those facing acute challenges such as the SIDS and post-conflict or natural disaster situations. It also saw a need to widen information dissemination about technical assistance, especially through social media. While the ICH Fund has a devoted budget for International Assistance, cooperation need not be limited to the avenues under the Convention. There is so much potential for South-South cooperation and international dialogue and cooperation through multinational files that remain untapped. The framers of the Convention and Operational Directives had this in mind. These initiatives need not be donor driven but designed and implemented by communities in the global South for communities of the developing world. In this regard, the delegation would like to see the Committee develop a more strategic approach to International Assistance and cooperation as this might help address the challenges that are increasingly faced. Intangible cultural heritage should be a force born out of creativity and passion of the human spirit for dialogue and mutual understanding. When communities share their practices and other communities appreciate and seek commonalities with those practices then we achieve the lofty goal of the UNESCO constitution, which is to build the defences of peace in the minds of women and men. It is not just a matter of using the appropriated budget or processing requests and reports; this is the heart of the ICH project and it is our collective responsibility to make it work for those that need it most.
7. The **delegation of Austria** took note of the facts and figures on the use of International Assistance in the reporting period and the 11 newly granted projects for International Assistance. These provided a good indication of the success of the dedicated efforts by the Secretariat to enhance the International Assistance mechanism by providing technical advice and assistance, ensuring the high quality of International Assistance requests. The delegation welcomed the provision of service beyond the International Assistance mechanism as well as increased efforts to ensure the monitoring and follow-up of the projects. The UNESCO Field Offices carry out some highly appreciated work in this regard, which could possibly be extended to category 2 centres, UNESCO National Commissions or NGOs. With more and more projects, there will be a greater opportunity to identify recurrent challenges and benefits from the experience of successful projects. Lastly, it welcomed the focus on monitoring, lesson learning and assessing the outcomes of funding projects by the newly established Safeguarding Implementation and Monitoring team of the Secretariat.
8. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat for its report, wishing to share some key elements of Senegal’s experience having benefitted from International Assistance. As a reminder, Senegal had initiated an ICH inventory in 2016 in order to assess the potential in the interior of the country and to evaluate the challenges to safeguarding. This had made it possible to prepare and submit in 2017 a request for International Assistance amounting to US$99,000, which was accepted by the Bureau. This project was co-managed by the UNESCO Office Dakar. It was an unprecedented experience, and despite all the concerns about burdensome procedures, it was a great success. The main objective was to strengthen national capacities, which involved participatory inventory work with the communities. The results were more than satisfactory and in fact exceeded expectations. A national inventory strategy was established, developed and implemented. Institutional actors, representatives of communities and five NGOs, which were previously unknown, were trained and participated in the inventory work and on the safeguarding plan. A national commission was even established by presidential decree for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, and this commission includes all the actors mentioned. Finally, there was a pilot inventory, that enabled 59 elements to be included in the first national representative list of Senegal, which may make it possible to present some elements in 2020 for inscription on the different lists of the Convention. In addition, educational models had been developed in an experimental phase in elementary schools in collaboration with the Ministry of Education. The delegation reserved a special mention for the communities, who were at the heart of this experience and from whom much was learned. Ultimately, the expertise was gleaned at the level of these communities, and the delegation wished to thank the communities, even if they were not present, as ultimately this statement was intended for them. It concluded by thanking the Secretary for the follow-up and useful advice, adding that a video had been made to show the work carried out on the ground.

*[Video projection of Senegal’s project]*

1. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the document presenting the status of the implementation of the projects and activities under the International Assistance mechanism. It noted with appreciation the global trend of the International Assistance mechanism in its broadened scope of actions through projects focusing not only on inventorying, safeguarding projects and preparatory assistance but also the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in education, as mentioned previously by the Secretary, as well as using the emergency assistance modality that uses the power of intangible cultural heritage in the consolidation of peace and lasting stability. Azerbaijan welcomed the efforts of Colombia and Niger within the framework of the emergency assistance projects in particular. It believed that the Committee should welcome the efforts of these States, which provide innovative community-based approaches to coexistence and reconciliation, as well as aiming to achieve increased resilience and dialogue between displaced populations and local communities in different contexts.
2. The **delegation of Cuba** underscored the extreme importance of International Assistance and the operationality of the ICH Fund, especially for less developed countries, African countries and Small Island Developing States. With regard to the project to identify and define intangible cultural heritage implemented by the National Commission of Cultural Heritage of Cuba, the project was given priority by the Ministry of Culture. However, despite its strong commitment, there had been certain delays in implementing the scheduled activities. The delegation explained that there was a delay in retaining resources because of the embargo imposed by the United States against Cuba. Nevertheless, two workshops were held with CRESPIAL, a category 2 centre, on the projects’ objectives and on the Convention to protect intangible cultural heritage. CRESPIAL has an expert in the field who, with the other experts, will work alongside the communities to guarantee the quality of the work and meet the project’s schedule. The delegation thanked UNESCO for the opportunity to work on this important project in the remotest parts of the country.
3. The **delegation of Zambia** joined the previous speakers to congratulate and thank UNESCO for the International Assistance received for intangible cultural heritage and safeguarding. As a beneficiary, it wished to briefly share its experience on its ongoing project entitled, ‘Strengthen the capacity for the safeguarding and management of intangible cultural heritage in Zambia’. The project aims to develop a Bachelor of Arts degree in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, adding that the timing in implementing such projects was crucial because it is a three-year project and projects funded under International Assistance all have a duration of three years. Therefore, within that three-year period the materials have to be developed to implement the programme. The delegation explained that the start of the project was difficult. The first workshop unfortunately attracted a lot of negative publicity, as mentioned in the report. It was presented by a number of news media and received a backlash. Fortunately, the authorities had the support of Invest in Zambia management. Zambia’s minister also supported the project and she was even forced to make a ministerial statement in parliament to allay the fears that people have about witchcraft. UNESCO together with Zambia’s permanent delegation in Paris also helped to allay fears that people had at the beginning. Fortunately, the storm came to an end and the programme is now running. There are now 16 students enrolled and 18 courses have been developed covering a four-year programme from first year to the fourth year. The last part of this project involves producing and publishing a programme manual that will guide those implementing this course and probably to also assist other countries that might wish to introduce a similar course. The manual is currently with the publishers and it was not known how long it will take to publish the final document.
4. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretariat for the presentation of its reports related to the implementation of International Assistance projects during this period. It supported the priority given to projects on capacity building and intangible cultural heritage in education. It congratulated the States and countries that are making efforts to ensure cohesion between the communities in a spirit of peace and solidarity. The delegation affirmed Armenia’s commitment to ensuring that the main beneficiaries of this assistance continues to be the countries of Electoral Group V in accordance with the overall priority for Africa.
5. The **delegation of Djibouti** thanked the Bureau and the Secretariat for granting US$82,000 for its capacity-building project to train civil society, communities and national actors. It also included the development of a safeguarding plan for elements of Djiboutian intangible cultural heritage as well as training in the preparation of files for the Representative List. The project runs until June 2020 and the first workshop would soon be held despite the delay due to technical issues and the availability of the facilitator. Djibouti is nonetheless committed to capacity building and the implementation of the project for which it was granted assistance.
6. The **Secretary** began by thanking all the States that had intervened and had benefitted from the Fund for their gratitude. Indeed, it was very encouraging as it is important that this mechanism of the Convention becomes more operational. He spoke of how the new SIM team will address some of the issues raised, thereby significantly improving and expanding the way International Assistance is managed, and not necessarily only in terms of numbers. The Secretary took note of some of the points raised by Colombia, noting that they also concerned the work of the Evaluation Body. The Philippines spoke of how to look at using the Fund as a South-South cooperation mechanism to broaden its scope through improved information sharing, including social media. These were the kinds of issues that the SIM team will work and concentrate on. He also took note of the idea of potentially exploring thematic areas of intervention, though at the moment the big challenge was to operationalize the Fund, which will be assisted over the years by this dedicated team and through future discussions. Fine-tuning its focus and learning from it will thus be an important aspect. The Secretary also took note of the comments by Austria, which were in line with some of the comments made by the Philippines, such as: What are the lessons learned? How can the Fund become a meaningful operational mechanism of the Convention, beyond granting funds? How can we learn from recurrent challenges? In that respect, lessons can be learned on safeguarding practices as the Fund will improve understanding of safeguarding through a series of concrete activities. The Secretary thanked Senegal, Cuba, Zambia and Djibouti for their appreciation and for their project implementation. Senegal spoke of its good experience of working with the UNESCO Field Office. Indeed, a couple of years ago the Secretariat started on a service modality with two experiences in Senegal and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which has so far proved successful, and in some cases where States so wished, it helped alleviate some of the burden related to administration and so on. It was thus very pleasing to hear that it is working and it was hoped that this may be a modality for other States. The Secretary also took note of Azerbaijan’s reference to the two projects focused on emergencies, which were particularly important. The Secretariat was also working with Cuba and it was aware of the larger context that may affect project implementation, but it tries to work to accommodate for these contexts as much as possible. The Secretary thanked Zambia and Armenia, adding that the Secretariat continued to work with Group V though of course it does not limit it to Group V(b). He thanked Djibouti, adding that the Secretariat understands that occasionally there are delays at the start of projects but he was convinced that the project will catch-up and run smoothly.
7. The **delegation of Colombia** supported both the Fund and the Secretariat, and spoke of two of Colombia’s projects. The first project is entitled ‘Intangible cultural heritage as a basis for resilience, reconciliation and construction of peace environments in Colombia’s post-agreements’,[[24]](#footnote-24) and the second project is ‘My Heritage, My Region: strategy for capacity-building in social management of the intangible cultural heritage in two departments of the Colombian Orinoco region’.[[25]](#footnote-25) The delegation wished to thank the Secretariat for the support given to the two projects. These projects are implemented on the ground and can serve as a platform for the development of a methodology that can be shared with other States Parties once the projects are concluded. The projects will serve as a basis for cooperation as it will be possible to share the knowledge generated from each project, which is the spirit of the Fund. Both projects are ongoing and have received the full support of the local communities in a permanent dialogue with the State of Colombia, the different stakeholders and the Secretariat, and have been adapted to the specific local context of each area. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Secretariat for its flexibility and for understanding the specific circumstances of each project.
8. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1–9 were duly adopted. The **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 9.b adopted.**
9. The **Chairperson** invited the States Parties that benefited from International Assistance and had completed their projects to share their experience.
10. The **delegation of Albania** expressed gratitude to the Chairperson and the Government and people of Colombia for the warm welcome and hospitality. The delegation wished to say a few words on the implementation of the International Assistance overseen by the ODEA Academy, a very active social society organization in Albania in the field of culture that helped prepare the nomination file that would hopefully be presented to the Committee at its next session. In conformity with the rules and procedures, the implementation process was subject to decision-making, monitoring and review by a steering committee composed of five members from the Ministry of Culture, the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Arts Studies, the National Centre for Traditional Activities, local authorities and the ODEA Academy. In this way, all stakeholders were fully involved in every step of the whole process. Experts that were contracted to help prepare the nomination file are among the most well-known, with ample experience in intangible cultural heritage research, public relations and festival organization. In fact, the International Assistance allowed such expertise. The responsibilities and timeframes were clearly established in order to guarantee a smooth and successful process. Reporting to the steering committee was ensured throughout. Special attention was given to the broad involvement of the communities, groups and individuals, especially youth. They have indeed been at the core of the preparation process and have been crucial in providing valuable information in various aspects of research, education, tourism and media. In this respect, 9,000 signatures were gathered throughout the country in support of the nomination. Serious work, a reasonable timeframe and rigorous monitoring and follow-up led to the timely preparation of the nomination file. The delegation thanked the Committee for the assistance provided. Indeed, as highlighted by several Committee Members, International Assistance represents an important tool for the implementation of the Convention. It was therefore pleased to report that the assistance had been properly used and its implementation had yielded satisfaction and the desired results.
11. Thanking Albania, the **Chairperson** noted that there was no representative from the **Democratic People’s Republic of Korea** present; however, the State had sent a video on the implementation of its completed project.

*[Video projection of the project by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea]*

1. The **Chairperson** noted that Kenya wished to speak.
2. The **delegation of Kenya** appreciated the reports from the Secretariat, adding that Kenya had benefitted from International Assistance and graciously received funding support amounting to US$144,430. This amount was used to safeguard the Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, which are three male rites of passage of the Maasai community. As a State Party, it was grateful that the funds went a long way in enhancing the safeguarding measures currently in place. Activities undertaken included several meetings with the representatives of the Maasai community, such as elders, men and women, youth and persons with disabilities, to educate them on the Convention. This meeting incorporated stakeholders including members from the National Museums of Kenya, the Kenyan National Commission for UNESCO and NGOs working in the culture sector. Capacity-building workshops were held with elders, men and women, youth and persons living with disabilities on community-based inventorying, identification, mapping and protection of the cultural spaces associated with the element, and educating and mentoring youth on the significance of the element. The State Party—through the Department of Culture—is currently working with the community elders and youth to create a website with information on the three male rites of passage and associated practices. Lastly, an evaluation of the safeguarding measures is also being undertaken and the final reports will be with submitted by March 2020.
3. The **Chairperson** made some announcements on cultural events organized by Colombia, as well as a cultural exhibition on some of its elements inscribed on the national list and UNESCO Lists of intangible cultural heritage.

**ITEM 10 OF THE AGENDA**

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2019**

**Documents:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/10*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10-EN.docx)

[*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.10*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.10-EN.docx)

**Decision:** [*14.COM 10*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 10 and the report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2019, inviting the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Ms SangMee Bak, representing the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation, its Vice-Chairperson, Mr Eivind Falk, representing the Norwegian Crafts Institute, and its Rapporteur, Mr Martin Andrade Pérez, representing the Erigaie Foundation, to join the podium. She recalled that the Committee established the Evaluation Body at its thirteenth session in 2018 to evaluate the nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and the Representative List, proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and requests for International Assistance greater than US$100,000. The Chairperson then explained how the agenda items would be dealt with, beginning with agenda item 10 and the overall report of the Evaluation Body on its work. The Rapporteur, Mr Andrade Pérez, would present an oral report 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 for specific questions addressed to the Evaluation Body on its report. The general debate on this item will take place after all the individual files had been evaluated, followed by the adoption of the overall decision 14.COM 10.
2. With no comments, the **Chairperson** continued that the Committee was asked to examine five nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, including one nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with an International Assistance request (item 10.a), 40 nominations to the Representative List (item 10.b), three proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices (item 10.c) and one request for International Assistance greater than US$100,000 (item 10.d). All files will be the subject of a brief presentation by the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, justifying the recommendation of the Body, along with the display of photographic material on the screens. Concerning the debate of the Committee on the files, and with 49 files to be examined, the Chairperson reminded the Committee that it also had to consider the new provisional upstream dialogue process. Due to the demanding task and tight schedule, the Bureau agreed at its meeting on 3 October to adopt the same procedure as in previous years and to invite Committee Members with amendments to the draft decisions to inform the Secretariat prior to the session, in line with the message sent by the Secretariat to Committee Members on 23 November. This organizational matter would allow the timetable to be amended accordingly. This procedure did not prevent any Member from taking the floor on any decision. It was noted that one nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List and four nominations for the Representative List had received requests for debate.
3. The **Chairperson** then explained the working method for the adoption of draft decisions. In principle, draft decisions that had not received any amendments or requests for debate would be adopted as a whole. Draft decisions for which amendments were submitted however, would be adopted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. In addition, draft decisions for nominations that were concerned by the dialogue process would also be treated on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis whether they had received amendments or not. It was noted that a process of provisional upstream dialogue had been introduced in this cycle for the first time on an experimental basis. Six files were concerned by this dialogue process, and in order to facilitate the decision-making process, the draft decisions proposed two options: referral and inscription. In all cases, the submitting State had two minutes following adoption to deliver a statement, show a video clip or to give a performance, as was customary. Regarding amendments to the draft decisions on nominations, particularly in light of Decision [11.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/8) on the ‘clarification on the decision making process concerning inscription, selection, or approval, of nominations, proposals and requests’, the Chairperson recalled the Committee’s decision-making process, which had also been discussed during the many meetings of the informal working group since its creation in 2016.
4. The **Chairperson** therefore took into account the outcomes of these previous meetings and ongoing discussions to apply the following working method for the examination of nominations under agenda item 10. In accordance with paragraph 14 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, it was the Chairperson’s duty to ensure the ‘smooth conduct of the proceedings and the maintenance of order’. As was reflected in [Decision 11.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/d%C3%A9cisions/11.COM/8), the Chairperson would thus ensure that the spirit of consensus and international cooperation prevail throughout the debates and decision-making process. She also reminded the Committee that the draft decisions proposed had been prepared by the Evaluation Body, a consultative body created with elected members to assist in an in-depth examination of the nominations. Therefore, the debates and decision-making should demonstrate respect towards the expertise and diligent work of the Evaluation Body. When amendments are put forward, in conformity with [Decision 11.COM 8](https://ich.unesco.org/en/d%C3%A9cisions/11.COM/8), the Chairperson would thus seek to establish consensus through the appreciation of both supporting arguments and objections to the amendments under consideration. To this end, when an amendment is proposed, she would first determine whether it received an *active relative support* from the Committee. In the case of an objection, she would then seek the *active broad support* from the majority of Committee Members. The Chairperson wished to emphasize that the Committee’s decision-making process had an impact on the credibility of the Committee and on the Convention as a whole. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments on the working methodology.
5. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked the Chairperson for the very clear explanation of the procedures, adding that it appreciated the very hard work conducted by the Evaluation Body. It regretted that it had been unable to inform the Secretariat earlier of its intention to introduce an amendment for file 10.a.5, namely the spring rite of Juraǔski Karahod of Belarus.
6. The **Chairperson** took note of the request and recalled several other important points on the rules and working methods of the Committee. During the general debates, priority would be given to Members of the Committee, but also to States Parties non-Members of the Committee and other Observers, if time permitted. During the examination of specific nomination files, participation in the debates would be limited to Committee Members, i.e. submitting States and non-members of the Committee shall not take the floor. An exception is given under Rule 22.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee when submitting States may take the floor to reply to specific questions and to provide information in reply to questions raised by Committee Members. At the same time, the same Rule specifies that submitting States – whether a Member of the Committee or not – shall not speak to advocate their own nominations. The Chairperson reminded Members and Observers that large numbers of people were following the Committee’s work through live webcast or through news media and it was thus important to keep as closely as possible to the schedule. With no forthcoming comments on the procedure, the Chairperson invited the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, Mr Martin Andrade Pérez, to present his report.
7. The **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body,** Mr Martin Andrade Pérez, was pleased to introduce the report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2019. This document is the result of an assessment of the files of this cycle and of the reflections of the Evaluation Body: a group of 12 members representing all six regions. It is composed of six individual experts who represent the States Parties non-Members of the Committee: Mr Pier Luigi Petrillo from Italy, Ms Ľubica Voľanská from Slovakia, Ms Sonia Montecino Aguirre from Chile, Ms Hien Thi Nguyen from Viet Nam, Mr John Moogi Omare from Kenya and Mr Saeed Al Busaidi from Oman, and six persons representing accredited NGOs: the Norwegian Crafts Institute, the Czech Ethnological Society, the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation, the Association pour la sauvegarde des masques, the Egyptian Society for Folk Traditions, and the Erigaie Foundation. The 12 members of the Evaluation Body met three times in March, June and September [2019]. When it met for the first time in March 2019, it elected Ms SangMee Bak from the Korea Cultural Heritage Foundation as the Chairperson, Mr Eivind Falk from the Norwegian Crafts Institute as Vice-Chairperson and himself as Rapporteur. Mr Andrade Pérez, therefore presented the report on behalf of all 12 members of the Body.
8. The **Rapporteur** explained that from March to June, each member studied every file. During the second meeting, the members discussed the concerns on each of the files after long deliberations, which in many cases had a diversity of opinions. Between June and September, the preliminary report was drafted, and during the third and last meeting in September, the Body discussed and drafted the final report, which was translated into French before 8 November when it was made available online. Additionally, during this cycle on an exceptional basis, the Evaluation Body wrote the questions and evaluated the answers of the six nomination files that benefitted from the provisional upstream dialogue between June and September. The work of the Evaluation Body consists of six documents. The first is the Report of the Evaluation Body on its work in 2019. It includes an overview of the cycle, the working methods of the Body, a number of general comments about the nominations, thematic issues the Body identified after the assessment, some specific issues regarding the Lists, and a draft decision for the Committee’s consideration. The next four documents concern the examinations for the nominations for each of the mechanisms of the Convention. The sixth document is the opinion of the Evaluation Body on nominations for the 2019 cycle concerned by the provisional upstream dialogue process. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body, Ms SangMee Bak, would present the last five documents to the Committee.
9. The **Rapporteur** recalled that 52 files had been evaluated and submitted to the Committee for its decision in this cycle. This includes five multinational nominations and five files that were referred from previous cycles and had been resubmitted in this cycle. Of these 52 files, there were 42 nominations to the Representative List, four nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List, two files for the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with International Assistance, three for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and one for International Assistance. As shown, the Representative List was still the most used mechanism. Out of the 52 files, 32 files were recommended for inscription, selection or approval, 12 were recommended for referral, three files were not recommended for inscription, selection or approval, and six were concerned by the provision of upstream dialogue. Regarding the working methods of the Evaluation Body, it was important to note that the Body only refers to the information included in the nomination files and their conformity with the required criteria. The evaluations are not an assessment of the value of the element or the quality of the project. However, the Body observed that the information external to the nomination could have allowed for a more informed assessment of the nomination. The members of the Evaluation Body did not evaluate and did not take part in the discussions of the files submitted by their country of nationality or the country in which the NGO they represent is located. The Body paid attention to the consistency of the file as a whole, treated all the files equally to ensure consistency between them and the recommendations, but also with the evaluations of previous cycles. In this cycle, despite the changes made to the nomination form, the Body remained consistent with the recommendation from previous years and did not recommend that files be referred based on criterion 2 only or on the periodicity of updating the inventories.
10. The **Rapporteur** emphasized the importance of the referral option as a tool for improving the quality of the files. It is not a negative evaluation of the file. It is applied when the information is considered to be insufficient or absent, and it is thus a very good opportunity to improve the quality of a file in its presentation of the element to the world. For this cycle five files that the Body recommended for referral or not to inscribe in previous cycles had been resubmitted. In some cases, the files had shown good improvement by following and applying the recommendations of the Committee, allowing for enough time. In other cases, the files included only few changes and did not take into account the recommendations of the Committee. Some of these States resubmitted the files in the cycle immediately following their examination by the Committee, which amounted to three months. The Evaluation Body recommends that the States Parties assess the recommendations carefully, allowing enough time to apply them, and that they try to avoid resubmitting the file in the next cycle without significant revisions. During this cycle, the Body assessed two files that used the combined mechanism for a nomination for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and a request for International Assistance. Both were recommended for referral and there was a long discussion about this mechanism among the members of the Body. The combined mechanism requires considerable effort by States Parties and ICH Form-01bis is complex and not easy to complete or evaluate. The mechanism did not seem as effective as expected in terms of results. The Body therefore agreed that further reflection and review should be undertaken on the adequacy, pertinence and effectiveness of the combined mechanism before continuing to use it in future cycles. As was known, the provisional upstream dialogue was another of the important challenges in this cycle for the Body. It was introduced in this cycle in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms and as a way to improve the nomination process on an experimental basis.
11. The **Rapporteur** explained how it worked in this cycle. During its second meeting, the Body agreed which files might benefit from the dialogue process and it drafted specific questions to be addressed to the States Parties concerned. Not all the files recommended for referral were included in this process. It was applied to files containing minor issues or a confusing statement that could be clarified with a simple question and answer exchange. It was important to note that the process was not used with the view to the nomination file being rewritten. Thus, after the meeting, the Secretariat submitted the questions to the States Parties, giving them one month to provide a concrete 200-word answer in both English and French. Two months before the third meeting, the Secretariat made the replies available to the members of the Evaluation Body who formed their individual opinions. These were discussed during the Body’s September meeting when collective opinions were reached on the relevant criteria for these nominations. The dialogue process was applied in six cases. The questions were related to the safeguarding plan, safeguarding measures, and community participation encountered in the nomination process. For all cases, the Body reached a positive opinion, which was a positive experience for the members. The Body felt that no files during this cycle were recommended to be referred or not inscribed as a result of minor aspects. When the Body recommended to refer or not to inscribe an element or a project during this cycle without a dialogue it was because the file contained *substantial* issues that could not be resolved through a simple clarification in a short time period and without a consultation process with the communities. An issue concerning the dialogue process was related to the additional amount of work for members of the Body. In many cases, the members of the Body had to re-examine the whole file, so it is important to clarify that this process should only be applied in particular cases and not for all the files due to the amount of work involved. Moreover, it would be unaffordable for the Body to reopen all the files of a cycle. The Body also noted that in many cases the answers seemed to have been provided by government authorities or researchers with less participation from the communities. In other cases, the answers were not as concrete as the Body was expecting, but after its own evaluation, it was found that some questions were not specific enough, which helped the Evaluation Body reflect on this process and give some recommendations to improve it in the future. The final recommendation of the Evaluation Body about the upstream dialogue is to continue with it, while proposing some amendments to the Operational Directives in order to allow the Body to change its recommendation for only the files concerned by the dialogue process during the September meeting.
12. The **Rapporteur** also noted, as in previous cycles, that many nominations presented linguistic problems, unclear and imprecise language or translations, typographical errors and grammatical mistakes. He recalled that the quality of writing of nomination files or their translation was important to ensure that the element is well understood. The files available online are an important tool for promoting and presenting elements of intangible cultural heritage. States Parties were also reminded to avoid the use of language that refers to uniqueness, exceptionality and immutability of elements. Expressions such as ‘unique’ and ‘prestige’ were used in some files that implied some hierarchy, as well as terms that described the integrity or authenticity of an element, which is contrary to the principles and spirit of the Convention. Another issue concerned the titles of the elements. Some of them are very general and suggested a common and widespread element that could exist anywhere. Other titles use generic terms or were very long and descriptive, and in some cases, there is a mismatch between the title and the content of the nomination file. It was important to note that the titles are the first presentation of an element so they must be carefully formulated and give a clear idea of its nature. Furthermore, the Body recalled the need to avoid references to exclusiveness, ownership or geographic origin in the title of the elements.
13. The **Rapporteur** then turned to the five multinational files evaluated in this cycle. While the Body recognizes the complexity of the preparation of these files and commends the States Parties for such a difficult task, it applies the same parameters as for nominations from a single submitting State. The Body also discussed the pertinence of the inscription of files when a criterion is satisfied for certain States but not for others. It was reminded that multinational nominations must be prepared collaboratively showing interaction and the sharing of information with an equal share of information from each country. This collaboration must not only be between the States Parties but also between the communities concerned, and the safeguarding measures should include joint measures to safeguard the element as a shared element that can create ties between countries, and especially between communities. As in previous cycles, the Body notes the interest of other States in joining these multinational nominations and invites the States to work towards the possibility of extended nominations. Finally, the Evaluation Body was pleased to recommend some nominations from this cycle as good examples: one request for International Assistance, two nominations for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and three for the Representative List.
14. The **Rapporteur** then turned to the Body’s discussions on several thematic issues. As in previous years, the Body assessed similar elements nominated for a single inscription by different countries as well as elements similar to ones already inscribed in the past by other States Parties. The Body wished to reiterate that the inscription of an element on the List does not imply exclusivity or ownership nor does it mean that other States cannot nominate similar elements practised on their territory, and it does not represent the means either to enforce geographic origin or the geographic indication of an element or to exclude other States. The Body wished to reiterate its invitation to consider working towards the possibility of extended nominations. This year for example, two different nominations were submitted for similar elements. While one is recommended for inscription and the other is not, these different recommendations are not intended to reflect a judgement on the elements themselves but rather reflects differences in the quality of the files submitted. Also, as in other cycles, many debates concerned the definition of intangible cultural heritage. The List themselves provide a definition of intangible cultural heritage which is enlarged every year through new inscriptions, meaning that any listed element will contribute to this definition. The Body recognized the open definition of intangible cultural heritage provided by the Convention, but it wished to reiterate that it does not mean that any cultural element can be included on the List. Several cases in this cycle provided an opportunity to discuss the complex relationship between the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the promotion of cultural goods, services and industries. While these two approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive, an emphasis on the promotion of cultural goods, services and industries rather than on the safeguarding of living heritage is not in line with the spirit of the Convention. As in previous cycles, this relation between intangible cultural heritage and economic development has been debated during the Body’s meetings. In many cases, elements of intangible cultural heritage are directly linked to economic activities. This link is not a problem in itself but many issues can arise as the result of it. First, the Body found that in some cases, the safeguarding plans or measures were primarily directed at preserving and reinforcing the economic aspect of an element.
15. The **Rapporteur** then spoke of other issues, for example, many nomination files included measures to address the risk of over-commercialization while others lacked them. The Body wished to reiterate the importance of this issue and invites all States to recognize over-commercialization and include corresponding measures. In the case of crafts, some files described the use and decorative aspects of the product rather than the cultural meaning and social functions of the practise, knowledge and skills related to the element. The management of tourism is another of the main challenges of elements of intangible cultural heritage. In many files, tourism was an important part of the safeguarding plan, while in others there were no measures directed at preventing the potential impact of excessive tourism. The Body wished to recall the importance of considering the risk of the potential decontextualization of an element as a result of tourism, as well as the need for its monitoring. The Body was concerned because some files focused on the promotion of a place as a tourist destination, while others highlighted the potential for increased visibility for tourism following inscription of the element. The Body welcomes safeguarding measures with the potential to raise awareness about the impact of tourism. Finally, the Evaluation Body wished to recall that the inscription of an element on the Representative List does not confer a special brand or label, which had been mentioned in some cases. Another major issue was the definition and nature of the communities, groups and individuals concerned. In some cases, the files did not clearly specify whether the community was a group of persons living in a particular geographic area or the practitioners of the element. In other files, the community was associated with a specific private organization or a group of professionals related to an element. In these cases, the evaluation of the files proved problematic due to the ambiguous nature of the community concerned. The definition of the community should also include a detailed description of the gender dimension with a clear identification of the roles of men and women, as well as letters of consent from practitioners of different genders. The Body was concerned by the absence of letters of consent from female members in some files that described the broad participation of women and girls in the practice. The Body recalled the importance of clearly defining the community’s groups or individuals concerned with elements of intangible heritage.
16. As in previous cycles, the **Rapporteur** recalled that some nomination files described the use of a top-down approach in the nomination process. Some cases were considered national elements that are recognized by the entire population of a country as part of their intangible cultural heritage. In these cases, the State asserts that the entire population appreciates the element or participates in the process of its nomination but without including any proof of this. In other cases, inadequate methodologies were used, such as surveys. There were also cases in which the community did not actively participate but merely approved information presented to it by external researchers. The Body invited States Parties to avoid such approaches and to guarantee wider community participation from the beginning of the process, with members of the community being directly involved in the preparation of the nomination file. As in previous cycles, some nominations relate to traditional sports. The Evaluation Body reiterated the importance of the distinction between traditional and professional sports. The Body had followed the definition of traditional sport as an expression of intangible cultural heritage when it is community based, has a clear cultural meaning, and is constantly transmitted across generations. The Body also noted that several elements nominated for possible inscription were closely related to physical space. The Body welcomed the focus on this connection, but reiterated the importance of keeping in mind that the inscription of an element on one of the Lists does not mean the related [physical] site will also be inscribed on the List. Finally, some nomination files highlighted the role of intangible cultural heritage in terms of environmental protection and sustainability. Even if the Body welcomed such files, it is important that they propose a balance between the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the protection of nature.
17. The **Rapporteur** then spoke about a number of issues identified by the Body in this cycle that made some nomination files contradictory or unclear. The first concerned the coherence of the whole file with the definition of the element. The Body recalled that without a clear definition of the element it is impossible to assess how its inscription could contribute to the purpose of the Representative List or to assess the threats it faces. Furthermore, if the element is not well defined the Body could question whether the communities gave their informed consent for the inscription of an element that was itself unclear. The definition also gives the idea of the bearers of the communities, which creates a link with criterion U.4/R.4 where they are more clearly defined. In some cases however, contradictory information was provided for different criteria. For instance, the communities that provide consent should correspond to the description given in U.4/R.4 and in the other section of the file. The safeguarding plan for elements nominated for possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List should have also been consistent with the threats defined under criterion U.2. If this was not the case, the safeguarding plan was considered insufficient. This is also the case when the threats listed are so general as to render it impossible to propose specific safeguarding measures. Finally, the fact that an element is included on a national inventory and is recognized as intangible heritage at the national level does not necessarily mean that it can be considered as intangible heritage as defined by the Convention. Some countries may have a broader definition of intangible heritage and may therefore not meet the requirements under U.1/R.1.
18. For the Urgent Safeguarding List, the **Rapporteur** explained that the Body wished to highlight the importance of identifying threats to an element in a specific manner, except when such threats are beyond the control of the community. In these cases, the Body recommended that measures be proposed to mitigate these threats without necessarily addressing them. As in previous cycles, there is still a misunderstanding of criterion R.2 despite improvements made to the nomination form. Many files continued to address the increased visibility of the element itself rather than the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Therefore, the Evaluation Body decided to take into account all the information provided in section 2 of the form in order to assess whether the file fulfils this criterion in general rather than focusing on whether the State had properly responded to each sub question. Based on this issue, the Body took the difficult decision not to refer files based on this criterion alone. However, the Body recommended that the Committee engage in an overall review of this criterion in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms. Finally, a very delicate issue was the importance of inventories. Very few nomination files fully satisfied criterion U.5/R.5 in the sense that it was not always clear how they contributed to safeguarding. The Body invited the Committee to undertake significant measures to underline the importance of inventories with a view to safeguarding and to determine the future approach to U.5/R.5 so as to guarantee the credibility of the Lists and the Convention.
19. The **Rapporteur** concluded his presentation with the participation of communities, groups and individuals. As for the community consent, the form, number and nature of this consent were recurrent concerns for the Evaluation Body. As in previous cycles, it was difficult to establish whether the number of letters of consent provided was sufficient. In certain cases, some of the communities that had signed the letters were not mentioned in the file, while in others some of the communities described had not provided any form of consent. The Body invited States Parties to be consistent in this regard. In some cases, nomination files described the process that included workshops and different activities in relation to community consent but without any proof of such activities. Moreover, the use of standardized letters of consent is strongly discouraged. Many nomination files used this methodology, which does not always demonstrate the active participation of the community. The Body also invited States Parties to pay special attention to the consent and translation of the forms of consent. In some cases, the information presented in the letters did not correspond to the information provided in the file. Finally, the Body welcomes different and innovative forms of consent, such as the use of videos or consultations via the radio to reach a wider community. Another recurrent issue related to the representativeness of the people who participated in the process and signed the letters of consent. As already noted, the definition of the community concerned is sometimes unclear. Nomination files presented a diverse understanding of the concept of community, which is not precisely defined by the Convention. As it is difficult to assess the nature of the community concerned without knowledge of the context, the Body recommended that the nomination file be referred only in the case of an evident top-down approach owing to a significant lack of coherence between the file and the letters of consent or a clear lack of community participation. Finally, the Body noted that some nomination files for the Urgent Safeguarding List suggested the use of a top-down approach, lacking clear links between the proposed plan and the communities concerned. Sometimes more importance was given to the promotion of an element than to its safeguarding by the communities. The Body encouraged States Parties to place the community’s concerns at the centre of the safeguarding plans, from the proposal of the plan to its implementation. These were the most critical points of the Evaluation Body report. On behalf of the Evaluation Body, the Rapporteur thanked the Committee for entrusting it with this task, and he also thanked his colleagues on the Evaluation Body for all their hard work, as well as the Secretariat.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for the important issues raised in the report,opening the floor for comments.
21. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Evaluation Body for its report as well as for the hard work accomplished over the last year, particularly with the implementation of the dialogue mechanism. The report clears up some of the questions it had on the implementation of this new experimental dialogue mechanism that will make it possible to raise the number of files for inscription, thereby contributing to facilitating the process of listing for the submitting States. The delegation therefore believed that the initiative is a major step forward to improving the mechanisms for listing. All of the replies from States that were submitted to the mechanism proved satisfactory with the Evaluation Body recommending their inscription. However, the delegation felt that the recommendation in the draft decision was unclear as two options were provided, as if the Evaluation Body had not really taken a decision on whether to recommend inscription or not. It agreed with the Evaluation Body that in some cases the questions were not sufficiently clear and that it was a problem for the submitting States to provide specific answers. The delegation recalled that the Evaluation Body’s work on the examination of files is based on the information contained in the documents presented and not on the element itself. It therefore agreed that the option to resubmit the files to the submitting States is a way of improving the files so that they can be listed in the future, though it understood the concerns of the communities concerned as well.
22. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** commended the Evaluation Body for its work, congratulated the Body for the report and excellent presentation. It really appreciated its work and the quality of the evaluations. In the report a number of very important issues and challenges were raised, which were really important and worthy of further reflection by the Committee, such as the issue of consistency of the evaluation – within and across parts of the cycle – consistency with previous decisions of the Committee, and many other issues that were raised by the Evaluation Body. The delegation also congratulated the Evaluation Body on introducing success in the upstream process, and it was very glad to see that countries benefitted from this process in six files in this cycle. However, it also wished to learn more on how the Evaluation Body chose to open the dialogue with particular cases. The delegation also noted that the dialogue process did take additional time for the Evaluation Body, and that questions should remain limited as much as possible. In line with the decisions of the Committee in 2018, the delegation drew attention to the fact that the dialogue process is not yet reflected in the Operational Directives and that the upstream dialogue in this cycle is an experimental process. It also noted the files submitted by two States for the combined mechanism of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and request for International Assistance, and believed that this combined mechanism represented an excellent opportunity for States seeking funds for safeguarding projects of intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding and should therefore be supported and encouraged. Based on the report however, the Evaluation Body had faced difficulties with the ICH Form-01bis. Steps therefore need to be taken to improve and simplify the form to respond to the needs of the submitting States. The delegation commended the States that had submitted multinational files for inscription in 2019. It believed that multinational files are of utmost importance among all the listing mechanisms of the Convention as they directly demonstrate the spirit of international cooperation and reflect the objectives of the Convention.
23. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** also noted the situation with regard to the distribution of files and the ceiling of 50 files in 2019, as applied by the Secretariat, concerning the 38 files that were submitted in 2018 but could not be treated. This meant that there were only 12 remaining spots for other priority files under paragraph 34 of the Operational Directives. It believed that the Committee needed to be mindful of all the developments with regard to the priorities in the examination of files set up by the General Assembly a few years ago. In this context, the growing number of files submitted for inscription on the Representative List might lead to a situation where nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List and multinational files would be pushed beyond the ceiling of 50 and thereby would not be treated within the ceiling. Therefore, the delegation asked the Secretariat to be vigilant of this situation and to reflect on possible ways in which the situation with the number of files and priorities could be harmonized in the future. Finally, Azerbaijan noted that this recurrent issue faced by the Evaluation Body, including in this cycle, was also reflected in the report. The Committee therefore needed to reflect on the ways in which the entire methodology of evaluation could be revised, as mentioned by the Evaluation Body, noting that its opinion is solely based on the information reflected in the nomination without any fact checking outside the nominations. The Evaluation Body confirmed in its report that information external to the nomination files could have allowed for a more informed assessment on whether the file responds to the criteria concerned. The delegation of Azerbaijan was of the view that the Secretariat had an important role to be particularly attentive to cases where external information would indeed be useful, especially when nominations raise issues linked to the territorial integrity of States Parties.
24. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its very detailed report and commended it for the quality of the work accomplished in 2019. The report raised important recurring questions, but the delegation was pleased that some had received concrete answers, as in the case of dialogue with the submitting States. The provisional dialogue process was tested in 2018 by the Evaluation Body and was conclusive in that it should lead to an improvement in the evaluation of files. Armenia thus supported the recommendation of the Evaluation Body to amend the Operational Directives in this regard. This was also the case concerning criterion R.2, the evaluation of which had proved to be relatively difficult. The delegation therefore supported the recommended approach to initiate a review of this criterion as part of the overall reflection on the listing mechanisms. The Evaluation Body also observed the excessive commercialization of certain elements, the need for broad community participation in the nomination process, and finally, the development of safeguarding measures and the updating of inventories. These are, of course, essential issues that must be taken into account and would benefit from further reflection.
25. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Evaluation Body for its immense work, the detailed report and its precise recommendations. The Netherlands urged Member States to take the report into account when preparing a nomination file as many important observations are covered, recalling that the Evaluation Body is the consultative body for evaluating nominations and is established by the Committee. The delegation values the expertise of the Evaluation Body and follows its recommendations as much as possible. In recent years it was noted that many countries found that dialogue was missing in the evaluation process and as a result the Committee strengthened the inscription process by introducing an upstream dialogue on an experimental basis, which was successfully applied. But what does this mean for the Committee during the deliberations on these files? The delegation was of the opinion that one of the outcomes of the new upstream process is that the recommendations by the Evaluation Body leave less room for the Committee to change ‘referrals’ in the draft decision. The delegation found that in the recommendations of the Evaluation Body many files showed top-down approaches and have less input by the communities themselves. This is very disappointing and is not in line with the purpose of the Convention. It was hoped that nominating States take note of the recommendations of the Evaluation Body in this regard. Moreover, the Body pointed to poor linguistic quality, a recurring issue in every report of the Evaluation Body in recent years. This points to the fact that the concepts of the Convention are still not fully understood, misunderstood or even not known to the drafters of the file and it was hoped that nominating States make use of UNESCO facilitators more often to assist in the drafting process of the file.
26. The **delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its work over the evaluation period and for the detailed report presented. It appreciated the challenges faced by the Evaluation Body and congratulated the members for stepping forward and undertaking this very critical work in furthering the aims of the Convention. However, at the same time, it was important to appreciate the difficulties faced by some States Parties in their nominations in terms of interpreting some of the requirements, specifically in the case of nominations to the Representative List regarding criteria R.2 and R.3 that have obviously been problematic in this cycle, as well as in criteria U.2 and U.3. in nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List. The delegation found that the upstream dialogue process provided a useful opportunity for clarification of the issues raised by the Evaluation Body, and it encouraged its use, albeit it was still far from being a success. This was just the first step and there is always the possibility of fine-tuning this mechanism. It is however, a very useful means for dialogue.
27. The **delegation of Japan** commended the efforts by the Evaluation Body and the good progress made since the last meeting of the Committee in 2018, and it particularly welcomed the introduction of the upstream dialogue. It noted two main concerns: i) the lack of dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State after the submission of the nomination file; and ii) the excessive reliance on the information contained in the nomination files. In this regard, this upstream mechanism had definitely improved the dialogue between the Evaluation Body and nominating States and the delegation welcomed the positive outcomes that have resulted from this process. At the same time, the mechanism needs to be reviewed for correctness notwithstanding its provisional aspect with six files selected for the upstream dialogue. In this regard, the delegation wished to know how the six files were chosen. The Rapporteur had mentioned minor issues and confusing statements, but these criteria were still not clear enough. The delegation also questioned whether it was a good thing or not to rely solely on the information contained in the nomination file. It appreciated that the Rapporteur correctly mentioned the importance of making an informed assessment and it is good to rely on the information contained in the file to achieve this. Nevertheless, the delegation felt that there was a contradiction. Also in 2018, the delegation had pointed out the issue of inappropriate language, i.e. ‘uniqueness’, ‘originality’, ‘authenticity’. The argument was based on the existing Operational Guidelines. This language was said to contradict the concept of the Convention, but the delegation voiced its concern and questioned the validity of such an argument. In its view, some elements are actually supported by the community because they reflect the uniqueness of the community; they are original to that community. This point should therefore be seriously addressed in the upcoming review of the evaluation process. Finally, the delegation pointed out other issues that were relevant to this year’s cycle, including exclusivity and geographical origins, adding that maybe the Committee should discuss these critical issues in the forthcoming process on the reflection of the listing mechanism to ensure the credibility of the evaluation.
28. The **delegation of Austria** congratulated the Evaluation Body for the consistency of its work, and the detailed and insightful report and its efforts and dedication to the evaluation of nominations. It also took note that the Evaluation Body welcomed the upstream dialogue mechanism and it congratulated the Body for coming up with a creative system that allows for the clarification of minor issues, though it agreed with others that further reflection was needed. As this was its last year on the Committee, Austria wished to look back over the four years on the number of repeated issues, positive developments, and recurring challenges. On the one hand, the Committee has seen more nominations that highlight the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to sustainable development, as well as an increase in multinational files. These nominations not only testify to the important role of intangible cultural heritage to foster dialogue and cooperation, they also show that living heritage does not necessarily follow national boundaries. Based on its own positive experience, the delegation encouraged further nominations of elements of shared intangible cultural heritage. On the other hand, the issues raised by the Evaluation Body were still of concern. Among them are a lack of community participation, inappropriate language, ownership issues, over-commercialization, tourism, as well as the small number of nominations to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. As a Convention for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, the collection of safeguarding practices could serve as a model for others and is at the heart of the Committee’s work. Speaking from its own experience, inscription on the Register has had a number of immensely positive effects, such as intensified dialogue and interregional exchange. There also seemed to be recurrent issues with the representation of really large communities; a similar case occurred in 2018 in Mauritius. The delegation thus asked the Evaluation Body to further explain criterion R.4 and what it considered sufficient evidence of community consent in that case. Concerning criterion R.2, the delegation asked if it understood correctly that the Committee would not consider this criterion when evaluating files until the end of the reflection process in 2022.
29. The **delegation of Cyprus** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its enormous work, especially in delivering on the dialogue process. However, it had a few questions for the Evaluation Body. How did it select the files for the dialogue, and based on what criteria? It was noted that some files had only one criterion and dialogue had not been applied to those files. Also, two options were provided, one negative and one positive, which did not reveal the Body’s position after the dialogue, but instead allowed the Committee to decide. It was felt that it would have been better had the Body given its opinion after the dialogue.
30. The **delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its impressive work. The report brought to the fore recurrent and emerging challenges in the evaluation of nominations, as well as the specific challenge of the abstract nature of the R.2 criterion. How does the Evaluation Body think it could be more appropriately adjusted to be better understood by States filling out the nomination forms? In its four years on the Committee, the delegation observed that States Parties often included pertinent information relevant to particular criteria under different sections dispersed throughout the file. Paradoxically, perhaps it is the word limits that make it difficult for States to give coherent answers. Hence, it may be necessary to examine and interpret the files more broadly rather than just looking for the answers under each subsection. It agreed with the Evaluation Body’s recommendations regarding the Urgent Safeguarding List that it ran the risk of being overshadowed by the Representative List when the Urgent Safeguarding List should really be the focus. The delegation also appreciated the Evaluation Body’s comments on the upstream dialogue process and it looked forward to discussing the proposed amendments to the Operational Directives that would allow the Evaluation Body to finalize its report at the September session, taking into account the answers provided by the nominating States whose files were subject to the dialogue mechanism. The delegation understood that this was not a perfect system but it believed that over time it could be further improved and made efficient. Lastly, on the important issues of over-commercialization and the impact of tourism, it believed that there should be more definitive guidance on these matters for all States. Certain terminology and perspectives regularly appear in the nomination files. In fact, it recommended the development of an updated guidebook that could help States and communities in dealing with these issues in the context of intangible cultural heritage and nominations. It was hoped that this would be reflected in the draft decision on item 10.
31. The **delegation of Poland** joined the previous speakers to congratulate and thank the Evaluation Body for its enormous efforts in facing the important new dialogue mechanism. For the first time, the Committee can observe the very positive effects of this work, especially as new doors had been opened in the implementation of the Convention, not least because the Committee has made more or less the same observations in many other previous sessions, particularly on the points concerning communities in the preparation of the files. The community’s awareness is crucial when speaking about the dissemination and understanding of the Convention, which can be seen in the right use of terminology, i.e. not to confuse this Convention with other cultural conventions, especially the 1972 Convention. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Evaluation Body, encouraging further work with a new attitude, as well as encouraging States towards more concrete dialogue.
32. The **Chairperson** thanked Poland, noting that Palestine, Colombia and Turkey wished to speak and could do so after lunch, inviting the Secretary to present some practical information.
33. The **Secretary** reminded delegates of some interesting events taking place during the lunch break such as the panel discussion, Safeguarding indigenous heritage and languages through education programmes, organized by UNESCO in celebration of the 2019 International Year of Indigenous Languages, and the meeting of the ICH NGO Forum – Working Group on Information and Communication Technologies.
34. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary and adjourned the session.

*[Tuesday, 10 December 2019, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** began the session by giving the floor to Colombia, followed by Palestine.
2. Thanking the Evaluation Body for its work, the **delegation of Colombia** wished to flag the issue of tourism and how it dovetails with the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. This issue was discussed in the previous week at a CRESPIAL event in Bogotá. Indeed, it was perfect timing as some recommendations from the Evaluation Body concerning monitoring and issues of decontextualization or commercialization currently do not have any recommendations, indicators or methods for developing monitoring mechanisms on these issues to ensure the follow-up and monitoring of tourism-related projects affecting intangible cultural heritage. In this regard, the delegation wished for greater reflection on the impact and consequences of tourism on intangible cultural heritage in the framework of this Convention. In this way, the Committee might be able to create an appropriate mechanism for the adequate monitoring and implementation of tourism.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** extended warm thanks to the Evaluation Body for its work and the Secretariat because it had been charged with something new and had successfully managed the dialogue process, which was greatly appreciated, particularly given the additional work. The delegation reminded the Committee that these issues will be further discussed under agenda item 14, the reflection on the listing mechanism and the mandate of the Evaluation Body. As was known, the Evaluation Body only examines the information contained in the file, which will also be covered under agenda item 14, but the Committee is also expecting answers regarding the process of selection and on issues concerning R.2, which regularly came up during the debate. The Committee understands that the Evaluation Body is doing its work correctly and that it strictly follows its mandate, but under item 14 it may wish to enlarge its mandate. It reiterated thanks to the Evaluation Body and Secretariat.
4. With no more Members wishing to speak, the **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
5. The **delegation of Turkey** extended thanks to Colombia for its hospitability. Regarding item 10, it followed closely the recent dialogue mechanisms for the nomination files and there was the expectation that it would be a solution for the recurring issues. However, the same issues remain, particularly in this cycle. For instance, for files with minor issues, an exchange of information between the submitting State and the Evaluation Body can ensure an improved evaluation. But what about files that make reference to exclusiveness, ownership and geographic location in the titles of their elements found in the territories of other States? How can the State Party that has serious concerns on the file become involved in the process? Is there an option for the State Party to bring its legitimate concerns to the Committee prior to its session? Did the Committee really expect to eliminate the politicization of nominations and thus strengthen the credibility of the Committee without leaving room for the concerned State Party [to voice its concerns]? How can the Evaluation Body make a recommendation for inscription when a nomination file contains inappropriate explanations or uses vocabulary for religious institutions, cities, regions of another State Party? Having examined the application form, consent letters and inventories, and being able to detect such issues, what is the best way for the Evaluation Body to proceed in this regard? The delegation did understand the working method of the Evaluation Body through which it evaluates the content of the file rather than the element itself. However, the terminology of inappropriate expressions, contradictory vocabulary or geographical location or references that do not belong to the element itself are problematic formulations in the documentation and are part of the content. Therefore, in ongoing and future deliberations to improve the evaluation process, the Committee should ensure that the evaluation of nomination files be in full compliance with the Convention, Operational Directives, relevant Committee decisions, the aide memoires, as well as the principles of mutual understanding and respect.
6. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur to provide answers and clarifications.
7. The **Rapporteur** began by thanking all the Members of the Committee for their kind words and support, adding that it was important to feel the support of the Committee in trying to improve the mechanisms. Concerning the questions posed, beginning with Cyprus, the Rapporteur noted that the main question asked by several Members was how the files were chosen to initiate the dialogue. It was explained that only files with minor issues were chosen, i.e. files that had only minor problems or confusing statements that could potentially be clarified with a simple exchange with the submitting State; this was the sole criterion of the Evaluation Body. In addition, the aim was not to have the State re-write the file, as this would involve re-evaluating the entire file and the Body did not have time to reassess six files. Thus, only minor issues were considered. The Rapporteur conceded that it was not easy to define the minor problems with the files. However, all 12 Members agreed that the six files chosen were the ones with minor problems. The other files contained more substantive issues and thus would have been more difficult to resolve, even 3 months would not have been enough to resolve most of the problems found in those files. Obviously, the mechanism still needed to be improved, but the Body sought not to have replies exceeding 200 words as more than this would already amount to a considerable increase in the work of the Body and it did not have the time to carry out that work in time for the Committee’s session. Referring to Guatemala’s remark on the Evaluation Body’s opinion after the dialogue, the Rapporteur explained that it was not the Body that defined the procedure, but rather it was bound by legal directives that do not allow the Body to change its opinion in its September meeting. The Secretary could best explain why there was another document with the Body’s opinion.
8. The **Secretary** referred to the question from Guatemala to explain that the reason two options were provided was for legal reasons and because this was a provisional cycle. It does not mean that the Evaluation Body did not have an opinion, but rather that the Body was not permitted to change its formal recommendation that was decided at its meeting in June. This was the rationale behind the proposed amendments to the Operational Directives under agenda item 14 that would allow the Evaluation Body to change its opinion in the next cycle.
9. The **delegation of Cyprus** remarked that the fact the Evaluation Body provided two options supposed that the Body had a positive, favourable opinion, otherwise it would not have presented a second opinion.
10. The **Secretary** invited the Committee to refer to the draft decisions that provided the opinion of the Evaluation Body, which is not the same as a formal recommendation. Thus, the paragraphs concerned [in the accompanying information document 10] refer to the Body’s opinion, but the onus was still on the Committee to decide between the two options.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification,inviting the Rapporteur to continue.
12. Referring to the upstream dialogue, the **Rapporteur** agreed with Jamaica that it was perhaps not the big success anticipated, but that it was still a very good first step. Obviously, the upstream dialogue has to be improved until the next General Assembly and the next two or three days will help introduce improvements to provide strong recommendations to the General Assembly. Regarding the question from the Philippines on how to solve the problems of criterion R.2 and also the question from Japan on external information, the Rapporteur referred to how the Secretariat and the Committee had begun this process of reflection on the listing mechanisms, including attempts to solve the issue of criterion R.2, as it has consistently been a problem from the beginning, with both the Evaluation Body and the Committee recommending its improvement. It was also felt by the Evaluation Body that the nomination form had been improved, but it did not work the way the Body would have wanted. The Rapporteur believed that the reflection process on the listing mechanisms would at least try to resolve some of these problems. The same could also be said about external information. It was true and clear to all members of the Evaluation Body that evaluating only the information contained in the file was sometimes problematic. Occasionally it was unclear what was happening behind the files and the Body wanted to know more. It was still unclear how this would happen, but it would no doubt be part of the reflection process. The Rapporteur remarked on the many discussions on dialogue and the importance of examining external information, but there was no apparent solution, not least because it can take weeks or months to evaluate a file. Finally, referring to the question from Austria on what can be considered sufficient information in the case of R.4, the Rapporteur remarked that the Evaluation Body always tried to analyse the specific cases. For some elements, there is a community of 20, 50, 100 persons behind the elements, sometimes there are 20 persons who have given their consent to the files, but when it concerns a national element it was not enough to have just 20 or so signatories on the consent form when hundreds of thousands of people were involved. Thus, it was case dependent involving many discussions that were not easy, but again the Body always reached a consensus and a final result.
13. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for these interesting clarifications, reminding the Committee that the general debate and the examination of draft decision 14.COM.10 will follow the examination of the individual decisions under items 10.a, 10.b, 10.c and 10.d.

**ITEM 10.a OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/10.a Add.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.a_Add-EN.docx)

**Files:** [*6 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10a-urgent-safeguarding-list-01097)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of nominations to the Urgent Safeguarding List under the first sub-item 10.a. The Secretariat had been informed that Egypt had withdrawn its file, which meant only five nominations were to be examined. Out of the five nominations, the first four nominations for examination were submitted by Botswana, Kenya, Mauritius and the Philippines. This would be followed by the examination of a nomination to the Urgent Safeguarding List combined with a simultaneous International Assistance request submitted by Belarus. It was noted that this was the second time the Committee would examine this kind of nomination; the first was at its eleventh session in 2016. Before starting the examination, the Chairperson recalled the five criteria that would have to be met and that would guide the decisions. She invited Ms SangMee Bak to introduce the first nomination.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the first nomination **Seperu folkdance and associated practices** [draft decision 14.COM 10.a.1] submitted by **Botswana**. The Seperu folkdance and associated practices involve singing, dancing and sacred rituals that are highly significant in the lives of Veekuhane community members. Seperu is a celebratory practice performed during ceremonies that mark important milestones in the community members’ lives. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Evaluation Body considered that the Seperu folkdance and associated practices provide the Veekuhane community, commonly known as Basubiya, with a sense of identity, social cohesion, pride and tribal bonds, and ensured the survival and continuity of the associated social functions. Despite efforts by community members and the authorities to safeguard it, the risk to the viability of the element is still very high. The proposed safeguarding plan aims to prevent the threats to the element. The practitioners of Seperu folkdance and associated practices actively participated in the community-based inventorying process, resulting in the nomination process. The Evaluation Body encouraged the State Party to avoid standardized letters of consent when submitting nomination files in the future, while ensuring that the diverse circumstances in which such consent is given are accommodated. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Seperu folkdance and associated practices on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this nomination and therefore turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 10.a.1 adopted to inscribe Seperu folkdance and associated practices** **on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
4. The **delegation of Botswana** thanked the Chairperson and congratulated Colombia for hosting this great event, and its people for their warm welcome and excellent preparation of this session. Botswana applauded the Committee for its thorough assessment of the nomination file on Seperu folkdance and associated practices following its referral in 2013. Botswana had noted the comments made by the Evaluation Body and had subsequently improved the file to a satisfactory level. A lot of effort had been made to close all the identified gaps on the referred file, and in March 2018 it was resubmitted for possible inscription for a second time. The time and effort taken by the community provided the opportunity to grow in terms of compiling a winning file. Botswana was delighted to receive the decision to inscribe the element, expressing commitment to the implementation of its safeguarding plan. The decision to inscribe the element has motivated Botswana to continue safeguarding diverse intangible cultural heritage. Botswana further applauded UNESCO for the support it received towards the promotion and preservation of its cultural heritage.
5. The **Chairperson** drew the Committee’s attention to the fact that the next file had benefitted from the provisional upstream dialogue process. It was noted that draft decisions for such files had a more complex structure than a standard draft decision. Additional paragraphs had been introduced to take note of the different considerations and steps involved in the process. The Chairperson recalled that the Secretariat had organized on 1 March 2019 an information and exchange session where the provisional procedure and timetable proposed for the dialogue process was presented, in conformity with paragraph 55 of the Operational Directives. In order to be fully compliant with paragraph 55, one fundamental rule was upheld when elaborating the draft decisions for the cases of dialogue, i.e. that the Evaluation Body should not change its [initial] recommendation to the Committee on any given nomination, as decided at its June meeting. The structure of the proposed draft decisions for dialogue cases thus respected this rule. As this is the first dialogue case under examination, the Chairperson asked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to guide the Committee through the draft decision, paragraph-by-paragraph.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Rituals and practices associated with Kit Mikayi shrine** [draft decision14.COM 10.a.2],submitted by **Kenya**. Paragraph 1 summarizes that the Luos community of western Kenya have been conducting rituals at the sacred Kit Mikayi Shrine for generations to pray for rain and bountiful harvests. However, the element is now threatened by several factors, including encroachment on surrounding areas, ageing practitioners, and decreased frequency, therefore requiring urgent safeguarding. Paragraph 2provides that the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4 and U.5 for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List from the information included in the file. The Evaluation Body considered that the Kit Mikayi Shrine is a place of soul-searching and meditation for the community and that several specific threats had been identified affecting the viability of the rituals and practices associated with the shrine. The bearers, practitioners and representatives of the community concerned have actively participated throughout all stages of the nomination process with the full support of the Government and State institutions, while certain aspects of the element are respected and transmitted in secrecy. However, the Evaluation Body considered in paragraph 3 that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.3. While the proposed safeguarding plan corresponds to the specific threats to the element and includes the participation of the local community, as well as the support of the local government, the Body could not fully assess the safeguarding plan owing to the lack of any timetable for the proposed activities.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** further explained that paragraph 4 sets up the dialogue mode and explains why the Body decided to initiate dialogue for the nomination concerned, making reference to Decision [13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10) through which the Committee decided to trigger a provisional upstream dialogue for the 2019 cycle. This paragraph also includes the relevant question that was addressed in relation to the criterion/criteria that was not met, as stipulated in paragraph 3. In this Kenyan case, it was considered that the safeguarding plan required under Section 3.b (Safeguarding plan proposed) was missing a timetable for the proposed activities, and it was asked to provide it. In paragraph 5, based on the submission by the State of a relevant timetable for its safeguarding plan, the Body considered the criterion satisfied, as indicated in the Body’s opinion information document 10. Furthermore, in order to facilitate the decision-making process of the Committee, the draft decision proposed two options: referral and inscription. This was not to say that the Evaluation Body did not have a consensus, but rather it had to respect paragraph 55 of the Operational Directives. The two option system thus presented a choice to the Committee, i.e. either to follow the recommendation of the Evaluation Body at the time of its June meeting or the opinion of the Evaluation Body subsequent to the dialogue process. Paragraph 6 in each of the options summarized the different considerations and the process for the evaluation of the nomination file. Paragraph 7 proposed the final decision whether to refer or to inscribe the element based on these considerations. Lastly in paragraph 8, for this file, there was also an additional recommendation to the submitting State related to the impact of tourism.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Bak for the clear presentation of the proposed nomination file and the explanation concerning the dialogue process. It was noted that this was the first examination of a draft decision of such a file, which would be adopted on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, as previously explained. The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.
9. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Secretariat once again for the significant and positive results of the dialogue process. It understood from the Secretariat’s explanation in the previous session that the Committee—for the time being—was obliged to have both options in compliance with the Operational Directives. Indeed, when the Committee decides to amend the Operational Directives there will be no ‘dual option’ but rather a final recommendation. Concerning this element, it was clear that it had benefitted from the dialogue process and that the Evaluation Body was satisfied by the responses from the State Party. For this reason, the delegation wondered whether it was possible to adopt the draft decision as a whole with Option 2 [inscription] without further discussing the issue. The Committee trusts the opinion of the Evaluation Body and would not now oppose its recommendation following the dialogue, which the Committee had advocated for many years.
10. The **delegation of Senegal** welcomed the report of the Evaluation Body on the nomination of the ritual associated with the Kit Mikayi shrine. As proposed by Palestine, the delegation believed that the Committee could directly move to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole. It supported option 2 to inscribe the element.
11. The **delegation of Poland** supported to adopt the draft decision as a whole with option 2, which was a very good example of the implementation of the dialogue mechanism, the results of which were very satisfying, demonstrating the fruitful dialogue with the submitting State.
12. The **Chairperson** noted that **Armenia**, **Zambia**, **Azerbaijan**, **Austria** and **Guatemala** agreed with the proposal and, noting the consensus, the draft decision was projected on the screen with option 2: inscription. With no further comments of objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 10.a.2 adopted to inscribe Rituals and practices associated with Kit Mikayi shrine on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
13. The **delegation of Kenya** warmly thanked the Committee for initiating a provisional upstream dialogue process between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States for the 2019 cycle. The short question and answer process was simple and enabled the submitting State to clarify the concerns raised. Consequently, the concerned criterion was met. Although the dialogue mechanism was on a provisional basis, it successfully facilitated the nomination of the Rituals and practices associated with Kit Mikayi shrine for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. Furthermore, the delegation conveyed very special thanks to the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their support and advice throughout the nomination process that made it possible for the element to meet the requisite threshold for inscription. It was delighted and humbled to accept the inscription of the Rituals and practices associated with Kit Mikayi of the Luos community in Kenya. Indeed, it was with great pleasure that the safeguarding of this important cultural shrine and the associated practices will now receive attention from local, national and international communities. Kenya will continue working hard to put in place measures that will ensure the viability and transmission of the practices associated with the shrine. It therefore welcomed the international community to come to Kenya and visit this cultural landscape, and to experience its spiritual, environmental, cultural, aesthetic, anthropological and social values. In regard to the impact of tourism on the safeguarding of the element in order to prevent its decontextualization, Kenya has a sustainable tourism management strategy to monitor the impacts of the increased visibility of the element, as well as to mitigate any adverse impacts related to tourism to prevent the over-commercialization of its intangible cultural heritage from increased tourism activities.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Sega tambour Chagos** [draft decision14.COM 10.a.3]submitted by **Mauritius**. Sega tambour Chagos is one of the types of Sega music of Mauritius with origins in the Chagos Archipelago. Like other Sega music, it is born from slavery and sung in Chagossian Creole particular to the islands. Sega tambour Chagos is a gentle, vibrant and rhythmic performance of music, song and dance based on the tambour, a large, circular instrument that is heated and then played to produce throbbing beats. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4, and U.5 for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Evaluation Body considered that Sega tambour Chagos plays a crucial role in the lives of Chagossians as a source of social and group cohesion, identity retention, self-confidence and pride. As a result of the forced and increasing displacement of Chagossians from their islands of origin, there have been numerous challenges to the viability of the element. The community, bearers, NGOs and researchers participated in the nomination process. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.3. The Body found that although there are many clearly identified threats to the viability of the element, the safeguarding plan does not address them. It focuses on the promotion of the element, particularly through performances, overlooking the family and community dimension of the element, which is described as the main area of concern in relation to Sega tambour Chagos. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* the nomination Sega tambour Chagos to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that an amendment to the draft decision had been received on behalf of Palestine, Cyprus, Kuwait, Djibouti, Jamaica, Lebanon and the Philippines. Palestine was invited to present the amendment.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that the amendment was also co-sponsored by Sri Lanka. It regretted that this file did not benefit from the dialogue process with only one criterion that was unmet. Nevertheless, the Palestinian expert, on her examination of the file, agreed with the evaluation of the Evaluation Body. The U.3 criterion was not clearly drafted and satisfactory for the Evaluation Body. The expert contacted the submitting State Party that was able to provide satisfactory clarifications, as noted in the amendments. The Sega tambour Chagos is a typical example of a bottom-up approach, not a top-down approach, which is very important. The Chagossian community itself was behind the nomination and involved in the whole process of the nomination, which was very important to keep in mind. In addition, everyone agreed that the element is in need of urgent safeguarding. The file mentioned that there is now only one family practising this musical activity. The delegation believed that inscriptions for elements in need of urgent safeguarding should be encouraged. This element is cherished by the community and the community is doing its utmost efforts to preserve it, believing that inscription itself is one way of safeguarding the element. However, the Evaluation Body was not satisfied with the proposed safeguarding plan submitted by the State Party. The delegation believed that this was only a problem of drafting.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** recalled that for the moment, the Evaluation Body is asked only to examine the information included in the file with no mandate to do any research beyond the information contained in the file. In addition, the Evaluation Body, unfortunately, did not have the means to include many of the files in the dialogue process. It understood the many constraints, especially time constraints, however, at this stage, the delegation believed that the clarification received from the State Party satisfactorily addressed the concerns. The main issue was related to the safeguarding plan and its objectives, but although the safeguarding plan submitted was unclear, the clarification by the State Party will make criterion U.3 clearer and more acceptable. The delegation also insisted that the request for inscription and the safeguarding comes from the community itself. Regarding transmission of the element, as mentioned by the Evaluation Body, from the beginning the element has been orally transmitted from generation to generation, but the younger generation unfortunately are attracted to new technologies and so on. The practitioners have an advanced age, which is of concern to the community. They want to attract the younger generation to this activity and they consider it part of their identity, which is also important to keep in mind and the Committee should encourage such files. The delegation fully understood the concerns raised on this criterion by the Evaluation Body and believed that it correctly examined the file. Moreover, the delegation believed that the purpose of inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List is never for the sake of commercialization or tourism but rather for the element itself. It was hoped that the Committee would agree and support its amendments.
5. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work, as well as the State Party for submitting this interesting file. It was noted that although some research and transmission activities had been carried out, they were insufficient as the lack of transmission was perceived as the main threat to the viability of the element. The delegation sought some clarification from the State Party on this aspect.
6. The **Chairperson** invited Mauritius to respond to the question posed by Kuwait.
7. The **delegation of Mauritius** explained that to ensure the transmission of the element the Government had initiated several actions, as set out in the safeguarding plan already submitted to the Committee, which included, among other things, the distribution of musical instruments to practitioners of the element and the promotion of regular performances to help the community to continue practising the element among a wider public, making the practitioners autonomous in the future. Under the culture exchange programme signed with Egypt in February 2019, the Tambour Chagos Group performed at the 7th session of the Aswan International Festival for Culture and Arts, which granted international visibility to the Sega tambour Chagos. More exposure will come with its recognition as threatened heritage that will contribute to its long-term protection. The Ministry, through the National Heritage Fund (NHF) and the Nelson Mandela Centre for African Culture (NMCAC), and in collaboration with the University of Mauritius have been documenting and disseminating the stories and knowledge of practitioners since 2018. Lastly, informal training was also provided to the community members, particularly to the youth, by the elders of the family.
8. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for the very comprehensive approach in the evaluation of Mauritius’ nomination, especially in identifying the threats to the viability of the element. Kazakhstan supported the draft amendment initiated by Palestine. To save time, it did not wish to repeat the arguments stated in the amendment and mentioned by Palestine. Instead, it drew the Committee’s attention to another feature of this story. Human history has faced many losses in the creation of humanity with unknown patterns of forgotten cultures and identity-markers of intangible cultures which we never had the chance to discover. The loss of cultural manifestations is irreversible. One could say that these are only invisible scratches on the huge mirror of humankind. However, this is not true. First of all, this is a tragedy for the community as it breaks ties with its deep historical roots. Secondly, this is a loss for humanity as a whole and we will never know how even minor losses are affected. Kazakh people have a historical event that happened in medieval times, but which is still emotionally echoed in songs and music. It therefore understands the sentiment of the Chagossian community. The delegation is confident that inscription of the nomination of Sega tambour Chagos would encourage the community and it thanked the Government agencies for its efforts in safeguarding this element, having addressed the very true concerns mentioned in the evaluation, particularly on the lack of transmission.
9. The **delegation of Armenia** took note of theremarks made by Palestine on the draft amendment, and it thanked the Evaluation Body for its work. It had no doubt that if the upstream dialogue had been expanded, this file would have benefitted from the exercise and that the information would have been provided by Mauritius, particularly with regard to the safeguarding plan. It was also important to note that this element is supported by the communities, which is very important. The element was clearly anchored within the population and communities. Keeping in mind the information provided concerning the safeguarding plan, and knowing that the remarks of the Evaluation Body specifically related to the safeguarding plan, the delegation asked Mauritius to say a few words on the additional information that was provided that responded to the issues raised.
10. The **Chairperson** invited Mauritius to respond to the question posed by Armenia.
11. Responding to Armenia, the **delegation of Mauritius** clarified that according to the latest census dated September 2018, there are 330 Chagossian natives and 1,504 second generation descendants of the Chagossian community currently residing in mainland Mauritius, and nine Chagossian natives and 41 descendants of the Chagossian community residing in Agaléga. As a small community, the element has always been practised exclusively among Chagossian family members. As stated by others, the request for inscription of this element on the Urgent Safeguarding List emanated from the community. The State Party adopted a down-top approach in working on this nomination file. Since the identification of the element, for its inclusion on the national inventory of Intangible Cultural Heritage in 2010, intensive research has been undertaken on the element through community participation and consultation. The delegation added that a prominent member of the Chagossian community, Mr Olivier Bancoult, who is one of the few remaining natives who was illegally uprooted from their native land, Chagos, was present. The focus had been placed on the promotion of the element because it is performed only by the Chagossian community. As the community was uprooted from its original homeland, many of the practises have been family and community based within Mauritius and these performances promote cohesion, nationhood and solidarity, and as such the element is family-driven irrespective of the immense challenges facing it.
12. The **Chairperson** noted the following Committee Members that wished to speak, including Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Azerbaijan, Senegal, Togo, Zambia, Jamaica, Djibouti, China, Poland, Austria and Cameroon, asking whether they had specific questions addressed to Mauritius.
13. The **delegation of Lebanon** asked Mauritius if it had established a schedule of activities, as mentioned in the report by the Evaluation Body. How sustainable are these activities?
14. The **Chairperson** invited other questions from the Committee.
15. The **delegation of Djibouti** recognized the excellent work done by the Evaluation Body, and it aligned with Palestine’s position as a co-sponsor. It noted that the Evaluation Body stated that the safeguarding plan focuses on the promotion of the element, particularly with regard to performances, which overlooks the family and community dimension of the element, described as the main area of concern. The State Party was asked to clarify this point.
16. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the State Party for this file on Sega tambour Chagos, which represents an important part of the identity of the people of the Chagos Archipelago. It noted that this important cultural practice is closely linked to the memories of slavery and it is used by communities to express collective memory and reinforce social bonding. The file identified a clear list of threats to the viability and transmission of the element, which includes displacement, marginalization, and misappropriation of traditional knowledge. The delegation appreciated the opinion of the Evaluation Body, conceding that perhaps the response to section 3 in the nomination file could have been constructed in a way that better addressed the threats to the transmission of the element and to present a clear outline of the objectives, expected results and timetable of activities. However, some measures presented in section 3 of the nomination file mentioned formal and non-formal training programmes, particularly for youth, to ensure the transmission of the element. The delegation wished to hear from Mauritius how it saw the safeguarding plan with a view to better addressing the threats to the element and to support its transmission.
17. The **Chairperson** invited Mauritius to answer the questions on the safeguarding plan, the transmission of the element, and on the calendar.
18. Referring to the safeguarding plan, the **delegation of Mauritius** explained that since the submission of the file in 2017 a number of key actions set out in the safeguarding plan have already been successfully implemented. The delegation referred to the updated safeguarding plan in a table form in the document that was circulated to the Committee. To name a few, the safeguarding plan has as an objective to create more Chagossian groups to perform the Sega tambour Chagos, to have more members of the Chagossian community join existing groups, and to have other individuals and groups practise the element once the element is safeguarded among the Chagossian community. The community would thus have greater visibility at national and international levels, and the elderly would be empowered to transmit the element to younger generations for posterity. With regard to the issue of overlooking the family and community dimension of the element, the delegation reassured the Committee that neither the family nor the community dimension have been overlooked. The nomination file is actually centred on the Chagossian community and the families who have driven the inscription process and participated actively in the preparation of the file. Thus, the family element has been pervasive throughout, which is in line with the spirit of the Convention that favours community participation in the inscription process. Moreover, it was the families and members of the community that invited the government to put their case forward and have driven the process. The performance is indeed an essential part of the practise which has survived. Currently, there was only one performing group of the Sega tambour Chagos, known as the Tambour Chagos Group. All the practitioners are exclusively from different generations of Chagossian families, including the mother, father, children and grandchildren. These performances promote cohesion, nationhood and solidarity, and as such the element is family-driven irrespective of the immense challenges facing it, as previously mentioned.
19. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether there were any questions to the Evaluation Body. With no forthcoming questions, she sought support for Palestine’s amendment.
20. The **delegation of Austria** asked whether the debate was closedas it wanted to introduce an amendment, explaining that the element was in urgent need of safeguarding but the Evaluation Body had some doubts to the effectiveness [of the safeguarding plan]. Thus, following a precedent in 2009, the delegation suggested that Mauritius submit annual reports that contain an evaluation of its effectiveness, its success and/or whether the safeguarding plan had to be adapted.
21. The **delegation of Jamaica** remarked that Jamaica co-sponsored the amended decision by Palestine. It wished to hear from the State Party whether Mauritius had contemplated documentation as part of its safeguarding plan, which it considered an important element in any safeguarding strategy for the protection of an element that is clearly in danger.
22. The **Chairperson** sought further questions to Mauritius.
23. The **delegation of Mauritius** reiterated that the Ministry of Arts and Cultural Heritage in Mauritius through the National Heritage Fund and the Nelson Mandela Centre for African Culture (NMCAC), and in collaboration with the University of Mauritius have been documenting and disseminating the stories and knowledge of practitioners since 2018. This practice will be ongoing until 2021, and continue thereafter.
24. The **delegation of China** went through the nomination file of Mauritius, especially the section on safeguarding measures and it also listened to the explanations given by Mauritius and was convinced that the proposed safeguarding measures touch upon the various stakeholders and actors involved in the future safeguarding plans. Although the way this is structured needs to be improved, there is wide participation and involvement of the various stakeholders and actors in the different aspects of safeguarding. The delegation was therefore convinced that the safeguarding plan satisfied the criterion, and it joined the other Members to co-sponsor the amendment.
25. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** thanked Colombia for its exceptional hospitality and congratulated the Chairperson for her excellent leadership. The Evaluation Body raised three issues under criterion U.3 that were not adequately addressed. The delegation believed however that the State Party had responded with detailed explanations. Having carefully listened to the explanations provided by the State Party, the delegation found that all the concerns of the Evaluation Body had been fully and convincingly addressed. It therefore supported the inscription of the element and wished to co-sponsor the proposed amendment.
26. The **delegation of Poland** supported inscription following the explanations provided, adding that it was convinced that the element merits inscription.
27. Having listened to all the comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. An amendment was introduced in paragraph 3 that considers the information included in the file satisfies criterion U.3.
28. Having listened to the explanations provided by Mauritius, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** wished to be added as a co-sponsor of the amendment.
29. The delegations of **Kazakhstan**, **Cameroon**, **China**, **Armenia**, **Zambia**, **Togo**, **Senegal**, **Poland**, **Colombia** and **Japan** joined the list of co-sponsors.
30. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 3, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 4 was also adopted to inscribe the element.
31. The **delegation of Austria** proposed the following amendment in paragraph 5, which would read, ‘requests the State Party to submit for the next four years after inscription annual reports on the results of the measures taken to ensure the safeguarding of the element and invites the State Party to ensure that the participation of the community is highlighted and clearly described in the annual report’. This would replace the new paragraph 6, as it was now redundant, which was to encourage the State to draft a comprehensive safeguarding plan.
32. The **delegation of Palestine** was not against the principle of the report, adding that the amendment presented made reference to the periodic report, whereas Austria’s proposal requests an annual report for four years. The delegation remarked that reporting is tedious that takes time and effort. It was not against reporting but felt that it would be better to request a biannual report, every two years, which would make it a little more flexible and easier for the State Party to submit.
33. The **Chairperson** asked Austria whether it could agree to the proposal by Palestine.
34. The **delegation of Austria** could agree.
35. The **Chairperson** turned to the amended paragraph 5, which was duly adopted.
36. The **delegation of Jamaica** remarked that it was unclear how many reports were actually required, and it wished to know whether this presented a burden to the State Party, as well as the kind of precedent this would set going forward for other States Parties, bearing in mind the heavy demands of providing these reports.
37. The **delegation of Lebanon** noted that biannual means twice a year and should be corrected.
38. The **delegation of Austria** confirmed it should be every two years. Responding to the remarks that this could set a precedent, the delegation reiterated that there had already been a precedent in the past. An amendment at the fourth session in 2009 included this requirement of submitting annual reports. It understood that the idea was not to overburden Mauritius with reporting, but it was important that the safeguarding plan be evaluated to ensure that it is effective. Otherwise, there would be no need to have a safeguarding plan if it did not work. The intention is to help the State ensure that it works, and if not, it would have the basis to adapt the safeguarding plan accordingly. This was therefore not meant to be an administrative burden but rather to ensure that the Committee can deliver on its decision.
39. The **delegation of Kuwait** clarified that the term is biennial, once every two years, and not biannual.
40. The **Chairperson** took note of the correction.
41. The **delegation of the Philippines** echoed the comments made by Jamaica. While it understood that a precedent had been set before for an annual report for an inscribed element on the Urgent Safeguarding List it also questioned whether this might add an additional burden on communities or the State Party, a developing country. It therefore wished to see clarification on how long this report would be and also whether it would be evaluated by the Evaluation Body or the Secretariat. Would there be an item on the agenda for instance? It also wished to know the opinion of the State Party concerned, i.e. how it viewed this reporting every two years and whether it would be acceptable.
42. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to complement the paragraph, which would read, ‘requests the State Party to submit biennial reports on the results of the measures taken every two years and to submit them to the Evaluation Body every two years after inscription’.
43. The **Chairperson** remarked that the request was not for every two years, but only for four years after inscription.
44. The **delegation of Mauritius** could agree with the proposed biennial reports.
45. The **delegation of Senegal** remarked that following the intervention from the Philippines it was a little uncomfortable. As much as it understood the concerns of Austria, which it shared, Mauritius had provided so many guarantees in relation to safeguarding, addressing all the concerns that had been raised. The delegation did not wish to further burden the State by requesting reports for an element inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It could agree with the biennial reports, but in truth, these reports could have been avoided.
46. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to clarify.
47. The **Secretary** wished to clarify the process on reporting on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The usual process is that a country submits a periodic report on the Urgent Safeguarding List every four years. This report does not go to the Evaluation Body but undergoes a synthetic analysis and is then presented to the Committee. The Secretary understood from the draft proposal that it was *not* requesting a report every two years, but rather a report until the first four-year cycle after which it would enter the normal reporting cycle.
48. Noting that Mauritius had agreed to the proposal, the **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 10.a.3 adopted to inscribe Sega tambour Chagos on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
49. The **delegation of Mauritius** spokeon behalf of the Government of Mauritius and the president of the Chagos Refugee Group, who were part of the delegation to this fourteenth session, to express heartfelt gratitude and sincere thanks to the Committee for supporting the inscription of the Sega tambour Chagos on the Urgent Safeguarding List. It was with great pleasure that the people of Mauritius, particularly the Chagossian community, welcomed the inscription of its first element on the Urgent Safeguarding List after the inscription of three other elements: Traditional Mauritian Sega in 2014, Bhojpuri folk songs in Mauritius, Geet-Gawai in 2016 and Sega tambour of Rodrigues Island in 2017 on the Representative List. This inscription promotes the Republic of Mauritius on the international intangible cultural heritage map and reinforces its commitment to safeguard, promote and transmit Sega tambour Chagos, especially among the family members, the youth and the Chagossian community at large. Today, while celebrating Human Rights Day, this inscription comes at an opportune moment, upholding the principle of human rights for those people who were brutally uprooted from their motherland. This inscription is symbolic and stands as a tribute to the resilience of the Chagossian people in the face of adversity. In May 2019, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution welcoming the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the sovereignty of Mauritius over the Chagos Archipelago and calling for the unconditional withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the territory and the resettlement of the Chagossian people in the Chagos Archipelago. Mauritius fully subscribes to the ideals of UNESCO through its adherence to a wide range of Conventions and it was fully committed to their effective implementation and to the welfare and good of the population. The delegation expressed its willingness to fully collaborate with UNESCO in the future and help in the relentless effort in promoting and sustaining culture, heritage and creativity around the world. The delegation concluded by thanking the Government of Colombia for all the support given in the successful organization of this session of the Committee.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the next nomination, recalling that the file also benefitted from the dialogue process.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Buklog, thanksgiving ritual system of the Subanen** [draft decision14.COM 10.a.4]submitted by the **Philippines**. Buklog is an elaborate thanksgiving ritual system of the Subanen, an indigenous people in the southern Philippines. The head of a host family, usually a village chief called ‘timuay’, plans the ritual system to express gratitude to the spirits. The rituals ensure harmony among family, clan and community members, as well as among the human, natural and spiritual worlds. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.3 and U.5 for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Evaluation Body considered that while the Subanen community is linguistically, culturally, geographically and religiously diverse, Buklog is one of its major cultural elements, tying the community together and creating harmonious cultural bonds with other communities. The viability of Buklog is strongly threatened by numerous factors. A detailed ‘comprehensive safeguarding plan’ had been proposed by representatives of the communities from eight municipalities, with the support of several organizations. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.4. It was unclear whether the community members were aware of the consequences of inscription of the element on the relevant List and whether they agreed with its urgent safeguarding. The Body further considered that a short question and answer process with the submitting State might clarify whether the nomination met the criterion concerned, and decided—pursuant to [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/ITH-18-13.COM-13-EN.docx)—to initiate a dialogue process to obtain information on the following question. Almost all the letters of consent and endorsement referred to inscription on the Representative List, and the Body had asked the submitting State whether it could confirm that the communities concerned had indeed been informed of and consented to its inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. In answering the question, the submitting State had provided convincing evidence that demonstrated that the communities concerned had given their consent to possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List after having initially worked on a nomination for the Representative List. Upon examination of the information provided by the submitting State, the Body considered that it adequately addressed the question and that criterion U.4 was satisfied.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that this was the second file concerned with the dialogue process, adding that the Committee would proceed in the same manner as had been conducted in the previous nomination file, examining the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** took noteof the positive outcome of the upstream process, and it thanked the Evaluation Body and the Philippines for this submission. The presentation of the Evaluation Body was very clear and the outcome was also very clear. The delegation therefore suggested to adopt the decision as a whole with Option 2: inscription.
5. The **Chairperson** sought support for the proposal by Palestine, noting support from Cyprus.
6. The **delegation of Austria** was very much in favour of inscription, but noted a discrepancy in paragraph 3 of the draft decision that stated that the information included was not sufficient.
7. The **Secretary** explained that paragraph 3 would remain concerning the unmet criterion U.4 as it would be read in conjunction with paragraph 4—that the file had benefitted from a dialogue process—followed by paragraph 5 stating that the Evaluation Body was satisfied by the dialogue process. In this way, a trace of the dialogue process would be given.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification, noting that paragraph 5 had been amended to Option 2: inscription. With no further comments or objections, and turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 10.a.4 adopted to inscribe Buklog, thanksgiving ritual system of the Subanen on the Urgent Safeguarding List**.
9. The **delegation of the Philippines** spoke on behalf ofthe Subanen communities of the Philippines to deeply thank the Committee for the inscription of Buklog. This is the fourth inscription for the Philippines and its first on the Urgent Safeguarding List. In preparing the nomination, the delegation took heed of the Evaluation Body’s advice to prioritize an element that needed urgent safeguarding to ensure its transmission and continued significance for practitioners and their communities. As a part of the social fabric of Mindanao in the southern Philippines, this inscription is seen to strengthen the bonds of fraternity and solidarity among indigenous people, Christians and Muslims in a resilient region that seeks to permanently replace conflict and discontent with peace, hope and sustainable development. The delegation then gave the floor to Ms Renee Talavera, head of the Cultural Communities and Traditional Arts of the Philippines National Commission for Culture and Arts to deliver a message of its chairperson and national artist for literature, Mr Virgilio Senadrin Almario.
10. The **delegation of the Philippines, Ms Talavera,** spoke onbehalf of the National Commission for Culture and Arts as it celebrates the inscription of the Buklog, thanksgiving ritual system of the Subanen on the Urgent Safeguarding List. This invaluable recognition for the Philippines would not be possible without the support and efforts of all the Subanen communities and municipalities in the Zamboanga Peninsula. The Dumendingan Peoples’ Organization, Kumalarang Arts Council, Kumalarang Weavers Association, St. Joseph College of Sindangan, Thindegan Dlibon Subanen, the Subanen community leaders and cultural masters, and the Subanen School of Living Traditions. Ms Talavera expressed deep gratitude to the UNESCO Living Heritage entity, the Evaluation Body and the States Parties to the Convention. She then gave the floor to the Subanen Cultural Master to express her gratitude on behalf of the community in a video message.

*[A short video message was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the examination of the nomination file submitted by Belarus to the Urgent Safeguarding List to which International Assistance was simultaneously requested to support the implementation of the proposed safeguarding plan. The Committee was asked to decide whether the nomination fulfilled the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and/or whether the International Assistance request fulfilled the criteria for granting assistance. It was underlined that the Committee would decide on the criteria for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List together with its decision on the extent to which the request met the criteria for International Assistance. The Chairperson recalled criteria A.1–A.7 for approval and paragraphs 10(a) and 10(b) that would guide the decision regarding the International Assistance request, which was shown on the screen. Concerning the International Assistance request, the Committee would evaluate the extent to which the request met the criteria for International Assistance as a whole; in other words, it was not necessary to meet every criterion in order for the request to be approved. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body was invited to present the combined nomination and request.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod** [draft decision14.COM 10.a.5]submitted by **Belarus**. The Spring rite of Juraǔski Karahod is performed by residents of the village of Pahost on St. George’s Day. For Belarusians, St. George safeguards livestock and agriculture. In Pahost, the holiday is observed through a specific ceremonial rite that encompasses various ceremonial activities, songs, games, omens and beliefs. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria U.1, U.2, U.4, and U.5 for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The Evaluation Body considered that the Spring rite of Juraǔski Karahod has important functions and meanings related to the religious beliefs of the community. The viability of the Spring rite of Juraǔski Karahod depends on a single village, the population of which is gradually ageing, with young people migrating to cities and losing their interest in the tradition due to globalization and the standardization of daily life. Members of the Pahost community participated in the nomination process and development of the safeguarding plan. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion U.3. The Body considered that, even if the safeguarding plan was clear, the proposed measures did not minimize the described risks and there was no evidence of past or present efforts to this end. The safeguarding measures were very general and did not address any specific threats, with poor community participation. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod to the submitting State.
3. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** further noted that Belarus had requested International Assistance from the ICH Fund in the amount of US$87,761 for the implementation of the safeguarding plan. The Body noted that, to be implemented by the Centre of Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts, the proposed 24-month project had three main objectives: i) research and strategy development; ii) promotion to enhance visibility of the element; and iii) the establishment of an institution and capacity building. The Evaluation Body considered that the project was developed by the community and reflected the needs and aspirations they identified. The amount of International Assistance requested was appropriate, and the proposed activities, reflected in the budget and timetable, were presented in detail. The project will engage experts from the relevant cultural and educational institutions, as well as from NGO partners. However, the Body considered that the proposed activities were generalized and do not focus on the Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod. The lack of specific measures and the general nature of the project made it impossible to ascertain whether it will have lasting results. The Body therefore recommended to *refer* the International Assistance request to the requesting State Party. The Evaluation Body further wished to remind the State Party to take particular heed of the impact of tourism on the safeguarding of the element to prevent its decontextualization and folklorization, and encouraged it to mitigate any adverse impacts relating to tourism.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked Ms Bak for outlining the issues raised in relation to the nomination file, opening the floor for comments. It was noted that Azerbaijan had requested to open a debate on this nomination file.
5. The **delegation** **of Azerbaijan** remarked that it was in fact Kazakhstan that had requested to open the debate, it did however table amendments with regard to the draft decision. First of all, the delegation commended Belarus for having submitted this combined file for Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod, representing an outstanding example of cultural practices linked to the regeneration of nature and spring, which also recalled some traditions that exist in Azerbaijan. The element highlights the role of traditional agriculture and respect for animals, and represents a strong marker of cultural identity of the region of Pahost. The delegation particularly noted the role of women, thanks to whom the element is still alive despite the serious threats it faces, such as the ageing of the communities concerned, the migration of young people to cities, and the folklorization of the element. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its report but it did regret that this file did not benefit from the upstream dialogue process. Having carefully studied the file and the recommendation proposed by the Evaluation Body, the delegation found that the answers to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body could in fact be found in the nomination itself. For instance, regarding past and current safeguarding measures, the nomination does provide such measures under section 3.a in the nomination file, which outlines a number of policy measures, research and inventory measures related to the element. Concerning community participation in the elaboration of the safeguarding plan, the activities 3, 7 and 9 directly refer to such participation. However, it agreed that their role could indeed be more explicitly demonstrated. With this in mind, the delegation tabled an amendment for the inscription of this element to the Urgent Safeguarding List, as it believed that the issues raised by the Evaluation Body with regard to criterion U.3 were in fact reflected in the nomination file, and that these issues were very much linked with criterion A.3 for International Assistance. Thus, the delegation supported the granting of International Assistance to the State Party.
6. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked Azerbaijan for the excellent presentation on its shared concerns of the proposed referral of the nomination of an element that had been maintained for many centuries by residents, mostly women, of the village of Pahost. The spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod is a very old tradition that, in its view, clearly deserved support to safeguard the element as there was a risk of losing it forever. It also commended Belarus for nominating the file together with a request for International Assistance which attested to the systematic approach of the State Party in its request for inscription of the element in need of urgent safeguarding and its support from the community. It was also important to note that the Evaluation Body found that all seven criteria for International Assistance related to the urgent safeguarding measures were met. The delegation thanked the Evaluation Body for its very comprehensive approach in evaluating the nomination, especially in identifying the weaker points of the file, specifically in relation to criterion U.3. The delegation hoped that this would help the State Party to better reflect on measures that were most beneficial for safeguarding the element. At the same time, the delegation regretted that this case did not benefit from upstream dialogue, as the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body could have been adequately addressed by the State Party in the dialogue process. It wondered whether some of the concerns of the Evaluation Body on U.3 arose from differences in terminology and referred more to challenges of a linguistic nature. As the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body indicated in his presentation, the upstream dialogue process can be used to clarify confused statements and unclear and imprecise language. In this regard, the delegation sought clarification from the State Party regarding the information provided to see how it can address the main concerns of the Evaluation Body. It therefore asked Belarus how it had interpreted the opinion of the Evaluation Body on the lack of specific measures to strengthen the viability of the element as stated in the nomination file and that the safeguarding plan may even increase the decontextualization and folklorization of the element.
7. The **Chairperson** invited Belarus to answer the specific questions posed.
8. The **delegation of Belarus** was grateful to the Evaluation Body for the professional work carried out on the assessment of its file, though it wished to draw the Committee’s attention to some important points indicated in the nomination file that were not taken into account. Unfortunately, there were no consultations or dialogue between the Evaluation Body and Belarus, which could have clarified these points ahead of the Committee session. The most pressing need in terms of safeguarding this element was related to the age of the local population and the departure of young people due to a lack of job opportunities. This is why the safeguarding plan focuses on the development of sustainable measures, which are included in its regional sustainable plan and elaborated for the Turaŭ area. The aim is to minimize risk and also to extend the practise of the element to the neighbouring villages, which used to practise this element in the past. The residents of the neighbouring villages have now joined the local bearers of Pahost for the celebrations and have made the plan sustainable by organizing the local intangible cultural heritage festival and the creation of a community centre. These measures were inspired by the practise in Bulgarian Chitalishte, which was selected on the Register of Best Practices [in 2017] and concerns community centres ‘Chitalishta’ and the local festival, which has been very effective as its practice has shown. This festival and community centre will consolidate the community, develop a public space, and stimulate local activity and communication. In addition, there is a capacity-building programme, which is indicated in the safeguarding plan, and there are plans to provide five extra workshops for local residents, including broad discussion with bearers on how to strengthen local responsibility for this heritage and elaborate a practical instrument for its sustainable development and safeguarding. The proposed measures are therefore clear and very specific. The delegation therefore did not to agree with the conclusion of the Evaluation Body and it asked the Committee to revoke its decision and inscribe the element.
9. The **delegation of Poland** supported the concerns raised by Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. Belarus proved that the nomination file had shown that the element requires special attention and the support of the international community. Most importantly, as described comprehensively in the file, the community of Belarus is facing serious challenges resulting from demography. The village of Pahost, where the element is performed, has been classified as ‘not prospective’ as underlined in the nomination file. With a gradually ageing population and with young people migrating, the need to safeguard the element is undoubtedly urgent. According to the Evaluation Body’s assessment, the file of the Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod on the Urgent Safeguarding List provides sufficient information to determine that the element constitutes an intangible cultural heritage element in urgent need of safeguarding because its visibility is at risk, despite the efforts of the community. Furthermore, as mentioned by Belarus, the element was nominated following the widest possible participation of the community, as noted in the inventory, and with the additional safeguarding measures clearly outlined. The delegation was therefore convinced that inscription would breathe new life into the community and empower the bearers to safeguard and transmit this heritage to the next generation. In order to safeguard the element for future generations and support the efforts of the State Party to safeguard the rite in the village of Pahost, Poland supported the inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
10. The **delegation of Austria** understood that the combined mechanism of submitting both an element for inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List and a request for International Assistance was a very challenging endeavour, demanding considerably more efforts from all stakeholders involved. The file at hand addressed an important issue, namely the severe threats to intangible cultural heritage caused *inter alia* by depopulation. This is a fact that is relevant to communities and groups in other regions as well. Indeed, it is mentioned in several sections, particularly in section 2 in that the viability of the element fully depends on the development of the region. Unfortunately however, this threat is not addressed in the safeguarding plan. In addition, objective 1 in section 3.b.1 aims at engaging the youth and increasing their interest and engagement in the element and finding new ways to use heritage to make intangible cultural heritage relevant for young people, described as an important measure that, if successful, will be useful to all States Parties. Unfortunately, the delegation could not find a corresponding activity in section 3.b.2 that explains how the State Party proposes to achieve this objective. To sum up, the safeguarding plan is an immensely important tool to ensure the viability of the element and for this reason it would be important to make sure that the proposed measures addressed the described risks.
11. The **delegation of China** commended the efforts of the Evaluation Body on its evaluation of this file and thanked Belarus for its explanation. It noted that the element does indeed face various risks and threats, such as the lack of practitioners, job opportunities and standardization, and so on, but that the communities, groups and individuals have made great efforts to ensure the viability of the element. The proposed safeguarding plan is clear with targeted strategies devoted to ensuring the transmission and viability of the element and to avoid possible decontextualization and folklorization, which would further endanger its sustainable development. As presented by the Evaluation Body, this was the second time that the Committee had received a combined file for the Urgent Safeguarding List and International Assistance, which deserves to be encouraged as it is more demanding from a technical viewpoint, particularly when all the criteria for International Assistance are satisfied in this case. Furthermore, the delegation observed that this nomination concerns a specific ceremonial rite related to spring. It was noted that there were more than 30 elements inscribed related to spring, mostly on the Representative List. This element would be inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, which it believed would enhance and contribute to the promotion of dialogue among the different elements and communities. The delegation therefore considered this nomination for possible inscription on the Urgent Safeguarding List.
12. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the amendment by Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. The element is threatened and inscription would indeed help its survival.
13. The **delegation of Cuba** supported the comments made by China, by Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan, adding that this nomination promotes intercultural dialogue and intergenerational dialogue and was thus important for sustaining intangible cultural heritage in different nations.
14. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the inscription of the element.
15. Before closing the session, the **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had adopted the nomination from the Philippines, however due to a technical mix up the accompanying video was not shown, but was now ready to be projected.

*[A short video of the element submitted by the Philippines was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the Bureau would meet again the next day in the morning to continue its work, inviting the Secretary to present some information.
2. The **Secretary** informed the Committee of two important evening events: a panel discussion on Safeguarding ICH in Latin America: where are we heading? organized by CRESPIAL, the category 2 centre in Latin America and the Caribbean region, and the opening of the UNESCO exhibition, Sounds of Living Heritage: a journey through indigenous languages, which had been organized in line with the International Year of Indigenous Languages.
3. The **Chairperson** reminded the delegates of the Colombian exhibition, adjourning the day’s session.

*[Wednesday, 11 December 2019, morning session]*

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

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

1. The **Chairperson** resumed the workof the previous session,recalling that the Committee had successively concluded agenda item 8 on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism, as well as agenda item 9.a, the report on the status of States Parties on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and agenda item 9.b on the use of International Assistance. With regard to agenda item 10, the Committee had an initial debate on the Report of the Evaluation Body, which was delivered by the Rapporteur of the Body. It then examined draft decisions from 10.a.1 to 10.a.4, but it did not complete its examination of draft decision 10.a.5. The Bureau met that morning for the second time and proposed a revised timetable that was published online. The morning would continue with agenda item 10.a. and conclude with the examination of draft decision 10.a.5, concerning the nomination combined with an International Assistance request submitted by Belarus. It was recalled that an amendment had been proposed by Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan for this file. The Committee would then immediately move on to agenda item 10.b and the examination of nominations to the Representative List. Furthermore, the Chairperson informed the Committee that the Secretariat had received one additional request for debate concerning draft decision 10.b.23 submitted by Mexico and Spain for its file, Artisanal talavera of Puebla and Tlaxcala (Mexico) and ceramics of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo (Spain). She also reminded the Committee of the amendments already received for draft decisions 10.b.10, 10.b.11, 10.b.22 and 10.b.36 concerning nominations submitted by Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Malaysia and Tajikistan, respectively. The Bureau also discussed the requests from certain States to examine a nomination file ahead of the agenda, which would be accommodated when possible. With 41 nominations to examine, three proposals for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and one request for International Assistance, the Chairperson asked the Members of the Committee to keep their interventions to a maximum of two minutes.
2. The **Chairperson** then turned to draft decision 10.a.5 concerning Belarus. An amendment was received from Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan, and the Chairperson would proceed with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. With no objections, paragraphs 1 and 2 were duly adopted. Criteria U.1 and U.2 were also adopted. It was noted that Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan had presented an amendment concerning U.3 that considers the safeguarding plan clear and that the criterion U.3 is satisfied.
3. The **delegation of Kuwait** wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
4. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** wished to draw attention to a typo in the amendment.
5. The **delegation of China** also wished to be added to the list of co-sponsors.
6. The **delegation of the Netherlands** remarked thatafter the discussion on the safeguarding plan, it felt uncomfortable with the current wording as the main threats identified had not been adequately addressed. In this regard it suggested introducing a biennial report.
7. The **Chairperson** noted an objection to the proposed amendment by the Netherlands, and she sought active broad support from the Committee.
8. Thedelegations of **Poland**, **Palestine, Senegal, Cuba, Togo, Djibouti, Mauritius Cameroon** wished to join the list of co-sponsors in support of the amendment by Kazakhstan.
9. The **delegation of Armenia** remarked thatafter hearing the arguments presented by Belarus on criterion U.3, as with many of the Members, it supported the inscription of the element on the Urgent Safeguarding List. However, given the reservations expressed, it wondered whether biennial reporting, as previously adopted, could be considered for this element.
10. The **Chairperson** remarked the active broad support of the Committee for the amendment.
11. The **delegation of Austria** shared the Netherlands’ concern and proposed to delete the first part of the amendment under U.3, ‘The safeguarding plan is clear’, and to start the sentence with, ‘The proposed measures […]’. In addition, in the latter part of the paragraph, to replace ‘will guarantee’ with ‘should guarantee’. The decision could also introduce the same language as proposed in the Mauritius file in reference to the biennial reports. Finally, the delegation proposed to replace ‘guarantees conservation’ with ‘guarantees its continued practice’.
12. The **Chairperson** asked Azerbaijan to comment on the proposed amendment by Austria.
13. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Austria for its constructive comments to the amendment, agreeing with the paragraph on the submission of a biennial report.
14. The **delegation of Poland** was satisfied with the improved wording, as proposed by Austria and the Netherlands.
15. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** appreciated the constructive contributions from Austria and the Netherlands, agreeing to the additional paragraphs as introduced in the Mauritius file.
16. The **delegation of Palestine** sought to be coherent with a previous procedure when in 2016 the Committee changed the evaluation following the explanation given by a State Party in U.3 with the following wording, along the lines, ‘further decides that based on the information provided by the State Party to the Committee at its present session concerning U.3, the following criterion for inscription is met’, suggesting that the Secretariat might add it later.
17. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked Austria for the constructive proposal.
18. The **delegation of Zambia** also supported the amendment by Austria and its inclusion of the paragraph on biennial reporting that was standardized for the Mauritius file.
19. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus on the amendment and the additional paragraphs, and criterion U.3 was duly adopted. Criteria U.4 and U.5 were also adopted. She then turned to paragraph 3 as a whole. The decision was paused while the Secretariat amended the draft decision to include the proposal by Palestine in paragraph 3, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 4 ‘to inscribe’ was duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to paragraph 5 concerning the request for International Assistance.
20. In line with its earlier comment, the **delegation of Austria** wished to introduce a new paragraph 5 on the biennial reporting before the provisions for International Assistance, which would read, ‘Requests the State Party to submit, for the next four years after inscription, biennial reports on the results of the measures taken to ensure the safeguarding of the element and invites the State Party to take particular heed of the impact of tourism on the safeguarding of the element in order to prevent its decontextualization and folklorization and encourages it to mitigate any adverse impacts relating to tourism’.
21. The **Chairperson** sought support for this new paragraph proposed by Austria.
22. The **delegation of Kuwait** soughtclarification on whether the International Assistance would be based on the outcome of the report every two years, i.e. what is the connection between International Assistance and the reports?
23. The **Secretary** explained that the reporting is in the context of the periodic reporting on elements on the Urgent Safeguarding List. The International Assistance is a separate case. He added that the biennial reporting only happens during the first four years, i.e. a report is submitted after two years, which is then followed by a second report that is the normal four-year report that follows in a regular cycle. The Secretary suggested that the Secretariat could find more appropriate language across the various decisions because the proposed biennial reporting is in fact a report two years after inscription followed by the normal Urgent Safeguarding List report after four years, and then every four years thereafter. Regarding Kuwait’s question, the reporting was not linked to International Assistance but to the urgent safeguarding status.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification.
25. The **delegation of** **Armenia** accepted the remarks by the Secretary, but it wished to see the concerns raised by Austria taken into account, adding that if the amendment ultimately facilitated the consensus of the Committee then it should be adopted.
26. The **delegation of the Netherlands** added its support to the amendment by Austria.
27. The **Chairperson** returned to paragraph 5, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 6 concerning International Assistance was also adopted. Paragraph 7 was adopted on a criterion-by-criterion basis, and criteria A1–A7 and paragraphs 10(a) and 10(b) were duly adopted. The Chairperson then sought active relative support for the amended paragraph 8 by Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan [to approve the International Assistance request].
28. The delegations of **Palestine** and **Poland** supported the amendment in paragraph 8.
29. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 8 adopted, as amended. She then turned to paragraph 9 and the amendment by Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan, ‘to take heed of the impact of unsustainable tourism […]’, which was duly adopted as amended. She then turned to paragraph 10 and the amendment proposed by Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan [to submit a biennial report].
30. The **delegation of Jamaica** noted an incoherence in paragraph 8, which was clarified.
31. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** remarked that in light of the amendment by Austria on the biennial reporting, paragraph 10 only added confusion and it thus proposed to delete it.
32. The **Chairperson** concurred with theobservation by Azerbaijan to delete paragraph 10 and to adopt the draft decision as a whole.
33. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** wished to return to paragraph 8, noting an incoherence in the wording that should read, ‘to approve the International Assistance request from the State Party’, which was duly corrected.
34. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 8 adopted.With no further comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision 14.COM 10.a.5 adopted to inscribe Spring rite of Juraŭski Karahod on the Urgent Safeguarding List, and to grant International Assistance in the amount of US$87,761**.
35. The **delegation of Belarus** remarked on this incredible moment that saw the intangible cultural heritage of a small Belarussian village receive international support and recognition, and the tears of joy of the folks and bearers of traditional knowledge and practices of the village of Pahost, the protectors and true keepers. Katsiaryna Panchenya and her fellow villagers safeguarded their heritage even during the time of strong Communist pressure when any cultural manifestation was banned. With international support, the Pahost community will continue to maintain their values for future generations. The safeguarding of the cultural heritage of the Pahost community is the Belarussian contribution to the common mosaic of culture, the development of universal dialogue, and the preservation of cultural diversity. On behalf of the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Belarus, the National Commission of UNESCO and the Pahost villagers, the delegation expressed gratitude to the Committee for its sincere and tireless support of the nomination of Juraŭski Karahod and for the understanding and respect for its values. The constructive critiques will be fully considered and reflected in the revised safeguarding plan for the Pahost community. Thanks were expressed to Colombia for its hospitality and excellent organization of this meeting.

**ITEM 10.b OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/10.b Add.2.*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.b_Add.2-EN.docx)

**Files:** [*42 nominations*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10b-representative-list-01098)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda sub-item 10.b and the examination of nominations for inscription on the Representative List. The Committee was informed that Germany and Bulgaria had withdrawn their files and that there were 40 nominations left to examine. Before starting the examination, the criteria that would guide the Committee’s decisions were recalled and projected on the screen. It was noted that all five criteria R.1–R.5 had to be met for inscription. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body was invited to present the files.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the first nomination, **Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.1] submitted by **Armenia.** Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions constitute the centuries-old art of Armenian letters, Armenian scripts, the rich culture of decorating letters and its various uses. The element is practised across the Armenian territory and is integral to the cultural identity of Armenian people. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the element plays an important function in terms of public literacy, self-expression and solidarity for Armenians all over the globe. Numerous and diverse efforts had been and continue to be undertaken to safeguard Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions. Diverse groups of stakeholders had actively participated in preparing and developing the nomination file at all stages, ensuring a comprehensive presentation of the element. The Body wished to remind the State Party that updating is an important part of the inventorying process and invited it to include detailed information in its next periodic report on the implementation of the Convention at the national level concerning the periodicity and mode of updating the List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Armenia, in accordance with Article 12.1 of the Convention.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions on the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments had been received for this file, inviting the Committee to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.1**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.1) **adopted to inscribe Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Armenia** expressed its sincere gratitude to the Evaluation Body for its recommendation and to the Committee for its decision to inscribe Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions on the Representative List. Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions represents one of the most beautiful jewels of Armenian heritage. For centuries it has permeated cultural, artistic, social and religious life in Armenia and beyond, and among the Armenian diaspora. Today, Armenians around the world are honoured by this international recognition granted to this element of their identity. With this new inscription, Armenia reaffirmed its attachment to the principles and objectives of the Convention, and reiterated its commitment to ensure greater visibility of intangible cultural heritage and to promote dialogue, while respecting cultural diversity.
5. The **delegation of Armenia** [second speaker – expert] spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport to thank the Committee for the inscription of Armenian letter art and its cultural expressions on the Representative List. She thanked all the communities, bearers, researchers and scholars, NGOs, and educational, cultural and religious institutions involved in the nomination process. The element represents the country’s centuries-old art of Armenia letters, the entirety of Armenian scripts, the rich culture of decorating letters, and its various uses in people’s lives, art and science. It is based on the Armenia alphabet created in 405 A.D. by Mesrop Mashtots following the one-letter-for-one-sound principle.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Transhumance, the seasonal droving of livestock along migratory routes in the Mediterranean and in the Alps** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.2] submitted by **Austria, Greece and Italy**. Transhumance is a form of pastoralism that shapes relations among people, animals, and ecosystems. Transhumant herders have in-depth knowledge of the environment, ecological balance and climate change, as this is one of the most sustainable, efficient livestock farming methods. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Transhumance is at the centre of the lives of many pastoral communities in Austria, Greece and Italy. Bearers, practitioners and local communities of the three States had contributed to safeguarding Transhumance through its documentation, transmission and promotion at the local, national and international levels. The communities in the three submitting States actively took part in the nomination process. The Evaluation Body commended the States Parties for preparing a high-quality multinational file that testifies to active networking among the communities in the preparation of the nomination and the overall safeguarding of the element. The Body further took note of the interest of other States in joining the nomination and encouraged the submitting States to consider working towards the possibility of an extended nomination with the interested States. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Transhumance, the seasonal droving of livestock along migratory routes in the Mediterranean and in the Alps on the Representative List.
2. The **delegation of Colombia** congratulated Austria, Greece and Italy for the very high quality of the file, which calls on cooperation and interchange among communities. It remarked that Spain is a country that is really at the heart of transhumance. The delegation believed that in the near future Spain will join this nomination because it would represent the transhumance map of all four countries (Austria, Italy, Greece and Spain) in the spirit of cooperation. In this regard, it had a draft amendment to the draft decision, requesting the Chairperson to give the floor to Spain so it could announce its future participation in this nomination.
3. The **Chairperson** thanked Colombia for its presentation and the words of explanation, adding that she was very clear about the procedure in that during the discussion, only Members of the Committee and submitting States were entitled to speak. If a Member of the Committee so requests, a State Party may take the floor, but Spain was not a State Party that had taken part in drafting the nomination. The Chairperson would be happy to give Spain the floor, but only after the Committee had taken its decision.
4. The **delegation of Colombia** asked the Legal Adviser whether—in the spirit of cooperation— Spain might speak before the Committee took its decision.
5. The **delegation of Cuba** also wished to hear Spain, particularly with regard to transhumance, a topic on which it had carried out work. The delegation was not against the inscription but wished to hear from all those that had worked on this file.
6. The **delegation of the Netherlands** made a point of order, as Spain was not a Member of the Committee and could only be heard *after* the Committee’s decision.
7. Along the same lines as Cuba and Colombia, the **delegation of Guatemala** wished to hear from Spain on the work it had carried out with respect to this element.
8. The **delegation of Kuwait** asked that the Legal Adviser be invited to speak.
9. The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the Legal Adviser would soon join the podium.
10. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson for assisting and not yet adopting the decision while the Committee awaited the answer from the Legal Adviser.
11. The **delegation of Austria** recalled that theChairperson was very clear in her instructions concerning the working methods, that States non-Members of the Committee can only take the floor if they are submitting States and if so requested by a Committee Member on specific questions on the file, but not to make a general statement. Spain, unfortunately, was not yet part of this file. Therefore, Spain was not in a position to respond to any specific questions on the file, which had been evaluated very positively and recommended for inscription. It would thus be dangerous to set a precedent and deviate from established practice. The delegation added that there had been other States non-Members to the Committee who had wished to speak and were refused. For the sake of the good practice of this Committee, the delegation urged the Chairperson to use her prerogative as the Chairperson to decide who should speak irrespective of the advice of the Legal Adviser.
12. The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Adviser to respond.
13. The **Legal Adviser** spoke of hishonour to attend and serve in his capacity as Legal Adviser. He understood that the question was whether a State that is not a Member of the Committee could take the floor. The Legal Adviser recalled the applicable Rule 22.3 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee which stipulates that the representatives of organizations, individuals and observers referred to in Rules 6, 7 and 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 may address the meeting with the prior consent of the Chairperson. In turn, Rule 22.4 provides that representatives of a State Party shall not speak to advocate inclusion on the Representative List mentioned of an item nominated by their State, but only to provide information in reply to questions raised. He indicated that the answer may be found in one of these two provisions and emphasized that the decision as to whether a State Party that is not a Member of the Committee may take the floor or not lies with the Chairperson in accordance with Rule 14.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, which states that the Chairperson accords the right to speak.
14. The **Chairperson** returned to her previous statement governing the Committee’s working methods, recalling that only Members of the Committee had the right to take the floor. However, one Member of the Committee may ask a submitting State Party to respond to a specific question concerning its file under discussion. In this case, the State Party non-Member of the Committee involved in the nomination would be able to take the floor and respond to the question, but not to discuss other matters. The Chairperson would therefore honour her opening statement to grant Spain the floor once the decision had been taken.
15. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked theChairperson for having taken this point into consideration, as well as the points made by the Legal Adviser. It would have liked Spain to have been given the floor but it understood her position. In this case, the delegation would table its proposed amendment at the appropriate time.
16. The **Chairperson** remarked that in light of the amendment submitted by Colombia, the Committeewould proceed to adopt the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.Paragraphs 1–5 were duly adopted.Colombia was invited to present its amendment in paragraph 6.
17. The **delegation of Colombia** congratulated and commended the submitting States for the high-quality of the file, adding that Austria, Greece and Italy had been consulted, as well as Spain, and were happy with the wording proposed, assuring the Committee that the wording of the amendment had received their backing, which would read, ‘As the tradition-bearing community of Spain requested to join the international nomination, based on the principle of international cooperation, encourages the submitting States Parties to work towards an extended nomination with Spain and any other interested States’.
18. The **delegation of Austria** thanked Colombia for having introduced this amendment, which had indeed been agreed upon by Italy, Austria, Greece and Spain. Austria looked forward to including Spain and any other interested States in this file.
19. The **Chairperson** noted Cuba, Zambia, and the Philippines wishing to speak, asking whether they agreed to the proposed amendment.
20. The **delegation of Zambia** suggested to include the standard wording ‘takes note that’.
21. The **Chairperson** noted the agreement by Colombia, and paragraph 6 was duly adopted. Adopting the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** **Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.2**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.2) **adopted to inscribe Transhumance, the seasonal droving of livestock along migratory routes in the Mediterranean and in the Alps** **on the Representative List**.
22. The **delegation of Italy** expressed thanks to Colombia for the organization of the Committee and for its hospitality. Also speaking on behalf of Austria and Greece, the delegation remarked that the inscription of transhumance was the culmination of ten years of work and its first thanks went to the communities of Austria, Greece and Italy. It thanked the Committee Members who recognized the value of this tradition. The seasonal transhumance of cattle marks the life of the herder. Along these ancient migratory routes, communities strengthen their ties to the land and to their ancestors. This movement, which has been repeated for centuries, is a living example of the coexistence between humans and nature, which respects biodiversity and the sustainable use of resources. This inscription also represents the diversity of cultures as the tradition of transhumance unites the Alps and the Mediterranean. This inscription was also the starting point for new international cooperation to safeguard the existing relationship and share good practices. Although there were currently three States involved in the inscription, there were potentially many more. Italy came to this nomination thanks to the enthusiasm of the communities, but also because of the commitment of other countries that were able to join. The timing of the procedures did not allow Spain to join the nomination from the start, but it was convinced that Spain’s presence, as well as its significant experience of transhumance, will be an added value to this project. The delegation spoke of the strength of the Convention that a positive celebration can be immediately followed by looking to expand the inscription even more in an inclusive approach.
23. The **delegation of Italy** [second speaker – representative of the communities] Mr Nicola Di Niro from the development agency for the Molise region in Italy wished to pass on the story, testimony and greetings of thousands of people involved in this nomination, thanking the Committee for its decision. The work was carried out with many herders and pastoralists. For the communities, inscription is not the destination but rather the starting point. He thanked all the local communities who made the nomination possible, addressing all mutual and Spanish friends and others with whom the work will continue to strengthen this inscription in the future so as to enhance pastoralism and the routes of transhumance.
24. The **delegation of Spain** thanked Colombia for having received its request and the Colombian delegation for its work in facilitating the process for Spain. It congratulated Austria, Greece and Italy for the high calibre nomination file, adding that it was disappointed that it was unable to join the nomination process from its start, but it proved difficult owing to time constraints. Once it had understood that the process was underway, it became too late to join. The delegation had sought to extend the deadline because it was unable to form part of what it considered the international cooperation on this file. However, Spain reassured the Committee that it was looking forward to joining. The delegation reiterated its thanks to Colombia and to all those who had lent their support to this nomination file. International cooperation needs to be reinforced everywhere around the world, and it would ensure that the extension of the transhumance file in the future will attest to that.
25. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that Mongolia had requested that its nomination file 10.b.24 be examined in the course of this morning’s session. With no objections, the Chairperson proposed to examine this file after file 10.b.5 submitted by Bolivia.
26. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Date palm, knowledge, skills, traditions and practices** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.3] submitted by **Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen**. The date palm has been connected to the regional population of the submitting States for centuries, serving both as the source of numerous associated crafts, professions, and social and cultural traditions, customs and practices, and as a key form of nutrition. The date palm, knowledge, skills, traditions and practices have played a pivotal role in strengthening the connection between people and the land in the Arab region, helping them face the challenges of the harsh desert environment. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the common work by the 14 submitting States demonstrated the strong potential of intangible cultural heritage to encourage dialogue. The past, current and proposed safeguarding measures by the submitting States are diverse and adapted to the specificities of each country without overlooking the cooperation between them. The communities, groups and individuals concerned played an important role in providing relevant field information and materials. The Body commended the 14 States for an exemplary initiative of regional collaboration among countries sharing similar cultural heritage, recognizing the complexity of this effort and its importance for the Arab region. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Date palm, knowledge, skills, traditions and practices on the Representative List.
27. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.3) **adopted to inscribe Date palm, knowledge, skills, traditions and practices** **on the Representative List**.
28. The **delegation of the United Arab Emirates** expressed sincere gratitude to Colombia for its warm hospitality and the Chairperson for efficiently guiding the discussions. It was with great pleasure and gratitude that it welcomed the decision of the Committee to include Date palm, knowledge, skills, traditions and practices, one of the most prominent symbols of its culture, on the Representative List. This achievement is the result of joint efforts in cooperation with 14 Arab countries in the Middle East and North Africa, namely Bahrain, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Yemen and the United Arab Emirates, which reflects the collective commitment to see the preservation and promotion of this shared element of cultural heritage. This file also serves as an example of how cultural heritage can strengthen dialogue, highlighting commonalities without losing the wealth offered by cultural diversity. The United Arab Emirates was proud to have taken the coordinating role among the countries submitting the nomination file, and it hoped that this would be one of many steps taken together in this and other fields.
29. The **Representative of ALECSO** (Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization) offered sincere thanks to the Chairperson and Colombia for the organization of this session and the warm welcome. Thanks also went to UNESCO, the Secretariat and to the Members of the Committee. Fourteen countries, under the aegis of ALECSO, participated in the nomination process at the request of their local communities. Date palm, knowledge, skills, and traditions and practices represents a unifying element and a symbol of acculturation between groups, communities and individuals in all the regions where this tree grows. This inscription is a reminder that the palm tree is more than a tree, it is a culture rooted in history, a witness to the great capacity of humans to adapt to the most difficult elements and natural conditions. This unifying element also demonstrates the great diversity of the participating countries, which is the whole spirit of the Convention. These countries share and promote the same values as UNESCO and thus offer an example of collaboration and cooperation, leaving the door open for other countries to join this element. She thanked the member countries of ALECSO that had worked so hard to develop this file.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular festival** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.4] submitted by **Belgium**. Ommegang of Brussels takes place annually over two evenings in July in the historic centre of Brussels. Nowadays, the tradition has evolved into a festive, local heritage event where various groups of volunteers meet and prepare for their roles together, encouraging younger members to get involved. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the Ommegang of Brussels supports local identity and strengthens social and community ties among the people of the city, inspiring a spirit of solidarity and friendship among participants and attendees. The inscription of Ommegang would make an important contribution to raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts as well as drawing attention to the link between intangible heritage and built heritage. The efforts made by the association Ommegang Oppidi Bruxellensis and by many groups of practitioners have ensured the safeguarding of the element over the decades, in addition to the support of the City of Brussels. The Body commended the State Party for a well-prepared file that can serve as a good example of how the inscription of an element on the Representative List can contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the significance of intangible cultural heritage. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular festival on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.4**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.4) **adopted to inscribe Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular festival** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Belgium** spoke onbehalf of the Brussels-Capital Region, of which this is its first file, and the Wallonia-Brussels Federation, which initiated it, and above all the heritage community involved in Ommegang, represented here in Bogotá by Mr. de Trazegnies, president of the organizing association. The delegation spoke of the gratitude and humility with which it welcomed the Committee’s decision to inscribe Ommegang of Brussels, an annual historical procession and popular annual festival on the Representative List. This urban and historic multicultural tradition, which includes several Belgian traditions, will carry the values ​​of UNESCO and the cultural conventions, asserting itself as an ambassador of intangible cultural heritage, as it has done since 1930; the date of the re-creation of the ancestral procession of the serments of the crossbowmen and the city of Brussels on the occasion of the centenary of Belgium. The Ommegang is a festive event in a renaissance tradition inspired by the 1549 procession. It begins with a blessing in the Sablon church and concludes in an apotheosis on the Grand Place in Brussels, which is inscribed on the World Heritage List since 1998, demonstrating the synergies that exist between the two Conventions. Work has been carried out on the file for over ten years by the heritage community, and this recognition is therefore not taken lightly with a safeguarding committee already in place. The Ommegang is an inter-generational event and a living heritage. The Marquis de Trazegnies, who has played the role of Charles V for over twenty years, joined the delegation to thank the [Committee and the Secretariat] for their excellent work in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and also the hosts and Colombia for their hospitality and excellent organization of this meeting.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **the festival of the Santísima Trinidad del Señor Jesús del Gran Poder in the city of La Paz** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.5] submitted by the **Plurinational State of Bolivia**.The festival of the Santísima Trinidad del Señor Jesús del Gran Poder takes place on the Day of the Holy Trinity in the city of La Paz. The celebration transforms and stimulates the social life of La Paz every year, emanating from a particular way of understanding and living Andean Catholicism. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that in addition to its sacred function, the element strengthens social cohesion, awareness of intangible cultural heritage, pride for heritage, respect and unity. The safeguarding measures included in the file are expected to ensure that the viability of the element is not jeopardized in the future. They have been proposed after consultations with the communities, especially with the fraternities, which are responsible for organizing the Fiesta.The Body encouraged the State Party to improve its inventorying process, both in terms of its overall methodologies and its procedures, and invited it to include relevant, detailed information in its next periodic report on the implementation of the Convention at the national level.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe the festival of the Santísima Trinidad del Señor Jesús del Gran Poder in the city of La Paz on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted no amendment or request for debate was submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.5**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.5) **adopted to inscribe The festival of the Santísima Trinidad del Señor Jesús del Gran Poder in the city of La Paz on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Bolivia** presented its warm greetings to the Chairperson and to the Members of the Committee, transmitting the fraternal greetings of the entire Bolivian people and Government, thanking UNESCO for inscribing the element, The festival of the Santísima Trinidad del Señor Jesús del Gran Poder on the Representative List. This folkloric event involves more than 40,000 dancers throughout the country who dance and sing to express their devotion to Jesus Christ. This festival has taken place since 1923. The communities of thousands of craftspeople work on the costumes and jewels to create new fashion trends every year. The declaration of the festival’s inscription on the Representative List reaffirmed the criteria for safeguarding and the importance of rituals in defining the identity of people, in this case the Bolivian people. It was an honour in this International Year of Indigenous Languages that UNESCO, as the lead body, inscribed this element. It wished to share its traditions and devotion, cultural expression, peace, harmony and tranquillity.

*[A short video of the element was projected followed by a dance performance]*

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of Mongolia’s request to now examine its file.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.24] submitted by **Mongolia.** Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs includes the traditional method of making airag and the related equipment and associated social customs and rituals. Bearers and practitioners inherit the related traditional practices and knowledge from their parents, which has kept the tradition alive for thousands of years.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the traditional technique of making airag and its associated customs conveys sociocultural information that reflects and explains the essential characteristics of the social relations of the communities of herders. The nomination file was the result of five years’ work. The procedures adopted for the preparation of the file were thoroughly discussed among the bearers, researchers, groups and communities concerned.The Body commended the State Party for proposing an element that shows how the nomadic pastoral use of land can be a way of achieving environmental protection and sustainability.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs on the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.24**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.24) **adopted to inscribe Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Mongolia** congratulated the Chairperson on her excellent chairpersonship of the Committee. It extended gratitude to Colombia and its people for the warm welcome to the beautiful city of Bogotá. On behalf of the people of Mongolia and particularly the Khokhuur community and practitioners, the Government of Mongolia and the Minister of Education, Culture, Science and Sports, the delegation expressed sincere appreciation to all the Committee Members, the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body for their diligent work that allowed for the inscription of the element, Traditional technique of making Airag in Khokhuur and its associated customs on the Representative List. The nature of the Airag in Khokhuur is a complement of several intangible cultural heritage oral traditions and expressions, traditional knowledge and social practices, ritual and festive events and traditional crafts. Airag in Khokhuur is not only an identity marker of nomadic Mongols, but also one of the symbols of solidarity and unity of Mongolian people. Mongolians have been safeguarding this traditional knowledge and practice for thousands of years by transmitting it from generation to generation. The inscription of this element is a significant moment for all Mongolians and this responsibility is received with great pride and commitment to ensure the viability of this element in the future. The Government of Mongolia is implementing a national programme of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage between 2019 and 2033 for enhancing the implementation of the Convention and the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in need of urgent safeguarding.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.6] submitted by **Brazil**. The Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão is a ritualistic practice involving forms of musical, choreographic, performing and ludic expressions in which the practitioners’ relationship with the sacred is mediated by the figure of the ox. The practice is heavily charged with symbolism, by reproducing the cycle of birth, life and death, it offers a metaphor for human existence itself. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the cultural complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão brings people together and strengthens their bonds, creating a shared identity for members of the community and promoting, during its cycle, an escape from daily life as experienced throughout the rest of the year. To ensure the viability of the element, the related expertise is transmitted through the creation of children’s groups, the promotion of dance workshops, and by encouraging children and youngsters with the creation of conviviality spaces in schools or Boi rehearsals. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for providing evidence of community consent in a community-customized rather than standardized format. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.6**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.6) **adopted to inscribe Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Brazil,** on behalf of the Ministry for Tourism and the Secretariat for Culture, as well as the Institute for National Historic and Artistic Heritage, thanked everyone for this inscription, remarking that the communities and social groups were right now celebrating the inscription of Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão on the Representative List. The IPHAN,[[26]](#footnote-26) the responsible Institute and the leading heritage body in Latin America with 82 years of existence that began implementing a policy of safeguarding intangible heritage nearly 20 years ago, had made a decisive contribution to the drafting of the Convention and subsequently the creation of CRESPIAL, the regional centre for the safeguarding of Latin America’s intangible cultural heritage. The inscription of this element will contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the relevance of intangible cultural heritage, as well as the importance of dialogue between different cultures. It will strengthen the image of Brazil’s cultural diversity abroad because it involves different forms of cultural expressions that make up Brazil’s identity. It is a cultural expression of extreme importance for the memory, cultural diversity and national history of Brazil and its people. Bumba-meu-boi is an obvious testimony to the great capacity for human beings to be creative, and it represents the different cultural processes that constitute Brazilian society as well as the various social, environmental and geopolitical contexts in Brazil. Last but not least, this celebration, the Cultural Complex of Bumba-meu-boi from Maranhão, is another gift of history in the life and culture of Brazil, a gift that Brazil and the IPHAN offers humanity. Special thanks were conveyed to the former chairperson of the IPHAN, Ms Kátia Bogéa.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

*[The nomination file (14.COM 10.b.7) submitted by Bulgaria was withdrawn].*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Morna, musical practice of Cabo Verde** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.8] submitted by Cabo Verde. Morna, musical practice of Cabo Verde is a traditional Cape Verdean musical and choreographic practice with instrumental accompaniment that incorporates voice, music, poetry and dance. Morna is a fundamental aspect of Cape Verdean social and cultural life, as it is performed at key life events, such as weddings, christenings, and family reunions. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the inscription of the Morna would create new opportunities for the exchange of knowledge among generations and among bearers from different regions of the archipelago and immigrant communities. The proposed safeguarding measures are coherent and feasible, highlighting the position and role of Morna practitioners and their close ties with local governments and NGOs. The Evaluation Body reminded the State Party that top-down approaches need to be avoided in all stages of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage by ensuring that communities are at the centre of all safeguarding efforts. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Morna, musical practice of Cabo Verde on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.8**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.8) **adopted to inscribe Morna, musical practice of Cabo Verde** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Cabo Verde**, represented by the Minister of Culture and Creative Industries,thanked the Chairperson, the Director-General of UNESCO, and States Parties of the Convention. Today, all Cabo Verdeans were happy. It thanked Colombia for the organization of the meeting. On behalf of the people of Cabo Verde and the Prime Minister, the Minister thanked UNESCO for the technical support that made the inscription of the Morna possible. Today, Cabo Verde, a small country made up of 10 islands in the middle of the Atlantic with half a million inhabitants on the islands and one million in the diaspora who are celebrating the inscription. The whole Creole nation expressed thanks to UNESCO, the experts, and to all the communities. The people felt honoured to have the element recognized, which brings people together. The Minister therefore expressed thanks from the entire people of Cabo Verde and invited two famous musicians to represent, not just the artists and composers but also the people of Cabo Verde because Morna is the very soul of its people.

*[A live performance of the Morna]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Byzantine chant** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.9] submitted by **Cyprus** and **Greece**. Byzantine chant, a living art that has existed for more than 2,000 years, is a significant cultural tradition and comprehensive music system forming part of the common musical traditions that developed in the Byzantine Empire. Highlighting and musically enhancing the liturgical texts of the Greek Orthodox Church, it is inextricably linked with spiritual life and religious worship. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Byzantine chant contributes to community-bonding and cohesiveness as it occupies a central role in the religious and social life of the community of Orthodox Christians. The inscription of the Byzantine chant would raise awareness of the importance of safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage of this multicultural region, increasing tolerance and understanding between people of different religions and cultures. The nomination process was led by key institutions representing communities of practitioners of the element, with the support of relevant state institutions. The Body commended the States Parties for an exemplary joint nomination process, demonstrating the effectiveness of communities from different countries working together to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Byzantine chant on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.9**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.9) **adopted to inscribe Byzantine chant** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Cyprus** was honoured to address the Committee on this happy occasion. A cultural tradition that has been persevered for more than two millennia, Byzantine chant has a central role in the religious worship, and spiritual and social life of Orthodox Greeks and Orthodox Christians at large. It is inextricably linked to the most important events in a person’s life, such as baptisms, weddings and funerals, as well as with the observance and celebration of religious festivals during times of happiness and sorrow, amiability and introspection. As a living art of lyricism and a comprehensive music system, it constitutes a poignant combination of language and verse, music and rhythm, characteristics that render it a powerful cultural expression and an essential trait of the collective identity of the Orthodox Greeks. Most importantly, it has maintained the continuity of the ancient Greek language with medieval and modern Greek, and with the Greek Cypriot dialect, and has significantly influenced folk and popular Greek music. The inscription of Byzantine chant on the Representative List will bring pride to the individuals, associations and communities involved and will solidify the element’s current visibility and constitute an incentive for younger generations to follow the footsteps of the older generation of chanters. Moreover, the inscription will encourage communities to join forces for the further safeguarding and promotion of intangible cultural heritage in Cyprus at large. The delegation expressed thanks to Greece for the excellent collaboration during the preparation of this nomination, as well as all the colleagues in Cyprus for their invaluable contribution. It thanked the Committee Members for their support, and especially to the anonymous chanters and congregation members in Cyprus and Greece who have kept this ancestral tradition alive through the centuries.
4. The **delegation of Greece** expressed gratitude to the Evaluation Body and the Committee for this favourable evaluation and inscription of Byzantine chant on the Representative List. It is a well-known and well-loved element that will make intangible cultural heritage visible to all parish chanters, particularly those who live in small isolated communities and members of small Byzantine choirs; an audience that may not know the Convention. Most importantly, the valorization of this living tradition will encourage people to reflect on the multifarious expressions of their heritage. Byzantine chant is an ecclesiastical art that permeates all the popular music traditions in Cyprus and Greece. Folk music and singing elements, such as Rebetiko in Greece and Tsiattista in Cyprus—both inscribed on the Representative List— draw heavily on this complete music system. Inscribing the source from which most of the Greek and Greek-Cypriot popular music traditions belong is a powerful conclusion. This is what intangible cultural heritage is about, the future and the creativity that comes from all of the elements inscribed.
5. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked Cyprus and Greece for this excellent file and all the work that they are doing in the framework of the Convention. It asked to allow Turkey to speak.
6. The **delegation of Turkey** expressed its strong objection to this decision. This nomination file contains elements that explicitly contradict the preamble, Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention, the Operational Directives, the aide-memoire for nominations for the Representative List, and Committee Decisions [12.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/11) and [13.COM.10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10). Articles 11 and 12 stipulate that the process of identification and submission of a nomination file can be initiated only for an element present in the respective territory of the submitting party. The Operational Directives which govern the conduct of the Evaluation Body have strict criteria in accordance with the Articles. In addition, the aide-memoire clearly refers to the principle of mutual respect in Articles 47 and 48. Even the Committee’s deliberations under agenda item 10 underlined the importance of avoiding reference in the title of elements to specific countries and objectives of nationality that may provoke sentiments contrary to the principle of international cooperation. Nomination files should be elaborated with utmost care in order to avoid misunderstandings. As such, the nominating parties should be careful about possible sensitivities and thus refrain from offensive formulations. Breaching the abovementioned conventional and ethical requirements, this nomination file contains hostile references to historical locations and Turkey’s history. In the inventories and geographical location part of the nomination form, reference was made to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople when the official name of this institution is Fener Greek Orthodox Patriarch, which is located in Istanbul. Accordingly, the file makes reference to an institution in Turkey that is against the abovementioned principles. Furthermore, naming it in a different way cannot be seen as a sign of goodwill. Secondly, the consent letters make reference to the ‘dark years of Ottoman rule for the 400 years under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire’, and cites certain regions and cities such as Constantinople, as well as hostile texts such as ‘in the region of Cyprus before 1974’. The delegation called the nomination file inappropriate as it disrespected Turkey’s territorial sovereignty, and Turkey therefore disassociated from this decision.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that Greece wished to respond.
8. The **delegation of Greece** wished to respond to the points raised by Turkey. Concerning the instances in the Greek inventory where it was stated that inappropriate language was included, on page 1 the name of the element is mentioned among other names as ‘chant of Constantinople’. Further, on page 7 of the inventory, several chanting traditions are mentioned, the first of which is the ‘Patriarchal chanting tradition’. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople is a 2,000 year-old religious institution. In the context of cultural and religious discussion, this institution is always mentioned by the name in which it has been known for two millennia. In the context of contemporary politics in the Republic of Turkey, the delegation fully acknowledged that the legal institution residing in Istanbul had acquired the name Fener Greek Orthodox Church. However, it was important not to conflate the two distinct notions. The first notion is the rule of law in the Republic of Turkey, which Greece fully respects and with which it complies in its foreign affairs relationships, and of course in official correspondence Greece must and does refer to the name of the legal entity as acquired under Turkish law. However, in religious and cultural contexts, the dynamic description of the Patriarchate in everyday communication is always referred to as Ecumenical. In this case, the second context is the only relevant text for the Greek inventory. The Patriarchate is not mentioned as the Fener Greek Orthodox Church because it is not known by this name in Greece but by its ancient name, Ecumenical Patriarchate. Greece deeply respects the Turkish law that governs the Fener Greek Orthodox Church, as well as their international relationship. However, this inventory was written by Greek bearers, and Greece was attentive to violations of the overarching principles of UNESCO in the inventory. Moreover, Greece never uses ‘Constantinople’ other than in this context.
9. The **Chairperson** congratulated Greece and Cyprus.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Music and dance of Dominican Bachata** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.10] submitted by the **Dominican Republic**. The music and dance of Dominican Bachata is a danceable musical expression deriving from a fusion of rhythmic bolero with other Afro-Antillean genres such as Son, the Cha-cha-cha, Merengue, and so on. The Dominican people consider the element as a vernacular cultural manifestation, omnipresent in community celebrations and social gatherings. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2 and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that music and dance of Dominican Bachata constitutes a powerful element of cohesion and a key component of the identity of its people, generating a sense of joy and happiness among participants. The inscription of the element would also contribute to strengthening the role of music and other cultural expressions worldwide. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.3 and R.4. The proposed safeguarding measures are very general and do not involve any specific commitments. They focus on the commercial and spectacular side of the element with a high risk of jeopardization and decontextualization. There is insufficient evidence of community participation and consent to the nomination process. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer*Music and dance of Dominican Bachata to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that an amendment had been received on the nomination file on behalf of 14 Members of the Committee (**Kuwait, Armenia, Azerbaijan, China, Colombia, Cuba, Djibouti, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Mauritius, Palestine, Senegal, Togo** and **Zambia**). She would therefore proceed with the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, inviting Kuwait to present the amendment.
3. The **delegation of Kuwait** indicated that Jamaica and Cameroon also co-sponsored the amendment.It supported the inscription of Music and dance of Dominican Bachata as the submitting State Party had clarified the criteria. Dominican Bachata is a danceable musical expression in which millions participate whether they are professional or amateur dancers in the Dominican Republic, as well as dancers around the world as it can be performed by anyone, anywhere. In fact, even in Kuwait, Bachata dancing is taught and enjoyed in gyms and dance schools, even in universities, keeping in mind that Kuwait is more than 11,500 km from the Dominican Republic. Bachata is therefore a dance enjoyed by people all over the world that has an element derived from the Creole people of Africa and the Caribbean. It is a dance of love, passion, fun. Bachata is an expression of joy and happiness. Regarding R.4, related to community participation within the framework of the nomination, since 2017 several meetings, workshops and conferences were held and organized by professionals, promoters, academics and even fans. Also, in the same year, it can be seen that documents were signed by performers, composers, musicians, singers and representatives of dance schools comprising the community. The Body mentioned the establishment of a council and a top-down governmental process, but having carefully studied the file, the delegation remarked that the council is just part of the process, not the whole process, and comprises groups of volunteers. Their role is to help expedite the process; they are a step in the process. Different persons within the community prepared the information and they engaged the council to help expedite the process. It might take months to obtain the approvals, but it takes the volunteer council only days. It is therefore a tool in the process, not the process itself. It is a cultural approach in some countries to use certain tools to help the nomination file, and does not imply that they are the ones preparing and engaging in the preparation of the files. The delegation therefore supported the inscription of the element and wished to give the floor to the Dominican Republic to clarify the points raised by the Evaluation Body.
4. The **Chairperson** took note of the Members of the Committee wishing to speak, including Armenia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Senegal, Poland, Austria and Palestine, inviting Armenia to take the floor.
5. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its detailed study on this element, expressing its marked appreciation for the element that constitutes a major component of the identity of the Dominican people. Naturally this encourages appropriation by the people, taking into account the importance and the significance of the element to them. The information that the Dominican delegation shared responds to the shortcomings identified by the Evaluation Body relating to criteria R.3 and R.4, in particular on the safeguarding measures, the risks of decontextualization, but also the participation of the community in the nomination process. In this regard, Armenia considered that the upstream dialogue could have helped resolve these shortcomings. The information presented by the Dominican delegation influenced its position to request the inscription of this element, and asked that the Dominican delegation share with the Committee the information it had provided to Armenia, specifically on community participation in all stages of the nomination.
6. The **Chairperson** asked the Members of the Committee wishing to speak whether they had specific questions addressed to the submitting State.
7. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that without doubt the people of the Dominican Republic strongly identify with Bachata, and the broad support for the inscription of this element was evident. However, it wished to ask the State Party to explain the idea behind the monitoring council that they seek to establish to preserve the integrity and authenticity of the element, which appears to not yet be in place. The delegation expressed concern because this structure seemingly negates the evolving nature of living heritage.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated the Dominican Republic for its nomination; a beautiful expression of vibrant culture that is famous far beyond the Dominican Republic, including in Azerbaijan. A championship of the Bachata is organized annually in Azerbaijan for which it was proud. It particularly noted the strong cultural function of the element, strengthening social cohesion with Dominican society and that it is an inseparable part of its cultural identity. The delegation commended the Evaluation Body for its careful examination of this file. The previous speakers already provided arguments in favour of criterion R.3, and it would speak on criterion R.4 and community participation. The delegation noted the meeting held in September 2017 at the National Archives with the participation of artists and musicians who proposed the inscription of the Dominican Bachata on the Representative List. Thus, musicians and artists had participated in the preparation of the nomination file. The delegation wished to hear from the Dominican Republic on how this or other activities mentioned in the file involved active community participation.
9. The **delegation of Senegal** spoke of how Bachata can be traced to Africa from where it came like many musical expressions and dances shared with the Caribbean and the Americas in general since slavery. Concerning the specific question on safeguarding measures, the delegation recognized the Evaluation Body’s precise work on these issues, but immense efforts had been made by the Dominican Republic, especially in music education, which is responsible for regulating the rhythm that conveys the dance. Thus, music education is itself a safeguarding measure, adding that in the case of Africa or the Dominican Republic, dance cannot be learned, dance is natural. In Senegal, the people live with dance and are born with dance, either you are a bad dancer or an excellent dancer, but dance cannot be learned, but music can be. By preserving the music, one preserves these rhythms and therefore music preserves the expression that is Bachata. The delegation asked the Dominican Republic to specifically explain the safeguarding measures, in particular with regard to music education, but also on educating the youth on transmission.
10. Thanking Senegal, the **Chairperson** would give the floor to Members wishing to speak after lunch, inviting the Secretary to make some practical announcements.
11. The **Secretary** announced some side events during the lunch break, including an information session on the reform of the periodic reporting mechanism and launch of the first regional cycle organized by UNESCO, and the ICH NGO Forum was holding a meeting of the Working group on research: towards a more formal organization of the group.

*[Wednesday, 11 December 2019, 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** took note of the three questions for the State Party. One concerned the monitoring council posed by Austria, the second concerned community participation by Azerbaijan, and Senegal wished to hear more about safeguarding measures and music education. She invited the Dominican Republic to respond specifically to these questions.
2. Responding to the question from Austria on the establishment of a council to preserve the integrity and authenticity of the element, the **delegation of the Dominican Republic** explained that some academics had set up the council as a result of previous discussions prior to submitting the file in the event that it was necessary to look at the possible, rapid extension of the element. However, the community as a whole, particularly the practitioners, turned down the proposal because they believed music to be a living element that must continue to evolve and even assimilate and integrate other rhythmic elements in a natural and spontaneous way. The council is therefore not part of the planned safeguarding measures either by the authorities or by the community. It was contained in the file because it was a previously held discussion on the council. Regarding the question by Azerbaijan on the evidence of community participation, the delegation explained that the Government of the Dominican Republic, with the support of community organizations, had formulated a strategic plan to conclude in 2020 with the construction of several municipal schools. Concerning the participation of the communities and civil society in the programme, the delegation highlighted the work by some NGOs that were particularly involved in safeguarding intangible heritage in the Dominican Republic, and over several years they developed activities on the dissemination, analysis and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. For example, the Centro León and the León Foundation of the city of Santiago for the north and centre of the country, the Spanish Cultural Centre in the Dominican Republic to the Cofradia Foundation, the Popular Theatre Foundation and the Dominican Network of Popular Culture, which brings together more than 60 institutions, including the House of Theatre in Santo Domingo.
3. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it had further questions to the submitting State.
4. The **delegation of the Netherlands** was concerned with the statement in the file on the safeguarding of the element by the music and entertainment industry as a promotion strategy. The Evaluation Body alluded to the commercial and spectacular side of the element with a risk of decontextualization and it asked the Evaluation Body to offer its reflection on this.
5. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** considered that the safeguarding measures were very general and did not involve any specific commitments, especially concerning the lack of community participation in the implementation of the measures, the establishment of a council devoted to the preservation of the integrity and authenticity of the element, and the problematic switch from non-formal to formal transmission were other problematic issues that could have a negative impact on the viability of the element. The Evaluation Body was concerned about taking the transmission or other measures of safeguarding out of the community or family context and placing them into institutionally based organizations.
6. As a State Party from Latin America and the Caribbean, the **delegation of Colombia** bore witness to the importance of this element, adding that the safeguarding measures would be complementary to a broader social process that already exists in the Dominican Republic, as well as much of Latin America and the Caribbean around the Bachata. It therefore reiterated its question on the safeguarding measures considering that this is an element that generates a lot of interest in the country and that already benefits from a great deal of social protection. The safeguarding measures were thus complementary to the existing community appropriation. The delegation therefore asked the State Party to further clarify this aspect.
7. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its report. Responding to the question by the Netherlands on the council, the delegation clarified that it was not a government council but rather it would be utilized when needed to expedite or speed up some of the processes. It would not be responsible for the safeguarding measures, as this was the responsibility of the communities. The council was thus a tool in part of the process.
8. The **delegation of the Dominican Republic** further explainedthat on 3 June 2015, the congress of the Dominican Republic declared Bachata a national cultural heritage aimed at safeguarding the Bachata. This decision required the State to take all necessary measures to protect the transmission and survival of Bachata in its most authentic expression, making it obligatory to protect the practitioners who practice it.
9. The **delegation of Poland** was satisfied with the answers provided by the Dominican Republic as they proved that Bachata music and dance is a people-oriented element of intangible cultural heritage. Most importantly, as described comprehensively in the file, Bachata is a key component of the identity of the people of the Dominican Republic. As was heard, many safeguarding measures had been adopted in the country over the years. The Ministry of Culture has launched programmes to preserve the traditional cultural practices of Bachata, especially through the involvement of the youth. It was noteworthy that an NGO was consulted during the nomination process. The delegation was convinced that Dominican Bachata will contribute towards safeguarding music and dance as a crucial instrument for promoting intercultural dialogue and tolerance. Poland supported the efforts undertaken by the State Party and wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
10. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision.
11. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported the points made by Poland, and in addition to the explanations provided by the State Party on R.4 concluded that this criterion actually came from the community to the State authorities and thus appeared through a bottom-up approach rather than the other way around. The delegation therefore supported inscription.
12. Having listened to the responses, the **delegation of Japan** alsosupported inscription.
13. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted, and criteria R.1, R.2 and R.5 of paragraph 2 were also adopted.
14. Turning to paragraph 3, thedelegations of **Poland, Japan, Guatemala** and **Sri Lanka** voiced support for criterion R.3, which was duly adopted. Criterion R.4 received broad support and was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 as a whole [that considers the criteria satisfied] was adopted. Paragraph 4 [to inscribe] was also adopted. Paragraph 5 [encourages the State Party to continue working to safeguard the element] was adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole.
15. The **delegation of the Netherlands** noted that paragraph 7 had been deleted but suggested retaining the paragraph to remind the State Party to remain alert to the possible risks of folklorization.
16. The **delegation of Austria** supported the statement by the Netherlands to retain paragraph 7. It also believed that it would do no harm to keep the original paragraph 5 [encourages the State Party to avoid top-down approaches] and the original paragraph 6 [to take heed in ensuring the continuity of social functions] given the serious concerns voiced by the Evaluation Body. The delegation congratulated the Dominican Republic and their communities, but these concerns were legitimate and it asked that the Committee consider –in a spirit of compromise – to retain the original paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 8 [recalls the importance of using appropriate vocabulary].
17. The **delegation of Kuwait** had no problem with keeping paragraph 7, but that paragraph 5 should be deleted because during the discussion it was determined that the approach was not top-down as paragraph 5 suggests.
18. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported the position of Kuwait, and although it understood the concerns of the Netherlands, the fact remained that Bachata is a very popular form of music in the State Party with no danger of decontextualization. It is in fact a very strong element.
19. The **delegation of Armenia** shared the opinion of Kuwait to retain paragraph 7 in the spirit of compromise, but paragraphs 5 and 6 should be deleted.
20. The **delegation of Colombia** also agreed with Kuwait’s position to delete paragraph 5, and with Austria’s suggestion to perhaps keep paragraphs 6 and 7.
21. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the Netherlands with paragraph 7, and also Austria with paragraphs 5 and 6, adding that these paragraphs should not be interpreted in a negative way, as they simply requested the State to pay attention to these points upon inscription.
22. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** agreed to Austria’s proposal in paragraphs 6 and 7, but also concurred with the point made by Kuwait and reiterated by Jamaica on paragraph 5, which specifically referred to the nomination process and would thus serve no purpose once the element is inscribed.
23. The **delegation of Senegal** shared the same sentiment as Azerbaijan. It agreed with Austria to retain paragraph 7, but not paragraphs 5 and 6, which would be contrary to the decision.
24. The **Chairperson** asked whether there was aconsensus to maintain paragraphs 6 and 7 and delete paragraph 5.
25. In the spirit of consensus, the **delegation of Austria** agreed to delete paragraph 5, but wished to maintain paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, adding that these paragraphs had been repeated in other files and it was fair to remain consistent in the examination of files.
26. The **delegation of Poland** supported the interpretation and statement by Austria.
27. The **Chairperson** noted the consensus to delete paragraph 5, and retain paragraphs 6 and 7, which were duly adopted, turning to Austria’s proposal to retain paragraph 8.
28. The **delegation of the Netherlands** supported to keep paragraph 8.
29. The **Chairperson** noted that there were objections, and paragraph 8 was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.10**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.10) **adopted** **to inscribe** **Music and dance of Dominican Bachata on the Representative List.**
30. The **delegation of the Dominican Republic** wished to link its words of appreciation to music at this new inscription as music is very much tied to happiness, not only to the people of the Dominican Republic but to an entire region. The thought that this rhythm might be lost can never happen. The artist who accompanied the delegation, Mr Vicente Garcia, represented the new expression of the Bachata rhythm, which despite the voiced concerns proved that Bachata is a living rhythm. Mr Vicente Garcia has won three Grammys and this showed that the rhythm is alive and will remain so well into the future.
31. **Mr Vicente Garcia** spoke of his honour to represent his country and Bachata, a music which remains alive and makes Dominicans feel proud as Caribbean people. The music came from Mr José Manuel Calderón, the precursor of Bachata, and was dedicated to all Bachata musicians who create this music.

*[A live performance of the music of Dominican Bachata]*

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that two submitting States had requested their files to be examined in the afternoon session: draft decision 10.b.16 submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran and 10.b.23 submitted by Mexico and Spain due to the travel schedule of the delegations concerned. With no objections, the Chairperson proposed to examine the two files after the examination of file 10.b.12 submitted by Italy, France and Switzerland.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Ethiopian epiphany** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.11] submitted by **Ethiopia**. Ethiopian epiphany is a colourful festival celebrated all over Ethiopia to commemorate the baptism of Jesus Christ by John the Baptist in the River Jordan. The viability of the element is ensured through its continued practice, with Orthodox clergies playing a pivotal role.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.4 and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Ethiopian epiphany is a religious and cultural festival during which Ethiopians gather together and celebrate, contributing to social cohesion and peace-making. The request to nominate Ethiopian epiphany came from the bearers and practitioners of the element.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.3.The State Party had not provided evidence of how the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany would contribute to ensuring the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The proposed measures are not aimed at safeguarding the element but rather at safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in general. The increases in tourism and commercialization are referred to constantly, but no concrete measures are proposed to counter their potential negative effects.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Ethiopian epiphany to the submitting State.
3. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that an amendment to the draft decision had been received on behalf of eight of its Members, including **Djibouti, Palestine, Kuwait, Senegal, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Mauritius** and **Zambia**, opening the floor for discussion.
4. The **delegation of Djibouti** thanked the Evaluation Body for its excellent work in general. However, despite the flaws in terminology and presentation of the file by Ethiopia, the Ethiopian epiphany, which has existed for more than 500 years, deserves to be inscribed. In its opinion, the file should not be dismissed but studied on its merits. The delegation noted that 12 Members of the Committee agreed that the inscription of this element on the Representative List would impact on awareness raising and increase the importance of the element and intangible cultural heritage in Ethiopia. It also clearly demonstrated its role in social cohesion, national unity and mutual understanding between peoples and religions –there are approximately 70 to 80 peoples in Ethiopia – thereby creating synergy and mutual respect for religions and inter-community rapprochements and the promotion of cultural diversity and cults, while stimulating research and inventories in this sector. All aspects of this element of the intangible cultural heritage of Ethiopia are characterized by its continuous recreation, testifying to its vitality and the dynamism of its environment, without forgetting its sustainability through continuous transmission to succeeding generations. With 500 years of existence, Ethiopia has specialized bodies in this field, such as the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage (ARCCH). Finally, the inscription will strengthen the synergy between the 2003 Convention and the World Heritage Convention because the Epiphany takes place in sites already recognized by UNESCO. Concerning criterion R.2, the element proposed for inscription would increase the visibility of other cultural expressions and have a considerable impact on the promotion of other elements of intangible cultural heritage, in particular the strengthening of related activities, such as intercultural dialogue, inherent in this event. On safeguarding measures under R.3, it must be recognized that the practitioners and bearers of this element have been able to safeguard it for hundreds of years despite disasters, conflicts and the eventful history of Ethiopia, guaranteeing transmission from generation to generation. Also, social and public recognition is a determining factor in the sustainability of this event, which is at the heart of social cohesion and national unity. It was noted that Ethiopia was currently at a crossroads and required the promotion of cultural heritage to contribute towards national cohesion and the preservation of peace, hence the importance of inscription of the element. The delegation remarked that the Prime Minister of Ethiopia was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize the previous day, and thus by granting Ethiopia this inscription was to pay tribute to the quality of its request and allow this diverse country, with more than 110 million inhabitants, to unite around this common element. The delegation concluded by expressing gratitude to the Secretariat and the co-sponsors, and wished to hear from Ethiopia so that it could provide further information on these aspects.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that Armenia, the Netherlands, Cuba, Poland, Senegal, Jamaica, Guatemala and Austria wished to speak.
6. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its work on the file. Looking at the evaluation, it was clear that the Ethiopian epiphany plays a unifying role in Ethiopian society, contributing to social cohesion and unity, mutual respect, understanding and coexistence between the different groups and communities. The element is obviously an essential marker for Ethiopians. The delegation therefore did not wish to dwell on the shortcomings raised by the Evaluation Body under R.2 given the difficulty in its implementation. In co-sponsoring the draft amendment, Armenia also took into account the information presented by Ethiopia under R.3, in particular on the possible excesses of tourism and commercialization. The draft amendment presented contemplates the addition of a paragraph following the inscription of the element to encourage the State Party to pay particular attention to the possible impact of these phenomena. The delegation sought to hear from Ethiopia about the possible measures in place in this regard.
7. The **Chairperson** invited Ethiopia to respond to the questions raised by Armenia.
8. The **delegation of Ethiopia** began by thanking the Secretariat, the Committee and the Government of Colombia for its gracious hospitality and hosting. The contribution of the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general is explained in various ways in the nomination file. Firstly, it is indicated that the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany would encourage and motivate other nations to safeguard and promote their intangible cultural heritage in an inclusive and participatory manner. Inscription would inspire the practitioners of the element to share knowledge with others, which would enhance respect for cultural diversity and contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage. The inscription of Ethiopian epiphany also provides the recognition of the values of mutual respect, social cohesion and peaceful coexistence, inspiring further inter- and intra-cultural dialogue among communities, contributing to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. Secondly, the proposed safeguarding measures encompass a set of concrete and extensive activities aimed at ensuring the viability of the element, with priority given to awareness-raising and training activities involving community members, as well as knowledge transfer towards the youth and the public. The proposed safeguarding measures include, among other things, research, documentation, publication, and promotional measures involving a wide range of actors, including bearers and practitioners of the element.
9. The **delegation of Ethiopia** further explained that Ethiopian epiphany, with its very long historical, cultural and religious memory of the Ethiopian public in general, has made a great contribution to peace-building, fully recognizing religious, ethnic and cultural diversity, encouraging sustainable development and mutual understanding, and has a very dynamic and strong attraction to global tourism. To counter the potential negative effects from increases in tourism and to protect the element from threats of undue commercialization, the celebration of Ethiopian epiphany is managed currently and in the past by concerned community members. Ethiopia also has culture and tourism offices that work together with the communities concerned to manage the ceremony so that threats from tourism in the celebration site is limited. Moreover, to check and reverse such threats, the communities work hand in hand with tour operators and hotels that host such groups of people. The community’s culture, the tourism offices and NGOs work together promoting the event, as well as informing society of potential elements that could pose threats on the celebration. Discussions on the mechanisms of safeguarding will be given priority, and dialogue between the users and practitioners of the element is undertaken in various high-traffic media. These were the main safeguarding measures.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Ethiopia for the explanation, opening the floor for questions.
11. The **delegation of Cuba** was satisfied with the answers provided by Ethiopia, and in light of the presentation wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
12. The **delegation of the Netherlands** expressed concern by the language used in the file. For instance, it is stated that the regional state governments are aware of the potential threats to the element by groups contrary to the beliefs and tradition of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and that this would not be allowed. The delegation wished to know to what this specifically referred. Another point of concern is the reference to the role of women, which appeared restrictive. Although the Netherlands understood that community members can each have their own responsibilities in the practice of a celebration, the wording in the file gave a sense of unease. It gives the impression that the submitting State will ensure that nothing changes in the celebration of the tradition. The delegation added that it was not referencing the practise of the element itself but just the file, asking the Evaluation Body to comment on the specific language used in the file.
13. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained that the Body found the language inappropriate and, as far as it understood, the Government was not allowing different voices or perspectives in the practice of this element, which caused concern. For these reasons, the Body found that the information in R.2 and R.3 was not sufficient to find them satisfied.
14. The **delegation of Poland** noted that many of the questions to the State Party concerned criteria R.2 and R.3 and insufficient evidence on how the inscription will contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. However, in the process of dialogue, the delegation found that the State Party very clearly explained that the inscription will encourage and motivate other nations to safeguard and promote intangible cultural heritage, and the nomination file explains how it provides mutual respect for human rights, equity, social cohesion and peaceful coexistence, thereby contributing to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. It was noted that the Evaluation Body had expressed some doubts on the statement by the State Party that the element will remain unchanged. However, after hearing Ethiopia’s explanation, Poland supported its request for the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany on the Representative List and it supported the amendment.
15. The **delegation of Senegal** fully understood the apprehensions of the Evaluation Body on certain questions, and also on the terminology used in the file, which is perhaps not acceptable in the Convention. Often, those who draft the file are not necessarily experts at the community level. From time to time, there is confusion between two Conventions and States Parties must do more to respect the terminology used. Concerning visibility, the delegation noted that the element is widely practised in Ethiopia. Not only in the capital Addis Ababa but in the twenty major towns of the country, as well as certain towns that are World Heritage sites, such as Axum, Lalibela and others, demonstrating the social cohesion that exists around this practice. The delegation noted that there were opposition groups, but that this was inherent in the life of nations generally, but what should be retained is that this cultural expression is really widely practised and has become an identity marker for Ethiopia. Nevertheless, the Committee could recommend that the State Party pay attention to the terminology employed in relation to the safeguarding measures, as well as to tourism and commercialization, which must be very clear in relation to certain social elements, as mentioned by the Evaluation Body. If these aspects are taken into account, the delegation could strongly support the inscription of this element on the Representative List.
16. The **delegation of Jamaica** took note of the questions and responses. However, it shared the concern of the Evaluation Body, referring in particular to Senegal’s statement regarding some weaknesses in the file. Nevertheless, it was satisfied by the explanations given by the State Party and, in light of the strength of the element itself, it supported inscription.
17. The **delegation of Guatemala** was satisfied with the questions posed by the other Members as well as the replies provided by the submitting State and was thus in favour of inscription.
18. The **delegation of Austria** commented on the beauty of the Ethiopian epiphany that fully deserved to be inscribed. Looking at the content of the file however, it shared the concerns of the Netherlands about the language used in Section 3 of the file, adding that this inappropriate language was not in line with the spirit of the Convention. The delegation strongly encouraged the State Party to ensure that this will not be the case. The section also contained several references to plans that will protect the element from being changed. Having listened to the Evaluation Body, the delegation expressed its discomfort and therefore strongly recommended that the file be revisited, which in its view will help safeguard this element in the spirit of the Convention.
19. The **delegation of Togo** wished to add its voice to those supporting the element, adding that it is an important element shared by the whole world, especially the Christian world.
20. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 received an amendment in R.2, which would consider the criterion satisfied. Criterion R.1 under paragraph 2 was duly adopted. The Chairperson gave the floor to Kazakhstan.
21. Thedelegations of **Kazakhstan and Lebanon** supported the amendment [in R.2].
22. The **Secretariat**, Ms Fumiko Ohinata, explained that—as a question of form—the criterion R.2 and R.3 that were not met would be placed under paragraph 3 should the Committee decide to inscribe the element. In this way, it would follow the standard chapeau wording, as previously mentioned by Palestine for past cases, which would read, ‘Further considers that based on the information provided by the State Party to the Committee at its present session’.
23. The **Chairperson** reiterated thatthe exact text under R.2 would be moved to paragraph 3, as explained by the Secretariat.
24. The **delegation of Austria** supported the Secretariat’s comment with the wording as cited under the chapeau of paragraph 3, adding that it had an amendment in paragraph 3.
25. The **Chairperson** noted that Austria agreed with the wording.
26. The **delegation of Kuwait** agreed with the Secretariat, adding that whenever there was an amendment it should be preceded by a standard paragraph. The delegation therefore suggested that the standard paragraph be added in future amendments by the Secretariat.
27. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** confirmed the procedure as indicated, suggesting that the Committee establish support for R.2, which would then be understood to belong under the new chapeau of paragraph 3.
28. The **delegation of Poland** also agreed with the Secretariat and the comments by Kuwait, proposing to first adopt paragraph 2 and then amend paragraph 3.
29. The **delegation of Cuba** wished to co-sponsor paragraph 2.
30. The delegations of **Cameroon**, **Lebanon, Jamaica, Guatemala, Poland, China** and **Togo** voiced support for the amendment.
31. For thesake of fairness, the **delegation of Kuwait** suggested to first add the standard statement before adopting paragraph 2, followed by the discussion on R.2 and R.3 as Members may wish to propose amendments.
32. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it wished to first move R.2 to a new paragraph and then discuss it, or to first discuss R.2 and then move it.
33. The **delegation of Austria** concurred withthe explanation by Kuwait, which is how the Committee normally conducts its work. The text first needed to be cleaned up, then criterion R.2 should be brought under paragraph 3 with the standard wording, and the Committee would then adopt paragraph 2 before it is moved to paragraph 3.

*[Pause to allow the proposed changes to the draft decision]*

1. The **delegation of Zambia** did not have any problems with the revised version of the text, but wished to propose wording that stated how the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany would contribute to ensuring the visibility of the element thereby serving as an example. In this way, R.2 would not be generalized but specific to the element.
2. The **delegation of Austria** respectfullydisagreed with Zambia as R.2 explicitly asks to ensure visibility of intangible cultural heritage in *general* and not of the element itself, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines.
3. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** pronounced criterion R.2 adopted as amended. Criterion R.3 had also received an amendment with the broad support of the Committee.
4. The **delegation of Lebanon** wished toconsider the terminology used in the amendment to R.3 as the current wording, relating to the safeguarding measures, mentioned awareness-raising and training, and one cannot undertake training for religious rituals. It therefore proposed to replace the term ‘training’ by ‘transmission’.
5. The **Chairperson** noted the Committee’s agreement to Lebanon’s proposal.
6. The **delegation of Austria** remarked on the pertinence of the suggestion by Lebanon, and suggested ‘transmission’ rather than ‘transmission activities’, which seemed odd.
7. The **Chairperson** concurred with the observation and pronounced R.3 adopted as amended.
8. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** suggested ‘further considers’ for the chapeau of paragraph 3.
9. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of paragraph 3 as a whole, which was duly adopted.Returning to paragraph 2, the Chairperson pronounced criteria R.4 and R.5 adopted, with paragraph 2 adopted as a whole.Paragraph 4 on the inscription of the element wasalso adopted.The Chairperson then turned toparagraph 5 [on the impact of tourism and undue commercialization].
10. The **delegation of Austria** wished toretain the latter part of the sentence, which read, ‘invites it to take due account in its safeguarding measures […]’, which reflected this general concern by several Members in the general debate. It was also useful to highlight this aspect so that the State Party can take due account of these risks in the future.
11. The **Chairperson** noted that the Netherlands agreed with Austria’s proposal in paragraph 5, and it was duly adopted. It was noted that paragraph 6 was a new paragraph, which would read, ‘Reminds the State Party that the dynamic and living nature of intangible cultural heritage should be continuously respected’, whichwas duly adopted. Paragraph 7 was also adopted [on top-down approaches]. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.11**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.11) **adopted** **to inscribe** **Ethiopian epiphany on the Representative List.**
12. The **delegation of Ethiopia** conveyed warm greetings from the Prime Minister of Ethiopia, His Excellency Dr Abiy Ahmed, winner of the Félix Houphouët-Boigny UNESCO Peace Prize in 2019 and the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 2019. On behalf of the Government of Ethiopia, the Minister of Culture and Tourism, the Authority for Research and Conservation of Cultural Heritage and the Ambassador of Ethiopia to UNESCO, the delegation expressed profound gratitude to Colombia for its warm welcome and hospitality. Sincere appreciation went to the Chairperson and the Secretariat, as well as gratitude to the Committee Members for their valuable support. The delegation especially acknowledged the efforts and excellent work undertaken by the Evaluation Body. It congratulated the concerned Ethiopian community members all over the world on this historic occasion of the inscription of Ethiopian epiphany on the Representative List, for which it was delighted. Inscription ensures better visibility of intangible cultural heritage and awareness of its significance, and it encourages intercultural dialogue that respects cultural diversity in the spirit of the Convention. The relentless and continued commitment undertaken by the State Party, the respective organizations, relevant stakeholders and concerned community members will ensure the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, including Ethiopian epiphany.
13. The **delegation of Eritrea** congratulated Colombia for successfully hosting this important event and expressed gratitude to the Chairperson for her efficient leadership. Eritrea recognized the work done by Ethiopia in inscribing this element, Ethiopian epiphany, and congratulated the State Party. However, Eritrea wished to raise a concern, the second time it has done so for an inscription by Ethiopia. The first concerned the inscription of the element, Commemoration feast of the finding of the True Holy Cross of Christ at the eighth session of the Committee; an element equally practised in both countries. Eritrea explained that epiphany is also celebrated in the State of Eritrea, which regrettably was not mentioned in the document prepared by Ethiopia. Again, the name of the element itself indicates that the practice is geographically confined to the country of Ethiopia. As in the case with Spain earlier in the session, Eritrea requested to join the international nomination based on the principles of international cooperation and in the spirit of the Convention, and also encouraged the submitting State Party to work towards an extended nomination with Eritrea and any other interested State Parties. Eritrea encouraged States Parties in general to be inclusive in recognizing the geographic existence of elements proposed for inscription.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked Eritrea for its statement.
15. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Alpinism** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.12] submitted by **France**, **Italy** and **Switzerland**. Alpinism is the art of climbing summits and walls in high mountains, in all seasons, in rocky or icy terrain. It is a traditional, physical practice characterized by a shared culture made up of knowledge of the high-mountain environment, the history of the practise and associated values, and specific skills. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Alpinism plays a central role in fostering social interaction between practitioners and helps cultivate mutual respect between rope team-mates. The communities, where gender diversity is the norm, have been involved in planning the proposed safeguarding measures throughout, particularly through alpine clubs, which are widely representative of the communities. The nomination was prepared by various alpinist communities. The Body commended the States Parties for submitting a file that underlines the importance of traditional knowledge about nature and the universe and offers a positive example of the sustainable relationship between human beings and their environment. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Alpinism on the Representative List.
16. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.12**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.12) **adopted to inscribe Alpinism on the Representative List**.
17. The **delegation of France** spoke on behalfthe delegations and the communities of the three countries to thank the Committee for this long-awaited inscription on the Representative List. It also commended the analysis of the Evaluation Body for the very favourable conclusions in its evaluation. The delegation also informed the delegates that, coincidentally, since 2003, December 11 has been declared International Mountain Day. It was recalled that in 2011, a few dozen enthusiasts gathered for a mountain festival, including the mayor of Chamonix in France and the mayor of Courmayeur in Italy and the inhabitants of their communes, to raise awareness of the sense ​​of solidarity and the high demands required of alpinism. These are values ​​that guide the daily life of mountain people in these territories at the foot of their common summits. Behind the art of climbing peaks and walls, alpinism also calls upon physical, technical and intellectual capacities. But what characterizes this particular practice shared by mountaineers is the knowledge of the environment and the changing climatic conditions and natural risks, the so-called ‘spirit of the rope’. It is a physical link with the rope that symbolizes mutual aid and assistance between practitioners, as well as a yearning for freedom and the constant analysis of the environment in which they live. In these countries, where mountaineering was born, this common culture is also based on the same aesthetic references, the same ethical principles, and the same forms of sociability shared around a practice where the spirit of competition is absent. This inscription is also a warning to the reality of local situations, which must also be taken into consideration, from the continuous decline in alpinism to global warming which makes the mountains more dangerous, but also to certain new habits of practitioners, often younger, who are far from the traditional spirit of the rope. This inscription will therefore allow for the safeguarding and transmission of this traditional knowledge, particularly in raising awareness among new audiences, as well as the protection of mountaineers and mountain guides that places this activity at risk, the prevention of risks related to the trivialization of these practices, and importantly, the strengthening of monitoring in the face of environmental changes. Through these different aspects, mountaineering communities can perpetuate a positive example of a sustainable relationship between human beings and their environment. This process of inscription engaged an extremely large community, made up of amateurs, federal trainers and professionals, estimated at around 700,000 practitioners in total in the three countries, of which around 5,000 mountain guides. Their mobilization required eight years in a cultural approach to mountaineering and its values that ​​was initiated by such organizations as national alpine clubs, the Fédération française des Clubs alpins et de montagne, the Club alpin suisse, the Club alpino italiano, national mountain guides associations, the Swiss Association of Mountain Guides, the National Union of Mountain Guides, and the Collegio nazionale guide alpine italiane. Finally, this application would not have been successful without the direct support of the cities of Chamonix in France, Courmayeur in Italy and the Canton of Valais in Switzerland, nor without the scientific collaboration of the University of Geneva and the administrative support provided by the French Ministry of Culture, the Italian Ministry of Culture and the Swiss Federal Office of Culture. On their behalf, the delegation thanked everyone for this recognition.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

*[The nomination file (14.COM 10.b.13) submitted by Germany was withdrawn]*

1. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the request by the Islamic Republic of Iran to now examine its file.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Traditional skills of crafting and playing Dotār** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.16] submitted by the **Islamic Republic of Iran**. The traditional skills of crafting and playing the Dotār are one of the most prominent social and cultural components of the folkloric music among the ethnic groups and communities of the Dotār regions. The tradition is passed on informally through the master-student method.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the element is a powerful reference point for collective memory and serves important symbolic functions among the communities concerned. The element has been safeguarded mostly through informal measures, but there has been a development of professional institutions in recent years. Dotār crafters and players, local researchers and a large number of bearers, practitioners, communities and groups actively participated in all stages of the preparation of the nomination.The Body commended the State Party for its monitoring system as an integral part of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional skills of crafting and playing Dotār on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.16**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.16) **adopted to inscribe Traditional skills of crafting and playing Dotār** **on the Representative List**.
4. **The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran** expressed warmest regards to Colombia for this amazing event. On behalf of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the delegation thanked the Evaluation Body and the Committee for inscribing Traditional skills of crafting and playing Dotār on the Representative List. Dotār is one of the most important musical instruments, played for centuries in a vast geographical area of Iran where different ethnic groups live together. The delegation believed that this inscription will lead to more friendship, closeness, peace, joy and respect in cultural diversity and human creativity among the bearers and practitioners sharing this element at all levels. Moreover, it was proud that this musical element, like others from other Member States, can function as cultural expressions that speak of humanity’s diverse musical appreciation. The delegation reiterated its thanks to the Colombian hosts for their warm hospitality and the Secretariat for this inscription.
5. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the request by Mexico and Spain to examine its file in the present session.
6. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Artisanal talavera of Puebla and Tlaxcala** **(Mexico) and ceramics of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo (Spain) making process** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.23] submitted by **Mexico and Spain**.The processes of making the artisanal talavera of Puebla and Tlaxcala (Mexico) and ceramics of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo (Spain) are identified with two communities in both Mexico and Spain. The ceramics have domestic, decorative and architectural uses.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4, and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the artisanal talavera ceramic-making processes have maintained a historical continuity that has turned the production of this type of ceramics into an identity symbol for Puebla and Tlaxcala in Mexico, and for Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo in Spain. In both Mexico and Spain, the relevant communities have actively participated in the nomination process.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.3.Although both submitting States presented comprehensive safeguarding measures, there were many problems associated with these measures. For example, the application of and mechanisms for validating designation of origin, the promotion of the concept of uniqueness and authenticity, which goes against the principles of the Convention, and there is undue focus on economic aspects rather than on safeguarding processes.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Artisanal talavera of Puebla and Tlaxcala (Mexico) and ceramics of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo (Spain) making process to the submitting States.
7. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that an amendment to the draft decision had been received and was supported by 19 countries, inviting Kuwait to present the amendment.
8. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body for its very constructive report, noting that this was one of the cases that would have benefitted from the dialogue process as it would have clarified many of the issues raised. Looking at the report of the Evaluation Body, the delegation was reminded of the intervention by Japan that spoke of how the use of the terms ‘authenticity’ and ‘uniqueness’ resulted in files being referred or rejected. However, neither in the file nor the report were ‘uniqueness’ or ‘authenticity’ mentioned. It did however mention the uniqueness of the tile in the sense that they are different from one another, rather than the process of making the tiles or ceramics. Each one is different because it is handmade by different artists. In this regard, the delegation asked Mexico or Spain to clarify these two points addressed by the Evaluation Body on the use of uniqueness or authenticity used in the file, as well as the commercialization of the process.
9. The **Chairperson** invited the submitting States to respond to the questions on authenticity, uniqueness and commercialization of the element.
10. The **delegation of Mexico** thanked Colombia and its authorities for their warm welcome, and the Government of Spain for the opportunity to speak in Spanish. It also thanked Kuwait and the Committee for the kindness in allowing Mexico to respond to the comments by the Evaluation Body on the nomination submitted with Spain. The delegation felt that these questions could have been dealt with through the dialogue mechanism had the opportunity been provided. With respect to the use of the terms ‘authenticity’ or ‘originality’, it was noted that at no point did the file mention or make any reference to these concepts. Rather, the file referred to specific individual pieces, as presented by Kuwait. The tradition is focused on the creativity of each craftsperson in the designs, forms and uses, adapting 16th century traditions to contemporary needs. In addition, the delegation believed that there had been a misinterpretation with regard to Mexico’s use of ‘designation of origin’, which was created in 1997 by the Mexican Government. Its main purpose was to protect the traditional knowledge and know-how of the craftspersons with respect to these types of ceramics. This took place at a time when there was a proliferation of damaging imitations, resulting in a loss of craftsmanship and the creation of unfair competition. The fact remained that this process focuses on craftspeople in workshops in Puebla and Tlaxcala, and reflects their important role. The experience documented in the file states that there are a number of initiatives that could protect these practices globally given the need to urgently protect these cultural practices threatened by others against the native peoples of Mexico; threats they have faced on many occasions over the years.
11. The **Chairperson** noted thefollowing Members wishing to speak, Guatemala, Armenia, Austria, Cuba, asking whether Mexico’s reply allayed their concerns, inviting Spain to speak.
12. The **delegation of Spain** echoed the comments made by Mexico, adding that had the Evaluation Body used the upstream dialogue process then these slight technical concerns might have been avoided. The delegation also noted that the Committee itself had recognized that participation was guaranteed by the bearer communities. Moreover, it was the bearer community of Spain that requested the Ministry of Culture to take up this file. Spain has many international files, and the Committee might also consider the importance of a nomination that brings together two continents for the first time in this Convention, i.e. Europe and Latin America. The designs [of the ceramics] have known many exchanges between the two continents and several generations have been practising this craft. There is an immense love placed by the artisans in their items. This expression is not just modelled clay, it expresses the love of the artisans of the smelt and baked clay representing an artisanal tradition that deserves inscription by the Committee for posterity.
13. The **delegation of Guatemala** was satisfied with the explanations given by Spain and Mexico. In its own analysis of the file, it agreed with inscription. The delegation explained that although some of the safeguarding measures concerned economic measures, such as tax reductions for the marketing of the ceramics or municipal taxes for activities linked to the practice, there were many other measures that concerned the preservation or the promotion of the element, i.e. the creation of schools for transmitting the practices, the organization of workshops, and information and capacity-training meetings. It was noted that the sustainable commercial activity of this element was of particular importance for its viability. Many families earn their living from this craft. With regard to community participation, the file clearly states the measures taken by the communities. For example, competitions between painters and potters, or the different literary and photographic competitions. Guatemala therefore considered that the file demonstrated the participation of the communities in the safeguarding plan. With regard to the denomination of origin, the delegation believed that this served more as a tool to protect the element, as indicated by Mexico. This is proved by the multinational scope of the nomination, which is not based on uniqueness or authenticity given the common measures but rather their different cultural and socio-economic realities, as explained by Mexico. The safeguarding measures will depend on those factors and be adapted to them.
14. The **Chairperson** suggestedto proceed to the adoption of the draft decision.
15. The **delegation of Austria** agreed that there was no question about the importance of the practise of this craft for the communities in Mexico and Spain. The Committee is not here to judge the element. The evaluation is based on the file and there were several issues identified in section 3. Regarding the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body, the point was not whether the concepts of authenticity and uniqueness are mentioned in the file, but rather that section 3 repeatedly referred to so-called ‘designation of origin’, which promotes the very concepts of authenticity and uniqueness if not ownership, and these clearly are against the principles of the Convention. This aspect needs to be fully understood and addressed by the States Parties. In addition, most of the safeguarding measures focused only on the economic aspects. Furthermore, what is most striking is that there are no joint safeguarding measures proposed through this multinational file. Instead, it appears as though they are two separate files claiming to be a multinational file. In view of these concerns, the delegation asked the submitting States to provide further explanations on the concept of ‘designation of origin’, what it implied and why there is such a strong focus on the economics of the element.
16. The **Chairperson** asked Spain and Mexico to specifically respond to Austria’s questions on the denomination of origin and its economic and commercial aspects.
17. The **delegation of Mexico** explained that the denomination of origin for the talavera ceramics was granted by the government precisely in order to guarantee the preservation of the artisanal processes. The denomination of origin had no commercial considerations and was created specifically because reproductions, imitations and unfair competition was affecting the Mexican craftspeople. The aim was to ensure that the process remained artisanal through the different workshops in Puebla and Tlaxcala, which had proved successful in preserving the traditional knowledge and the artisanal art techniques associated with these ceramics, which is the central focus of the nomination file.
18. The **delegation of Spain** reiterated Mexico’s arguments, remarking that Austria had asked about common safeguarding measures and yet such measures are not considered in the Operational Directives. Moreover, Austria had never enquired about common safeguarding measures in Spain’s other nominations including international elements, especially at a time when it is logical to implement specific safeguarding measures in line with the different realities in both continents. These are weak arguments that would have been resolved had the Evaluation Body applied the upstream process. In addition, the arguments and observations made by Austria are inconsistent given that this is the first time it had presented such an argument.
19. The **delegation of Armenia** co-sponsoredthe draft amendment and supported the inscription of the element. However, among the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body was the question concerning the lack of community participation in the implementation of the safeguarding measures. The delegation therefore asked the submitting States to share with the Committee their comments on this aspect.
20. The **delegation of Jamaica** commented on R.3 and the focus of some Committee Members on—what they consider—the undue stress in the economic aspect of the nomination file. The delegation reminded the Committee that sustainable livelihoods can be found within the context of the Convention and that the submitted file should be interpreted not with a focus on commercial value to the element but that it contributes to people’s livelihoods, which has been the case for some time. It therefore had no issue with that aspect, and on that basis, among others, it supported the inscription of the element.
21. The **delegation of Cuba** considered that the observations by the Evaluation Body regarding criterion R.3 had been allayed by the explanations given by Mexico and Spain. The nomination file mentioned community participation both in the draft of the file, as well as the implementation of the safeguarding measures. Therefore, participation by the bearer communities, associations of craftspeople as well as the regional and local governments, both in Mexico and Spain, through meetings, workshops, assemblies, letters and correspondence were seen throughout the file. With regard to the safeguarding mechanisms for intangible cultural heritage created by Mexico and the denomination of origin, the delegation felt that this explained how certain commercial aspects can in fact help to promote and better protect elements of intangible cultural heritage, not least because of cases of cultural appropriation by foreign companies. In such cases, the native cultures of Mexico had fallen victim on several occasions in recent years. Traditional artisanal techniques are the main means of subsistence for the craftspeople and their families, making the safeguarding of this heritage viable. Considering these aspects, and having heard from Mexico and Spain, the delegation believed that criterion R.3 was met and it supported the draft amendment presented by Kuwait to inscribe the element.
22. The **delegation of Colombia** also had a question regarding the denomination of origin, which Mexico had answered, adding that when the Evaluation Body made its recommendation, it did not take into account the Latin American context. When countries do not take protective measures, many of these manifestations of local artisans are lost. The purpose of the denomination of origin was to protect the craft, not to ensure its uniqueness or exceptionality. The delegation therefore fully concurred with Mexico’s explanations.
23. The **delegation of Austria** wished to respond to Spain’s comment regarding the consistency of Austria’s criticism on the question of joint safeguarding measures. The delegation was of the understanding that this was the first time—at least during Austria’s membership of the Committee—that the Evaluation Body had made the point of a lack of joint safeguarding mechanisms. Therefore, Austria had never been in a position to take up this criticism and highlight this point. The delegation specifically asked the States Parties to explain the concrete joint cooperation measures undertaken by the communities and the joint safeguarding measures that are envisaged.
24. The **delegation of Mexico** explained thatthe joint safeguarding measures were being established. Each country has their own measures, though in the near future there will be a join symposium where other possible safeguarding measures will be considered. It is a task that Mexico is committed to and will undertake.
25. The **delegation of Spain** emphasized that the value in the coordination of the work meant that the joint safeguarding measures were in fact the sum of two series of measures corresponding to each of the realities. The delegation asked Austria to specifically identify where in the Operational Directives joint measures are alluded to, as they simply do not exist. The measures are the sum of the two sets of safeguarding measures for the bearer communities in Mexico and the bearer communities in Spain. There are no past examples because examples have never arose. There is no article in the Operational Directives that insists on the presentation of joint safeguarding measures. Nevertheless, there had been meetings between the two submitting States and there will continue to be meetings to discuss the safeguarding measures, albeit they will correspond to each distinct reality.
26. The **Chairperson** noted a consensus and turned to the adoption of the draft decision.
27. The **delegation of Austria** did not wish to prolong the debate but the report of the Evaluation Body under R.3 specifically referred to ‘a lack of common safeguarding measures to support the multinational character of the file’. In its understanding, joint activities for safeguarding and cooperation was the whole point of a multinational file. Should Spain require further explanation why this was so, the delegation suggested that the Evaluation Body comment on the current practice of multinational files i.e. this was not something that Austria invented.
28. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained how this expression was included in the report on R.3. After a lengthy discussion on this issue, the Body agreed that inscription is not the end of safeguarding efforts and, particularly in multinational nominations, close communication and collaboration among the co-submitting States Parties would be expected. The spirit of multinational nominations is finding similarity in the element and working for better collaborative safeguarding efforts together. Some Evaluation Body members stated that this multinational nomination seemed to be putting together similar elements without working on further safeguarding measures. This was why the statement was included in the report. However, the Body was fully aware that it was presenting a recommendation and that the final decision on inscription or approval lay with the Committee.
29. The **Chairperson** returned to the adoption of the draft decision. Paragraphs 1 and 2 with no received amendments were duly adopted. Criterion R.3 in paragraph 2 had received an amendment [that the criterion was satisfied], which received broad support from the Committee, and with no objections it was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 as a whole was adopted as amended. Paragraph 4 ‘to inscribe’ was supported by 19 Committee Members and was duly adopted. Paragraph 5 [on commercialization] was adopted as amended. Paragraph 6 was deleted. Turning to the draft decision as whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.23**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.23) **adopted to inscribe Artisanal talavera of Puebla and Tlaxcala** **(Mexico) and ceramics of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo (Spain) making process on the Representative List**.
30. The **delegation of Mexico** thanked the Committee on behalf of the Government of Mexico, the Ministry of Culture and the National Institute for Anthropology and History for having satisfied the desires of the artisanal communities that bear this traditional knowledge in order to create the ceramics of Puebla and Tlaxcala. The ceramics are not only proof of Mexico’s cultural diversity, they are also the material representations of one of its markers of identity shared with other communities in Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo. Mexico reconfirmed its commitment to the safeguarding, preservation and promotion of Mexico’s intangible cultural heritage in close cooperation with the bearer communities and all stakeholders, as was clearly reflected in the methodology and the prior, informed consent.
31. The **delegation of Mexico** [second speaker – representative of the bearer community]warmly thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to attend this meeting. Artisanal talavera is a tradition that has roots in Islamic, Egyptian, Moroccan and Spanish traditions which came to Mexico to add to the history of this great country that is rich in culture and traditions. There are a number of buildings, churches and facades in Puebla that are decorated with talavera ceramics. This form of expression conveys feelings of pride, creativity, freedom and emotion that the craftspeople put into every piece. On behalf of the governments of Puebla and Tlaxcala, the communities wished to thank UNESCO for the recognition granted and to express their commitment to preserve this practice for future generations.
32. The **delegation of Spain** thanked the Members of the Committee for their cooperation in inscribing this special element, and to those who provided the amendments to clarify the doubts that have arisen. The delegation thanked Mexico for the joint work and excellent coordination, as well as the different communities who dedicate themselves to this craft.
33. The **delegation of Spain** [second speaker] represented by the president of the Association Tierras de Ceramica spoke of this historic day for the craftspeople and ceramicists of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo in Spain. These bearer communities – who have invested their hearts and souls to be here – were grateful for this recognition and opportunity to preserve and pursue their craft. Thanks went to the Committee for this recognition, and to Mexico for this great journey that opened up a path of cooperation between both bearer communities.
34. The **delegation of Spain** [third speaker] spoke of the pride of Talavera de la Reina and El Puente del Arzobispo, along with its Mexican brothers and sisters, of this shared history and traditions, reflected in its cultural diversity and living heritage represented by the ceramicists. They are excellent guardians and custodians of their trade, their lives and their history, a common history. This recognition provides tremendous help to guarantee the transmission of this craft to future generations. The delegation expressed thanks to Colombia for the wonderful welcome, and for the support received from the Member States and for its artisans.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the subsequent nomination file submitted by India.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Sowa-Rigpa, knowledge of healing or science of healing** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.14] submitted by **India**. Sowa-Rigpa, knowledge of healing or science of healing, is a traditional medical system of relevant communities. Since its introduction, the practice has been transmitted through teacher-student and family lineages. Sowa-Rigpa is a complete guide to leading a healthy life based on a harmony of body, mind, spirituality and cosmos. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4 and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Sowa-Rigpa is a culturally and socially accepted practice and community-supported healthcare system. Sowa-Rigpa, knowledge of healing or science of healing is a very good example of an element related to knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe. Efforts were made to include various stakeholders in the preparation of the nomination file. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.3. The Evaluation Body considered that, although the submitting State presents the element as a community practice closely bound to the rural environment, the safeguarding measures, which do not separate between past initiatives and proposed ones, concentrate on the institutionalization of Sowa-Rigpa without demonstrating its community practice. The Body further considered that a short question and answer process with the submitting State might clarify whether the nomination meets the criterion concerned. The Evaluation Body decided to initiate a dialogue process to obtain information on the following question: *In which ways will the proposed safeguarding measures address the safeguarding of the element as it is practised at the community level?* Answering the question, the submitting State provided clarification of how the communities will benefit from particular safeguarding measures carried out at the institutional level through education, budget allocation, and promotion of the practice.Examining the answer, the Evaluation Body considered that the answer adequately addressed the question, and that criterion R.3 could be considered satisfied.
3. Noting an amendment to the draft decision,the **Chairperson** invited Palestine to present the amendment.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** congratulated all the States Parties that inscribed their elements. With regard to the Sowa-Rigpa file, lengthy and hard consultations had taken place prior to the opening of the session. It was important to note that despite divergent opinions among the States Parties concerned, mutual respect was always present in the spirit of UNESCO. This encouraged Palestine to reach this proposal, which admittedly was not ideal for the States Parties concerned. Nevertheless, it thanked the States Parties concerned for their relative flexibility and spirit of cooperation, and it was glad to propose this middle ground language that should be acceptable to all Committee Members. It was not an ideal solution for all the States Parties but it was acceptable to all Committee members, who had been informed of the process, the evaluation and the outcome. This proposal should therefore save the Committee time from an unnecessary and lengthy debate, and the delegation asked that the Committee adopt the proposed amendment on the draft decision in its entirety without debate. It also asked the Chairperson to decline any interventions before its adoption. The proposed draft decision was shown on the screen. The floor would subsequently be opened to interventions by the Committee and the concerned States Parties. The delegation concluded by thanking all the Members who had helped in this process.
5. The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the amended draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.14**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.14) **adopted to refer Sowa-Rigpa, knowledge of healing or science of healing to the submitting State Party.**
6. The **delegation of India** thanked the Evaluation Body for its extremely commendable work, adding that it found the experience of the upstream dialogue process highly constructive. It welcomed the conclusion by the Evaluation Body that the Sowa-Rigpa, as practised in all the mentioned territories in the file, satisfied all five criteria for inscription. The file also complied with the purposes and objectives of the Convention. It therefore cannot but take note of the Committee’s decision to refer instead of inscribe the nomination with a certain disappointment. The delegation had worked hard, as mentioned by Palestine, with several Members of the Committee to arrive at a consensus language for the draft decision. Unfortunately, despite its best efforts, it could not find a language that was mutually agreed. Under the circumstances, and given the current draft language adopted by the Committee, it was not an ideal solution, as mentioned by Palestine, as it was unable to arrive at a mutually agreed text. The delegation reserved its rights as a State Party under the Convention to communicate its views on the matter as appropriate at a later stage. It requested that the present statement be reflected in the records.
7. The **delegation of China** invited the Vice-Minister of Culture and Tourism to speak, who gave his speech in Chinese, which was followed by interpretation in English.
8. The **delegation of China** welcomed the decision adopted by the Committee as amended in the spirit of dialogue and mutual respect through which the Committee maintains the spirit and integrity of the Convention. The delegation deeply appreciated the Committee Members, in particular, the delegations of Palestine and Japan, as well as the Secretariat for their great contribution in facilitating consensus through dialogue. China is gravely concerned by this nomination as it infringes upon the territorial sovereignty of China and Pakistan. It carefully studied the nomination file and found multiple references to territorially disputed areas along the China-India and India-Pakistan borders. Among the 74 letters of consent of the communities, 70 were from the communities in these disputed areas. The delegation also found the submitting State invited an irrelevant politician to this nomination to speak on its behalf. The China-India boundary has never been officially demarcated and Kashmir is an internationally recognized disputed area according to relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions. This nomination runs against the objectives of the Convention and breaches the provisions of the Convention, particularly Articles 11 and 12. It hinders mutual respect and dialogue among the communities concerned and politicizes the nomination mechanism. China is strongly opposed to any attempt to turn the 2003 Convention into a platform to resolve territorial disputes and political issues. It deeply appreciated the discretion of the Committee in dealing with nominations concerning disputed issues. The delegation joined hands with the Committee to continue its diligent work to further reflect and improve the listing mechanisms so as to ensure the healthy and sustainable development of the Convention. The delegation asked for Pakistan to be given the floor.
9. The **Chairperson** was unable to give the floor to Pakistan or India due to time constraints. She reminded the Committee of the Bureau meeting the following morning.
10. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates of side events taking place, including a UNESCO panel discussion on universities and intangible cultural heritage, challenges and opportunities in Latin America and the Caribbean held by the UNESCO Office Montevideo in collaboration with CRESPIAL, the general meeting of the ICH NGO Forum, a seminar on cultural tourism and intangible cultural heritage by the Heritage Directorate from the Ministry of Culture of Colombia, and a presentation on safeguarding measures of the intangible cultural heritage, territories and realities by the UNESCO Chair in transcultural musical studies.
11. The **Chairperson** adjourned the day’s session.

*[Thursday, 12 December 2019, morning session]*

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning to discuss the organization of the day’s work, noting that a total of 28 files were left to examine before the adoption of the overall Decision 14.COM 10 with only 15 files covered the previous day. The Committee was therefore asked to proceed at a greater pace, limiting the length of interventions. When an amendment is submitted with a long list of co-sponsors for example, only one Committee Member will take the floor to present the amendment. India had asked for the right of response concerning Decision 14.COM 10.b.14 and was invited to speak.
2. The **delegation of India** rejected the statement made by the delegation of China in the previous session. As regards to Sowa-Rigpa system of medicine (the subject of the nomination), the delegation stated categorically that Sowa-Rigpa is not solely owned by any one country. It is a collective intangible cultural heritage, including that of India, which has deep roots in its civilization. Contrary to observations made by the delegate, it is a globally recognized fact that the principle text of Sowa-Rigpa, Chatush Tantra itself has been translated from the Sanskrit Ashtanga Hridya, which has Indian roots. In fact, in 2018, an element by the same name [Lum medicinal bathing of Sowa Rigpa] was inscribed [on the Representative List by China]. Even though the system is practised by communities in India, India did not raise any objections because it genuinely believes that practices can be common across borders. The delegation also rejected the factually incorrect references to territorial disputed areas. It clearly affirmed and asserted that the territories mentioned in the nomination file are and will remain integral and inalienable parts of India and the dossier is fully compliant with Articles 11 and 12 of the Convention. All the communities mentioned in the file also live in the areas that are territories of India. The delegation completely rejected unwarranted and self-serving references by the Chinese delegation to Kashmir and India-Pakistan relations. The delegation stated categorically that the territories of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh are an integral part of India. Further, there was an attempt to bring in third parties into the discussion in complete disregard of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, which Members of the Committee are expected to know, abiding by its rules and not trying to use the Committee as a political platform. It has been the view that the file was ready to be inscribed and was referred to by the Committee in the previous session due only to extraneous reasons, which are not in keeping with the objectives and purposes of the Convention. In view of these developments, and in line with India’s previous intervention, the delegation reserved its right under the Convention to decide on acceptance or rejection of paragraph 7 of the decision. It also reserved the right to resubmit the same file for inscription at a later stage. It requested that this statement be reflected in the records. The delegation remained ready to respond further if required.
3. The **delegation of China** reiterated its remarks that a nomination file should be based on dialogue and mutual respect, and it requested that the floor be given to Pakistan.
4. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Pakistan.
5. The **delegation of Pakistan** thanked the people and the Government of Colombia for their warm hospitality and excellent arrangements of the session. Pakistan was fully aware of the framework of the Convention and attached great importance to its work on the protection of living heritage. It was particularly grateful to Palestine and Japan for their sincere efforts in bringing about a consensus. Pakistan expressed its deep appreciation for the understanding shown by the Committee Members on the nomination file of Sowa-Rigpa. This file contained many references to Sowa-Rigpa practised in areas that are part of Jammu and Kashmir, which is an internationally recognized disputed territory and is the subject of over a dozen United Nations Security Council Resolutions. The principles of territory are specifically mentioned in Articles 11, 12 and 13 of the Convention as well as related criterion in R.5, which requires that the element is included in an inventory of intangible cultural heritage present in the territory of the submitting State, as defined in Articles 11 and 12. As previously mentioned, there are various United Nations Security Council Resolutions that call for the final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir disputes. Pakistanfully realised that the Committee did not have a mandate to pronounce on territorial disputes, but at the same time it is the responsibility of States Parties to refrain from using this platform to legitimize their illegal control over a disputed territory. The delegation was glad that Members of the Committee took into account this very important point, as well as the technical and legal considerations in the evaluation of this file, referring it to the submitting State Party. It was hoped that the file will be deferred until the determination of Jammu and Kashmir status as per UN Security Council Resolutions.
6. The **Chairperson** then turned to the next nomination file submitted by Indonesia.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Pencak Silat** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.15] submitted by **Indonesia.** Pencak Silat is a traditional martial art practice that encompasses aspects of physical, mental and spiritual health, and aesthetics. Its practitioners are taught to maintain their relationship with God, human beings and nature, and trained to defend themselves and others.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Pencak Silat fosters community integration and social cohesion within communities and promotes traditional games as a form of intangible cultural heritage. Safeguarding measures to ensure the viability of the element includes research activities and the inclusion of Pencak Silat in school curricula. The file was also prepared with active participation of the relevant practitioners and local communities, including the Pencak Silat schools. The 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 Pencak Silat on the Representative List.
8. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.15**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.15) **adopted to inscribe Pencak Silat** **on the Representative List**.
9. The **delegation of Indonesia** thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe Pencak Silat on the Representative List. This inscription marked its tenth element on the List, which was welcomed with great pleasure. Although better known worldwide as a type of martial arts, Pencak Silat is actually an ancient tradition that has been transmitted over many generations. The term Pencak is better known in Java, while the term Silat or Silek is better known in West Sumatra. In addition to using local terms, each region has their own move, style, accompanying music, and unique supporting equipment. The successful nomination resulted from excellent collaboration and participation of all Pencak Silat stakeholders, practitioners and local communities from all 34 provinces of Indonesia, as well as central and local governments. The inscription of Pencak Silat will trigger more efforts to safeguard this intangible cultural heritage and give the Government a platform to include Pencak Silat as national cultural heritage into the curriculum of academic schools, not only as part of physical education but also as a course under the arts and culture category. Pencak Silat will also become a source of identity and creativity. It is the DNA of the new creative economy. With effective nurturing, creativity improves the human sense of development and constitutes the key ingredient for job creation and tourism, crafts, music, cinema and creative industries. The delegation took note of the two points underlined in the recommendation for future nomination files, respectively on the form of consent letters and the importance of updating the inventorying process; important aspects when submitting a nomination and also the periodic report. The delegation realized that successful inscriptions mark the beginning of the real hard work of safeguarding measures. It concluded by thanking the Government of Colombia for the preparation of the session and the people of Colombia for their hospitality.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Provision of services and hospitality during the Arba’in visitation** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.17] submitted by **Iraq**. Provision of services and hospitality during the Arba’in visitation is a social practice performed across the central and southern regions of Iraq from where processions of visitors and pilgrims converge towards the Holy City of Karbala. The tradition is an immense display of charity through volunteering and social mobilization, and considered to be a defining element of Iraq’s cultural identity.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the proposed safeguarding measures are well-conceived and coherent with the importance of the element. They provide a logical continuation of the measures undertaken by the communities concerned and the State Party, and cover different goals centred on ensuring the viability of the provision of services and hospitality during the Arba’in visitation. Relevant communities participated in the nomination process at various stages.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Provision of services and hospitality during the Arba’in visitation on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.17**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.17) **adopted to inscribe Provision of services and hospitality during the Arba’in visitation on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Iraq** expressed appreciation to Colombia for hosting this fourteenth session and for the facilities that enabled it to attend. On behalf of Iraq and the Iraqi practitioners of the element, the delegation extended sincere thanks and gratitude to the Chairperson, the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the inscription of the most important and popular social rituals in which the majority of Iraqi communities meet together to practice, irrespective of their different ethnic and religious orientations.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Irish harping** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.18] submitted by **Ireland**. Irish harping is at the heart of the identity of the people of the island of Ireland. The harp is Ireland’s national symbol and has been played for more than 1,000 years. While some men and boys play the harp, women and girls are the primary practitioners.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Irish harping is performed during state occasions, at concerts, weddings, funeral ceremonies, and in almost all celebrations and gatherings in Ireland, connecting people and communities at times of heightened emotions. The proposed safeguarding measures would sustain and promote the element. Irish harping was nominated based on consent from individual bearers and their communities, the wider Irish society, artists and state representatives.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Irish harping on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.18**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.18) **adopted to inscribe Irish harping on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Ireland** expressed deep gratitude for this important recognition of Irish harping. The harp has been played in Ireland for over 1,000 years. Through periods of change in Ireland, the teaching and playing of the Irish harp was maintained through a strong oral tradition that was passed through the generations over many centuries. In the past 60 years, the practice, teaching, interpretation and craftsmanship of Irish harping has flourished to the point where today there are more people than ever learning, playing and listening to the wonderful repertoire of Irish harp music both in Ireland and around the world. Indeed, so deep is the connection between Irish harping and Ireland that the harp is the national symbol of Ireland. It is the main element on the seals of office of Ireland’s president and all government ministers and offices. For the past 500 years, the harp is featured on all coins minted in Ireland. Today’s inscription on the Representative List reinforces and draws greater attention to such a key element of Ireland’s national identity and to the importance of appreciating and safeguarding its intangible cultural heritage. The delegation also recognized that it would not be in this room today if it were not for the generation of previous and current harpers who through their love of Irish harping have ensured its preservation and evolution. It paid tribute to the harpers within Ireland and their many supporters who were central to the nomination process, which is a proud and emotional day for them. The delegation concluded by thanking the Chairperson for the wonderful hospitality in Colombia.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Celestinian forgiveness celebration** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.19] submitted by **Italy**. The Celestinian forgiveness celebration was inspired by Pope Celestine V who issued a historical ‘Bull’ as an act of partnership among local populations. Taking place in the city and province of L’Aquila, the tradition comprises a set of rituals and celebrations transmitted uninterruptedly since 1294. The practice conveys a sense of continuity and cultural identity for the whole community. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the element strengthens the communication and relationships between generations and creates an intense emotional and cultural engagement. The proposed safeguarding measures for the Celestinian forgiveness celebration have been well-formulated with the communities concerned who were at the core of their design and will play a central role in their implementation. The Body commended the State Party for acknowledging the possible negative impacts of tourism by proposing creative safeguarding measures to prevent such threats and welcomed its initiative to adopt a code of behaviour addressed to tourists and attendees to respect the practice. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Celestinian forgiveness celebration on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.19**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.19) **adopted to inscribe Celestinian forgiveness celebration** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Italy** remarked that the celebration of the Celestinian forgiveness is a symbol of cohesion and social inclusion that has its roots in the first jubilee in history, celebrated in the third century. The delegation thanked the members of the Evaluation Body and the Committee for recognizing the values of this tradition, which celebrates an act of reconciliation and peace. The traditional practices of forgiveness represent a legacy that has been transmitted continuously for centuries, an expression of cultural identity, and the values ​of sharing, hospitality and brotherhood. This inscription also celebrates the strength and values ​​of intangible heritage in emergencies. The L’Aquila community, even when struck by the 2009 earthquake, was able to safeguard this element of unity and resilience. The delegation’s thoughts were with all the communities of L'Aquila who were now celebrating. Today’s inscription was thus an important step in a journey that aims to preserve and promote a living heritage. The delegation read out a message received from the community of L’Aquila, which read, ‘The Committee of Great Forgiveness as well as all the citizens of L’Aquila and the Abruzzo communities in Italy expresses a special gratitude to UNESCO for having inscribed this celebration on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The L’Aquila community, guardian of this annual rite of reconciliation, has survived the centuries, while maintaining a tradition of peace from generation to generation. Today, thanks to UNESCO, the renewed dimension of an open and united life of peace finds its full recognition. Through Celestinian forgiveness, recognized by UNESCO, we ideally welcome all communities committed to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage’.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Ak-kalpak craftsmanship, traditional knowledge and skills in making and wearing Kyrgyz men’s headwear** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.20] submitted by **Kyrgyzstan.** The Ak-kalpak is a traditional male hat made with white felt, which bears deep sacral meanings. Ak-kalpak craftsmanship is a cumulative, ever-evolving body of knowledge and skills passed down by craftswomen in the communities concerned comprising felting, cutting and sewing and pattern embroidery.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the social dimension of Ak-kalpak has an integrating nature as it establishes ties between different Kyrgyz tribes and communities, men of different ages, education and status, and women engaged in craftsmanship. The proposed measures were defined with the participation of the Ak-kalpak craftswomen community and representatives of the Craftsmanship Council, and the State Party is committed to supporting them financially.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Ak-kalpak craftsmanship, traditional knowledge and skills in making and wearing Kyrgyz men’s headwear on the Representative List.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.20**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.20) **adopted to inscribe Ak-kalpak craftsmanship, traditional knowledge and skills in making and wearing Kyrgyz men’s headwear** **on the Representative List**.
6. The **delegation of Kyrgyzstan** expressed gratitude to the Government of Colombia for its warm welcome and hospitality. The Kyrgyz Republic greatly appreciated the support of all Members of the Committee and the Evaluation Body. It praised the efforts of the Secretariat in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and promoting the integration of intangible cultural heritage into formal and non-formal education programmes. Kyrgyzstan’s experience shows that the integration of an element of intangible cultural heritage into education programmes is a reliable tool for enriching educational programmes, as well as for transmitting intangible cultural heritage from generation to generation. Ak-kalpak craftsmanship is a centuries’ old practice of the Kyrgyz people, which is surviving and evolving. This practice is safeguarded by the Ak-kalpak craftswomen and transmitted both in traditional ways, as well as through the integration of this craft in the curriculum in the relevant formal education institutions. The shape of Ak-kalpak symbolizes the snow-capped mountains of Kyrgyzstan. The embroidered patterns reflect the admiration of local flora and fauna, and the diversity of colours highlights the diversity and wealth of Kyrgyz culture. Ak-kalpak is a microcosm of local people’s interaction with the environment and the practice of it highlights the links between traditional livelihoods, world views and living heritage. Ak-kalpak craftsmanship is a co-element of cultural identity and contributes to building a shared sustainable future. For example, making Ak-kalpak requires good quality sheep wool which requires sustainable pasture management achieved through traditional herding practices, such as seasonal migration in tune with natural cycles. Felt headwear is often worn for decades, thus serving as an example of sustainability. Today all Ak-kalpak practitioners and craftspeople throughout the country share the joy in witnessing the element inscribed on the Representative List. For the people of the Kyrgyz Republic, this inscription means a lot and will boost safeguarding measures. The delegation thanked all the parties and communities involved in safeguarding and promoting intangible cultural heritage, adding that it was extremely happy to share this moment of celebrating the cultural diversity of humankind.
7. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Fone Lam Vong Lao (lamvonglao) (lamvong)** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.21] submitted by **Lao People’s Democratic Republic**. Initially started as a simple dance performed around a central bale of rice to celebrate harvest time, Fone Lam Vong Lao has evolved over time into the fine stylistic dance featured in all national events as a symbol of ancient and popular culture.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 and R.3 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Fone Lam Vong Lao promotes social cohesion and strengthens continuity in Lao society through its messages associated with healthy life and security. Various safeguarding measures are proposed including training activities, research, documentation and the promotion of the element.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2, R.4 and R.5.The file failed to demonstrate how the inscription could contribute to raising awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general and focuses mainly on increasing the visibility of the element itself. Although the element is national in scope, only four letters of consent were provided, without any evidence or clear description of community participation in the nomination process. Furthermore, information related to the inventory was missing, such as the name of the inventory, its updating mechanism or the name of the institution in charge of updating. Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Fone Lam Vong Lao (lamvonglao) (lamvong ) to the submitting State.
8. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.21**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.21) **adopted to refer** **Fone Lam Vong Lao (lamvonglao) (lamvong) to the submitting State**.

*[The delegation of Lao People’s Democratic Republic was absent]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Silat** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.22] submitted by **Malaysia**.Silat is a combative art of self-defence and survival rooted in the Malay Archipelago. Traced back to the early days of the Langkasuka Kingdom, Silat has evolved into a fine practice of physical and spiritual training also encompassing traditional Malay attire, Silat musical instruments and customs.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.4 and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Silat portrays Malay identity and is a medium of exhibiting social interaction among communities. The nomination of Silat was carried out with the participation of the practitioners and communities and associations concerned. Silat was included in an inventory of intangible heritage in 2008 and declared as national heritage in 2009.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.3.The nomination mainly focuses on how the inscription would help enhance the visibility of the element itself. The proposed safeguarding measures do not include the participation of the communities either in the planning or the implementation stage. The nomination file only states that they will be consulted during this process, but without their active participation.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Silat to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that an amendment to the draft decision had been receivedon behalf of 8 Committee Members, inviting the Philippines to present the amendment.
3. The **delegation of the Philippines** noted,as with the majority of files that received referral recommendations, that the State Party had difficulty in providing a clear answer on how the inscription of Silat would contribute to the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. As previously conveyed, the delegation supported the review and reformulation of criterion R.2 and its corresponding questions in the nomination form. Notwithstanding this aspect, having conducted an in-depth review of the file, the delegation was of the opinion that the nomination file in fact provides adequate information on the contribution of the element in raising visibility and awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general. Section 2(i) and (ii) of the file indicate that intangible cultural heritage associated with the element, such as attire and oral traditions, would be positively impacted. Inscription would also raise awareness of traditional music, dances and other performing arts, and even film at local, national and international levels. Furthermore, inscription of the element would clearly promote dialogue among communities, groups and individuals, and promote cultural diversity. It could also be seen from the answers provided in sections 1, 4 and 3 that the element is indeed exhibiting social interaction among communities, and transcends various cultural and ethnic boundaries. It is also a vehicle for international dialogue and cooperation. Hence, from the information provided, the file fulfilled criterion R.2. As mentioned throughout the nomination file, especially in section 3.b. the communities were represented with the National Silat Federation (Persekutuan Silat Kebangsaan Malaysia–PESAKA) and the Malaysian Society of Malay World Arts of Silat (Dunia Seni Silat Melayu Malaysia–DSSM). These organizations are continuously involved in all the planning and implementation stages of safeguarding measures for Silat. In addition, the State Party suggested the establishment of more training centres to ensure the transmission of the element. The delegation asked that the State Party further comment on the observations of the Evaluation Body on criteria R.2 and R.3.
4. The **delegation of Malaysia** began by congratulating the Government of Colombia on hosting the session and for its great hospitality. Malaysia took full note of the report of the Evaluation Body on its nomination file. In this regard, it wished to clarify the criteria R.2 and R.3. For the R.2 criterion, the definition of Silat is clearly stated in the nomination file, which has evolved to become a part of a social and cultural tradition with the appearance of physical and spiritual training. Regarding the definition of Malay Silat, specifically under two related domains (performing arts and knowledge concerning the nature and the universe), it was stated in section 1.a. of the nomination file that the inscription of Silat is closely attached to Silat attire (the Malay traditional attire), and the oral tradition, as well as Malay traditional weapons, represented by traditional craftsmanship, and traditional Malay music. The statement answers the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general by these elements. Concerning criterion R.3, as stated in the nomination file section 3.b. (i), the communities are represented by the two main bodies, the National Silat Federation (Persekutuan Silat Kebangsaan Malaysia–PESAKA) and the Malaysian Society of Malay World Arts of Silat (Dunia Seni Silat Melayu Malaysia–DSSM). These bodies continuously conduct programme activities, providing information on Silat in the form of videos and printed materials, and references to the communities and martial arts practitioners through research by various universities, institutions and independent researchers that recount and describe the values, ethics, norms, restrictions and philosophy, and defines the meaning and interpretation in every one of its movements. Other related research focuses on the relationship between master and disciple. These measures ensure the viability of Silat in the future and that negative impacts would be addressed and countered. Furthermore, the delegation found some misinterpretations by the Evaluation Body, which stated that community involvement would be consulted but without their active participation. In fact, the safeguarding measures of the Silat community will be clearly consulted from time to time under the close supervision of PESAKA and DSSM, as stated in the file. Moreover, in the nomination file in section 3.b.(ii), it was clearly stated that the community of Malay Silat established a training centre and, in 2018, the Government of Malaysia decided to spend 130M RM to have a complex of Silat.
5. The **delegation of Poland** noted theconcerns of the Evaluation Body and the statement from the Philippines, and wished to ask Malaysia how it planned to provide measures to counter the possible negative impacts of the inscription of the element.
6. Having listened to the clarifications, the **delegation of Senegal** proposed to align with the very clear and pertinent intervention by the State Party that addressed the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body, and supported the amendment by the Philippines.
7. The **delegation of Palestine** concurred with Senegal and proposed – for the sake of time – to go directly to the draft decision as amended given the satisfactory explanations provided.
8. The **Chairperson** sought the agreement of the other Members.
9. The **delegation of the Netherlands** asked that the Evaluation Body be given the opportunity to react to the answer provided by the State Party before going to the draft decision.
10. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** explained thatapart of the Evaluation Body’s report referred to shared heritage and the Body had spent a long time evaluating this particular file. It found that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.3 because it strictly bases its evaluation on the contents of the nomination file. Of course, there are expressions that can be understood as satisfactory for R.2 or R.3, for example in enhancing the visibility and awareness of certain intangible cultural heritage. However, the Operational Directives and the form clearly state that it is about enhancing the visibility and awareness of intangible heritage in general, and therefore the Body found R.2 unsatisfactory. As for R.3, there were references to local organizations and communities, but after a lengthy discussion, the Body reached consensus that although the organizations and communities had been consulted and had opportunities to express their views, they did not take active roles or initiatives in either planning or implementing the safeguarding measures.
11. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body for the explanation.
12. For the sake of transparency, the **delegation of Poland** wished to hear Malaysia’s answer.
13. The **delegation of Malaysia** remarked thatfor any elements inscribed on the national list, a management plan and monitoring efforts have to be established to identify and overcome any negative impacts that may arise by prescribing guidelines and procedures, as stipulated in section 124F of the National Heritage Act 2005 of Malaysia.
14. The **delegation of Poland** was satisfied with the answer provided.
15. The **Chairperson** then turned to theadoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis.Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Criterion R.1 in paragraph 2 was also adopted.Criteria R.2 and R.3 received amendments [that the criteria are satisfied], which was supported by the **Philippines, Kazakhstan, Djibouti, Mauritius, Togo, Zambia, Kuwait, Palestine, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Senegal, Poland, Sri Lanka, Cuba, Lebanon, Zambia, Armenia, Jamaica, Cameroon, Japan** and **China,** which were duly adopted. Criteria R.4 and R.5 were also adopted. Paragraph 2 was adopted as a whole. Paragraph 3 was consequently amended to inscribe Silat, which was supported by the Committee Members previously cited. Paragraph 4 was also adopted as amended [Encourages the State Party, when submitting nomination files in the future, to endeavour to answer specific questions in a clear and succinct manner].
16. The **delegation of the Netherlands** proposed an amendment in paragraph 5, which would read, ‘urge the submitting States Parties to ensure that the safeguarding measures include the active participation of the communities in the planning and the implementation stage and to develop clear measures to prevent the possible negative impacts of the inscription of the element’.
17. The **Chairperson** asked whether there was support for the new amendment in paragraph 5.
18. Thedelegations of **Sri Lanka, Zambia** and **Togo** expressed support.
19. The **delegation of Jamaica** supported the amendment by the Netherlands, but suggested to replace ‘urges’ with ‘encourages’.
20. The **delegation of the Netherlands** agreed with the change in wording.
21. The **delegation of Austria** supported the amendment by the Netherlands and amended by Jamaica.
22. The **delegation of Zambia** also supported the amendments made by the Netherlands and Jamaica, and suggested ‘guidelines’ in place of ‘measures’ in paragraph 5.
23. The **delegation of Lebanon** also supported the amendment by the Netherlands.
24. The **delegation of Guatemala** also supported the amendments made by the Netherlands and Jamaica.
25. The **delegation of Senegal** also agreed, but noted an error in the wording of the French version, which was duly corrected.
26. The **delegation of the Philippines** agreed with the amendments.
27. The **Chairperson** therefore pronounced paragraph 5 adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.22**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.22) **adopted to inscribe Silat on the Representative List**.
28. The **delegation of Malaysia** spoke onbehalf of the Government of Malaysia and the Ministry of Tourism, Arts and Culture to thank the Committee, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for their excellent work in ensuring the smooth running of the meeting. This is a significant decision for Malaysia as it is the second inscription of intangible cultural heritage after ratification of the Convention in 2013. To date, Malaysia has three elements under the Convention, namely Mak Young theatre, inscribed in 2008, Dondang Sayang in 2018, and now Silat. Silat is a combative art of self-defence and survival rooted in the Malay Archipelago. It was traced back to the early days of the Langkasuka Kingdom until the reign of the Malacca Sultanate era (13th century). Silat has now evolved to become part of the social culture and tradition with physical and spiritual training. There are many styles of Silat, inspired by movements of human anatomy, nature and animals, in which the name of Silat is known. Silat fosters agility, skill, thoughtfulness, strategy, boldness, confidence, diligence, creativity and courteousness. In Malaysia alone, there are more than 150 known Silat styles. The delegation invited all Member States to come to Malaysia to witness the martial art performance presented widely by the communities at various events. Inscription is just the beginning and Malaysia was committed to safeguarding and implementing the safeguarding plans. It looked forward to having good cooperation and would be ready to work closely with all Member States in areas of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage throughout the world.
29. The **delegation of Malaysia** [second speaker], representing the Silat community,thanked the Committee for the inscription of Silat and all the Members who offered their support.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.25] submitted by **Montenegro.** Boka Navy, a traditional maritime organization, encompasses a series of activities, practices and rituals associated with bringing the remains of St. Tryphon to Kotor, dating back to 809, in which seafarers played a significant role. On these days, together with citizens, traditional festivities are practised on the streets and squares of the different locations. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criterion R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Boka Navy was included in the Register of Cultural Properties of Montenegro (Book of Intangible Cultural Properties of the Register) in 2013. The Administration for the Protection of Cultural Properties is the body responsible for maintaining the inventory. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.1, R.2, R.3, and R.4. The Evaluation Body found that the file did not provide a clear description of the element. Many activities, practices and rituals are mentioned, but without any information about their nature, social functions and cultural meanings. The file focused on the visibility and awareness of the element itself, pointing out the values of Boka Navy in connection with identity at the local level. The proposed safeguarding measures lacked the measures directed at the possible threats mentioned as a result of tourism. The file did not provide any information about the mechanisms and methodology of the work with the communities involved with Boka Navy.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization to the submitting State.
2. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Palestine.
3. The **delegation of Palestine** recalled that the Evaluation Body evaluates the information contained in the file not the element itself, and it was found that the information did not satisfy the criteria. It therefore suggested to adopt the draft decision as a whole, unless any Members wished to intervene, and allow the State Party to respond.
4. The **delegation of Colombia** agreed with Palestine, that the floor should be given to Montenegro at the proper time, indicated by the Chairperson.
5. The **delegation of the Philippines** supported the comments by Colombia and Palestine to have a debate on the element without amending the draft decision.
6. The **delegation of Cuba** also wished tohear from Montenegro.
7. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Montenegro.
8. The **delegation of Montenegro** wished to emphasize once again the importance of the very first nomination for Montenegro on the Representative List, Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization. Montenegro is a country that pays significant attention to the Convention. The local community concerned appreciated the conclusion of the Evaluation Body, which recognized the importance of Boka Navy and opened the possibility for its inscription on the Representative List in the future. Montenegrin cultural policies are in accordance with UNESCO Conventions and other standards. For Montenegro, the List is not a platform for competition, and the local communities are not objects but subjects of intensive cooperation. Having said that, the delegation will carefully follow the recommendations of the Evaluation Body and improve the file in order to submit it at the next cycle. It was convinced that the Boka Navy, which cherishes the values of humanity for 12 centuries with its multi-culture and multi-ethnicity, will enrich intangible cultural heritage worldwide once inscribed. For exactly that reason, the delegation remained open to those who cherish the same values. It thanked Colombia for organizing this wonderful event in Bogotá with its real sense of cultural diversity.
9. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.25**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.25) **adopted to refer Boka Navy, traditional maritime organization to the submitting State**.
10. The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination file, inviting Palestine to speak**.**
11. The **delegation of Palestine** recalled that it had requested the Bureau to postpone the nomination file submitted by Morocco until the afternoon session.
12. The **Chairperson** remarked that a request had been received to examine the nomination file in the present session.
13. The **delegation of Palestine** confirmed that this was in fact an error.
14. The **Chairperson** thus turned instead to the nomination file submitted by Nigeria.
15. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Kwagh-Hir theatrical performance** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.27] submitted by **Nigeria**.Kwagh-Hir theatrical performance is a composite art form encompassing a spectacle that is both visually stimulating and culturally edifying. As a form of total theatre, Kwagh-hir incorporates puppetry, masquerading, poetry, music, dance and animated narratives in articulating the reality of the Tiv people.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Kwagh-hir as a form of total theatre which serves as an effective cultural and traditional mechanism for transmitting values and norms to the community. Due to the regular presentation of the element at national festivals, its inscription may raise awareness of intangible cultural heritage both in connection with the element and beyond.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.3 and R.4.The Body considered that safeguarding measures were not proposed to counter the possible impacts of the inscription on the viability of the element. The complexity of the community behind the nomination process and their active participation in it therefore needed to be clarified.The Body further considered that a short question and answer process on criteria R.3 and R.4 with the submitting State might clarify whether the nomination meets the criteria concerned. The Evaluation Body decided, pursuant to Decision 13.COM 10, to initiate a dialogue process in order to obtain information on the following questions:R.3: *What kind of measures will be taken in order to ensure that the viability of the element will not be jeopardized?* For example, how will the safeguarding measures prevent the potential decontextualization of the element as a result of increased tourism?R.4: *Taking into account that many communities other than the Gboko community are concerned with the element, how did these other communities (Makurdi, Adikpo, Katsina-Ala, Zaki Biam, Konshisha, Vandeikya and Tarka) participate in the nomination process?*In answers to the two questions, the submitting State stressed how performances and contests held at the local level have traditionally been the way of safeguarding the element. The Evaluation Body considered that if this level of safeguarding is prioritized, the opening up of the tradition to a new public, as described in the proposed safeguarding measures, should not jeopardize the element. The submitting State also demonstrated that the Gboko community was selected by all the communities concerned to be their focal point for the nomination process. Upon examining the information provided by the submitting State, the Evaluation Body considered that it adequately addressed the questions, and that criteria R.3 and R.4 were satisfied.
16. The **delegation of Palestine** noted the positive outcome of the upstream dialogue process once again, and it thanked the Evaluation Body, while formally requesting to close the debate and move directly to the adoption of the draft decision as whole with Option 2: inscription.
17. The **Chairperson** noted the general agreement of the proposal.
18. Thedelegations of **Senegal** and **Zambia** supported the proposal.
19. With no objections, and turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.27**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.27) **adopted to inscribe Kwagh-Hir theatrical performance** **on the Representative List**.
20. The **delegation of Nigeria** spoke on behalf of the Gboko people of Benue State in Nigeria and the Tiv bearers of the Kwagh-Hir theatrical performance to express profound gratitude to UNESCO on the inscription of Kwagh-Hir theatrical performance on the Representative List. This inscription represents a high point in the history of culture in Nigeria with one of its cherished elements now accorded international recognition. The delegation thanked members of the Bureau who supported its nomination and the hard-working Evaluation Body for a job well done. The delegation also appreciated the Minister of Information and Culture, Mr Lai Mohammed, for his support, demonstrating the importance attached to culture by the President Muhammadu Buhari. The delegation acknowledged the contributions of colleagues from the Federal Ministry of Information and Culture and the National Institute for Cultural Orientation in putting together the nomination file. The delegation then spoke of the wonderful hospitality of the Colombian people and congratulated the Chairperson on her conduct of the session. The delegation concluded by acknowledging the work of Prof. Gowon Ama Doki and invited the Rt. Hon. Ngunan Addingi, the Commissioner for Culture and Tourism of the Benue State, the home state of the bearers of this inscribed element, to say a few words.
21. The **delegation of Nigeria** [second speaker] Ms Ngunan Addingi spoke on behalf of the Benue State government and the Kwagh-Hir theatrical group to express gratitude and thanks to UNESCO for this international recognition. The Kwagh-Hir theatrical group will truly be preserved by stimulating the younger generation to find creative use of this art, and to secure the future by taking deliberate steps to guarantee a sustainable cultural integration through continuous Kwagh-Hir activities to promote and mitigate the threat of disappearance. Thanks also went to the governor of Benue State and congratulations to Benue State and Nigeria.

*[The Vice-Chairperson of Austria presided over the following session]*

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the nomination, Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing) submitted by Norway, inviting the Evaluation Body to present the file.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing)** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.28] submitted by **Norway**. The practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing) includes traditional dance and music, interwoven in the social context. Setesdal can be traced back to the 18th century and has enjoyed continuous transmission. It is constantly evolving with new song texts being made for traditional ‘stev’ tunes and new composed tunes. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the element provides both practitioners and the community as a whole with a strong sense of identity and pride. A large number of safeguarding measures have been undertaken and they ensure the viability of the element, especially with the initiatives taken by the communities. Local communities of the Setesdal valley, and particularly the NGO Setesdal spelemannslag, actively participated in the nomination process. The Evaluation Body encouraged the State Party, when submitting nomination files in the future, to avoid standardized consent letters.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing) on the Representative List.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.28**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.28) **adopted to inscribe Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing (stev/stevjing)** **on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Norway** expressed warm thanks to Colombia for hosting this meeting, and sincere gratitude to the Committee and to the Evaluation Body for accepting and including its nomination file, the Practice of traditional music and dance in Setesdal, playing, dancing and singing, on the Representative List. It was a great honour for Norway and a big day for Norway. It was especially happy and proud because this is the first Norwegian inscription on the Representative List. For the community involved, this acknowledgement is of great importance. The community had been working hard in order to safeguard and develop traditional music and dance in Setesdal. This is very much a living inclusive tradition involving the whole community across generations, which also involves people who are new in the community, and it is an element practised in many different arenas, such as schools, cultural houses, pubs and many other public and private venues. The inscription is a significant credit for the local community, municipality and county, which have all actively supported and promoted this work. However, this is also a significant recognition for everyone working in traditional music and dance throughout Norway, and in other Nordic countries. The preparation of the inscription was built over many years with determination and effort in the Setesdal community in order to keep the tradition alive and relevant. Their efforts with practitioners have also led to increasing awareness of the importance of involving the wider local community. It was the delegation’s understanding that the preparation of this inscription further enhanced this work. It was hoped and believed that this will inspire people, practitioners, communities and governments to safeguard intangible heritage worldwide.

*[A live performance of the traditional music in Setesdal]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Hatajo de Negritos’ and ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ from the Peruvian south-central coastline** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.29] submitted by **Peru**.Hatajo de Negritos’ and the ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ from the Peruvian south-central coastline are two complementary expressions featuring music and singing as part of Christmas celebrations, hailing from the central department of Ica in Peru. The expressions are biblical representations of the story of the visit of a group of shepherds to the new-born baby Jesus and the arrival of the Wise Men.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the ‘Hatajo de Negritos’ and the ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ are important representations of the mestizo and afro-descendant identity of the region. The viability of the element is ensured by certain families and members of the communities who organize the dance groups and provide them with areas for rehearsals in the months before Christmas. During the nomination process, many associations and municipalities actively participated in drafting the file and provided their free, prior and informed consent.The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for submitting an exemplary nomination, in particular in relation to the safeguarding measures.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe ‘Hatajo de Negritos’ and ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ from the Peruvian south-central coastline on the Representative List.
2. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.29**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.29) **adopted to inscribe Hatajo de Negritos’ and ‘Hatajo de Pallitas’ from the Peruvian south-central coastline** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Peru** thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for acknowledging the Hatajo de Negritos and Hatajo de Pallitas by inscribing the element on the Representative List. These artistic, musical and dance festivities are a big part of family and community life and an essential element on the intangible cultural heritage landscape of Peru. Two dancers were present and pleased to take part in the meeting. The delegation was very aware that this kind of element contributes to the recognition of longstanding traditions, adding that it would submit its reports in 2020 or 2024 so that its experience could be shared. It was also grateful to the Regional Directorate for its work on intangible cultural heritage, as well as CRESPIAL for all its hard work behind the scenes in preparing this nomination file.
4. The **delegation of Peru** [second speaker]spoke on behalfof the Minister of Culture who was unfortunately unable to attend to reaffirm Peru’s commitment to safeguarding its intangible cultural heritage, as well as regional and local customs. This element and its inscription on the Representative List was the fruit of two years’ work on the part of the Ica, working hand-in-hand with the Ministry of Culture that had prepared this file for the first time in 2016. All the families who year after year had organized the groups, events and their practice spaces also reaffirmed the importance of this element to their culture and identity, which is a testimony to their commitment to the music and dances to protect their heritage. It was also noted that this was the first Afro-Peruvian element inscribed, which attested to the community’s ability to express their identity and longstanding history of dance.
5. The **delegation of Peru** [third speaker] a representative of the Hatajothanked everyone for their work and all those who evaluated this particular element of Hatajo cultural heritage. With evident emotion she extended warmest thanks to all those back home, as well as the ancestors who brought this rich element of culture all the way from Africa to Peru. She had been dancing for 25 years and this was a huge source of pride to witness this international acknowledgement of the heritage of her ancestors. She thanked all those who continue to support this culture.
6. The **delegation of Peru** [fourth speaker] a representative of the Hatajothanked the Lord for the privilege to be able to attend, and expressed thanks on behalf of all of those who worked with the Hatajo. On behalf of colleagues and friends back home, he paid tribute to the Hatajo heritage and was delighted to see Hatajo acknowledged as intangible cultural heritage of humanity. It was seen as a posthumous recognition of all of those who bore this tradition through the ages and whose legacy was left for the Hatajo today who are committed to continuing the practice of this element with the same passion and fervour. A gift of a coloured sash was presented to the Chairperson and the Assistant Director-General to express thanks from the people of the province.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

*[The Chairperson reprised her role]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Winter festivities, Carnival of Podence** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.30] submitted by **Portugal**. Winter festivities, Carnival of Podence is a social practice which is associated with the celebration of the end of winter and the arrival of spring and takes place over three days in the streets of the village and in the houses of neighbours who visit each other. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the element functions as a reference to the community’s historical past and as an important symbolic marker of cultural identity. The community was fully involved in all stages of the nomination process. It is worth highlighting that the nomination is part of the safeguarding process and that it was the community that requested it. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party, and especially the community of Macedo of Cavaleiros, for submitting an exemplary nomination, showing how a small community can take responsibility for its intangible cultural heritage through a fully community-based approach, and for explaining how gender roles evolve in response to social and economic changes. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Winter festivities, Carnival of Podence on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.30**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.30) **adopted to inscribe Winter festivities, Carnival of Podence** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Portugal** spoke withgreat pride that this element was inscribed on the Representative List. It was pleased that the community of Macedo of Cavaleiros had presented an exemplary nomination, which showed how a small community can assume responsibility for its intangible cultural heritage through a community approach, and how the gender roles evolve in response to social and economic changes. Portugal is fully committed to safeguarding its very rich intangible cultural heritage in addition to those already inscribed. The delegation congratulated the Committee and the Portuguese NGOs for their excellent work and congratulated the community of Macedo of Cavaleiros for the exemplary nomination and for the success of its inscription.
4. The **delegation of Portugal** [second speaker – president of the committee] extended warm greetings to the kind people of Colombia and for their courtesy and hospitality, and exemplary organization of this event. Special greetings were expressed to the Chairperson and the Director-General of UNESCO. Inscription of the element on the Representative List will contribute to the safeguarding of ancestral traditions and the rights of a very small community of only 1,400 inhabitants. The risk of depopulation of the region is evident and UNESCO has given communities the responsibility for social and economic appraisal in the safeguarding of their elements under a depressed economic context and the risk of disappearance. The preservation of this pagan and Christian tradition lost to time is very important for the social and cultural valorization of the region. The president was honoured and proud of the people of Podence for their determination and for their commitment towards this element. He extended warm thanks to all those who made this nomination a success, as well as UNESCO for this recognition. The president concluded by congratulating Brazil and Cabo Verde, the fellow countries, for the success of their nominations and to all the other countries whose elements were inscribed.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Ie Samoa, fine mat and its cultural value** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.31] submitted by **Samoa**.The ‘Ie Samoa is a special finely hand-woven mat fastened at the hem with two rows of green and red feathers, and a loose fringe on one end. Traditionally woven with fine strippings of the pandanus plant, the final product is silk-like. The ‘Ie Samoa is displayed and exchanged at festive celebrations or on important gatherings such as weddings and funerals, and its exchange contributes profoundly to the maintenance of the social structure.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4, and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that ‘Ie Samoa is a unifying element of cultural heritage among Samoan people that conveys messages of respect, peace, recognition, honour and unity. The initiative to nominate the element for inscription on the Representative List came from the weavers of the traditional art form and other community members through public consultations. The ‘Ie Samoa was identified and defined by the communities themselves and chosen as the first element to be included in an inventory because of its longstanding viability and unwavering importance for the Samoan community.However, the Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.3.The Evaluation Body considered that the information about the communities’ participation in the planning of the safeguarding measures was not clear. Furthermore, the focus appears to be on the commercial value of the element rather than on safeguarding its social functions and cultural meanings.The Body further considered that a short question and answer process with the submitting State might have clarified whether the nomination met the criterion concerned, and decided, pursuant to [Decision 13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10), to initiate a dialogue process in order to obtain information on the following question: *How did the communities participate in planning the proposed safeguarding measures?*To this question, the submitting State explained that the community partook in the process to explore innovative ways to safeguard the element and participated in the development of the proposed safeguarding measures.The Evaluation Body considered that the information provided by the submitting State adequately addressed the question and that criterion R.3 was satisfied.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that the Philippines and Palestine had requested the floor.
3. The **delegation of the Philippines** warmly congratulated the Pacific Island State Party of Samoa for this exceptional element, which is the first for Samoa and the communities concerned. Considering the positive outcome of the dialogue process, it proposed to move directly to the draft resolution and the adoption of Option 2: inscription.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** supported the proposal by the Philippines.
5. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** congratulated the submitting State for its first nomination, and the Evaluation Body for the successful dialogue process, adding that it supported the proposal to move directly to the draft decision with Option 2.
6. Thedelegations of **Colombia, Cyprus, Guatemala, Cuba** and **Poland** supported Option 2.
7. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole with Option 2. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.31**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.31) **adopted to inscribe Ie Samoa, fine mat and its cultural value** **on the Representative List**.
8. The **Chairperson** noted that Fiji would speak on behalf of Samoa in its absence.
9. As a Small Island Developing State of the South Pacific, the **delegation of Fiji** spoke on behalf of the governments of the Kingdom of Tonga, the Solomon Islands, the Cook Islands, Palau, Kiribati, and the Fiji Islands to congratulate the Chairperson on her chairpersonship. It also acknowledged the warm hospitality received during its stay. The Samoan Government did not send a delegation due to the current epidemic they currently faced, with the measles outbreak claiming the lives of 72 Samoans, 61 of whom were children under the age of four. The Small Island Developing States of the South Pacific were here today standing in solidarity with Samoa during this time of crisis. The Pacific Islands have also been tasked with reading the remarks from the Samoan Government, which extended gratitude to the Committee, and to all the delegates on behalf of the Government and people of Samoa. Samoa’s nomination of ‘Ie Samoa, fine mat and its cultural value recognizes not only a culture but the history of a region whose ingenuity leads the world in the art of traditional handweaving. As a Member State of the Convention, Samoa appreciated the support received in this nomination. It will move to strengthen national efforts to safeguard this national treasure for the appreciation of Samoans everywhere and the enhancement of its cultural practices and values. Samoa concluded by thanking UNESCO and all countries represented here and also the Pacific delegations for their support.
10. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Moutya** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.32] submitted by **Seychelles**.Moutya was initially a nocturnal dance performed outside around a bonfire. The sole instrument is the moutya drum. To this day, the dance remains a social expression where stories and news are shared, though the context of the songs have changed drastically, now being more light-hearted.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.4, and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Moutya serves as an important symbol of national identity and a unifying social factor and is practised spontaneously by individuals as well as in the form of a stage performance. The bearers and practitioners have participated in many meetings and workshops about the nomination file, putting forward their concerns and suggestions about the process.However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2 and R.3.There was no evidence of how the inscription of the element would contribute to ensuring the visibility and awareness of the significance of intangible cultural heritage. On the contrary, the nomination file focused on the visibility of the element itself and, in particular, on the promotion of tourism. The proposed safeguarding measures could decontextualize the element, inasmuch as the focus is placed on its status as a commodity or tourist attraction.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Moutya to the submitting State.
11. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.32**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.32) **adopted to refer Moutya to the submitting State**.
12. The **Chairperson** noted the absence of Seychelles, and turned to the next nomination.
13. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Drotárstvo, wire craft and art** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.33] submitted by **Slovakia**.Drotárstvo is the technique of manufacturing using wire. Dating back to the 18th century when wire craftsmen discovered the interesting properties of wire and developed a simple technique based on manual bending, binding and interlacing metal fibres without welding or soldering, a technique still used to this day. The relevant community sees it as an example of converting the disadvantage of a poor region and simple craft into an advantage or ability to build on the artistic value and beauty of wire products.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered Drotárstvo, wire craft and art serves as an identity marker of the Drotária population and to some extent as a symbol of Slovak national identity. Drotárstvo is a widely practised form of traditional craftsmanship in Central Europe and its inscription could promote programmes directed at the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in the whole region. The proposed safeguarding measures take into account the concerns regarding the possible over-commercialization of the practice following its inscription and were planned during regular meetings of the bearers in a bottom-up process.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Drotárstvo, wire craft and art on the Representative List.
14. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.33**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.33) **adopted to inscribe Drotárstvo, wire craft and art** **on the Representative List**.
15. The **delegation of Slovakia** thanked the Colombian Government and the people of Bogotá for their hospitality and the great organization of this meeting. Special thanks were extended for the outstanding cultural event on Monday evening when delegations had the chance to see a Colombian dance and musical performance. It also thanked the Secretariat for the huge work undertaken under the Convention. On behalf of all wire craft masters in Slovakia, the delegation expressed thanks to the Committee. Since the 18th century, several generations of masters of wire crafts have produced useful items, but also created decorative objects and sculptures. These masters managed to turn the occasional and supplementary occupation of less developed regions into a real craft and a profession that has become more increasingly developed, expanding across the border. The men and women working with wire have preserved the wire craft with their whole hearts and patience, considering it to be the best way to involve the younger generation in safeguarding this element.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Holy Week processions in Mendrisio** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.34] submitted by **Switzerland**.The Holy Week processions take place in the historic town of Mendrisio on the evenings of Maundy Thursday and Good Friday, attracting over 10,000 spectators. On these occasions, the city’s lights are turned off and the streets are lit by the glow of ‘transparencies’. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the Holy Week processions in Mendrisio are a cultural and spiritual event that involves and brings together a significant portion of the population of the Mendrisio region. The proposed safeguarding measures include a wide variety of activities connected with the transmission, promotion and study of the element as well as awareness-raising activities. Researchers, members of the Foundation in Mendrisio and state and local authorities (the Federal Office of Culture, municipality of Mendrisio) participated in drafting the nomination file and related discussions.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Holy Week processions in Mendrisio on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.34**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.34) **adopted to inscribe Holy Week processions in Mendrisio** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Switzerland** congratulated Colombia and the city of Bogotá for the perfect organization, with heartfelt thanks to the people of Colombia for their hospitality and kindness. It thanked the Committee for its decision to inscribe and acknowledged the work of the Evaluation Body. The inscription of *Processioni della Settimana Santa di Mendrisio* recognizes the strong involvement of the local population of all generations in the preservation and transmission of a living tradition. This element is characterized by the creativity manifested in the savoir-faire linked to the painting of pictures and luminous lanterns, which give these processions a special character. Today, in Bogotá, the first element from Italian-speaking Switzerland is inscribed, which will contribute towards strengthening the visibility of its intangible cultural heritage, which is so essential for the cohesion and identity of this multicultural country and to fruitful dialogue between the different communities that together comprise the Swiss Confederation. Congratulations, Mendrisio. The delegation concluded by thanking the Foundation for the historic procession of Mendrisio that knew how to federate all the carriers of the tradition who carried this nomination.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.35] submitted by the **Syrian Arab Republic**. The practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose are mainly practised by farmers and families in Al-Mrah village, in rural Damascus, who possess expert knowledge of producing essential oils and traditional medicine from the Damask Rose, among other things, as well as the village community and families who organize the yearly Damascene Rose Festival.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah are an important cultural symbol for Syrian people in general. The inscription of the practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah would reinforce the idea of intangible cultural heritage as a tool for sustainable development and highlight elements that contribute to building a harmonious relationship between human beings and nature. The bearers produced the specific proposals for the safeguarding measures and were involved in all stages of the process.The Evaluation Body encouraged the State Party to take particular heed of the impact of over-commercialization on the safeguarding of the element, which is not taken into account in the safeguarding measures despite the potential increase in market demands.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.35**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.35) **adopted to inscribe Practices and craftsmanship associated with the Damascene rose in Al-Mrah** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic** spoke of itsgreat pleasure to observe the decision to inscribe this element on the Representative List. It thanked the Evaluation Body for its much appreciated commendation of its nomination file. During the process of preparing this nomination, an elderly farmer was asked how long his community had grown the Damascene rose. He replied ‘since infinity’. The Damascene rose is in the hearts and minds of the Syrian people. Its patterns are carved into the wooden and copper masterpieces of the craftsmen. Its fragrance fills the room of the city’s mosques and churches, and its festivities each year are a display of celebrated common values and traditions. Syria is first and foremost the Syrian people. Its greatest strength continues to be the rich diversity of cultures that make up its collective identity. The delegation believed that safeguarding and promotion of this identity lies in the full integration and participation of all segments of society, communities and all Syrians, especially the active participation of women who have preserved, presented and passed on this cultural heritage, maintaining its integrity for generations. The bearers of the Damascene rose are an example of how intangible cultural heritage can be a main source for sustainable development, and how this development can be part of the daily existence of communities. For many centuries through to today, the Damascene rose continues to inspire the stories of Syria’s generations. It has cemented in them a bond to their land, their families and to their communities. The annual festival in 2019 adopted a slogan which translates as ‘from Syria to humanity’. This is a result of an effort of cultural organizations and institutions, including governmental departments and civil society partners, in promoting the objective of the Convention and the values of intangible cultural heritage to be safeguarded for the benefit of humanity. The delegation thanked UNESCO and the Living Heritage section, and the host country Colombia for the inscription of Practices and craftsmanship of the Damascene rose, from Syria to humanity, in pursuit of a peaceful and prosperous future for all.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that more time was needed before examining the nomination submitted by Tajikistan, which was duly postponed until after lunch.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the nomination **Nuad Thai, traditional Thai massage** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.37] submitted by **Thailand**. Nuad Thai, traditional Thai massage is regarded as part of the art, science and culture of traditional Thai healthcare. As a non-medicinal remedy and manual therapy, it involves bodily manipulation in which the practitioner helps rebalance the patient’s body, energy and structure to treat illnesses believed to be caused by the obstruction of energy flow along ‘sen’, lines understood to crisscross the human body. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1, R.2, R.4 and R.5 for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the practice of Nuad Thai strengthens social solidarity, enhances self-reliance and is an example of love and kindness, a quality that has inspired and come to define Thailand as a caring society. The nomination process involved community organizations, practitioner groups, professional organizations, private business organizations, governmental agencies concerned and key individuals through formal and informal meetings. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criterion R.3. While the proposed safeguarding measures would safeguard Nuad Thai in a broad context, especially through the promotional activities, clarification was required on how the safeguarding measures would benefit the communities concerned specifically. The Body further considered that a short question and answer process with the submitting State might clarify whether the nomination meets the criterion concerned. The Evaluation Body decided to initiate a dialogue process in order to obtain information on the following question: *How will the proposed safeguarding measures benefit the communities concerned?* The submitting State demonstrated that the proposed safeguarding measures will ensure the transmission of the element at both the institutional and non-institutional levels and will encourage the local community to safeguard the related knowledge. The Evaluation Body considered that the answer provided adequately addressed the question and that criterion R.3 was satisfied.
3. The **delegation of Armenia** stated that the fileattested to the benefits of this process of dialogue, and it supported the inscription of the element and thus to move directly to the adoption of the draft decision to inscribe.
4. The delegations of **Kuwait, Palestine, Cuba, Cyprus, Togo, Azerbaijan, Guatemala, Japan, China, Cameroon, Kazakhstan, Austria, Senegal** and **Zambia** supported the proposal by Armenia for Option 2: inscription.
5. With no further comments or objections, **the Chairperson** turned to theadoption of the amended draft decision as a whole. The **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.37**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.37) **adopted to inscribe Nuad Thai, traditional Thai massage** **on the Representative List**.
6. The **delegation of Thailand** thanked the Government of Colombia for the excellent organization of this meeting, and the Chairperson, the Evaluation Body and the Committee for the positive consideration of the inscription of Nuad Thai, traditional Thai massage. It also welcomed the provisional upstream dialogue process, which had proved effective. This inscription is historic and helps promote the practice of Nuad Thai locally, nationally and internationally, helping to better preserve the century-old tradition of community healthcare which has defined Thailand as a caring society. Today, Nuad Thai also significantly contributes to the sustainable economic development of many local communities in Thailand.

*[A short video of the element was projected together with a live demonstration]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated Thailand, inviting the Secretary for some announcements.
2. The **Secretary** shared some information on the day’s side events, including an information session on two funding priorities: capacity-building and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in education organized by UNESCO, an event on intangible cultural heritage for integration and coexistence organized by the ICH group of the Ministry of Colombia, and a meeting of the working group #Heritage Alive organized by the ICH NGO Forum.
3. The **Chairperson** invited the delegates to join with practitioners of cultural practices inscribed on the representative list of intangible cultural heritage of Colombia at an event during lunchtime. In addition, there was an event on dialogue of knowledge with indigenous truth systems, structuring the world to safeguard it. The morning session was adjourned.

*[Thursday, 12 December, afternoon session]*

1. The **Chairperson** welcomed the delegates to the afternoon session.
2. **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Gnawa** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.26] submitted by **Morocco**. Gnawa is a set of musical events, performances, fraternal practices and therapeutic rituals, mixing the secular with the sacred. Gnawa is a Sufi brotherhood music combined with lyrics with a generally religious content, invoking ancestors and spirits. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Body considered that Gnawa provides its followers and practitioners with a very strong sense of identity promoted within society and therefore constitutes a social link that not only brings members of a group together but also connects such groups with the rest of the population in a city, village or region. The proposed safeguarding measures were drafted with the communities concerned, and the communities played a key role in all stages of the nomination process. The Evaluation Body encouraged the State Party to pay more attention to achieving a gender balance in the safeguarding of the element by recognizing women’s active role in its practice.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Gnawa on the Representative List.
3. The **Chairperson** noted no amendment or request for debate, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.26**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.26) **adopted to inscribe Gnawa on the Representative List**.
4. The **delegation of Morocco** spoke of its great honour and gratitude for this decision to acknowledge Gnawa as intangible cultural heritage of humanity at this session of the Committee in Colombia, a great country with which Morocco has had excellent relations for more than 40 years. This acknowledgment is a great recognition for Morocco and its King, Mohammed VI. The delegation was delighted to see that the identity of the nation and the authenticity of this practice was recognized, as are the outstanding diversity of cultural practices in Morocco. Gnawa is universally identified as one of the many faces of Moroccan identity. The need to safeguard this practice is based on the recognition of the Arab-Muslim, African and Berber practices involved therein. Over the years, it has taken on international renown with its musical-spiritual practices interconnected with blues, jazz and other genres. In the Essaouira, there is an international festival of Gnawa music, and recognized musicians from around the world come to meet with Gnawa residents, giving birth to a rich intercultural dialogue as they share experiences in these collective soundscapes. The delegation was delighted to have Gnawa added to the other elements already inscribed on the Representative List, which illustrates the richness and diversity of the cultural landscape in Morocco and underscores its importance. The inscription of Gnawa will foster its internationalization and safeguarding. The delegation extended special thanks to UNESCO, which stands as a veritable oasis of culture, tolerance and peace, for turning this dream into a reality in inscribing this element that has taken many years to reach fruition. Throughout the history of our origins we are better able to shape and understand our present; culture binds us together and enriches our identity.
5. The **delegation of Morocco** [second speaker] Mr Abdelssalem Amarir, Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports thanked Colombia for its excellent welcome, and the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for the work carried out. He expressed deep gratitude to the Committee for its valuable support, inviting the delegates to discover Gnawa with the master, Mr Abdeslam Alikkane, and his troupe.

*[A live performance of the Gnawa]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Traditional Turkish archery** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.38] submitted by **Turkey**. Traditional Turkish archery encompasses principles, rituals and social practices, the craftsmanship of traditional equipment, archery disciplines and shooting techniques that have evolved over the centuries. Bearers and practitioners ensure the continued viability of the element by adopting it to fit contemporary conditions.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body noted that the practice is considered as part of Turkish historical and cultural identity and strengthens the sense of cultural continuity. The State Party and the communities concerned have undertaken many safeguarding measures that ensure the viability of the element. The proposed ‘Strategic Plan for the Safeguarding of Traditional Turkish Archery’ strengthens these measures. The plan has clearly defined goals and objectives developed with the participation of the many bearers and actors related to the safeguarding of the element.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional Turkish archery on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.38**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.38) **adopted to inscribe Traditional Turkish archery** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Turkey** spoke on behalf of the people and Government to thank the Evaluation Body and the Committee for expressing their positive statements about the nomination file. It strongly believed that the inscription of this element on the Representative List will contribute to the visibility of traditional archery and intangible cultural heritage at local and national levels, and raise awareness of related organizations and practitioners of traditional archery in different geographical areas of the world. Recent years have witnessed a rapid increase in the number of related NGOs and practitioners in Turkey, both at local and national levels, making the element more visible. Related NGOs have shown great efforts at safeguarding the element in sustainable ways.
4. The **delegation of Turkey** [second speaker] representative of the Archers Foundation spoke of traditional Turkish archery as not only a game, but also an important element of cultural life in Turkey with its educational, cultural, social and religious dimensions. It consists of principles, rituals and social practices, craftsmanship of traditional equipment, archery disciplines and shooting techniques that have evolved over centuries. In fact, the practise of archery is part of Turkey’s historical and cultural identity. For this reason, the Archers Foundation actively participated in the preparation of the file. He thanked the Committee, not only on behalf of the relevant communities but also on behalf of all Turkish people. The Foundation is committed to ensuring the visibility of this element in close cooperation with related NGOs, national authorities and other institutions, such as the Traditional Turkish Archery Federation and World Ethnosport Confederation.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Traditional turkmen carpet making art in Turkmenistan** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.39] submitted by **Turkmenistan**.Traditional turkmen carpet making art in Turkmenistan relates to the production of traditional Turkmen carpets and carpet products: hand-woven woollen textile products decorated with ornamental art. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the carpet-making art is broadly integrated into the social and cultural life of Turkmen people and is considered as a sign of cultural identity and unity. The proposed safeguarding measures are coherently organized around seven main areas: transmission, research and documentation, education, publications, promotion and awareness raising, protection and preservation, and national capacity building. The Evaluation Body invited the State Party to explore measures directed at the socio-economic empowerment of women given their key role in the safeguarding of the element.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Traditional turkmen carpet making art in Turkmenistan on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.39**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.39) **adopted to inscribe Traditional turkmen carpet making art in Turkmenistan** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Turkmenistan** remarked thatthe country is known around the world for its magnificent carpet; a symbol of Turkmen people. The art of turkmen carpet making originated a long time ago and spread across all regions of Turkmenistan. The turkmen carpets are woven by the hands of Turkmen women from wool, cotton and silk. It is ornamented with strictly geometrical patterns which pertain to the five main tribes of Turkmenistan. In Turkmenistan, the carpet is so sacred that even the national flag has carpet ornamentation on it. The carpet making art is integrated into the social and cultural lives of Turkmen people and is considered a sign of cultural identity and unity. Carpet making in Turkmenistan plays important roles in the family, community rituals, social practices and festive events. The annual celebration of Carpet Day plays a key role in the transmission of the element by gathering various communities in social cooperation. The Turkmen are proud that the file of Traditional turkmen carpet making art in Turkmenistan is inscribed on the Representative List. The delegation thanked everyone for their support. It believed that the inscription will stimulate interest among communities from across the world in encouraging dialogue at the international level.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.40] submitted by **Ukraine**.The tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics, which includes dishes, ceremonial items, toys and tiles, arose in the 18th century, reaching its golden age in the mid-19th century. The ceramics are used in everyday life and have a practical and artistic value.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that the tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics is recognized as an integral part of the local community life, which forms part of the sub-ethnos Hutsuls, relating to different aspects of their social and cultural life. The viability of Kosiv ceramics has been ensured by the State and the communities concerned in many ways. The proposed safeguarding measures continue to strengthen these previous measures. The community of bearers had been fully involved in the nomination process since 2013 at various stages.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.40**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.40) **adopted to inscribe Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Ukraine** spoke of its honour to address the delegates, congratulating everyone. It was pleased to see the accomplishments to preserve the cultural and intangible heritage of the world because, in this time of globalization and rapid digital technology, our priorities are to preserve the wealth of cultures and its various peoples; a foundation for intangible cultural heritage. The delegation thanked everyone for their trust and support to include the Tradition of Kosiv painted ceramics on the Representative List. It was a great honour and responsibility to enrich the world’s heritage with one of the traditions of Ukraine’s rich and diverse heritage. Kosiv painted ceramics are an integral part of the local ethnic community of the Hutsuls. From time immemorial they have lived in Ukraine and kept their ethnographic day-to-day traditions. The ceramics were not just utilitarian, they were seen and are still seen as depicting the history of the Hutsuls. The images on the ceramics present the most important events in their history and the traditions of their daily lives. The Hutsuls keep these objects in their homes, forming a link between the generations with their roots, preserving and conserving their identity in a globalized word. Representatives of the local community and bearers of the tradiiton from Kosiv in western Ukraine in the Carpathian mountains were also present at the session. Today, Kosiv is a ceramic producing centre keeping the tradition alive by decorating their homes with hand-painted ceramics. The delegation thanked the representatives of the community for their dogged and painstaking work to preserve this heritage at national and international levels.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Khorazm dance, Lazgi** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.41] submitted by **Uzbekistan**. The movements of Khorazm dance, Lazgi encapsulate human creativity by reflecting the sounds and phenomena of surrounding nature, feelings of love and happiness. Khorazm dance, Lazgi is a key form of self-expression and is transmitted across the generations through the creation of new versions of performances. From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Khorazm dance, Lazgi promotes a spirit of solidarity and fraternity among people belonging to different social categories. Influenced by social life and the activities of the local communities, it represents real life in its movements and is also a means of satisfying the moral needs of the people. The viability of Khorazm dance, Lazgi is not currently under any serious threats. The proposed safeguarding measures are to be implemented with the active participation of the communities concerned. A bottom-up approach was adopted during the preparation of the nomination. The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Khorazm dance, Lazgi on the Representative List.
5. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.41**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.41) **adopted to inscribe Khorazm dance, Lazgi** **on the Representative List**.
6. The **delegation of Uzbekistan** expressed sincere gratitude to the Chairperson for her excellent moderation, and also the Colombian Government and the Secretariat for arranging this meeting at the highest level. It was with delight, honour and pride for the delegation to witness a part of history with the Representative List enriched with another cultural element, Khorazm dance, Lazgi, from Uzbekistan. It expressed sincere appreciation to all involved in considering this nomination, and the Evaluation Body and the Committee Members for their valuable support. Lazgi deserves to be on the List for many reasons. First, initial elements of this dance appeared when humans invented fire. Second, the elements of Lazgi are totally different from other dances in the region, even in Uzbekistan. Third, Lazgi is well known because of its fiery and increasingly energetic nature. Creators of this dance are Khorazm who have lived and still live in the lowest slopes of the Amudarya river. Today, Lazgi is very popular in all parts of Uzbekistan and is performed on all public holidays, festivals and family events. This element will be preserved for future generations to come. Having a very rich history in cultural heritage, Uzbekistan has much to offer the Representative List and it looked forward to working closely with this Committee in this regard. In the coming years, Uzbekistan will promote the inscription of the Bakhshi art, the narration of folk epics in combination with storytelling and some examples of ethnic sports.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Practices of Then by Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups in Viet Nam** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.42] submitted by **Viet Nam**.Then, an essential ritual practice in the spiritual life of the Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups in Viet Nam, reflects concepts about human beings, the natural world and the universe. Then ceremonies describe a journey in which the Then Master (male or female) controls ghost soldiers travelling from the earth realm to the heaven realm**.** From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied all five criteria for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Then rituals express the cultural identity of Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups, from customs to musical instruments, dance and music. The viability of the element is ensured by individuals, families or communities inviting Then Masters to pray for health, peace and good crops. The communities and artists were actively involved in planning the proposed safeguarding measures. The folk artists and communities concerned actively participated in all stages of the preparation of the nomination file through meetings, seminars, conferences and workshops.The Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee inscribe Practices of Then by Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups in Viet Nam on the Representative List.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.42**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.42) **adopted to inscribe Practices of Then by Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups in Viet Nam** **on the Representative List**.
3. The **delegation of Viet Nam** remarked that at this precise moment, people from 11 provinces in the northern region of Viet Nam are immensely gratified that the Then by Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups in Viet Nam is inscribed on the Representative List. The inscription has enormous significance as it testifies to the rich cultural identities of Viet Nam and its sense of togetherness. It promotes cultural diversity and encourages dialogue among individuals, communities and the different ethnic groups in terms of spiritual values, and the harmonious relationships between human beings and the natural world. The practice expresses the consolidation of solidarity of the ethnic groups and respects ethnic world views in conformity with UNESCO’s objectives. On behalf of the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism of Viet Nam and the communities that practice the Then rituals of the Tày, Nùng and Thái ethnic groups, Viet Nam is committed to carrying out the action plan on the safeguarding of the practice. Finally, the delegation expressed sincere thanks to the Evaluation Body, the Committee and the Secretariat for their work and support for the inscription of this element.

*[A short video of the element was projected]*

1. The **Chairperson** introduced the last nomination file to be examined.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next nomination **Falak** [draft decision14.COM 10.b.36] submitted by **Tajikistan**.Falak is a musical genre associated with the musical culture of mountain-dwelling Tajiks and includes vocal and instrumental varieties in both one-part and cyclic forms. Falak is considered as an integral part of traditional cultural life in Kulob and Badakhshan and is closely connected to the spirituality of the communities concerned.From the information included in the file, the nomination satisfied criteria R.1 and R.4. for inscription on the Representative List. The Evaluation Body considered that Falak is connected with people’s religious and personal lives, which endows the element with social roles and cultural importance. About fifty communities from Badakhshan, Kulob, Dushanbe and other cities and places were involved in the preparation of this nomination. However, the Evaluation Body considered that the information was not sufficient to assess criteria R.2, R.3, and R.5.The file does not explain how the inscription of Falak would encourage the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general, nor how it would encourage dialogue. It also fails to show how the inscription would promote respect for cultural diversity. Though many safeguarding measures had been undertaken to ensure the viability of Falak, the proposed safeguarding measures are not concrete enough. The nomination file does not clearly demonstrate how the inventory was drawn up with the participation of the communities, groups and NGOs concerned.Therefore, the Evaluation Body recommended that the Committee *refer* Falak to the submitting State.
3. The **Chairperson** noted an amendment received by Kazakhstan with the support of many Committee Members, inviting Kazakhstan to present the amendment.
4. Having studied the file, the **delegation of Kazakhstan** strongly believed that the beautiful tradition of Falak fully deserved inscription on the Representative List. It also believed that this was not a bad file and it deeply regretted that the Evaluation Body chose not to engage in the dialogue process with the submitting State Party, thus, limiting the community’s chances to explain its case better and to address the concerns raised by the experts. From studying the file, the delegation believed that at least two of the criteria, indicated as not met by the Evaluation Body, can be considered satisfied. The third criterion was also debatable. The delegation wished to ask the Tajik delegation on their view of the Evaluation Body’s conclusion on the inadmissibility of the file under criterion R.2. The Evaluation Body believed that the file did not explain how the inscription of Falak would encourage the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general nor how it would encourage dialogue, and failed to show how the inscription would promote respect for cultural diversity with which the Kazakh delegation disagreed. The delegation added that the Body’s conclusion was unfair.
5. The **Chairperson** invited questions from other Members of the Committee.
6. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Tajikistan for the submission of the Falak nomination. It particularly noted the significant role Falak plays in the communities in Tajikistan, as Falak musicians and performers are well respected and represent an integral part of society. The delegation also appreciated the work of the Evaluation Body and its recommendation. Although it disagreed with certain parts, it appreciated the Body’s work. The delegation had consulted among the Committee Members and understood the established practice. However, for the sake of consensus and consistency in the decision-making in previous Committee sessions, and for the sake of preserving the spirit of the established practice, it believed that this issue should be discussed and the State Party should be given the opportunity to express its views on the Evaluation Body’s recommendation. The delegation believed that criterion R.2 was satisfied with the information provided in the file. First of all, as mentioned in numerous cases, criterion R.2 remains problematic where many countries continue to experience difficulties. With regard to the Body’s recommendation in R.2, the delegation conceded that the answers to criterion R.2 in this nomination could have been better formulated, but it also found statements that replied to the concerns raised by the Evaluation Body. For instance, the section on R.2 (i.b) contains a list of expected outcomes in terms of promoting intangible cultural heritage in general at the national level as a result of the Falak inscription. At least lines 1, 4, 5 and 6 of the list of these achievements directly refer to intangible cultural heritage in general. Furthermore, as far as the aspect of dialogue under criterion R.2 is concerned, the file mentions that the inscription might provide further involvement of communities into the network of traditional artistic schools, thus promoting dialogue among these communities. It is also expected to unite Tajik mountaineers around shared heritage practices. In this context, even though certain aspects could have been stated in a more precise manner, the delegation believed that this criterion was met. In criterion R.5, the delegation considered that section 5 of the file does contain the name of the institution in charge of inventorying in Tajikistan (the Research Institute of Culture and Information of the Ministry of Culture) in subsection (ii), and an inventorying process is clearly outlined in subsection (vi). With regard to community participation in inventorying, the file referred to the participation of ICH Kulyab, a local centre of ICH of the Hulbuk museum, as well as, most importantly, to the NGO called Odam va Olam, which is also identified in the file as representing the community. With this in mind, the delegation believed that the information under R.2 and R.5 satisfied the two criteria. Concerning criterion R.3, the delegation wished to ask Tajikistan: What are the activities or measures foreseen for safeguarding Falak, especially for those supporting the evolving and dynamic nature of ICH, and how were the communities concerned involved in planning the safeguarding measures?
7. The **delegation of Austria** expressed deep disappointment that its agreement had not been kept. No amendments should have been introduced in this case and it was hoped that this would not set a negative precedent for the future and that the Committee could return to the original understanding of the agreement. The delegation wished to express its concerns and also pose a question to the submitting State. Coming from a country located in the Central Alps, Austria was very familiar with musical cultures in the mountains and their importance for communities who are living in these often remote areas. What it particularly admired about this element is the representation of the spiritual relationship between the practitioners and the mountains. [On a personal level as an alpinist], the delegation hoped to hear Falak someday when hiking in the mountains of Tajikistan. Unfortunately however, three sections of this file needed to be revised. Concerning R.5, it was not clear to Austria if and how the communities participated in the inventorying process. The file mentions local centres of ICH that have gathered information about the element. To its understanding, the NGO does not represent the community. With reference to paragraph 80 of the Operational Directives, concerning the creation of a consultative body to facilitate the participation of bearers and practitioners in a drawing up of inventories, the delegation wished to ask the State Party, how have the local centres and the NGO mentioned in section R.5 (vi) facilitated the participation of communities, and in what ways did the communities participate if they did so? The delegation then wished to hear from the Evaluation Body and its reflection on the answers given by the State Party.
8. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked Tajikistan for this nomination, acknowledging the importance of the element Falak for the communities concerned and the State Party, and recognizing the immense efforts of the State Party in preparing this nomination. Noting the comments of the Evaluation Body, it wished to ask the State Party how the inscription of the element would raise visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general and promote dialogue. While noting the informal agreement not to open dossiers with three or more unmet criteria, the delegation also felt that it was important to respect the prerogative of Committee Members to debate on any file and appropriately amend draft decisions if they so decide on a case-by-case basis. The delegation highly appreciated the constructive approach of the State Party, the co-sponsors of the original amendment to the draft decision and the Committee as a whole in this regard, and welcomed the discussion on this file.
9. The **delegation of Kuwait** spoke as one of the co-sponsors of the draft amendment to the decision, adding that for an agreement to be valid it should be validated by all Members, including the newcomers. Moreover, the agreement was made before many of the present Members came to the Committee, adding that Kuwait was unaware of it. However, if the agreement had taken the form of a decision, it would undoubtedly have respected it. Having said that, the delegation would have appreciated a dialogue process with this file, noting that some of the files examined during this session had two criteria that were not met, but following the dialogue process, they were found satisfied and the elements were inscribed. Thus, if dialogue had been used with this file, we would have had less than three criteria not met. Having looked and discussing the file with the submitting State Party, the delegation believed that criterion R.5 had been met. The Research Institute of Culture and Information organized a group to undertake a Tajikistan national inventory to work on the file, consisting of scholars, culture officers, craftspeople, artists, folklore performers, NGOs and others. During 2013, the inventory group members carried out fieldwork in the different regions of Tajikistan. The element of Falak was identified on the basis of requests by the Falak performers, local communities, NGOs and individuals. The inventory was drawn up with the participation of the Falaki communities, with the ICH database created for the inventory. In 2016, Falak was inscribed on the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage of Tajikistan and it had since been updated under the responsibility of the Institute of Culture and Information. The delegation therefore believed that R.5 had been met, but would nonetheless like to hear from the State Party for more clarification, thanking the Committee for opening the discussion.
10. The **delegation of the Netherlands** noted that the Evaluation Body had found that three out of the five criteria had not been met, which is why it was deeply worried that amendments to the draft decision had been introduced. The Evaluation Body is the consultative body for evaluating nominations established by the Committee. As previously stated, the Netherlands greatly values the expertise of the Evaluation Body and take its advice seriously, and for the credibility of the Convention its advice should be followed. For this reason, it aligned with the statement by Austria and its questions to the submitting State on community participation.
11. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to return to the issue of the agreement raised by Austria, not to say that it was not committed to this agreement, because a country may indeed not have been present when this agreement had been reached, but because a new element had been introduced: the upstream dialogue process. In fact, had this process been effectively implemented in this case, the criteria may very well have been satisfied. Consequently, this important element of dialogue, which had proved its many benefits, would have been useful within the framework of an open discussion with the submitting State, allowing Tajikistan to intervene on the concerns raised on the criteria that were not satisfied. This aspect should therefore be kept in mind, i.e. had this dialogue been initiated, which has had conclusive outcomes in a number of previous cases, the Body may have reached a different conclusion.
12. The **Chairperson** invited Tajikistan to respond to the questions posed. Azerbaijan posed a question on criterion R.3 and how the community was involved in the safeguarding measures. Austria posed a question on R.5 and how the local centres and NGOs can facilitate community participation in the inventorying-making process. The Philippines raised a question on how the element raises the visibility of intangible cultural heritage. Both Kuwait and the Netherlands raised a point on community participation.
13. The **delegation of Tajikistan** expressed its sincere appreciation for the interest shown in its nomination. It also thanked the Evaluation Body for its constructive comments that it will definitely take into consideration when finalizing the event-planning for safeguarding the tradition of Falak as an important element of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation turned to the questions raised on criteria R.2, R.3 and R.5. Regarding R.2 and the visibility in general, organizations and associated institutes in Tajikistan do tremendous work to increase the visibility of Falak. In the education sector, Falak education is transmitted from family and local schools into the curriculum of State music schools and faculties. Many conferences, seminars and masterclasses are organized. Collecting examples in rural areas was done by conservatory students between 2004 and 2017. Many publications were made, for instance, the first collection of Falak music notes was published, which encouraged traditional music among the urban population and youth. Other consequences include extensive research at national and regional levels, the popularization of classic and modern poetry of Falak, implementation of joint projects on Falak in education, music performances, research and fieldwork. Regarding encouraging dialogue and cultural diversity, the cultural integration of two mountainous regions of Tajikistan, Kulob and Badakhshan, connect the rural and urban populations of different ages, gender and social groups, through the popularization of traditional music that promote traditions of eastern music traditions worldwide. The wider recognition of the element as a universal cultural phenomenon is seen through research and the spiritual nature and poetic qualities of Falak, which fosters interregional and international cooperation in joint projects related to the element. In response to the safeguarding measures proposed in R.3, the nomination states that since Falak is sustained in rural environments of mountainous areas of Badakhshan, Pamir and Kulob, the main responsibility for safeguarding the element lies on the bearers falakkhons, as it has been for many years. Therefore, in rural areas the main safeguarding measures mentioned involve sustaining the rural communities and the traditional mode of [master-disciple] transmission, ustod-shogird. At the state level, the proposed safeguarding measures include the listing of master falakkhons in the State inventory of master performers, and activities in the framework of the Tajikistan cultural policy and State programme on safeguarding between 2003 and 2020, as well as capacity-building activities in the framework of UNESCO programmes, like the Aga Khan Music Initiatives, incorporating Falak in school curricula and university programmes, the organization of conferences and seminars, maintaining traditional music at local and regional levels, and the organization of Falak Day.
14. The **delegation of Tajikistan** then turned to criterion R.5, explaining that Falak was inscribed on the national list of Tajikistan in 2016 and each element is updated every three years following its inscription. However, the nomination file did not clearly state that the institution in charge of the inventory is a research institute. The inventory of Falak was conducted in 2001 and 2012 by the bearers, NGOs, Odam va Olam and Hunarmandoni, as well as local schools in the course of the meeting with the 15 communities in the Kulob and Badakhshan regions and Dushanbe. At first, Falak was identified and included in local registers of Khulbuk Museum complex and Hulbuk museum. Later it was included in the State registry in 2014. The National ICH list of Tajikistan was first drawn in 2010 with 46 elements. The inventory explains the traditional terminology by which traditional schools are taught by concretizing the melodies attributed to Falak.
15. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the submitting State for this element, Falak. Having listened to the explanation by the State Party, it wished to be added as a co-sponsor for the amendments on R.2 and R.5. Regarding the agreement previously mentioned, the delegation clarified that the outgoing Members and the Secretariat were fully aware of its origin. Palestine was behind this agreement when it chaired the drafting group in 2017 when the Committee was chaired by Ambassador Lee from the Republic of Korea. Indeed, it was before the newly elected Members in 2018. Nevertheless, all new Members were informed and the agreement was respected at the last Committee session in Mauritius [in 2018]. It was considered that the Committee at this current session was still respecting the agreement in that the spirit was not to reverse the recommendation of the Evaluation Body. In this case, there were three criteria that had not been met and the agreement stipulated at that time for the Committee not to submit amendments on such files. However, this is a special case, and the delegation could agree with the Philippines that in any case this is an informal agreement. Nevertheless, the delegation was happy that it is still respected and it thanked the submitting State, as well as the co-sponsors of the amendments for agreeing not to turn over the overall recommendation, which is a referral. The Committee should therefore not bring into question the informal agreement that had been in place since 2017 and is still valid and respected.
16. The **delegation of Senegal** strongly supported the remarks made by Palestine. A *gentleman's* agreement agreed by the Committee commits it, even if some Members are unfortunately unaware of it. Moreover, in the earlier sessions, the Committee had shown that it is open to dialogue and therefore it is open to debate the more difficult subjects. In the same vein, the delegation could agree to this amendment. However, the delegation felt uncomfortable that some Members of the Committee did not feel bound to the agreement owing to the fact that they were unaware of its existence. Nevertheless, it respected their points of view, as everyone maintains the right to express their views in this setting.
17. The **delegation of Austria** asked the Body to comment on the explanation by the State Party and express whether the explanation provided, in particular on R.5, was satisfactory, which was a very important point for Austria if it was to agree on the amended text on R.5.
18. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to explain the Evaluation Body’s view after hearing the submitting State’s explanation, particularly on R.5. However, the Chairperson first wished to give the Evaluation Body’s perspective on the dialogue process. Ideally, almost all of the nominations would have benefitted from the dialogue process, but the Body had to select the ones that were most appropriate for such a process. This is why only six of the referral cases were selected. The decision by the Evaluation Body to remark on the three different criteria that were unmet was not easily made. The Chairperson first of all explained that the Committee is not an arena where new pieces of information can be presented. On R.5, the Chairperson appreciated hearing the existence of several different organizations and institutions involved in the inventory-making process, but there was still a lack of information on how these organizations or institutions were related, and whether they were really the communities practising this element. Thus, the Body needed some concrete information in that regard. On R.2, the Chairperson noted the very helpful, useful information from the submitting State on how inscription of this element would facilitate dialogue and communication among the different organizations or entities, but the answer still focused almost solely on enhancing the visibility of Falak rather than enhancing the visibility or awareness of intangible cultural heritage in general.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked the Evaluation Body, and then turned to the adoption of the draft decision, with paragraph 1 duly adopted. In paragraph 2, criteria R.1 and R.4 were duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was duly adopted as a whole. In paragraph 3, criterion R.2 was amended [the inscription of Falak would encourage the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general] and supported by **Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Kuwait, China, Mauritius, Cameroon, Djibouti, Jamaica, Togo** and **Palestine**.
20. The **delegation of Austria** was of the opinion that R.5 had to be kept [i.e. it was not met].
21. The **Chairperson** clarified that the debate concerned R.2 and the amendment to delete R.2.
22. The **delegation of Austria** remarked that it shared the Evaluation Body’s finding in R.2, but because there was difficulty in assessing this criterion, as noted in previous cycles, it was willing to accept the amendment. However, it encouraged the State Party to return to this section when they work on the file again and to consider the comments made by the Evaluation Body. As the Committee clearly heard from the State Party, there is still a misunderstanding of R.2. Tajikistan was very clear how the inscription would increase the visibility of the element, but R.2 asks how the inscription of Falak would increase the visibility of intangible cultural heritage in general. The delegation would therefore appreciate if Tajikistan would revise its file to expand on this aspect.
23. The **Chairperson** noted the relative active support to delete R.2 [under paragraph 3], which was duly adopted as amended. Criterion R.3 did not receive an amendment [the criterion was not met] and was adopted. It was noted that an amendment had been received to delete R.5 [under paragraph 3 (not satisfied) and to consider it satisfied].
24. The **delegation of Austria** appreciated the efforts of Tajikistan to provide information and explain how the communities were involved, however the information requested was not provided. Consequently, it had great difficulty in agreeing on the amended text, which read that on the basis of the information provided criterion R.5 was satisfied. The delegation recalled that it specifically asked where in the file it is mentioned. It noted two centres and an NGO involved in the inventorying, but they did not comprise the community unless it is specifically indicated in the file that they facilitated the community’s participation. The delegation conceded that it may be a misunderstanding in the wording and that the NGO does in fact represent the community comprising the bearers or practitioners, but nothing in the file suggested that this was the case. The delegation therefore asked that the State Party reflect on this issue and ensure community participation in its true sense. Austria wished to maintain its position in R.5 but would withdraw its reservation if a Member of the Committee could indicate where it was explicitly stated that the NGO represented the community.
25. Having listened to the intervention by Austria, the **delegation of Azerbaijan** insisted that the participation of the communities through this NGO was ensured, as already reflected in the nomination file. The NGO Odam va Olam represented the community of the element, as cited in the file where it states that the NGO represented the musicians, artists, and so on, and were taking part in the different festivals, which is a clear identification of the community’s participation in this NGO. The delegation insisted on retaining the amendment in R.5.
26. After hearing the answers by the State Party, the **delegation of the Netherlands** was not confident that R.5 was met and supported Austria’s request to return to the original text.
27. The **delegation of Palestine** noted the general and common misunderstanding in R.5 with some Members of the Committee having one interpretation and other experts disagreeing with that interpretation. At this stage, the most important point was to respect the original recommendation of the Evaluation Body [to refer] whether R.5 is amended or not. The delegation reiterated that R.5 is often a matter of discussion and interpretation, and whether it is satisfied or not would not—in this case—change the overall recommendation. For this reason, the delegation appealed to Austria and the Netherlands for their flexibility and to accept R.5 as amended as there was broad, active support.
28. The **Chairperson** noted no broad active support for the deletion of R.5 at this stage.
29. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** aligned with the opinion of Azerbaijan that the NGO represented the community as it involves practitioners of this element, and it is one of two entities through which practitioners can work to make their intangible cultural heritage known, promoted, advanced and strengthened. It understood some of the concerns raised by Austria however, but it wished to retain the amendment.
30. The **delegation of Cyprus** understood that this file was in any case recommended for a referral, even if criteria R.2 and R.5 are deemed satisfied, and would only be re-submitted in a subsequent year. In which case, the criteria could be redrafted, which would include criterion. R.5. Thus, the adoption of R.2 and R.5 [as satisfied] would not change the situation.
31. The **Chairperson** explained that an amendment had been received for R.5 and therefore it was opened for debate.
32. The **delegation of Senegal** concurred that the Committee was asked to pronounce on the received amendment, adding that if the agreement had been respected, the Committee would not have had to discuss this criterion. However, if the NGOs work with the communities and that it is specified in the dossier then these NGOs have a relationship with the communities concerned, and therefore Senegal could sponsor this amendment.
33. The **delegation of Kuwait** fully understood the interpretation of Austria regarding R.5, but Kuwait’s interpretation was the same as Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan in that these NGOs represent the community, and therefore it supported the amendment.
34. Having listened closely to the different interpretations, the **delegation of the Philippines** spoke of its national experience in which NGOs involved in the preparation of files represent the communities concerned, and it appeared that this was the case in this file. Hence, it was happy to join the list of co-sponsors for this amendment, noting its broad, active support.
35. The **delegation of Armenia** believed that this was a subjective issue in that questioning the representativeness of those who are solicited within the framework of this consultation would require knowledge of the structure of the communities and the way they are represented. In which case, those disputing the veracity of this assertion should provide precise information on the way in which such communities are structured and represented. The delegation added that it was important to take into account the statement by Tajikistan.
36. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order by Palestine.
37. The **delegation of Palestine** explained thatwhenever there is disagreement on an amendment and one option receives active, broad support then the amendment is decided. Thus, at this stage the Committee could adopt R.5. as amended and move forward.
38. The **Chairperson** agreed with the understanding, but was waiting for Armenia to conclude.
39. The **delegation of Armenia** concurred with the Chairperson, adding that Members should be allowed to conclude their arguments. The delegation reiterated that a Member questioning the way in which communities are represented should have precise knowledge of how these communities are structured and their degree of representativeness.
40. The **Chairperson** noted the active broad support of the Committee to delete R.5.
41. The **delegation of Austria** remarked thatactive broad support did not imply that it had given its consensus yet, insisting that nothing in the file suggested that these centres or NGOs were representative. However, the delegation could agree to have the amendment adopted as proposed to delete R.5, but it still encouraged and urged the State Party in the revision of its file to ensure community participation in all stages, particularly on this point. In this regard, it proposed an amendment to ensure community participation, to follow the paragraph on the decision to refer.
42. The **Chairperson** returned to the debate on R.5, reiterating that it had received active broad support for its deletion [in paragraph 3], which was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 was then adopted as a whole. An amendment had been received in paragraph 4 concerning R.2 and R.5 [that the criteria were met], which was supported by **Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Kuwait, China, Mauritius, Cameroon, Djibouti, Jamaica, Togo** and **Palestine**, and was duly adopted. Paragraph 3 was adopted as a whole. Paragraph 5 that ‘decides to refer’ was duly adopted.
43. The **delegation of Austria** presented an amendment for a new paragraph 6 that ‘urges the State Party to ensure community participation throughout the process of revising the file’.
44. Before proceeding to the final decision, the **delegation of Kazakhstan** wished to state that this file did not merit a referral and deserved inscription. In addition, in the case of R.5 on whether NGOs represent the communities and whether it is indicated in the file could have been clarified with upstream dialogue. If this was not very clear from the file, there could have been a request to explain how the communities participated through the NGOs, which would have resulted in one less criterion unmet.
45. The **delegation of Armenia** found the expression ‘urges’ to imply that the State Party had not considered the criterion, introducing a notion of doubt, proposing instead ‘encourages’.
46. The **delegation of the Netherlands** supported the new paragraph 6, and ‘encourages’.
47. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** echoed the remarks made by Kazakhstan on the dialogue process, adding that this was a clear case where dialogue would have been beneficial for the State Party concerned to understand the requirements of R.5. Thus, if there was such a misunderstanding about community participation and the representation of the NGO, the Evaluation Body could simply have asked for clarification from the State Party to satisfy R.5. The delegation therefore strongly encouraged the Evaluation Body in the future to take this into account on how the upstream process can be utilized in a way that could also facilitate the Committee’s debates. With regard to Austria’s proposal amended by Armenia, it supported the amendment, ‘encourages the State Party to ensure community participation’.
48. The **delegation of Jamaica** supports the wording of ‘encourages’, adding that the Committee needed to recognize the spirit, not only the letter of the Convention, which was a clear difference. It supported the amendment.
49. The **Chairperson** noted an agreement on paragraph 6 with ‘encourages’.
50. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to clarify that his point of order was not intended to interrupt a Member. It also supported the amendment, amended by Armenia.
51. The **Chairperson** returned to the new paragraph 6, which would read, ‘Encourages the State Party to ensure community participation throughout the process of revising the file’, which was duly adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson** **declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.b.36**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.b.36) **adopted to refer Falak to the submitting State.**
52. The **delegation of Tajikistan** spoke onbehalf of the Government to thank the Government of Colombia for its warm and fraternal welcome and for the good organization of this session. It thanked the Evaluation Body and the Committee Members for supporting the Falak nomination. The delegation reaffirmed its attachment to the Convention and the interest of the Government to continue in its implementation and consolidate the efforts made with the involvement of the communities in the safeguarding of Falak, through which the Tajik peoples recognize and express themselves every day and in the future.
53. The **Chairperson** invited the Vice-Chairperson of Poland to preside over the two subsequent files submitted by Colombia and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

*[The Vice-Chairperson of Poland presided over the following session]*

**ITEM 10.c OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/10.c Add*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.c-Add_EN.docx)

**Files:** [*3 proposals*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10c-register-01099)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the examination of proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, informing the Committee that Panama had withdrawn its file, with now only two files left to be examined under this item. The Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Committee was asked to examine the extent to which the proposals best reflect the principles and objectives of the Convention. Thus, it was not necessary to meet every criterion for the proposal to be selected. The purpose of the Register is to select effective safeguarding practices to be disseminated and potentially replicated elsewhere. The criteria for evaluation were projected onto the screen. The Chairperson of the Evaluation Body was invited to present the first proposal submitted by Colombia.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the proposal **Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building** [draft decision 14.COM.10.c.1] submitted by **Colombia**. The safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building addresses the weakening of traditional crafts through a system of intergenerational transmission of knowledge between master and apprentice based on the non-formal ‘learning by doing’ method. The safeguarding strategy aims to train different sectors of the population, create labour connections and foster cultural entrepreneurship. From the information included in the file, the programme responded as follows to the criteria for selection as a good safeguarding practice. The Evaluation Body considered that the programme aims to strengthen safeguarding measures that ensure the viability of traditional crafts throughout the country. The strategy promotes the coordination of safeguarding efforts at the national and international levels. The objectives of the programme focus on enhancing the recognition of and respect for cultural diversity, ensuring the continual transmission of traditional skills and know-how, and promoting the contribution of intangible cultural heritage to peacebuilding. The programme has been implemented with the participation of the bearers and communities concerned, with their free, prior and informed consent. The file demonstrated the commitment of various stakeholders that would cooperate in the dissemination of the strategy. The safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building, which promotes the transmission of knowledge and skills related to crafts, clearly responds to the needs of developing countries, especially with regards to vulnerable populations affected by socio-economic exclusion. The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for its first selection of the programme and for proposing an exemplary file that presents a safeguarding programme deeply grounded in community development and social inclusion, which contributes to the sustainable livelihood of communities and serves as a model for peacebuilding in other countries, especially in post-conflict situations. The Evaluation Body therefore recommended that the Committee select Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices as best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.c.1**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.c.1) **adopted to select Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building** **on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices**.
4. The **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated everyone and the Colombian people more generally for the great success achieved, demonstrating that this is one of the best ways of preserving and promoting intangible cultural heritage.
5. The **delegation of Colombia** added thatthe ‘Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building’ is actually a platform covering three different platforms: the workshops, the framework for qualifications, and the skills development centres for culture. The workshops were possible thanks to a policy for sustainable development with the objective of boosting intangible cultural heritage, particularly among young people, which started to spread throughout Colombia in Cartagena, Mompox and Popayán. Consequently, given the increased impact and positive outcomes of these workshop schools, they started to spread to other regions of the country and other cities. These schools have now become a point of reference in Latin America and beyond because of their focus on sustainability and the way they embrace cultural diversity and a diverse range of skills. In terms of the framework of qualifications under the Ministry of Education, a great deal of progress had been made and intangible heritage has now been given recognition through the Masters, serving as a good example of practice and learning by doing. As a multi-ethnic and multicultural country, Colombia is very aware of the importance of highlighting the value, respect and need to transmit knowledge in this way, and that it is equally important to learn from books and to learn manually. This approach has been very positive in bolstering the safeguarding strategy. Finally, there was a great focus on developing skills, focusing on development and a commitment to learning in the development centres. It was found to be a useful tool for development in underprivileged areas for peace building and for reintegrating vulnerable communities. For Colombia, it was very pleased for the recognition of its first listing on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, and it was delighted for its success thanks to all of the efforts undertaken by Colombia to bolster its intangible heritage that align perfectly with the values of the Convention and UNESCO. It was hoped that this would encourage other developing countries to follow similar lines, serving as a model for master-to-apprentice transmission of knowledge. The aim was to inspire, change, share and see good practices spread to other countries. Profound thanks went to the apprentices, the masters, the centres for skills development, the Ministry and all stakeholders who took part. It was happy to convey this successful outcome to those who had helped bolster Colombia’s identity and culture.

*[A short video of the Good Practice was projected]*

1. The **delegation of Colombia** [second speaker]represented by the Ministerof Culturewishedto share this special item of information with everybody and handover the floor to Spain.
2. The **delegation of Spain** wished to take the floor to extend its thanks to Colombia for the presentation of its excellent nomination file selected as a Good Safeguarding Practice, which really does align with the peace-building objectives of UNESCO. This outstanding file is a very legitimate way of attesting to the objectives of the Convention as a whole, and as an excellent example of integration and social cohesion. As was noted in the file, this practice actually began with the Cartagena skills development centres and these workshop schools came about thanks to international cooperation with Spain from 1992 onwards, adding that at the time these kinds of workshop schools were said to be places to live, work and create contacts and connections, and learn to work differently and, above all, to restore dignity. The Government of Spain spoke of its absolute privilege to have contributed, even in a small way, to the creation of this programme which then took on a life of its own and had blossomed, as seen under the Ministry of Culture, which was also reflected in the comments by the Evaluation Body. As seen in the file, it is important to be able to replicate this model to other areas, not only within Colombia but throughout the continent and even in Asia. The delegation thanked the workshop schools as an excellent example of a peace-building mechanism that is unfortunately so necessary. Congratulations went to Colombia and all the stakeholders.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson** then turned to the second and last proposal to be examined.
4. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the next proposal **Biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela** [draft decision 14.COM.10.c.3] submitted by the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela**.The activities associated with the biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela involve gathering several palm species in a specific group of mountains. Several innovative measures were designed as part of the biocultural programme, including educational projects for young people and cultural activities for the wider community.From the information included in the file, the programme responded as follows to the criteria for selection as a good safeguarding practice.The Evaluation Body considered that the programme established a creative interconnection between safeguarding and nature conservation based on the concept of biocultural heritage. The programme supported the safeguarding of local traditions, contributed to strengthening community cohesion and a sense of belonging among its bearers, and creatively supported the interconnection of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage with the protection of natural diversity. The programme has proven effective in contributing to the viability of intangible cultural heritage. The community was involved in the programme through the associations of palmeros. The community and individuals concerned are clearly committed to cooperating in the dissemination of the programme. The programme could be applicable to the needs of developing countries.The Evaluation Body commended the State Party for proposing an exemplary file that sheds light on the fundamental role intangible cultural heritage plays in relation to sustainable development and protecting the environment, with an impact on a wide community, whose citizens have become agents of transformation.The Evaluation Body therefore recommended that the Committee select Biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices as best reflecting the principles and objectives of the Convention.
5. The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.c.3**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.c.3) **adopted to select Biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela** **on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices**.
6. The **delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** congratulated its sister country, Colombia, for the successful selection of its very important file on the Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building, noting the importance of the input from everybody and it was delighted to have been part of this process. Congratulations also went to the organizers of the meeting, particularly the Colombian people, as well as the Director-General of UNESCO, the Secretary, and the security section, Mary Moné, who ensured the safety of all, and finally all the delegates present. The delegation wished to highlight the important work undertaken by the Evaluation Body, expressing its thanks. It recalled the UNESCO phrase ‘since wars begin in the minds of men and women, it is in the minds of men and women that the defences of peace must be constructed’. Venezuela has withstood continued outside threats but it continues to promote this culture of peace based on human and social values and its interaction with its natural environment, as can be shown in this file whose aims have been examined and found worthy of being selected as an example of a Good Safeguarding Practice, not only at the regional level, but internationally. The ‘Biocultural programme for the safeguarding of the tradition of the Blessed Palm in Venezuela’ is part of its intangible cultural heritage. Learning how to share, how to work and live together with those who are not the same, this focus on social inclusion and citizenship is based on trust, mutual respect, values and a mentality for peace and tolerance, ensuring the protection of the planet and its biodiversity. On behalf of the Venezuelan people and the president, Mr Nicolás Maduro, the delegation extended thanks to the Evaluation Body and to the Committee, adding that sustainable development and intangible cultural heritage go hand-in-hand.

*[A short video of the programme was projected]*

1. Thanking Venezuela, the **Vice-Chairperson** remarked that the examination of the proposals submitted for the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices had now been completed.

*[The Chairperson reprised her role]*

**ITEM 10.d OF THE AGENDA**

**EXAMINATION OF REQUESTS FOR INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/10.d*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-10.d-EN.docx)

**File:** [*1 request*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/10d-international-assistance-requests-01100)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 10.d*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.d)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to the request submitted by Burkina Faso, inviting the Chairperson of the Evaluation Body to present the file.
2. The **Chairperson of the Evaluation Body** presented the request **Capacity building for stakeholders involved in safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage in Burkina Faso** [draft decision 14.COM 10.d]submitted by **Burkina Faso**. The proposed 24-month project is geared at building the capacities of stakeholders involved in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Burkina Faso. Following an inventorying process, conducted as part of the implementation of the Convention, the need to establish a critical mass of stakeholders capable of taking on the process of safeguarding living heritage at the national level became clear. The Evaluation Body considered that from the information provided in the file, the request responds as follows to the criteria for granting International Assistance given in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Operational Directives. The Evaluation Body considered that the activities are to be implemented for and by members of the communities concerned including women and young people. The budget is detailed and appropriate. While they are ambitious, the proposed activities correspond with the objectives and expected results of the project and are feasible under the proposed timeline. The training programme is aimed at establishing a wide network of people with the appropriate tools to safeguard intangible cultural heritage and a team of facilitators who can replicate the training across many regions, as extensively as possible. The specific purpose of the request for assistance is to reinforce local and national capacities to safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The proposed project would promote strong decision-making and produce behavioural changes to improve the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, encouraging the adoption of a bottom-up approach in its management. The Evaluation Body thus recommended to approve the International Assistance request from Burkina Faso for the project entitled, Capacity building for stakeholders involved in safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage in Burkina Faso and grant the amount of US$387,770 to the State Party.
3. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendment or request for debate had been submitted, and proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared Decision** [**14.COM 10.d**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10.d) **adopted to grant Burkina Faso International Assistance in the amount of US$387,770.**
4. The **delegation of Burkina Faso** spoke of its honour to rejoice in the welcome received in Bogotá and to express the appreciation of the authorities in charge of culture in Burkina Faso for granting financial assistance. It conveyed greetings and thanks from all the traditional communities of Burkina Faso, who will—first and foremost—be concerned by the implementation of the project’s activities. Warmest thanks were also presented to the Secretariat for their continued support throughout the process of developing the project. It also expressed gratitude to the Committee and to the Evaluation Body. This project follows on from one that ended in 2017. The main recommendation that emerged from the conclusions was that there was a need for a follow-up aimed at building the capacities of communities and other actors. Although they understood the concept, more actors and communities became fully involved with intangible cultural heritage. The main outcome of the project was that they were consequently more open to better safeguard their elements. This project thus consolidates the results achieved by the first project. The delegation was thus proud of this renewal of trust that had been granted by the Committee. However, the execution of this project will not run smoothly and will undoubtedly face difficulties, of which the delegation was well aware. The country was going through difficulties, not least linked to the security crisis throughout the Sahel region in Africa. For this reason, the delegation reiterated its plea for understanding with regard to the project’s execution. Despite this, the State’s commitment remained intact to achieve the goals set. This project had been taken into account in the strategic document of the Ministry in charge of culture, and will therefore be well executed. The delegation sincerely believed that the results of this project will make it possible to achieve the objectives set and thus provide the people working alongside communities to help them safeguard their intangible heritage, even on the smallest scale.

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

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2019**

1. The **Chairperson** returned to the general debate on the report of the Evaluation Body under agenda item 10.
2. The **delegation of Austria** began by congratulating all the States and communities behind the elements inscribed on one of the Lists or Register, adding that it is a great moment of joy and pride for everyone. However, it was very concerned about the procedures for inscription and the viability of the Lists, as well as the credibility of this Committee. The whole system is under threat. Some years ago, confronted with similar concerns, the Committee took steps with the introduction of an upstream dialogue to help solve this problem. The delegation still believed that it was a good way of helping States amend minor issues in their files and improve the information provided. The idea being that no more files would be referred on minor issues, only those with major deficiencies, irrespective of the number of criteria not met. In addition, there exists an informal agreement among the Committee not to amend any file with more than two unmet criteria. The delegation regretted that this agreement had not been kept. The experience in the preceding two days showed that the experimental upstream dialogue has to be adapted. The Committee still overturned many decisions for referral by the Evaluation Body. The credibility of the criteria, the decisions of the Evaluation Body and of the Committee itself was at stake. Ending on a positive note, it welcomed the upcoming discussions on the nature and functions of the Lists. It hoped that new creative ways would be found to maintain the Lists and Register in full accordance with the Convention.
3. The **delegation of Jamaica** reiterated its congratulations to the Evaluation Body for its work. It recognized the difficulty of examining a large number of files and it commended the Body for successfully concluding its work during this cycle. Having said that, it wished to remind that the Evaluation Body makes recommendations, while it is the Committee that takes the final decision. Having made its recommendations, with due respect, the Committee is able to provide its own input into the final decision. The delegation also noted with some concern the weaknesses in some of the nomination files that have been presented for evaluation. In the delegation’s mind, it speaks of the need for continued capacity building, particularly in terms of the preparation of files. Nevertheless, it commended the Evaluation Body for its work.
4. The **delegation of the Philippines** reiterated its comments at the beginning of this item when it noted the recurrent issues of possible decontextualization and over-commercialization that came up in the evaluation of some files. In order to address this problem, it had previously suggested some possible guidance based on the recommendations of the Evaluation Body that could be prepared by the Secretariat in order to guide States Parties and communities in the preparation of their files. It also supported the comments made by Jamaica that targeted capacity building and international assistance can really help improve the nomination process. The system had to be examined holistically with the aspirations of States Parties and communities to have elements inscribed on the Lists, but also—as mentioned by Austria—to maintain the credibility of the system and the clarity of procedures. Finally, it warmly congratulated all the States Parties and communities whose elements were inscribed.
5. The **delegation of Armenia** also congratulated the Evaluation Body for its work. It noted the recurring questions, but agreed with Jamaica, supported by others, on the need to build the capacity of submitting States, adding that some of the nominations that the Committee examined attested to the need to move in this direction. However, it also recognized the relevant work that had been carried out with the dialogue process. In this regard, the Evaluation Body recommended amending the Operational Directives, and the delegation could agree to those recommendations. It was also understood that the Evaluation Body proposed to return to the examination of R.2, the evaluation of which had proved relatively difficult. The delegation shared this view of initiating a reflection of this criterion in the context of the global reflection on the listing mechanisms.
6. The **delegation of Zambia** thanked the Evaluation Body for its good work, which was principally due to the introduced upstream dialogue process that smoothed the way in which the Committee made its decisions. The delegation recalled the events in Addis Ababa in 2016 when the Committee had to work beyond 24 hours to resolve certain issues. This dialogue process had thus streamlined the way in which the Committee makes its decisions, and it thanked and congratulated them once again.
7. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** supported the suggestion made by the Philippines to prepare guidance as some of the concepts used in the files are difficult to understand, such as commercialization and folklorization, a term it learned for the first time at this session. This would therefore be very useful for those preparing proposals for the first time.
8. The **delegation of Poland** congratulated the Evaluation Body for its contribution and work, and its efforts to respond to the needs of States Parties by introducing the dialogue mechanism. However, there remained other challenges in the nomination process, and at this stage there was a need to stay focused and be prepared for the upcoming reflections.
9. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Evaluation Body on its very hard and professional work on the 48 files examined, adding that the upstream dialogue had proven very effective and was appreciated. The delegation thanked the Chairperson for the swift examination of the files, and the Secretariat for its hard and efficient work. Finally, the delegation thanked the Committee Members for their constructive dialogue and occasional sense of humour.
10. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Evaluation Body, adding that the Committee had established the Body and therefore must help it conduct its work under the best conditions, which would be achieved by increasing its credibility for which the Committee was responsible. As mentioned by Jamaica, the Committee is sovereign by its decisions and by its way of working, but it can weaken the Evaluation Body or make it stronger. The delegation hoped for the latter and that the Evaluation Body would become stronger and more credible. The delegation remarked on the excellent work carried out by the Evaluation Body since its establishment and warmly congratulated its members.
11. The **delegation of Cuba** underscored the complex work carried out by the Evaluation Body in analyzing so many and such diverse files. At the same time, it appreciated the upstream dialogue mechanism and hoped that more submitting countries will benefit [in the future]. As mentioned by Senegal, the Committee needs to support the day-to-day work of the States Parties when presenting the nomination files. It was hoped that a methodological guide – one of the proposals made – would help achieve that.
12. The **delegation of China** commended the Evaluation Body for its great job over the past year, joining the previous speakers to congratulate all the submitting States for their inscriptions or selections on the Lists. It also welcomed the exemplary examples highlighted by the Evaluation Body. The delegation took note of some of the issues raised by the Evaluation Body during its work. Firstly, regarding the upstream dialogue mechanism. It noted that most of the submitting States had benefitted from this mechanism, yet it still required further reflection and observations. The delegation expressed some concern about the criteria and how the nomination files were selected, which appeared vague. Secondly, there was concern on the semantic issues raised by the Evaluation Body, for example, in the definition of intangible cultural heritage, the definition of the communities concerned, ownership, exclusivity, geographic locations, as well as the standardized community consent and the inconsistency between the different sections in the nomination file. Furthermore, the delegation highlighted the need for consistency in the decisions made by the Evaluation Body and the Committee. Lastly, the delegation appreciated the great work of the Evaluation Body, which facilitated the overall reflections on the listing mechanisms.
13. The **delegation of Colombia** expressed thanks to the Evaluation Body, adding that it fuels the Committee’s discussions making it possible to discuss the various nomination files in an informed way. It thanked the States Parties for successfully inscribing their elements, adding that there should be greater interest shown to the Register of Good Practices, which represents the heart and spirit of the Convention, transforming attitudes and creating awareness of the importance of intangible cultural heritage.
14. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** joined previous speakers in congratulating and commending the work of the Evaluation Body, adding that it supported the Evaluation Body. It understood that its evaluations are based on the information provided in the nomination file, which sometimes leaves room for interpretation by the experts of the Body, the Committee Members and by States Parties that provide it. In this regard, the introduction of the upstream dialogue process was indeed a very important tool to introduce additional clarification, especially with regard to criterion R.2; a criterion that many countries experience difficulties with. The delegation hoped that the upstream dialogue process would be further developed to enable submitting States to clarify the information that would subsequently help the Committee make a clear decision on the files. At the same time, given the difficulties that countries are facing in responding to certain criteria, the delegation believed that capacity-building activities of the Secretariat play an important role, echoing the remarks by Jamaica on the importance of capacity building in terms of the nomination process. The delegation also commended the attitude of the Committee on the issues raised during the consideration of the nominations, and it thanked them for their constructive cooperation and approach.
15. The **delegation of Japan** thanked the efforts of the Evaluation Body and congratulated all the States Parties for their hard work on the nominations. The upstream dialogue had been successful and it commended the Evaluation Body for this effort. The delegation still believed there was room for improvement on how to select and proceed with the upstream dialogue, the discussion of which would continue in the reflection of the reform process.
16. With no more comments from the Committee, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Observers.
17. The **delegation of Hungary** commended the Chairperson for her efficient chairing of the session, thanking Colombia for its warm welcome and hospitality. It noted with great satisfaction that the Evaluation Body had recommended 31 elements overall for inscription on the Lists and the Register. This showed that States Parties made careful and thorough preparations and had submitted high-quality nomination files, and it hoped to see this positive trend continue in the future. The delegation also acknowledged the positive effects of the dialogue process. This intermediary step in the evaluation cycle will obviously have beneficial results for the listing system and it looked forward to further streamlining this process. It was evident that many nominations faced difficulties with criterion R.2, a recurring issue that would also be discussed under agenda item 14 [reflection on the listing mechanisms]. The issue of over-commercialization was also noted and the delegation welcomed more guidance for States Parties to address this concern. The delegation spoke of its general discomfort when processes, rules and regulations under the Convention and Operational Directives are not fully observed and when ethical principles meant to complement these two basic texts are not fully followed. Hungary had been very involved in the drafting of the Convention and served twice on its Committee. It was currently serving on the World Heritage Committee and it wished to stress that it viewed these Committees as expert bodies and in this regard the credibility of the process for the implementation of the Conventions must be respected at all stages, from the work of the Evaluation or Advisory Bodies to the decision-making of the States Parties serving on the Committees. All States Parties were collectively responsible for ensuring the sustainability of the Convention and its credibility. Finally, as a strong supporter of this extraordinary normative instrument, the delegation hoped these comments will be received in a constructive spirit in which they were intended.
18. The **delegation of Switzerland** thanked the Chairperson for the opportunity to allow Observer States Parties to speak on this agenda item. It also wished to congratulate the Evaluation Body and the Committee for their hard work. The decisions concerning the inscriptions on the various lists represent an important task of the Committee, which requires discussions of the requirements and expectations relating to each nomination. To do this, the Committee needs the room to manoeuvre, while considering the expertise of the Evaluation Body. The Evaluation Body not only provides recommendations concerning the inscription or not of an element, it also identifies the issues concerning the viability of the element, the participation of communities, or certain anticipated risks such as folklorization, decontextualization or commercialization by over-tourism. Switzerland regretted that the Committee in some of its decisions rejected these specific recommendations for the attention of the submitting State. These recommendations represent valuable guidance for putting in place consistent safeguarding measures and appropriate monitoring of the element. As such, it seems essential to retain this information in the decisions. The delegation recalled that the inscription of an element is not only the recognition of an element, but also the starting point to strengthen its safeguarding with the participation of the communities concerned.
19. The **delegation of Norway** followed the discussions of the Committee with great interest and wished to underline that it was aware of the hard work and considerable effort put into its preparation and thanked both the Committee and the Evaluation Body in this regard. As mentioned earlier, Norway believed that the safeguarding practices would be reinforced if the conclusions of the Evaluation Body would be more fully reflected in the discussions, regardless of the decision to inscribe or not, as this would be beneficial for all parties involved.
20. The **delegation of Lithuania** acknowledged the warm welcome in Colombia, remarking on the many beautiful and interesting nominations inscribed. However, as many Observer delegations and Committee Members had underlined, there is the question of credibility and attitude towards the Evaluation Body. The delegation remarked on the excellent work of the expert-driven Evaluation Body and it took note of the few voices that were trying to protect and defend the work of the Evaluation Body. It was hoped that after the Committee’s deliberations this week that many more voices of support will be heard.
21. The **delegation of Finland** supported the views expressed by Hungary, Switzerland and Lithuania.
22. Given the time, the **Chairperson** would give the Evaluation Body the opportunity to respond in the next session, inviting the Secretary to make some announcements.
23. The **Secretary** informed the delegates of a meeting of the ICH NGO Forum working group on ethics, as well as a panel discussion on the Heritage Emergency Fund: safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in crises organized by UNESCO.
24. The **Chairperson** invited the delegates to an event with intangible cultural heritage practitioners inscribed on the national list of Colombia, as well as practitioners of the elements inscribed in this session of the Committee. The Chairperson adjourned the day’s session.

*[Friday, 13 December, morning session]*

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

**REPORT OF THE EVALUATION BODY ON ITS WORK IN 2019**

1. The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee had advanced well the previous day and had completed the examination of 25 nominations to the Representative List, two proposals to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and one request for International Assistance, with the previous session ending with a general debate under agenda item 10. Following the revised timetable by the Bureau, the Committee would start the day’s session with the Evaluation Body’s response to the general debate under agenda item 10, followed by the examination of the overall draft decision 14.COM 10 and agenda item 11 on the modification of the name of an inscribed element, agenda item 12 on the follow-up of elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention, as well as agenda item 13 on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. The afternoon session would proceed with agenda item 14 on the reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, and agenda item 15 on the reflection on the participation of non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention. It was noted that amendments were received for agenda items 10 submitted by the Philippines and Austria respectively, and two amendments for draft decision 14.COM 12 submitted by Austria on behalf of the Committee.
2. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked on the criticisms made by several States regarding ethics and morality, and suggested that they look at their own positions. The delegation spoke [on a personal level] of his city Bethlehem, a World Heritage site, of which he was proud. As the birthplace of Lord Jesus Christ, he offered a quote to describe this sentiment ‘Why do you look at the splinter in your brother's eye, when you don't see the beam in yours?’.
3. The **delegation of Senegal** noted an issue in the French interpretation, which was resolved.
4. The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to respond to the Committee’s remarks.
5. Speaking on behalf of the Evaluation Body, the **Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body** made remarks on the three long days of discussions. The Evaluation Body wished to congratulate the States Parties for the inscriptions of their elements. Thirty-five new elements had been inscribed on the Representative List, five on the Urgent Safeguarding List, two projects selected on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices and two projects approved for International Assistance, one of them using the combined mechanism. They were all wonderful and showed the diversity of intangible cultural heritage to the world. Their inclusion will be a matter of pride for the communities and States, and above all, their inscription will contribute towards their safeguarding. For the Evaluation Body, it had been a privilege to be part of this process. Together with States Parties, the main goal is to help build a better system of cooperation and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, not only by evaluating files but also by sharing concerns and reflections about the mechanisms of the Convention. This year, the dialogue process was introduced in order to help States Parties clarify minor challenges in their files. The process was used when the Evaluation Body considered that a referral could be turned into a *yes* by asking a simple question. In all, the dialogue mechanism was used on six files. After receiving the answers from the six States Parties, the Body gave a favourable opinion. Five of them were inscribed and one of them was referred. The Body wished to clarify that by recommending a referral, it was not saying that the element should not be inscribed on the Representative List or on any of the Lists, the Body is proposing that the State Party improve the file, and in some cases, the nomination process. The file is the presentation of the element, not to the Evaluation Body but to the world. It is the first introduction to an element, whose file can be freely downloaded from the UNESCO website. The published files also serve as models for new files to be drafted in the future.
6. The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Evaluation Body recommended 12 nomination files for referral, two of which were withdrawn, four were referred and six were inscribed or accepted. During these last three days, many States Parties wondered why in some cases the Evaluation Body did not open a dialogue. The Rapporteur explained that these incurred lengthy discussions involving many days of deliberations during the year. After carefully reading all the files, the members all agreed that the files recommended for referral should be rewritten in order to resolve their issues. For the other files, it was deemed not possible to use the dialogue mechanism to solve the issues with a simple question/answer exchange. At this point after three days, the Evaluation Body agreed with Jamaica that the dialogue process was not a success, not for the Evaluation Body, and has to be seriously improved. The Body understood that the Committee always makes the final decisions and has its own agreements or understandings, which was not an issue in itself. However, the Body wants to support the Committee’s decisions with very good assessments and contribute to its credibility and to the credibility of the Convention. The Body’s principle motivation is to see successful safeguarding stories managed and enjoyed by the communities, with the traditions passed down to their children. The Committee elected the Evaluation Body as a group of experts, entrusting its members specific tasks. But the Evaluation Body is not only a group of experts, it is also a group of 12 human beings who can make mistakes. It is also a group of people passionate about intangible cultural heritage who have worked directly with the communities and with the States in all six regions of the world for many years. As such, the Evaluation Body encourages the inscription of elements on the Lists and also wants to contribute to a better understanding of intangible cultural heritage in each one of these elements. That is why it recommended to refer some of these inscriptions so that these wonderful expressions of human creativity can be presented to the world in the best possible way so that the world can understand them clearly in all their magnitude. The Body had no doubts about the importance or pertinence of these elements being included on the Lists. Yet the 12 members of the Evaluation Body found problems on certain files, even if sometimes the Committee did not see them. In many other cases, the Committee also found these issues and agreed with the Evaluation Body, but it also agreed to change the recommendations of the Evaluation Body after hearing the arguments of the States Parties. In some cases, the Body gave negative assessments about one criterion, sometimes on four criteria.
7. The **Rapporteur** reminded the delegates that the real issue was not the number of criteria with issues, but rather the quality. Occasionally, the Body found more problems with one file recommended for a referral on just one criterion than another file with three unmet criteria. Sometimes there was no evidence of community participation at all, even if the rest of the file is very good. Sometimes there is no inventory at all. For the Evaluation Body, the problems with files recommended for referral were not minor or weak. Resolving these issues would involve changing the nomination file, requiring a re-evaluation and discussion of the file, and although the recommendations of the Evaluation Body can be changed the files are not going to change. The Evaluation Body was almost always satisfied with the answers and clarifications given by the submitting States during these meetings, but these clarifications are not going to be included in the files. With the result that this common work, the entire evaluation, the listing process and even the Convention’s credibility is questioned. The Evaluation Body is not against any nomination; on the contrary, it supports the Committee and its tasks. The Body is here to guarantee the correctness of the files and to help States improve the quality of their files to show the richness of their intangible cultural heritage in the best way possible. The Rapporteur asked that the Committee not misunderstand the work of the Evaluation Body. i.e. that it was against nominations recommended to be referred or against submitting States. On behalf of the Evaluation Body, the Rapporteur asked that these observations be taken into account on the reflection of the listing mechanism, which will be a very good opportunity for all, especially for the Convention. The Rapporteur concluded by congratulating all the States Parties with inscribed elements, and especially the States Parties that had an opportunity to improve their files in the coming cycles.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked the Chairperson and Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body for their excellent work, remarking on how the Committee appreciated how they proceeded with each file. She then turned to the adoption of the draft decision, informing the Committee that two amendments by the Philippines and Austria had been received, and they would be invited to present their amendments at the opportune moment in the examination of the draft decision. Returning to the draft decision, paragraphs 1–13 were duly adopted. It was noted that an amendment was presented by the Philippines and Palestine in paragraph 14 [on the production of a guidance note], which the Philippines was invited to present.
9. The **delegation of Poland** supported the amendment.
10. The **delegation of the Philippines** recalled its earlier comments regarding the issues [of decontextualization and over-commercialization of elements] that were highlighted by the Evaluation Body in the evaluation process on a number of files, adding that it would be good to have a user-friendly document with the recommendations of the Evaluation Body regarding those issues that could serve as guidance for future nominations and thus serve as a useful tool for strengthening the preparation of nominations
11. The **delegation of Jamaica** aligned with the amendment by the Philippines in paragraphs 14 and 17.
12. The **Chairperson** noted support for paragraph 14 from **Cuba, Sri Lanka, Senegal, Djibouti, Lebanon, Togo, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Japan, Azerbaijan, Austria, China, Colombia Cyprus, Netherlands, Mauritius, Zambia, Guatemala** and **Kuwait.**
13. The **delegation of China** did not object and appreciated the amendment by the Philippines. It proposed a slight change in the wording from ‘best practice’ to ‘good practice’ in keeping with the terminology.
14. The **Chairperson** noted the agreement to change ‘best’ to ‘good’.
15. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
16. Noting the broad support, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 14 adopted as amended. Paragraphs 15 and 16 with no amendments were also duly adopted. A new paragraph 17 was proposed and supported by **Austria, Azerbaijan, Senegal, Netherlands, Jamaica, Togo, Lebanon, Guatemala, Kazakhstan, Cyprus, Cameroon, Japan, Kuwait, Poland** and **Djibouti**, which would read, ‘Recalls that, in order to uphold the sustainability of the listing system, the credibility of the process for inscription must be ensured at all stages, and hence, underlines the importance that the decisions of the Committee shall be based only on sound expert recommendations and evidence-based considerations’.
17. The **delegation of Palestine** sought a clarification from Austria on the rationale.
18. The **delegation of Austria** proposed that Azerbaijanpresent theamendment.
19. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Austria for initiating paragraph 17, adding that it had a strong conviction that the credibility of this process is a crucial element of the Committee’s discussions and must be upheld by the Committee. The credibility was not only based on the evaluation of the Evaluation Body, whose members are human and can make mistakes, as mentioned earlier by the Rapporteur, but credibility is also based on the Committee’s debates and the scientific considerations and expert recommendations that the Committee provides in response to the Evaluation Body’s recommendations. The delegation wished to highlight that Azerbaijan had during these sessions voiced support for certain criteria in a number of files based on information found in the nomination itself, as identified by its own experts. This was the rationale behind the amendment and it was grateful to the Committee Members who offered their support.
20. The **delegation of Armenia** understood clearly the motivation for the amendment and it supported this important approach. However, the amendment mentioned ‘sound expert recommendations’ [‘*recommandations judicieuses’* in the French version], which was open to interpretation, and therefore proposed instead ‘relevant recommendations from experts’.
21. The **Chairperson** took note of the proposed change in wording.
22. The **delegation of Kuwait** suggested to delete ‘relevant’ so as not to prejudge an opinion.
23. The **delegation of Austria** agreed on the deletion of ‘relevant’ as there were no irrelevant expert opinions.
24. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked Azerbaijan for the clear explanation, though it was felt that the wording in English and French was somehow confusing. It also supported the proposal by Armenia to include ‘relevant’ or ‘*pertinent’* in French.
25. The **Chairperson** remarked that the opinion of an expert is in any case valid.
26. The **delegation of Palestine** surmised that an expert opinion may or may not be relevant, and therefore preferred to retain ‘relevant’.
27. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to pronounce on paragraph 17 without the word ‘sound’ and ‘relevant’, which was duly adopted.
28. The **delegation of Colombia** appreciated the apt comments made by the Rapporteur, especially concerning the difference between overturning a decision and looking at what the file actually states. It appreciated this important analysis and his frankness. In this regard, the delegation wished to know whether the statement will be incorporated into the summary records or whether it should be acknowledged in the draft decision.
29. The **Secretary** concurred that the oral report would be fully reflected in the summary records.
30. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretary for the clarification. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 10**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10) **adopted.**

**ITEM 11 OF THE AGENDA**

**MODIFICATION OF THE NAME OF AN INSCRIBED ELEMENT**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/11*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-11-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 11*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/11)

1. The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to present the next agenda item 11.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** from the Secretariat explained that the item concerned the change of the name of a programme in the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. It was recalled that in 2018 the Committee selected this programme currently entitled in English, Land-of-Legends programme, for promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region (South-Sweden), and in French, ‘*Terre des légendes’ pour promouvoir et redynamiser l’art du conte dans le comté de Kronoberg (sud de la Suède).* On 15 March 2019, the Swedish Ministry of Culture informed the Secretariat of its wish to change the name of the programme in order to delete the parentheses. According to paragraph 41 of the Operational Directives, ‘One or more States Parties may request that the name by which an element is inscribed be changed. Such a request must be submitted at least three months prior to a Committee session.’ This procedure had already been applied, in 2015, for an element of Guatemala inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List in 2013 [Nan Pa’ch ceremony / Nan Pa’ch ceremony]. Sweden’s request was received within 3 months of the Committee's deadline. The Committee was therefore requested to approve the name change proposed in English to ‘Land-of-Legends programme, for promoting and revitalizing the art of storytelling in Kronoberg Region’, and in French to Le programme *Terre des légendes pour promouvoir et redynamiser l’art du conte dans le comté de Kronoberg.* The Secretariat further proposed to remove the quotation marks used in the original name of the element in French so that it better corresponds to the title in English.
3. The **Chairperson** remarked that this item was simple to resolve and therefore suggested moving directly to the draft decision. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 11**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/11) **adopted.**
4. The **delegation of Sweden** thanked the Committee for its decision to modify the name of the Land-of-Legends programme. To delete the parentheses is indeed a technical correction, which did not change anything in substance regarding the inscription. It was hoped nevertheless that Kronoberg is remembered as a special place in southern Sweden that is filled with stories. The delegates were invited to visit the Land-of-Legends and meet all the storytellers at these magical places. The delegation also wished to underline the importance of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Since 2018, when the Land-of-Legends programme was inscribed on the Register, they have had quite a busy time sharing their methods in many ways both nationally and internationally. This Register really gives the opportunity to share safeguarding methods and highlight the decisive work of practitioners and NGOs in the implementation of the Convention.

**ITEM 12 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/12 Add*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-12_Add-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 12*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 12 and the follow-up on elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention, which focused on the case of the Aalst carnival, an element practised in Belgium and inscribed on the Representative List in 2010. It was noted that this was the first time that the Committee was asked to examine a specific case in this context. The Chairperson recalled that this item was on the agenda based on the Bureau’s decision on 21 March 2019 that specifically requested ‘to raise the case of the Aalst carnival in the context of the follow-up of inscribed elements on the Lists of the Convention, which includes the possibility of removing elements from the Lists of the Convention in accordance with paragraph 40 of the Operational Directives’.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that the item was included on the agenda based on Decision 14.COM 1.BUR 4, which followed the Committee’s debates at its thirteenth session in 2018, during which the need to reflect on the follow-up of inscribed elements was recognized in [Decision 13.COM 9](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/9). Document 12 focuses specifically on the case of the Aalst carnival. Since its inscription on the Representative List in 2010, complaints from the public and concerned parties had been received by the Secretariat in 2013, 2018 and 2019, which were particularly numerous in 2019 with 28 letters and emails, as well as an online petition gathering over 22,000 signatures. These letters had been made available to Committee Members since 28 November 2019. In its assessment of the case, the Secretariat took into consideration a number of aspects that justified bringing this specific case to the Committee: i) the severity of the issue; ii) the repetitive nature of the issue; iii) the number and diversity of correspondence received; iv) the reaction from the communities concerned; and v) a lack of response from the State Party until 5 December 2019. However, on December 5 2019, the Permanent Delegation of the Kingdom of Belgium to UNESCO sent a *note verbale* to the Secretariat requesting that the Aalst carnival be removed from the Representative List at the request of the city of Aalst and on behalf of the community of the Aalst carnival, as published in an addendum to the working document on 7 December.
3. Presenting the Secretariat’s assessment of this case, the **Secretary** underlined that this was not an attempt to determine what constitutes intangible cultural heritage for the communities of Aalst nor to prescribe whether and how these communities shall practise their own living heritage. The assessment sought the conformity of the Aalst carnival with UNESCO's values, with the definition of intangible cultural heritage according to Article 2 of the Convention, and with the criteria of the Representative List. Regarding the conformity of the element with the founding principles of UNESCO, the Secretariat recalled that the Convention was adopted under the auspices of UNESCO by its General Conference, which constitutes an essential aspect of its object and purpose. The display of representations that overtly contradict some of the core values underpinning the existence of UNESCO, affected not only the credibility of the Convention and of the Committee, but also of the Organization as a whole. Regarding conformity with the definition of intangible cultural heritage, the acts observed in several editions of the carnival encouraged stereotypes, mocked certain groups and insulted the memories of painful historical experiences, whether or not intentional, that contradict ‘the requirements of mutual respect among communities, groups and individuals’. As such, the element contradicts Article 2 of the Convention and thereby no longer satisfies criterion R.1. Concerning the compatibility of the element with the purpose and criteria of the Representative List; since its inscription, the element has triggered strong protests from various communities that felt unduly mocked and attacked by some of the carnival’s representations. The inscription has not encouraged dialogue among communities and indeed appears to have fostered mistrust between and among communities. As such, the element contradicts Article 16.1 of the Convention and thereby no longer satisfies criterion R.2. In light of the considerations and assessment presented, the Committee could consider that the element no longer satisfies criteria R.1 and R.2. The draft decision therefore proposes that the Committee remove the Aalst carnival from the Representative List, in accordance with paragraph 40 of the Operational Directives. Such a decision was also in line with the request for its removal submitted by Belgium on 5 December 2019.
4. Thanking the Secretary for the detailed presentation, the **Chairperson** remarked that this case had been extensively discussed and that the Bureau had agreed to move directly to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole and by consensus. Nevertheless, Committee Members, States Parties and Observers were invited to make a statement if they so wished following the adoption of the decision. The Chairperson noted that there were two received amendments to the draft decision, both submitted by Austria on behalf of the Committee, as previously discussed at the Bureau and reached by consensus. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 12**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12) **adopted**.
5. The **delegation of Austria** thanked all the Committee Members and the Secretariat for the great cooperation on this rather difficult issue, adding that it wished to make a statement of principle on behalf of Austria. Austria is strongly committed to preventing and fighting racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia in all its forms. In March [2019] it reacted swiftly and decisively when the Secretariat asked the Bureau to inscribe the carnival of Aalst on the agenda of the Committee. The manifestations seen on some floats were clearly and unequivocally anti-Semitic, taken straight out of Nazi propaganda. This had not been the first time. These deeply racist and anti-Semitic imageries have been a recurrent feature in the carnival in the last years, before and after inscription. The delegation regretted that the community had not addressed this issue, adding that this did not concern an issue of freedom of speech, the right to satire or mockery, nor did it relate to the regulation of humour. The Committee cannot tell the carnival community how it should practice its tradition, and it should continue to do so as it saw fit. However, it cannot continue with UNESCO’s blessing. The case had been clearly and convincingly stated by the Secretariat why the carnival of Aalst should be removed from the Representative List. Again, there is no arbitrariness or lack of legal certainty. The Committee has the legal basis, as well as the political and moral responsibility to take this decision. These manifestations clearly contravene the requirement of respect among communities, the very definition of intangible heritage, the founding principle of UNESCO and the purpose and spirit of the Convention and the Representative List. In view of the absence of the community addressing this, there is a real risk that UNESCO or this Committee are seen as condoning these behaviours. On the eve of the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp, Austria and the Austrian people—in the face of 65,000 Austrian-Jewish brothers and sisters, friends and neighbours who perished in the Shoah and hundreds of thousands of holocaust survivors made refugees—cannot be seen as complicit. Austria wants to see a clear red line drawn. With rampant anti-Semitism and racism, and with Jewish and other minority communities under attack, Austria, as Europeans, cannot turn a blind eye to these manifestations happening in Europe. Austrians turned a blind eye some 85 years ago when Jewish communities were under attack, and will not turn a blind eye again.
6. The **delegation of Colombia** believed thatthis was one of the most important decisions to come out of this Committee meeting and that the Chairperson had the right to remove a practice from a List when it undermines the universal respect for human rights. Inscription on a List provides an expression with universal visibility. UNESCO cannot grant that visibility when the expression is in violation of the principles and aims of the Organization since this would undermine the organization’s credibility. This is particularly pertinent when the principles of human dignity are under attack, as well as principles of opposition to discrimination that undermines mutual respect between communities, groups and individuals, and mocks the historical memory of a people’s suffering. The Committee had taken a historic, unanimous decision to bring attention to all States that cultural expressions and inscribed practices must respect the universal principles of respect for human rights and be a source of rapprochement and peace between peoples.
7. The **delegation of Armenia** remarked that the questions raised by the case of the Aalst Carnival, which touch upon common fundamental values and the objectives of the Convention, must give rise to serious concern. Armenia reaffirmed its firmest condemnation of racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia and its commitment to combat, in all circumstances, intolerance and all forms of discrimination. The representations that repeatedly marked the various editions of the Aalst Carnival were considered unacceptable and racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic. Such representations undermine human dignity and the values of tolerance and mutual respect held by UNESCO and to which Armenia is particularly attached. They are also contrary to the 2003 Convention. It also noted that the inscription of the Aalst Carnival on the Representative List had not fulfilled one of its essential objectives, which was to promote dialogue between the communities. For these reasons, the delegation supported the decision to remove the Aalst Carnival from the Representative List.
8. The **delegation of Jamaica** viewed with deep concern and disappointment the situation that led to the decision to remove an element from the Representative List. It was even more disappointing that the organizers of this event had chosen to use freedom of expression to justify the persistent, negative and offensive representations. It welcomed Belgium’s request for removal from the List, however with some reservation. The delegation was gratified that the decision adopted was unanimous. The Committee must uphold the Convention’s principles, especially with regard to mutual respect, and it therefore supported this decision without reservation and expressed gratitude to Austria for spearheading and coordinating this effort to issue a statement that will be heard around the world and make a difference going forward.
9. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Secretariat for the document, which presented a detailed overview of the situation and the problems caused by the Aalst Carnival. The carnival served as a platform for mockery, lack of respect and discrimination against certain groups who rightly felt attacked. Guatemala has committed itself to mutual respect and the values of UNESCO and the Convention in opposition to the values of hatred that this carnival promoted. It was hoped that there are mechanisms to prevent this type of manifestation, and it agreed that the Operational Directives have a mechanism in place that allows for the removal of such elements when they no longer uphold the values of the Convention. Withdrawing an element from the List will create a precedent, but it is a positive one because it ensures that UNESCO and its Member States uphold the fundamental values to which all subscribe. Following the communication sent to the Secretariat from the Belgian municipality, the community would withdraw this element, and therefore the delegation fully endorsed the decision in its entirety and was mindful of the communication received from Belgium with respect to its withdrawal from the List.
10. The **delegation of Cyprus** wholeheartedly agreed with the decision, emphasizing that all States Parties should diligently avoid unpleasant situations such as these in the future. An element that directly or indirectly touches upon sensitive historical and political issues should be treated with the utmost care. Most importantly, unacceptable gender, social, racial or ethnic discriminatory or offensive bias have no place in this Organization.
11. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** supported this decision with a clear conviction that inscription of intangible cultural heritage should serve for dialogue and mutual understanding. It should serve as a bridge for reconciliation and should unite the communities rather than divide. The delegation joined the previous speakers in condemning all manifestations of discrimination, including anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia. It was unfortunate and regrettable to hear that an element inscribed on the List of the Convention supported such forms, impeding dialogue among communities and provoking sentiments contrary to the spirit of the Convention and purposes of this List. As was already mentioned by the Secretary, the element contradicts criteria R.1 and R.2. At the same time, the delegation recognized the efforts of the Belgian authorities and their request to remove the element from the Representative List. This alarming case raises at least three questions. Firstly, it concerned the methodology of evaluation and the identification of this issue by the Evaluation Body. Secondly, it spoke of the absence of clear mechanisms and procedures in the listing and transfer of an element from one List to another, which would be tackled under agenda 14. Thirdly, there is an absence of an evaluation of the element in this process. As every element in this Convention goes through an evaluation process, logically a listing should also subsequently pass the same procedure. This is the case with the World Heritage Convention. The delegation wished to see these issues raised under agenda Item 14 and asked that the Committee and the Secretariat be mindful of these issues.
12. Speaking asan Arab and Muslim country, the **delegation of Kuwait** welcomed this decision that condemns all forms of racism. In fact, in 2005, before the item was even inscribed in 2010, the Arab League of Education, Culture and Science Organization (ALECSO), comprising 22 Arab countries, condemned the Aalst Carnival as it was offensive to Muslims. It was hoped that the Committee would learn from this process and ensure that future files are in line with the values of UNESCO and the Convention.
13. The **delegation of Poland** emphasized its firm opposition to all forms of discrimination, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, hate speech and intolerance, and its commitment to preventing and combatting all incidents of this character worldwide. It attached the utmost importance to the promotion of intercultural and interreligious dialogue, and mutual respect and understanding, one of its top priorities in international fora. These values are of particular importance at UNESCO. It therefore thanked Belgium for these explanations and decision to request the removal of the element to dissipate tensions among communities and the controversy surrounding the carnival, which is itself of importance for the local community, cultivated and celebrated seamlessly for centuries. The delegation underlined the urgent need for the development of effective and transparent mechanisms for the follow-up and monitoring of elements inscribed on the Lists of the Convention. In relation to the examined document prepared by the Secretariat, the protection of intangible cultural heritage under the Convention can only be granted on the basis of the principles set out therein. The delegation saw the importance of guidelines to the Operational Directives to properly address these problems, such as possible changes in the nature of inscribed elements, as well as their intentional or unintentional misuse that go against the principles and values stipulated in the Convention, in particular under Article 2, and against the spirit of UNESCO and its aims. In this context, there is a need for constant capacity-building and awareness-raising activities.
14. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** spoke ofits nation as a very diverse, multi-ethnic community including a small but active Jewish community. As a country whose soldiers participated in the liberation of Auschwitz, Treblinka, Majdanek and other places, which [on a personal level] he visited on several occasions, the delegation joined others in condemning all forms of discrimination, including racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia, and therefore it supported the adopted decision. At the same time, it was recognized that Belgium agreed to the removal of the element from the List and the Belgian Government’s willingness to remain in the spirit of UNESCO and the Convention. It was hoped that the Committee will work together to avoid such sad occasions and cases in the future.
15. The **delegation of Djibouti** associated itself with the various statements by Members of the Committee, but also wished to emphasize that this kind of case can only occur in the absence of a mechanism for monitoring the elements inscribed on the Representative List. Hence, the importance of finding a solution that could prevent its recurrence, for example by drawing the attention of States Parties to these issues in the nomination file. In addition, every State Party is responsible for its elements inscribed on the Representative List, and it would be appropriate to request that the Member States of the Committee and States Parties to the Convention be more sensitive and vigilant in the face of such behaviour and cases.
16. Thanking Djibouti, the **Chairperson** congratulated the Secretariat, acknowledging its work on this subject, and also for the discussions and reflections that had taken place within the Bureau. The decision taken by the Committee indeed marked a very important point for the future of the Convention.

**ITEM 13 OF THE AGENDA**

**INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN EMERGENCIES**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/13 Rev*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-13_REV-EN.docx)

[*LHE/19/14.COM/INF.13*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.13-EN.docx)

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

1. The **Chairperson** then invited the Secretariat to present the next agenda item 13.
2. The **Secretary** was pleased to present this item on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies following three cycles of reflections, adding that the operational principles and modalities presented in the document represented the culmination of this work. Based on the knowledge and experience acquired in recent years, they offered an overarching framework on how best to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, in line with the principles of the Convention. While acknowledging that there is no one-size-fits-all approach, these broad principles and modalities will provide a valuable platform to engage a wide range of stakeholders on the vital role that intangible cultural heritage can play in emergency situations. They also mark a transition in the Committee’s work from a period of reflection to a focus on building capacities and awareness to implement these core principles and modalities in specific local contexts. The Secretary explained that this was an important contribution of the Convention to help safeguard intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and protect the lives and wellbeing of its bearers, which should always be a priority in any emergency situation. Ms Fumiko Ohinata was asked to continue the presentation.
3. The Secretariat, **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** began by tracing the main lines of discussion undertaken by the Committee in developing this topic over the previous three sessions. When the Committee initiated the reflection in 2016, the emphasis was placed on the dual nature of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, both in terms of how emergencies affect the practice and transmission of living heritage and on how communities can draw on their intangible cultural heritage as a tool for preparedness, resilience, reconciliation and recovery. The Committee in 2016 also expressed the need to obtain more knowledge on the topic to better understand its complexity through real-life situations. In 2017, at its twelfth session, the Secretariat reported to the Committee its activities to explore the role of intangible cultural heritage in both armed conflicts and natural disasters. The Committee pointed to a future direction that privileged community-based needs identification and requested the Secretariat to continue its work to pilot this approach. The Committee in 2017 also encouraged the Secretariat to enhance awareness and build capacities on this issue and to strengthen cooperation with relevant UN entities. At its thirteenth session in 2018, the Committee felt that the time had come to define operational modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and requested the Secretariat to organize an expert meeting on the topic in 2019 with the aim to transform the knowledge and experience acquired into methodological guidance for States Parties and other relevant stakeholders. The Expert Meeting took place on 21 and 22 May 2019 at UNESCO Headquarters with the generous support from China [see [document INF.13](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-INF.13-EN.docx)]. It brought together 21 experts from the six UNESCO electoral groups, who were wholeheartedly thanked for their tireless efforts. The experts agreed on a set of operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, building on the Secretariat’s earlier work in emergency contexts. It was noted that five salient points emerged from the meeting.
4. First, **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that the operational principles and modalities addressed both armed conflict and natural disasters, which is in line with the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Action for the Protection of Culture and the Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict.[[27]](#footnote-27) While recognizing that there are important differences between these two types of emergencies, the aim of the meeting was to reach broad safeguarding principles and methodologies which can then be adapted to local circumstances and conditions, as relevant and appropriate. Second, in line with previous Committee discussions, the operational principles and modalities emphasize the dual nature of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. Thus, they not only concern the safeguarding of living heritage at risk, but also how it can be harnessed by communities as a powerful resource to draw upon in emergencies. Third, the operational principles and modalities are structured around the three main phases of an emergency cycle: preparedness, immediate response and recovery. The experts proposed this approach to align with existing humanitarian frameworks and modes of operation, while respecting the core principles of the Convention. Fourth, the approach places communities at its centre, as safeguarding intangible cultural heritage cannot be separated from the protection of the lives and wellbeing of its bearers. The principles recognize that communities must play the primary role in identifying and safeguarding their intangible cultural heritage at all stages of an emergency. It promotes a community-based approach to support the capacities of affected communities to identify and address their immediate safeguarding needs and draw upon their intangible cultural heritage in response and recovery efforts. Lastly, the operational principles and modalities are relevant to a broad range of stakeholders involved in emergency management, including disaster preparedness and relief specialists, humanitarian actors, NGOs and armed forces. These underpinning principles seek to sensitize stakeholders to the dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies and to provide a platform for these stakeholders to engage with the principles of the Convention in their work. The working document presented the operational principles and modalities to the Committee for endorsement with a view to transmitting them to the eighth session of the General Assembly.
5. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** further explained that in addition to the expert meeting, the document outlines other activities conducted in the context of UNESCO’s ongoing action to protect culture in emergencies. For example, the Secretariat continues to provide technical and financial assistance to countries for safeguarding projects in emergency contexts through its international assistance mechanism.[[28]](#footnote-28) Over the years, it has supported projects in Mali, Niger, Côte d’Ivoire and Colombia. The Heritage Emergency Fund provides an additional and complementary source of support, with several interesting examples from the Fund showcased at a side event the previous night. The Secretariat continues to strengthen collaboration with other international and UN partners working in the field of emergencies. For example in 2019, as part of the Syrian component of the European Union-funded project, a joint methodology was developed and piloted with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to map the cultural resources of displaced communities in Lebanon. Lastly, the Secretariat has sought to strengthen its work related to disaster risk management with the development of capacity-building materials, due to be finalized in 2020, and the integration of disaster risk reduction strategies in the inventorying guidance note. The operational principles and modalities thus provide an overarching framework to support the implementation of the Convention in emergencies. They do not define an exhaustive list of actions, but rather propose an overall framework of core principles and actions that should be adapted to specific local contexts, becoming more refined and context specific in the years to come. In some ways, they mark a transition point in shifting towards an operational phase to build capacities and implement these principles in specific emergency situations.
6. The **Secretary** was pleased to report that the Secretariat had recently received a contribution from Switzerland to support capacity-building activities on intangible cultural heritage and natural disasters. Azerbaijan also officially expressed its intent to support capacity building in situations of conflict, including forced displacement. This good news was reflected in the revised document on this item. Since then, Switzerland formalized its contribution to the Fund, and the Secretariat proposed to amend the draft decision accordingly to reflect this recent development. The Secretary thanked these States Parties for their valuable support, reiterating that emergencies remain a complex area of intervention for intangible heritage, and more financial support is needed to build on this solid foundation and implement the operational principles and modalities through practical projects or other activities.
7. Thanking the Secretariat, the **Chairperson** opened the floor for comment.
8. Noting the importance of the topic, the **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Secretariat for its report and presentation, and would propose amendments to paragraphs 2 and 9.
9. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** welcomed the progress achieved by the Secretariat since the Committee’s last session in advancing the work of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, including in situations of armed conflict and natural disasters. It commended the Secretariat for the success of the Expert Meeting on ICH in emergencies in May 2019, which helped develop operational principles and modalities presented to the Committee. The delegation particularly supported the idea that dealing with such situations, especially concerning conflict and displacement, would mean establishing new forms of cooperation with actors that would require tailored capacity-building and outreach activities. It strongly supported the idea that States need to ensure that communities, including internally 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. With this in mind, Azerbaijan was pleased to support the activities dedicated to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in situations of conflict and forced displacement through an earmarked financial contribution. It believed that the result of this work will guide the Convention in efforts to prevent and mitigate the effects of conflict and displacement on the intangible cultural heritage of communities.
10. The **delegation of Austria** appreciated the debate on the role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies as an essential element for guiding the future work of the Convention, also with a view to achieving the 2030 Agenda. As was known from the recent General Conference and also the Forum of Minsters, the protection of cultural heritage and the promotion of cultural pluralism in emergencies are central goals, and intangible cultural heritage can make an important contribution in this regard. The delegation concurred with the concept of the dual role of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies with regard to the threats posed on intangible cultural heritage and also that intangible cultural heritage plays a central part in a community’s resilience and ability to respond to situations of emergencies such as armed conflicts and natural disasters, but which also includes the effects of climate change that are not only apparent in big disasters like floods or droughts but are often revealed in small decay and deterioration, threatening cultural heritage. The delegation also emphasized the important role of NGOs in drawing upon their expertise and experience in the field. It also welcomed the proposal for capacity-building in order to make the link between disaster risk reduction and the role of intangible cultural heritage more widely understood, and it looked forward to the newly developed materials. The topic has wide implications also for other Conventions. Thus, in line with the General Conference, the delegation proposed to make more use of synergies, in particular with the 1999 Second Protocol Committee.
11. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked thatthe draft operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies are highly relevant amid increasing levels of emergency conditions encountered by communities and nations. The Philippines is on the frontline of climate change impacts and – sitting under the Ring of Fire – its increased exposure to hazard. Hence, it is keenly interested in this topic and a national expert actively participated in the Expert Meeting. Concerning the draft decision, the delegation acknowledged the value of intangible cultural heritage in reducing the risk of emergencies. However, the concept of preparedness in the draft decision did not encompass the notion of risk reduction. Preparedness presupposes the inevitability of emergencies, but communities have capacities to reduce risks drawing from their own intangible cultural heritage. It was thus necessary to articulate the notion of risk reduction in the draft to emphasize the role that intangible cultural heritage can play in building conditions that address the vulnerability of communities and groups. Moreover, the emphasis on emergencies without risk reduction limits the range of actors. A more holistic intersectoral approach was necessary for preparedness, response, recovery and reconstruction. Some States Parties, like the Philippines, have put in place structures for risk reduction, which can be tapped in order to integrate intangible cultural heritage and to enhance intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in emergencies. The delegation had amendments to the draft operational principles and modalities in this regard. In some cases, emergencies can generate divisions or stir tensions in communities. Hence, the complexity of community conditions, including latent issues that can arise during emergency situations, must be taken into account in measures to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
12. The **delegation of Poland** supported UNESCO’s policy regarding the protection of cultural heritage in emergencies. As a State Party, it was involved in a global debate on the subject and supported UNESCO activities in this field. By fully supporting the work on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, as well as UNESCO’s policy on heritage in conflict, with special regard to the Strategy for the Reinforcement of UNESCO’s Action for the Protection of Culture and Promotion of Cultural Pluralism in the Event of Armed Conflict,[[29]](#footnote-29) it underscored the importance of a multifaceted approach to the safeguarding and protection of cultural heritage as a whole, including in both tangible and intangible aspects. In emergencies, tangible and intangible heritage are linked. International law has standards to pay specific attention to the protection of cultural heritage during armed conflict. For this reason, a strategy of UNESCO’s international cultural protection legal instrument, the relevant legal norms of international humanitarian law and international human rights law, both as treaty and customary law should be conducted. Poland is very engaged in the deeper reflection on taking measures to protect elements in times of emergencies. During the conference organized in Warsaw in 2018,[[30]](#footnote-30) experts from around the world underlined the necessity of a community-centred approach, a comprehensive attitude to recovery and reconstruction, and the protection of heritage, and they presented operational principles corresponding to the Warsaw Recommendation,[[31]](#footnote-31) which constituted another step towards the development of a more effective, more interlinked system of international instruments. Poland appreciated the result of the intangible cultural heritage in emergencies report and congratulated its authors for the excellent work, while also commending the Secretariat for its work. The delegation shared the opinion that in today’s world, it is crucial to take all necessary measures to prevent cultural heritage from threats to deter the transmission, visibility and viability of intangible heritage, which are core elements of people’s cultural identity and wellbeing. It shared the view of the need for operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, and strongly believed that thanks to this set of universal guidance the process of recovery and resilience of intangible cultural heritage will be more effective.
13. The **delegation of Guatemala** thanked the Secretariat for its presentation on this item, as well as for the organization of the Expert Meeting, which was very useful to all States Parties wishing to further safeguard their intangible cultural heritage, as well as the bearer and practitioner communities. Part of the work that is being done in Guatemala in this regard involves the Ministry of Culture through its ICH Board, which met in June [in 2019] to establish protocols for safeguarding in emergencies, particularly concerning the risk of volcanic eruptions, earthquakes and other threats. However, it also believed that the analysis should include displaced persons and migrants, particularly those who want to remain in the territory. The cultural practices with which they identify therefore needs to be dovetailed into the solutions identified. In 2020, Guatemala foresees running a pilot project for three municipalities in Guatemala. It was hoped these could later be rolled out into the Central America region where it was looking at cultural techniques and how to preserve them.
14. The **delegation of Japan** remarked on the Expert Meeting held in May [2019] and spoke of the presentation made on natural disaster and ICH given by Prof. Hiroki Takakura of Tohoku University who had undertaken various projects in the area following the earthquake and tsunami of 2011. Prof. Takakura was invited to speak to provide the viewpoint of an expert.
15. **Prof. Hiroki Takakura** wished to share some scientific findings about the contribution of intangible cultural heritage during the recovery phase of a natural disaster. He explained that the 2011 Japanese earthquake and tsunami caused the loss of 20,000 lives and the displacement of 500,000 people. Following the 2011 disaster, the Japanese Government commissioned an emergency survey of the intangible cultural heritage in the tsunami area whose aim was to identify necessary safeguarding measures. His team carried out a short-term survey with non-structured field interviews with 250 individuals in 25 local communities, concerning more than 50 elements of intangible cultural heritage. While the team identified damage to related elements, it also found the distinctive role of intangible cultural heritage in the prolonged disaster recovery period. The survivor faces a series of sudden, tragic and unfamiliar events in relatively isolated conditions. It was found that the traditional local performing arts festival provided an opportunity for social gatherings of the displaced populations. These were opportunities for the victims to share the collective memories, for the bearers and practitioners of the intangible cultural heritage to promote an active social life and a sense of solidarity, and to promote a prompt recovery across the broader community. Based on this experience, it was found that the power of everyday social, cultural life embedded in intangible cultural heritage contributed to a sense of recovery among the community suffering from the disaster. The team also noted many other related roles of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, such as in armed conflicts or others. In conclusion, Prof. Takakura emphasized the special role of intangible cultural heritage within the cycle of community-building and he encouraged further scientific examination of their crucial roles in the context of both natural and human-made disasters.
16. The **delegation of China** expressed its deep appreciation of the Secretariat’s efforts on its work on intangible cultural heritage safeguarding in emergencies, an issue to which China is very attentive. In this regard, it recalled the International Conference on Intangible Cultural Heritage in Celebration of the Tenth Anniversary of UNESCO’s Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage[[32]](#footnote-32) held in June 2013 in Chengdu, China. During the conference the Chengdu Recommendations[[33]](#footnote-33) were issued that addressed the central role intangible cultural heritage could play in helping communities prevent or mitigate natural disasters, and especially in helping people recover from such events to reweave their social fabric and to reaffirm their cultural identities. Intangible cultural heritage was also addressed for its essential role in sustaining the natural environment, and it is accepted that knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe play a role in maintaining sustainable ecosystems and biodiversity and in helping communities ensure food security and health. The delegation further recalled that the new chapter of the Operational Directives was approved, particularly Parts 3 and 4, in which the role of intangible cultural heritage was further described for its contribution to environmental protection and peace building. The delegation therefore welcomed the results of the Expert Meeting and its operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, which it believed would place these issues in a broader and more comprehensive context. Hence, it also underlined the importance of integrating intangible cultural heritage in emergencies under the overall capacity-building strategy.
17. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Secretariat for its efforts and the progress made in the area of intangible cultural heritage and emergencies. In the meeting of experts in 2019, an expert from Curaçao, one of the Caribbean islands in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, was present. The Caribbean islands suffer every year from emergencies, especially hurricanes, and one can see how climate change contributes and will continue to contribute in the future to these emergencies. Operational principles and modalities have now been developed, and although general, they are very important steps forward since the start of this reflection in 2016. What is very clear is that there are many different emergency situations. Natural disasters are creating complex situations in various regions in the world with different stakeholders and a need for different strategies. To develop a structure in which information can be shared between these different stakeholders, [the involvement of] humanitarian actors, NGOs, and armed forces is key. This means that humanitarian actors have to bring the intangible cultural heritage perspective into their work and know where they can find information about the intangible cultural heritage of the communities. The integration of information about the vulnerability of elements to potential emergencies in inventories so as to facilitate identification and access is an important modality in the stages of preparedness, response and recovery. The delegation believed that online participatory tools could play a role in this, for instance with cultural mapping or apps that could be used by communities and heritage organizations. Equally important is to develop an infrastructure in which the different Conventions, for instance the 1999 Second Protocol, could work together to see where synergies could be made possible. It is important that existing infrastructures and operational entities are involved and can develop knowledge and skills to include intangible cultural heritage and the needs of the communities into their work in all three stages of preparedness, response and recovery. The delegation welcomed the work on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, and it hoped that good practices and the results of projects all over the world can be shared by the different stakeholders.
18. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretariat for the presentation of information related to the issue of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. It reaffirmed the importance and relevance of this issue that requires the implementation of measures to safeguard intangible cultural heritage in these specific cases, while considering the communities affected by these situations. The delegation also took note of the work carried out by experts that led to the development of a set of operational principles and modalities for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies.
19. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Secretariat for helping to understand this important issue, adding that it was also important to have an emergency fund for intangible cultural heritage. The delegation presented a Colombian project that had benefitted from emergency International Assistance[[34]](#footnote-34) [in 2018] to generate methodologies on reconciliation processes between communities based on the identification of intangible cultural heritage. Colombia has been working with communities to reintegrate former combatants of the FARC into mainstream life in the region of El Conejo. It has worked hand-in-hand with communities using intangible cultural heritage to help them build a community together, comprising 20 per cent of people from El Conejo, 20 per cent of former FARC combatants, and 40 per cent of local inhabitants. Not only have 1,000 people from the region benefitted from these initiatives of reconciliation and reintegration, as well as human resilience through intangible cultural heritage, but the project also benefitted El Conejo Public library and other institutions around tourism. It also provided psychological support for community members, and a museum of living heritage for El Conejo residents and FARC former combatants so as to build a collective memory. In addition, they have also created their own intangible cultural heritage practices built on living heritage by bringing former combatants into the El Conejo territory who have organized an annual carnival in celebration of the reconciliation of these two communities. They also have farms with organic and medicinal plants. Former FARC combatants actually know a lot about traditional medicines given the conditions they experienced as combatants, joining this experience with the knowledge of traditional plants and medicines of the communities of El Conejo and thereby strengthening their communities. Another initiative involves working on joint tourism practices to promote tourism in the region. The goal of these initiatives is to show that financing this fund not only results in greater knowledge of living intangible cultural heritage in the region, but it also enhances the quality of life of community members, while strengthening processes of social integration, building harmony within communities that had been torn apart. The delegation took the opportunity to thank Switzerland and Azerbaijan for their generous contributions, which are testimony to the importance of these initiatives, not only nationally – even though national process are very important in Colombia – but also for the local communities whose living heritage can play a central role in stimulating new forms of reconciliation, while enhancing heritage that are in fact very much part of the daily lives of the affected communities.
20. The **delegation of Lebanon** congratulated the Secretariat for its efforts and the progress made with regard to intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations. Having participated in the Expert Meeting in May, as well as in the revision of the text on the principles and modalities, the delegation wished to reiterate its congratulations for the work. However, an issue that called for reflection (concerning the development of an integrated management approach for the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in conflict situations described in paragraph 23) was whether humanitarian organizations will be present in the States during the three phases described in the modalities, i.e. preparedness, response, recovery. The Lebanese experience shows that these organizations only settle in a country during a conflict, i.e. during phase 2 or the response phase. For instance, they were present during the conflict from 1975 to 1990, and again when they resettled and developed their activities to meet the needs of the Syrian and Iraqi refugees from 2011. The issue therefore supposes a reflection on the other two phases of the modalities, i.e. preparedness and recovery.
21. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Secretariat for this exhaustive report, which synthesized all the elements and conclusions of the panel of experts that met in May to reflect on this issue. Coming from Senegal, a country in the heart of the Sahel and in the eye of a storm with regard to terrorism that prevails in these regions, it was concerned by the question of emergency. During this meeting of experts, in which Senegal participated, the analysis of the situations on the ground presented a measure of the threats experienced by the communities to their intangible cultural heritage, for example in cases like Mali where the situation is extremely serious. Even for a country like Senegal, which has a reputation for stability, it has been experiencing an independence crisis in the south of the country in the Casamance for more than a decade. Indeed, when it came to finding the first solutions for peace, Senegal turned to intangible cultural heritage and an expression shared by all the countries in West Africa called ‘joking relationships’, which is inscribed by Niger [on the Representative List in 2014]. This joking relationship is an element of social cohesion and social regulation that is maintained through kinship along ethnic and linguistic lines. This is how the Serer of West-Central Senegal are considered linked by kinship with the Jola of Casamance, who are considered as independentist rebels. This kinship was therefore used to allow the Serer to initiate meetings and dialogue with the Jola, which were the very first peace talks held in Senegal. The situation has since stabilized and today this level of intangible cultural heritage intervention has been fully appreciated by the whole nation. The delegation gave another example [in a personal account] of his time as a teacher in the region of Casamance and, as a pedagogical adviser, he initiated cultural activities in schools that allowed young people to ‘exorcise’ malevolent thoughts (seen culturally as more or less a taboo) through theatre and traditional games, which allowed young people to talk about the conflict and which perhaps were the first steps towards a consensus and peace. Culture is therefore extremely important from this point of view. Concerning the principles and the modalities proposed, as mentioned by Lebanon, there may be issues for further reflection, but in general these principles and modalities are operational and have been proposed following a concrete analysis of the situation in several cases.
22. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** recognized the relevance of this issue given the two relatively recent events in Sri Lanka, namely, the 30-year internal conflict that ended in 2009 and the Asian tsunami of 2004, which severely affected the country’s intangible cultural heritage. Many communities were displaced, while in some cases entire communities were washed away by the ocean. However, without properly trained experts on handling post-disaster recovery actions, the country has not yet been able to achieve anything fruitful to address the losses. Sri Lanka therefore supports all UNESCO programmes that can help States Parties faced with these issues to safeguard their intangible cultural heritage in the event of natural and human-made disasters, especially in the area of capacity building.
23. The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for the interventions and reflections, and for recognizing the work of the Secretariat on this issue, turning to the adoption of the draft decision. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 had received an amendment by **Austria, Palestine, Cyprus and Poland**, which would read, ‘all relevant rules of Humanitarian Law and International Human Rights Law, both as treaty and customary law’.
24. The **delegation of Palestine** wished to add, ‘including occupation’, after ‘in the event of armed conflict’.
25. The **Secretary** did not oppose the amendment, but expressed concern that the amendment immediately followed the naming of the Strategy document 39/C35 and it was therefore not consistent with the document’s official title.
26. The **delegation of Palestine** conceded that this was true, but there was no impediment to the general understanding that whenever armed conflict is discussed it naturally includes occupation. The delegation was flexible, but it was a matter of principle and it sought the opinion of the other Members.
27. The **delegation of Austria** understood Palestine’s interest in including this wording. However, as mentioned by the Secretary, it was not legally possible to change the name of a document of the General Conference, the supreme organ of UNESCO. If there was a doubt, the delegation would request the advice of the Legal Adviser and it suggested deleting the wording for the sake of consistency and for legal reasons.
28. The **delegation of Cyprus** saw no problem in being more analytical in the paragraph, and therefore agreed with Palestine’s amendment.
29. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** supported Palestine’s proposal in principle, but it also understood the rationale presented by the Secretary and Austria. As a matter of compromise, it suggested that Palestine include this element further in the text where it mentions armed conflict. It supported the proposed amendment in paragraph 2 by Austria and others.
30. The **Chairperson** asked Palestine whether it could agree with Azerbaijan’s proposal.
31. The **delegation of Palestine** agreed to place the text elsewhere in the draft decision.
32. The **delegation of Poland** added thataccording to the international law of armed conflict, occupation is one of the stages of armed conflict.
33. The **delegation of Armenia** wished to keep the original title of the document. Furthermore, if ‘occupation’ appeared in another paragraph it would then open up to other elements. It agreed with Poland that armed conflict includes occupation, however, Armenia was concerned that its introduction would require listing other situations. For example, Austria was also correct to cite disasters due to climate change in relation to natural disasters in emergency situations. Was the Committee therefore open to listing all these situations? Armenia also wished to co-sponsor the amendment in paragraph 2.
34. The **Secretary** explained that obviously the Committee’s document does not have precedence over normative documents by the General Conference related to situations of conflict. This document is intended to propose modalities and principles of working with intangible cultural heritage. In that sense, it might be a moot point to start proposing definitions as they have already been adopted by organs established to address issues of situations of emergencies.
35. The **Chairperson** suggested not to use ‘occupation’ as this was implied under armed conflict.
36. The **delegation of Palestine** added thatsince everyone agreed that armed conflict includes occupation it did not see a problem with including it in the paragraph, inviting Azerbaijan to identify the paragraph where it could be added without posing a problem for the Secretariat.
37. The **Chairperson** proposed to move forward and adopt paragraph 2, and return to the amendment further in the draft decision.
38. The **delegation of Palestine** asked that Azerbaijan first identify the most suitable place to insert ‘occupation’ in the draft decision.
39. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** suggested paragraph 10, which would read, ‘Invites contributions from States Parties to implement a range of practical projects, which will contribute to the ongoing safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, including the situation of armed conflict, occupation, natural and manmade disasters’.
40. The **Chairperson** proposed to return to paragraph 2.
41. The **delegation of Armenia** proposed to adopt paragraph 2 as it currently stood, adding that the document in question could not in any case be modified.
42. The **Chairperson** concurred [to delete Palestine’s amendment] and pronounced paragraph 2 adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 and 4 were also adopted. It was noted that Austria had presented an amendment in paragraph 5.
43. The **delegation of Austria** explained that it wished to add at the end of the sentence, ‘including the effects of climate change’, explaining that this also affected the practices of intangible cultural heritage.
44. The **delegation of Austria** [second speaker] also spoke of an important discussion at the High-Level Forum and the United Nations General Assembly in the 1999 Committee, where Austria is also a member, on the issue of climate change and the effects on cultural heritage including intangible cultural heritage. The delegation added that this was nothing new and in fact UNESCO as a whole had been praised [for its work in this field].
45. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 5 adopted as amended. Paragraph 6 was also adopted. The Chairperson noted that the Secretary wished to speak.
46. The **Secretary** wished to present an amendment in paragraph 7 submitted by the Philippines that specifically refers to the Annex to the working document 13. The amendment to the Annex concerned paragraphs 2 and 5 in the ‘modalities’ section under ‘preparedness’, and proposed to add ‘risk reduction and’ to complement ‘emergency preparedness’. It was noted that the Philippines had spoken about the amendment in its earlier intervention.
47. The **delegations of Poland**, **Palestine, Lebanon, Kuwait, Cyprus, Cuba, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Togo, Mauritius** wished to co-sponsor the amendment.
48. The **delegation of Austria** noted the amendment to the Annex and also wished to make a slight amendment to add ‘as well as the consequences of climate change’ in the first sentence after ‘caused by natural and human-induced hazards’.
49. The **Secretary** reminded the Committee that this document containing the operational principles was the result of discussions among 30 experts who had detailed discussions on these issues including on climate change, which they felt was a broader issue.
50. The **Chairperson** asked Austria if it could agree to withdraw its amendment.
51. The **delegation of Austria** agreed to withdraw.
52. The **Chairperson** thanked Austria, noting that Kuwait withdrew its intervention.
53. With Austria withdrawing its amendment, the **Chairperson** pronounced the Annex adopted and returned to paragraphs 7 and 8, which were duly adopted.
54. The **delegation of Palestine** noted that the Secretariat always cooperates with accredited NGOs on the ground, particularly in emergency situations. It therefore wished to propose a slight amendment in paragraph 9, which would read, ‘in cooperation with accredited NGOs’.
55. The **Secretary** appreciated the observation and agreed on the need to work with accredited NGOs. However, this amendment implied that the Secretariat was invited to work with all 168 accredited NGOs. It was therefore unclear as to what was being requested, which would make it difficult for the Secretariat to implement the decision.
56. The **delegation of Palestine** fully understood and changed the wording to ‘in cooperation with accredited NGOs as appropriate’.
57. The **delegation of Lebanon** did not agree with the amendment, not least because there are so few accredited NGOs in the Arab world. In this sense, the amendment was linking capacity building with a form of collaboration with NGOs.
58. The **delegation of Armenia** suggested‘accredited NGOs concerned’ as this would make specific reference to NGOs concerned by the issue.
59. The **Secretary** reiterated that the paragraph was unclear as it requested the Secretariat to work with all accredited NGOs when developing its capacity building. He understood that this was not the intent and that the intention was to work with NGOs in *implementing* the capacity-building. It was therefore a question of wording.
60. The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend paragraph 9 to find appropriate wording, and to move to paragraph 10.
61. The **delegation of Austria** wished to explain the rationale behind its amendment in a new paragraph 10.[[35]](#footnote-35) Austria was recently elected member to the 1999 Committee that is in charge of implementing the Second Protocol to the 1954 Convention. After its first meeting the previous week, the 1999 Committee had actually adopted this very same language [concerning armed conflict situations]. There was great interest in the 1999 Committee to pursue these ideas of achieving more synergies between the 2003 Committee and the 1999 Committee, and there was a proposal, introduced by Belgium, that was adopted along those lines. It was important for Austria to keep the wording flexible to allow the Secretariat of both Committees, in cooperation with the Chairpersons, to decide the best way to arrange for a joint meeting between the Bureaus. The delegation felt that this would be a very good opportunity to make sure the discussions in the present Committee and the resulting document, which it was about to adopt, are also brought to the attention of the 1999 Committee in discussions with specialists on armed conflict. This would also bring the discussion forward in that context.
62. The **Chairperson** noted support for the amendment from **Palestine, Azerbaijan, Poland, Cyprus, Netherlands, Jamaica** and **Guatemala.**
63. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** wished to speak after the adoption of the amendment in paragraph 10, agreeing on the importance of synergies, to insert a new paragraph to accommodate the concerns previously raised [on ‘occupation’ by Palestine].
64. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 10 adopted, and invited the Secretary to present the proposed amendment in paragraph 9.
65. In order to recognize collaboration with NGOs, the **Secretary** proposed the following wording, ‘Requests that the Secretariat continue its efforts to develop a capacity-building approach to operationalize the proposed principles and modalities and build awareness of their importance among actors in the field of heritage safeguarding, including non-governmental organizations accredited to the 2003 Convention’.
66. The **Chairperson** felt that this was an excellent proposal to which Palestine agreed and paragraph 9 was duly adopted as amended. The Chairperson gave the floor to Azerbaijan.
67. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** proposed a new paragraph 11, which would read, ‘Further encourages States Parties to pursue their efforts in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in situations of armed conflict, including occupation and natural and manmade disasters’.
68. The **delegation of Austria** could agree with theamendmentby Azerbaijan, but had an issue with the order of wording and proposed, ‘including occupation as well as in situations of natural and man-made disasters’.
69. The **delegation of Palestine** suggested a comma after ‘including occupation’, as it specifically referred to armed conflict.
70. The **Chairperson** assured the Committee that the Secretary would correct the punctuation.
71. The **delegation of Armenia** notedthe listing of situationsthatmight arise and proposed to include, ‘post-conflict situations and disasters caused by natural or man-made risks, as well as those due to the consequences of climate change’.
72. The **delegation of Cyprus** supported the amendment, amended by Armenia, but preferred ‘including occupation and post-conflict situations’.
73. The **Secretary** reiterated that stylistic and grammatical errors would be corrected, adding that the wording throughout the document is ‘human-induced hazards’ and not ‘man-made’.
74. The **delegation of** **Lebanon** wondered whether post-conflict situations are part of emergency situations.
75. The **Secretary** confirmed that in previous discussions, post-conflict situations did indeed fall under emergency situations.
76. The **delegation of Colombia** clarifiedthat the example given earlier on its project financed by [The Heritage Emergency] Fund was actually a post-conflict situation.
77. Thanking Azerbaijan and Armenia for the amendments, the **delegation of Palestine** wished to co-sponsor Armenia’s amendment.
78. The **Chairperson** turned to paragraph 11 as amended, which was subsequently supported by **Cyprus**, **Lebanon** and **Jamaica** and received the broad support of the Committee, which was duly adopted. Paragraph 12 was also adopted.
79. The **Secretary** explained that paragraph 13 pertained to the contribution by Switzerland and the intent by Azerbaijan to support capacity-building activities.
80. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraphs 13 and 14 adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 13**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/13) **adopted**.
81. The **delegation of Switzerland** thanked the Secretariat for the excellent work carried out on intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. It particularly welcomed the important step taken with the expert meeting, which had provided operational principles and modalities. It seemed particularly appropriate to consider how intangible cultural heritage can be used to prevent natural risks, to contribute to their management, but also to strengthen the resilience of communities, in post-disaster situations. As such, Switzerland wished to contribute to capacity building in the field of intangible cultural heritage in the prevention of natural risks. Switzerland would therefore make a voluntary contribution of US $100,000 for material and training in this area. Switzerland also welcomed the adoption of the amendments calling for collaboration with the 1999 Committee of the Second Protocol, recalling the international provisions relating to emergency situations.
82. The **Chairperson** thanked Switzerland for its contribution, which was much appreciated.
83. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates of the lunchtime events, including a seminar on ICH in urban contexts organized by the ICH Group of the Ministry of Culture of Colombia, as well as the launch of the 2003 Convention Research Bibliography.
84. The **Chairperson** adjourned the morning session.

*[Friday, 13 December, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 14 OF THE AGENDA**

**REFLECTION ON THE LISTING MECHANISMS OF THE CONVENTION**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/14*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-14-EN.docx)

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

1. The **Chairperson** turned to another important item, the reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention, and the discussion on the overall long-term reflection on the listing mechanisms to be completed by 2022. At the same time, the Committee would deliberate on the results it would like to achieve before 2022, i.e. the so-called ‘early harvest’. The Secretary would make a presentation in two parts. Part I would explain the agenda item and the considerations for the overall reflection, after which the floor would be opened for debate. Part II would explain the early harvest package, i.e. the revisions to the Operational Directives that will allow the Evaluation Body to carry out the upstream dialogue. In was recalled that for this cycle, the Evaluation Body had implemented the upstream dialogue on an experimental and provisional basis.
2. **Part I**. The **Secretary** explained thatthis was indeed the first time the item had been included on the Committee’s agenda. The Committee had discussed the undeniable positive aspects of the Lists, but also the issues and challenges relating to the listing mechanisms on numerous occasions, including during the present session. The first time the Committee expressed the need for this overall reflection was at its twelfth session in 2017 when it examined a request, submitted by Viet Nam, to transfer an element from the Urgent Safeguarding List to the Representative List (see Decision [12.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/14)). At its thirteenth session in 2018, the Committee reiterated the need for an overall reflection. On the same occasion, it accepted the voluntary supplementary contribution from Japan to the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund (Decisions [13.COM 6](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/13.COM/6) and [13.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/10)) to enable the reflection to take place. The overall aim of the initiative was: i) to reflect on the nature and purposes of the Lists and the Register of the Convention; ii) to reflect on the relevance of the various criteria for each of these mechanisms; and iii) to review the methodology for the evaluation and examination of nominations. Given the complexity of the issues, this reflection will span over a long period. The Committee in 2018 requested that the reflection be finalized by 2022. At the same time, the Committee also requested that the Secretariat propose ways to improve the inscription process of nominations, as part of the ‘early harvest package’. This includes the ‘provisional upstream dialogue’ process between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States, which was used for the first time during the 2019 cycle on a provisional and experimental basis. This ‘dialogue’ will be formalized through revisions to the Operational Directives by the General Assembly at its eighth session in 2020 should the Committee and the General Assembly so decide. A provisional timeline for the reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention was presented in Annex I of the working document. The next important occasion to advance the reflection would be a meeting of experts. It had been hoped to hold the meeting earlier in 2019 but it was decided to postpone the meeting until 16 to 18 March 2020 (at UNESCO HQ) owing to the exceptionally heavy workload of the Secretariat in 2019 (NGO consultations, expert meeting on ICH in emergencies, the General Conference of UNESCO). The Secretary reassured the Committee that the change of schedule did not impact the overall calendar of the reflection. Experts will be appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO, taking into account their profiles, experience, geographical balance and gender. To help identify suitable participants, the Secretariat had sent a letter on 17 October 2019 asking States Parties to propose an expert in intangible cultural heritage who could take part in this expert meeting, though this would not guarantee his or her participation. The original deadline was 18 November 2019, and 30 States Parties had made suggestions. Following several requests, the deadline was extended to 15 January 2020.
3. The **Secretary** further explained the considerations for the overall reflection. To prepare the forthcoming reflection process, the working document provided a non-exhaustive summary of challenges encountered by the Evaluation Body and the Committee related to the listing mechanisms, which was broken down into four categories. The first category concerns the overall approach to the listing mechanisms. The second category addresses issues related to the criteria of inscription. The third category relates to issues with regard to the follow-up of inscribed elements. The fourth category concerns the methodology for the evaluation and examination of nominations. The Secretary remarked that these challenges shed light on a number of questions States Parties may consider during the reflection process. As an example, States Parties should decide: i) the future they wish to see for the Lists and the Register, i.e. a strict and rigid criteria-based selection process or, alternatively, an inclusive, more open and fluid listing system; ii) whether to continue with a system of indefinite listing or a fixed-term listing system, which includes sunset clauses; iii) how best to share successful safeguarding practices; iv) how the notion of representativeness is to be understood and applied; v) whether some of the criteria, and in particular R.2, be revised, adapted or deleted; vi) how best to monitor the status of elements already inscribed on the lists, which is part of the long-term reflection. The working document and its Annex II includes a list of four cases that were subject to correspondence received by the Secretariat during the reporting period concerning already inscribed elements. As already seen under agenda item 12 in the case of the Aalst carnival, it may be important to take some intermediate measures pending the conclusion of the overall reflection. This would allow the Secretariat to bring information received by the Secretariat to the attention of the Committee on already inscribed elements. The draft decision suggests that the Committee may, in the meantime, request the Secretariat to continue to bring information received from third parties concerning already inscribed elements to the attention of the Committee. Finally, the last question concerns the methodology of evaluation and examination. Under point vii) should the Committee and the Evaluation Body use only the information included in the files, or should publicly available information be used? These questions would not be answered during the present session but in a long-term process that may expand to more questions and considerations. Nevertheless, the Committee’s thoughts, comments and suggestions would be very important to feed into the reflection process.
4. The **Chairperson** remarked that the ultimate aim of this reflection was to help communities better safeguard their living heritage. She was sure that all Members agreed that the Committee aspired to a system that recognizes and takes into account the safeguarding intentions of submitting States and communities rather than their drafting capacities, and she opened the floor for comments.
5. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the Government of Japan for its generosity in facilitating the organization of the expert meeting on this issue and also the Secretariat for the excellent report, which really encompasses the main issues before the Committee. The upcoming expert meeting will be an opportunity for the Committee to look at more expansive questions concerning the listing mechanisms of the Convention, and the delegation wished to congratulate the Secretariat for its report on this issue. It also wished to underscore the importance of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The delegation believed that this instrument truly reflected the spirit of the Convention because it draws attention to the different techniques for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in all its different forms. Similarly, the efforts undertaken for sharing good practices are all very laudable, but the importance of these good safeguarding practices as a follow-up mechanism for the implementation of the Convention is worth highlighting. Many people see the Convention as an instrument for transformation and also for strengthening safeguarding practices. Given everything that has been achieved in the ICH NGO Forum, the delegation believed that the Committee could also recognize some of the recommendations emanating from there and that could dovetail into the reflection on the listing mechanisms.
6. As a founding Member State of the Convention, the **delegation of Japan** expressed the fact that it greatly cherishes and values the intangible elements of Japan’s history and it wished to share some views on the root of the fundamental problems, particularly why the lofty concept and objectives of the founding members of the Convention were not being achieved. In short, a large part of the problem now faced comes from the fact that the founding fathers and mothers of the Convention had very lofty, idealized objectives that, although still very relevant to all now, has experienced divergence and discrepancies in the process of putting them into practice. The delegation understood that the drafters of the Convention had actually reflected very carefully on the lessons learned from the experience of the 1972 World Heritage Convention. There were two main key concepts they shared when they drafted the Convention. Firstly, they did not adopt the concept of outstanding universal value because of the many problems it caused with regard to exclusivity and because of its authoritarian character. Secondly, they did not adopt the examination mechanism assumed by ICOMOS because it is thought that ICOMOS had become a sort of Leviathan having already accumulated a huge amount of authority and power, becoming an economy in itself. Thus, the lessons learned from the World Heritage Convention is still relevant, even today. Through the process of implementing the Convention, some divergence was observed from the original intentions and objectives, which was partly reflected in the use of inappropriate language that described outstanding universal value , such as ‘uniqueness’, ‘authenticity’, ‘originality’, which were often used. But at that same time, is it correct to categorically deny those words when drafting the nomination files? The delegation was of the view that this was not right, and it was actually making the preparation of the files more complicated and difficult. Actually, in many cases, an element does reflect or represent the uniqueness of the community because it is cherished and treasured by the community itself, i.e. it is original to the community and it is therefore valued and treasured. However in many cases, although they are unique and original, the elements are not necessarily universally outstanding. These were two different concepts and this confusion was making the process of preparing the nomination files very complicated.
7. The **delegation of Japan** further explained that as the concept of outstanding universal value is generally accepted, what then is the core concept of ICH? There are many suggestions, including the idea of a community-centred approach, which is very important. But still, what does this mean precisely? Yes, it may suggest a bottom-up approach, a people-centred or a community-centred approach, but what does this exactly imply? The criteria established attempt to put that concept into practice. However, it is known that some criteria cause confusion, like R.2 for example. Also, the community-centred approach somehow rejects commercialization or the engagement of local and national authorities. This was why Japan supported and appreciated the initiative by the Philippines and other States to offer guidance for the use of terms concerning commercialization and decontextualization. However, it still seems inappropriate to use decontextualization, as the definition remains unclear and is yet another source of confusion and difficulty for the submitting States in preparing a good nomination file. In this case, the Convention did not adopt the type of evaluations carried out by ICOMOS for intangible cultural heritage with visits to the nominating State at a huge cost in time and energy. But then, what should the Convention do in place of ICOMOS? So far, no visits to a nominating State by the Evaluation Body have been arranged as members of the Body are advised to focus on the evaluation of the nomination file, examining only the information presented. In some cases, there has been a lack of sufficient information but also an absence of dialogue with the nominating States, which are sources of disagreements between Member States and the Evaluation Body, causing divergence in some cases. The delegation appreciated the attempt to start the upstream dialogue process despite the many problems during the evaluation process. Moreover, this process needs to go ahead. In this information age and without onsite inspection, there are many ways to establish a dialogue and to collect information from the Internet and other media. This involves working together to find a better and more credible evaluation mechanism. Finally, Japan once again reiterated its very strong commitment to this very critical process for the future of intangible cultural heritage.
8. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the detailed document presenting the key issues related to improving the listing mechanisms of the Convention, as well as the relevant timeline with a view to finalizing the reflection on the listing mechanisms for the ninth session of the General Assembly in 2022. It thanked the Government of Japan for its contribution in this regard. While noting the diverse issues, the delegation believed that many of the issues are in fact interlinked. It particularly recognized the strong link between the reporting on elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and the issues of transfer and/or removal from one List to another. It was hoped that the reform of the listing mechanisms will fill the legal vacuum that currently exists in the Operational Directives in this regard. Concerning multinational nominations, the delegation felt that little attention had been paid so far to the issue of extensions of multinational elements already inscribed to other States who wish to join. The process of extension is particularly complex for the coordinating State, especially in cases of multiple countries submitting one joint nomination as they have to restart the whole process. It therefore considered that the review of the listing mechanisms might be an excellent opportunity to address this issue, and it had submitted an amendment to the draft decision in this regard. The delegation carefully considered the results of the so-called ‘early harvest package’ of the upstream dialogue process and it looked forward to the draft amendments to the Operational Directives with regard to the procedure for such dialogue. It also saw the need for the Evaluation Body to follow the principle of dialogue through a short question and answer approach, which proved to be very useful and important where this process is not seen as a redrafting of the nomination as a whole.
9. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** further added, as mentioned previously under agenda item 12, that there was a need to revise the Operational Directives in order to establish clear and specific procedures and criteria for the removal of an element from the List and the transfer from one List to another, which was the logic behind the Committee’s Decision [12.COM 14](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/14) when it examined this issue, and it had submitted a draft amendment in this regard. Last but not least, the delegation brought attention to the press release drafted by UNESCO on the removal of the Aalst Carnival from the Representative List. Unfortunately, it came as a surprise to note that ‘Islamophobia’ was omitted in citing and condemning these different forms of racism. The delegation therefore asked that this point be addressed so as to correct the press release as soon as possible.
10. The **delegation of the Philippines** explained that in light of the decision on agenda item 12, it wished to join other colleagues in expressing the urgent need to define clear, objective and predictable procedures and criteria for removing an element from the Lists of the Convention. There is insistence on strictly following the rules, procedures and practices, but exceptions are made when there are larger external influences and factors at hand. Setting fair, transparent and State-driven procedures should be a priority of the global reflection, together with the possible redefinition of criterion R.2 and clear procedures for the transfer of elements from one List to another. The Philippines believes in the dynamic nature of intangible cultural heritage and that there should be a holistic relationship between the listing mechanisms of the Convention. Inscription is not an end in itself but only a means to raise visibility with the aim of safeguarding. Hence, it reiterated its earlier remarks that the Committee should not fall into the World Heritage paradigm. The delegation also drew attention to other risks seen in other listing mechanisms in UNESCO, such as the World Heritage List and the Memory of the World Register, so as to insulate the Convention from political and territorial disputes. Therefore, while the delegation understood the reason for the Evaluation Body to take into account information outside nomination dossiers, it must also be sensitive about verifying the information sources and [possible issues of] politicization so as not to create a quasi-communication procedure or dispute-settlement mechanism for elements on the Lists. Another crucial element is that the reform process should endeavour to hear the voices and address the interests of the communities concerned. Likewise, States Parties—as the drafters and signatories of the Convention—should be active participants in the global reflection. The Committee has to be fully engaged in the process that must be as inclusive and open as possible. In this regard, it recommended that interested Committee Members be invited to send experts as observers to the preliminary expert meeting scheduled in March 2020. The delegation welcomed the results of the initial dialogue procedure, which the Philippines has consistently advocated since the Committee’s session in Addis Ababa in 2016. There was initial resistance to the idea, which took two years to realize after much work and debate, including in the framework of the Ad Hoc Working Group which the Philippines co-chaired in 2018. The delegation was glad that the Evaluation Body, the Secretariat and States Parties seem satisfied with it, noting as well that it could still be improved. Nevertheless, it emphasized that the dialogue will not ensure inscription of all nominations nor is it meant to do so. States Parties continue to have a responsibility to submit nominations that meet all the criteria from the outset. Having said this, the delegation supported the adoption by the General Assembly of the amendments to the Operational Directives, which formalize the dialogue process for files that require minor clarifications.
11. The **delegation of Austria** thanked the Secretary for the comprehensive overview of the challenges ahead that is a very good and concise reminder for all. It was recalled that the Committee had discussed the question of removal of an element from a List and the transfer from one List to another, as well as the nature and purposes of the Lists, a number of times. The delegation very much welcomed the proposal of an expert meeting to deal with these questions and make suggestions for possible adoption by the next General Assembly, as the introduction of new forms, criteria and requests should be given careful consideration. An important point that should not be overlooked is a reflection on the follow-up of inscribed elements. A case in which the criteria for inscription were no longer met had just been discussed [the Aalst Carnival] but there had also been elements inscribed that had given rise for concern. There were many options for such follow-up, for instance, a community-based peer-to-peer review system using a new tool like ‘Dive into Intangible Heritage’[[36]](#footnote-36) to form working groups across domains, themes and so on. Accredited NGOs could also be involved, for example by asking them to submit shadow reports with the participation of communities. The new reporting cycle might also be helpful in the follow-up process given the fact that there will be more meetings and exchange sessions across the regions. Finally, a point for consideration by the expert group could be on the purposes of the Lists. As a Member of the Committee for four years, the delegation felt that the Committee spends a significant amount of time and energy on discussing nominations for the Representative List, which undergo a heavy nomination and evaluation process, and not always with the expected results which can then cause irritation and disappointment among the different stakeholders. Therefore, the time might be ripe to consider making the Representative List more representative and inclusive; a chance to celebrate the great diversity of cultural expressions and human creativity together, while allowing the communities to spend their energy on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through the sharing of good safeguarding practices and by caring for elements in need of urgent safeguarding.
12. The **delegation of Austria** [second speaker] wished to add to the comment made by Azerbaijan to request the Secretariat to rectify the omission in the press release on the Carnival of Aalst. The delegation specifically included in its amendment to Decision [14.COM](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12) 12 that the Committee condemn all forms of discrimination, including racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. It therefore joined Azerbaijan in its concern and requested to include ‘Islamophobia’ in the press release, as it was very important to do so.
13. The **delegation of the Netherlands** thanked the Secretariat for the very well-prepared documents, and Japan for its support of the expert meeting and the reflection on the listing mechanisms. As seen from the discussions of the last few days, this agenda item is very timely and the experts should thoroughly discuss and follow-up on this topic during the General Assembly in June 2020. The past days have shown that there is a lot of confusion about and misunderstandings of the concepts of this Convention. For the past 10 years UNESCO has invested in capacity-building, but it seems that the effects are not always reflected in the files. The delegation wondered whether this pointed to a deeper underlying problem. Is the system transparent and inclusive enough, or does the system need to adapt more rigorously? At this stage of the reflection process, the Netherlands would like to discuss a more fluid and dynamic approach. It was open to discussing sunset clauses, adding that it would like a listing system that allowed for a more process-oriented approach and a sunset clause might allow for this to happen. There could be other ways to make it more dynamic, and it was interested in discussing all the options. For example, new ways to interconnect with the communities without depending too much on the efforts of the submitting States so as to share all kinds of safeguarding practices. In addition to utilizing NGOs, new technologies could help in achieving this. The UNESCO project ‘Dive into Intangible Cultural Heritage’, supported by the Netherlands and designed by a Dutch artist, is a good example of this. The delegation was also open to discussing the criteria of the Lists to make them less formulaic. It sought to have a system by which urgent safeguarding was placed at the centre of deliberations and the sharing of good practices. The follow-up of inscribed elements should, in its opinion, be a light mechanism. Again, NGOs could play a role in verifying the information that is brought to the Secretariat, as well as playing a role in strengthening the application of the Ethical Principles. An online toolkit of these principles, which was discussed by the Committee in Windhoek, Namibia, in 2015, could help in this regard. The new reporting system could also be helpful in the follow-up as it encourages States Parties to work together, set their targets, and report on the indicators.
14. The **delegation of Kuwait** thanked the Secretariat for the report and Japan for its support of the listing mechanism, echoing Japan’s concern regarding the use of ‘uniqueness’ and ‘authenticity’. With regard to the dialogue process, the delegation remarked on the very positive impact it had had on the evaluation process, adding that it favoured its expansion even on files that would not lead to inscription, as this dialogue process would be beneficial for some elements. Regarding the use of publicly available information when evaluating the file, the delegation supported the possibility for the Evaluation Body to exercise the freedom and flexibility to use such information. Regarding de-listing, it believed in a clear mechanism for any de-listing process in the future. Finally, the delegation wanted to share its disappointment with regard to the press release given the hard work over the last few weeks under agenda item 12 to make it as consistent as possible, which involved many closed-door meetings in a calm and quiet decision-making process. Unfortunately, the misunderstanding concerning the press release issued from HQ had already negatively impacted in the press across the Arab region concerning the difference in the Committee’s decision with the content of the press release. As a Committee Member, an Arab and a Muslim country, the delegation reiterated its deep disappointment with what had happened, adding that it hoped it was an honest mistake that should be corrected as soon as possible.
15. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary to respond to this specific issue.
16. The **Secretary** was unable to respond as he was unaware of what had happened, but he would inform the Committee as soon as he had information to share.
17. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretariat for its presentation of the issues related to the mechanism for inscription on the lists, whether relating to the criteria for inscription, the follow-up of elements inscribed, or the mechanism for evaluating nominations, noting that the issues addressed in the context of this overall reflection were of vital importance for the future of the Convention. It thanked Japan for its contribution to the organization of this reflection. The delegation supported the inclusive approach, which will prevail in the process of the global reflection that will begin in the first quarter of 2020. It thanked the Secretariat for the new deadline granted to the States Parties to appoint their experts. Regarding the upstream dialogue process, it was noted that the Committee had had the opportunity to address this issue and the delegation reaffirmed its position and took note of the positive outcome of this upstream dialogue process, which was introduced on an experimental basis in 2019. On this point, it took due note of the amendments proposed to the Operational Directives, which establish an operational framework to make it possible to improve—by this short process of questions and answers—the examination of files concerned by the dialogue process. However, these guidelines contained wording that leads the Evaluation Body to transmit its questions in one of the two working languages, but which requires States Parties to respond in the two working languages. The delegation wished to know the reason for this, as it seemed logical that the Evaluation Body should ultimately transmit its replies to the State Party in both working languages. It surmised that there might be operational reasons that had led to this wording, however, the work carried out within the framework of UNESCO should be exercised in the two working languages as a matter of principle. With regard to the issued raised by colleagues on the press release, the delegation was also surprised that the communiqué had been changed, especially given that the correct wording had already been formulated, which read, ‘Condemns all forms of discrimination, including racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia’. This wording should have been reflected in the press release, putting aside any religious Muslim or Christian affiliation as a position of principle; one that was defended by States Parties on this issue in the session concerned.
18. On this matter, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General.
19. The **Assistant Director-General, Mr Ernesto Ottone** apologized to the delegates for the press release, explaining that a human error had occurred with a person in Paris having inadvertently omitted a word when the text [of paragraph 5 of Decision [14.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12)] should have been repeated in its entirety, but which had now been corrected.
20. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Ottone for the explanation, noting that Palestine, Senegal, Djibouti and Sri Lanka wished to take the floor.
21. The **delegation of Palestine** beganby thanking the Secretariat for its very clear and coherent working document, and Mr Ottone for the clarification and all the delegations who had raised this issue, including Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kuwait, with the understanding that this amounted to human error. The delegation thanked Japan for its commitment to the Convention and its continuous effort to promote the purposes of the Convention and to address the challenges and confusion, as expressed by the delegation of Japan to which it fully subscribed. It also agreed with the previous interventions regarding the need for a clear procedure for de-listing. In this regard, the delegation joined the amendments submitted by Azerbaijan, the Philippines and others. Regarding other issues raised by the Philippines, it fully agreed with its intervention on the procedure of de-listing but also in the verification of information. In this regard, the method of work of the Memory of the World Register could serve as an inspiration. Regarding the dialogue process, the delegation fully agreed with the positions taken by the Philippines and others on this issue. The follow-up question was also thoroughly addressed by Austria; a position that Palestine shares. Regarding the mechanism in place concerning communications about inscribed elements on the Lists received by the Secretariat, the delegation requested that these be brought to the attention of the Committee.
22. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Secretariat for its very clear report, and the Ambassador of Japan for recalling the principles that prevailed when the 2003 Convention was adopted. He mentioned the concepts of exclusivity, outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity, and it must be said that at the time, faced with the glaring imbalance in the 1972 Convention with very little representation from Africa, the 2003 Convention was welcomed. It was also said that this Convention promotes the notion that all cultures are equal. This Convention was thus welcomed by African States as it gave them the possibility of inscribing several elements that express the cultural heritage in a comprehensive and encompassing manner. However, today it can be observed that Africa faces other major challenges and that it has not inscribed the practices and the elements that it had hoped. These major challenges could be related to capacity building, but there are also other very important issues, related to the criteria. For example, on the issue of communities, can anyone say exactly how each community is organized in Africa? [Speaking from a personal perspective, as someone who works in the field], the delegation explained that in Senegal the communities were not all the same across the regions. In addition, in a community where there is a hierarchy with a secret society or with patriarchs, such as customary chiefs who manage the community, these people do not sign letters of consent, they delegate and yet they are the practitioners. However, this may be difficult for the Evaluation Body to understand. These are the mechanisms that govern these communities in this part of Africa. Although it is not obvious, there is dialogue, and a person signing on behalf of the community, because he/she was been delegated by the customary chiefs of the community, can be explained in these terms. These are the questions that arise in R.2 or in other criteria. For this reason, Senegal supports that the dialogue mechanism be continued and strengthened, and therefore it supported the amendment proposed by States Parties that the dialogue mechanism be taken into account in the Operational Directives.
23. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** thanked the Secretariat for the excellent report and Japan for its financial contribution to this project. The delegation wondered whether it might be appropriate to establish a small sub-committee within the Evaluation Body to carry out research to check certain claims made by States Parties that might lead to disputes between States Parties, which may be done by increasing the number of Members on the Evaluation Body. The delegation wished to hear comments from other Committee Members on this idea.
24. The **delegation of Djibouti** thanked the Secretariat for the quality of the document drafted by experts on the mechanism for inscription on the Lists. It also thanked Japan for its constant support of intangible cultural heritage. Given the importance of this mechanism, the delegation asked that the expert meeting be open for the participation of all experts. It thanked the Chairperson and Colombia for their work [in the organization of this session] that had been expertly carried out in a spirit of tolerance and mutual respect. The different obstacles had been overcome and all 24 Members of the Committee have worked hand-in-hand, including on highly political issues, to make this meeting as successful as possible. It regretted the serious error committed by the Secretariat, though it accepted the explanation and the apology given by the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Ottone.
25. The **Secretary** noted the number of questions addressed, adding that the Assistant Director-General had already pronounced on the error that had occurred and that he would therefore not return to the issue. Regarding the issues related to the reflection on the listing, the Secretary wished to respond to the question posed by Armenia on why a State Party had to submit responses in two languages in the dialogue process. He explained that it had been introduced because in 2018 the Secretariat had faced a difficult situation in processing all the files, which had been part of the resistance to the dialogue. He hoped that that this reflection would thus fix the whole system, particularly as the Evaluation Body is overloaded and this ‘fix-it’ solution was the compromise reached in 2018 when discussing how to manage the upstream dialogue with the very little time available. Thus, it was hoped that all these issues in the overall revision are addressed and examined in their entirety so that the whole process from the submission of the file to its examination, to the dialogue and to the Committee’s decision can be reviewed together. The point made in the report is therefore to take a holistic look at the process itself so that it becomes manageable. He took note of the questions raised by Senegal and others on the dialogue mechanism, explaining that a proposal included in the Operational Directives will be discussed under Part II, which will allow the Evaluation Body to change its decisions in September. The Secretary reiterated that once the overall reflection had taken place, there would be ways to more thoroughly improve the dialogue mechanism, while still allowing the Committee to work within the structure of the mechanism.
26. The **delegation of Armenia** thanked the Secretary for his reply, adding that its question was more about why the response to the submitting State is not submitted in the two working languages and not the fact that the submitting State must respond in the two working languages. The Committee must respect the balance between the two working languages, but addressing the submitting State only in one language creates an imbalance. Thus, it was very important to insist on this issue for the sake of linguistic plurality.
27. With no further comments from the Committee, the **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
28. The **delegation of Latvia** expressed its appreciation of Colombia’s hospitality in hosting this Committee session, and for the Chairperson’s leadership. The delegation was aware that inscriptions on international lists may have diverse and long-term consequences at various levels. It believed that the decisions taken, as well as the process of decision-making, are of equal importance. While congratulating the diversity of intangible cultural heritage inscribed in 2019 and recognizing the additional efforts that the provisional upstream dialogue has meant for the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat, the delegation believed that the consultative expertise provided by the Evaluation Body needs to be more duly considered by the Committee. Latvia also seconded the statement made by Lithuania the previous day that appreciated the contribution of Committee Members who had made committed efforts to follow the spirit of the Convention during this session. The delegation wished to echo the general statement made by the Evaluation Body following the examination of nominations by the Committee at this session and before the overall Decision [14.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/10), in particular the concerns raised therein regarding the credibility of implementing the Convention at the international level. The delegation would appreciate having the Evaluation Body voice its opinion in the further reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention. Latvia maintained its commitment to have the Convention and its implementation remain a credible reference of importance, as it affects national and local levels in so many countries worldwide. In the context of the reflection on the listing mechanisms, it therefore particularly wished to underline the importance of pursuing a reflection on the issues related to the follow-up of inscribed elements, which should be duly mentioned in the working document of this agenda item where it reflects the usefulness of the periodic reporting mechanism. The delegation believed that the periodic reporting, especially in relation to the overall results framework, is a crucial measure for exchanging experiences and reflecting upon the impact of the Convention, including its listing mechanisms.
29. The **delegation of Czechia** recalled that it was one of the founding countries of the Convention and was thus particularly attached to its well-being. It had prepared a speech on the overall approach of the mechanisms linked to the inscription on the lists, on the criteria, the follow-up of the elements, and the evaluation methodology. But having followed the work of the Committee in recent days, and having seen that almost all the nominations submitted in this cycle had been inscribed regardless of the recommendations given by the Evaluation Body, the delegation wondered why this had been the case. The delegation took note that the Committee did not heed the advice of the experts of the Evaluation Body that the Committee itself established, even when it deemed that the referral of files would improve the file and thus benefit the element. In this case, it might be better to simply open the lists to all expressions of intangible cultural heritage and thus save valuable time. The delegation referred to the Secretary’s observation at the beginning of this meeting that 1,300 people registered to follow the work of the Committee, which devoted two full days to examining the nomination files based on the same model. The Committee thanked the Evaluation Body for its relevant opinions, it accepted without reservation its recommendations to inscribe an element, but it followed almost none of its recommendations to refer. At the end of item 10, the Committee concluded by congratulating the Evaluation Body whose work had not been respected. In this regard, why not create a standard encyclopaedia or world register of the tremendous diversity of intangible cultural heritage and instead take advantage of the presence of the delegates to discuss the more important aspects of the implementation of the Convention and the safeguarding of living heritage.
30. The **delegation of Lithuania** began by thanking the Secretariat for the quality of the working document concerning the reflection on the mechanism of inscription on the lists of the Convention. The delegation remarked that certain difficulties linked to the mechanism for inscription on the list were moreover clearly visible during this session of the Committee, in particular with regard to the failure to follow-up on the recommendations made by the Evaluation Body relating to the referral of nominations. In some cases, the amendments proposed by the Members of the Committee substantially diverged from the expert opinion of the Evaluation Body. However, the Evaluation Body is comprised of experts or NGOs themselves appointed by the States Parties to the Convention. This aspect was crucial with regard to the credibility of the inscription mechanisms, including the dialogue process. The provisions made in the dialogue process, in the case of only minor technical issues, were often not approached in the same way by the Evaluation Body or the Members of the Committee. Nevertheless, the cases in which States have the option to provide additional information before the session or to present explanations during the session, in rare cases, should be agreed. Or there should be an agreed understanding of what constitutes a *minor* technical issue so to prevent various misinterpretations and to avoid this frequent recourse owing to the fact that some countries did not benefit from the dialogue process, which ultimately would facilitate the work of the Evaluation Body and the Committee. The delegation was of the same opinion as the Evaluation Body that a referral can be an excellent instrument to improve the files, and that sometimes it can even serve as a guide for countries to carry out certain very positive and necessary steps in favour of safeguarding the elements. This could perhaps save time and allow the Committee to focus more on matters other than [inscription on] the Representative List. With regard to the overall approach to the mechanisms for listing, the delegation stressed the importance of the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices, which has so far been under-utilized with only two practices registered in 2019. The Committee could therefore reflect more on the need to establish national, regional or sub-regional registers, like those of the Nordic countries, for example Nordic safeguarding practices, which could perhaps raise awareness among States Parties to more easily identify good practices. The delegation was also in favour of continuing the global reflection on the criteria and the follow-up of the elements inscribed.
31. The **delegation of Palestine** apologized for interrupting the debate but on behalf of Kuwait, Djibouti, Lebanon, Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan, it asked for a 5-minute suspension in order to meet with the Chairperson and the representative of the Director-General, Mr. Ottone.
32. The **delegation of Armenia** remarked that a requestto interrupt the debate is important and therefore States Parties, Members of the Committee, had the right to be informed of the very urgent issue that would cause the Committee to suspend its work.
33. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that it was convinced that all the colleagues, whether Members of the Committee or not, are respectful of UNESCO’s values, but unfortunately the damage had been done. The media around the world were in the process of transmitting the first press release, which despite having been corrected, was in fact inaccurate. The delegation recalled that Armenia had earlier cited the specific paragraph [5] in Decision 14.COM 12 but the corrected version unfortunately omitted the word ‘including’. Unfortunately, the world’s media were using the first version which omits ‘Islamophobia’ and ‘all forms’. For this reason, it called on the Chairperson and the representative of the Director-General to find a real solution that would correct this problem.
34. The **delegation of Armenia** felt that this request and situation did not only concern the five delegations mentioned but that it concerned all States Parties as well as the Members of the Committee. Consequently, if the meeting is suspended, then all the Members of the Committee would be attentive to the explanation given in relation to the issue raised by Palestine. The delegation was therefore speaking on behalf of the entire Committee.
35. The **delegation of Djibouti** explainedthat the delegations had asked to meet separately with the Chairperson, as representative of Colombia, as well as the representative of the Director-General because they are attached to UNESCO, and in the hope that this fourteenth session [of the Committee] would not be openly exploited, adding that even minor issues can be resolved privately. Since the start of the meeting, the Committee had worked in a spirit of openness, tolerance and mutual respect. The delegation therefore asked that the issue not be brought out into the open, but rather that the issue be resolved as quickly as possible in the most civilized way among those who love and respect UNESCO.
36. The **delegation of Palestine** fully agreed with Djibouti. However, it noted that Armenia wished to have an open discussion so that the Committee could take part in resolving the situation, to which Palestine could agree. However, it wished to have the discussion in the presence of Mr Ottone to address the issue. The delegation was of the opinion that the only solution at this stage was to have a statement read, either by the Chairperson or by the representative of the Director-General, to explain and attribute the mistake to human error, which would be a satisfactory solution.
37. The **Chairperson** agreed that this error had to be resolved quickly, noting that the issue had previously been on the table but not the solution. If the solution required her to read out a statement explaining what had happened to redress the mistake then she was happy to present an immediate statement. The Chairperson fully understood the situation. She added that this issue did not only affect three, four or five Member States of the Committee, but the entire Committee since the decision adopted was supported by the Committee as a whole. The Chairperson reiterated that it was not a problem for her to proceed with a statement right away.
38. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Chairperson for her comprehension.
39. The **Chairperson** noted the common accord, briefly suspending the session.

*[10-minute suspension]*

1. The **Chairperson** was ready to deliver a prepared statement together with the Assistant Director-General Mr Ottone who was also present. The statement read, ‘At the request of the Members of the Intergovernmental Committee for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, I, as the Chair of the fourteenth session of the Committee have asked for the following correction to the press release published by UNESCO in the morning of 13 December. The corrected version of the press release now includes Belgium’s request to remove the element of Aalst Carnival from the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. Also, the last sentence of said press release was corrected to read as follows: UNESCO stands by its founding principles of dignity, equality and mutual respect among peoples and condemns all forms of discrimination including racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia’.
2. The **Chairperson** noted that Belgium wished to take the floor.
3. The **delegation of Belgium** had wished to intervene under agenda item 14 in general to thank the Committee and the Secretariat, but also for correcting the press release that took note that Belgium had requested the withdrawal of the Aalst Carnival from the Representative List prior to the commencement of the session.
4. The **Chairperson** wished to highlight the gesture by Mr Ottone to return when he was on his way to the airport to be present for the statement, recalling his earlier acknowledgement of the error in the press release. She wished him a safe journey back to Paris.
5. The **delegation of Belgium** returned to agenda item 14 to thank the Secretariat for the quality of the working document. Following the recommendations of agenda item 12 adopted earlier that morning, Belgium strongly supported the reflection on the mechanisms linked to inscription on the lists of the Convention, with a particular focus on the Operational Directives, the five criteria, and the 12 Ethical Principles that strengthen the implementation of the values of UNESCO to which Belgium adheres. In this regard, the delegation recalled that Belgium was among the first countries to adopt specific legislation in 1995 against all forms of discrimination, including racism, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and xenophobia. In this context, Belgium wished to offer its expertise to make the Convention evolve positively, as it had always done since its creation.
6. A **Representative of the ICH NGO Forum** (from the Association of Folk Artists of Poland), wished to share a point of information. During its symposium on Sunday [8 December], the Forum addressed the upcoming process on the global reflection on the reform of the listing mechanism with a view to reflect on the advisory functions of NGOs. All NGOs were invited and provided their views, along with many concrete recommendations. The Representative wished to draw the Committee’s attention to five points. Regarding pre-inscription monitoring, it was stressed that communities and NGOs should be increasingly involved in the selection process of nominations of intangible cultural heritage elements to a UNESCO List as this varied widely and now laid fully in the hands of States Parties. The need to introduce bottom-up strategies in pre-inscription monitoring, as well as creating a space for dialogue was raised. Regarding post-inscription monitoring, participants of the symposium agreed that such monitoring is not taking place because there are no concrete procedures available to monitor elements following inscription. Such procedures should include, among other already raised issues, whether and how safeguarding plans are implemented, and whether and how communities benefit from them. The NGOs also hope that a new periodic reporting system will be inclusive for NGOs. Regarding the assessment of the urgent need to safeguard an element, there was no methodology available at the moment to evaluate the level of urgency at hand. There was also little understanding of what ‘urgent safeguarding’ means, and there was a need for more specific criteria for determining whether an element requires urgent safeguarding and when it should be removed or transferred. The importance of the application of the 12 [Ethical Principles](https://ich.unesco.org/en/ethics-and-ich-00866) was also highlighted in this regard. Ethical principle 4 states that all interactions with communities should be contingent upon their free, prior, sustained and informed consent. The notion of empathy was suggested when embarking on urgent safeguarding projects. Regarding the discussion on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices participants agreed that the Register is not given the visibility it deserves and it is not perceived as important. They agreed that it is now constructed in a manner that makes it unattractive for States with criteria that are very difficult to meet. Existing criteria should either be revised or transformed into more concrete terms, or fewer criteria should be provided. Aide-memoires need to be created to guide States in preparing their nominations. There is also a need to establish capacity-building training focused on the Register. Finally, the fifth point concerned alternate, lighter ways of sharing good practices. Participants mentioned that a substantial number of ongoing and inspiring initiatives were taking place, but they are not connected. There is a lack of clarity as to whom should take the initiating or coordinating role to share a best practice. Participants recommended concentrating efforts on clustering and coordinating the networks and initiatives that already exist. The ICH NGO Forum plans to prepare a written report presenting all the conclusions elaborated during this discussion, making it available on its [website](http://www.ichngoforum.org/) to all NGOs as well as to the Secretariat before the global reflection process on the reform begins in March 2020. The ICH NGO Forum concluded by thanking Japan for supporting this process.
7. The **Chairperson** thanked the ICH NGO Forum, the Committee and Observers for their pertinent comments and reflections, which were well noted and would be used to shape the overall reflection. The Secretary was invited to present Part II of his presentation on the ‘early harvest package’.
8. **Part II.** The **Secretary** explained that the ‘early harvest package’ concerned changes to the Operational Directives to formalize the provisional upstream dialogue process. It was noted that over recent cycles, the Committee had expressed discomfort that no distinction was made between files recommended for referral by the Evaluation Body due to minor technical aspects and those that had more fundamental issues. For this reason, the Committee at its eleventh session in 2016, decided to establish an informal ad hoc working group to examine *inter alia* the issues related to dialogue between the Evaluation Body and submitting States. To remedy this situation, and based on discussions initiated in 2016, the Committee in 2018 decided to initiate a ‘provisional upstream dialogue’ between the Evaluation Body and the submitting State(s) for the 2019 cycle. In particular, the Committee requested that the Secretariat transmit any questions raised by the Evaluation Body on files for the 2019 cycle to the States Parties concerned following the second meeting of the Evaluation Body in 2019. At the same time, the Committee invited the States Parties concerned to submit clarifications to the Evaluation Body before the third meeting [in September] of the Evaluation Body in 2019. As explained in the document, a specific provisional arrangement was necessary to respect the calendar of evaluation specified in paragraph 55 of the Operational Directives. As previously explained by the Chairperson and the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body, the experience was positive in its application, even though the results were not as initially expected. The advantages—and this should reassure the Committee—meant that nominations benefitting from the dialogue process did not need to wait an additional two years to be re-examined. Based on this experience, the Committee may wish to follow the suggestion of the Evaluation Body and endorse the amendments to Chapter I.15 of the Operational Directives, as provided in Annex III to the present document. The Secretary however underlined the importance of maintaining the existing timetable for the evaluation of files *not* concerned by the dialogue process. Otherwise there was a real risk that the Evaluation Body would be unable to complete its evaluation by the September meeting.
9. The **Chairperson** first thanked the Government of Japan for its generous contribution, which made this crucial reflection possible, opening the floor for comments.
10. The **delegation of China** wished toshare some thoughts on the reflection of the listing mechanisms. Firstly, it thanked the Secretariat for the informative presentation, adding that it was an honour to meet Mr Koichiro Matsuura in November 2019 in Japan, the founding father of the 2003 Convention to whom it offered thanks for facilitating the negotiation, approval and adoption of the Convention. The delegation believed that all States Parties have benefitted from the listing mechanisms since the Convention was implemented, not only at the local but also at the national and international level. We, States Parties, should always bear in mind the purpose of the Lists and objectives of the Convention, and should make our utmost efforts to avoid any sensitive or political issues so as to maintain the credibility of the Convention. Nevertheless, the delegation admitted that States are confronted with various concurrent issues and new challenges in the process of the implementation of the Convention, as well as the listing mechanisms. These issues include, but are not only limited to, the imbalances of the Lists and Register, difficulties with criteria (from the perspective of submitting States in elaborating their nominations and from the Evaluation Body and the Committee in its evaluation and examination), as well as the follow-up monitoring system, among other issues. In addition, the delegation took note that still more provisions were lacking with regard to the removal and transfer of nominations from one List to another, which required further reflection and efforts both from the States Parties and the Committee. Regarding the dialogue process, the delegation believed that this preliminary process is crucially important and is a very positive approach. It was also thankful for this process that had benefitted some nomination files. However, it wished to share some of its observations in this 2019 cycle. Firstly, the delegation wished to know to what files should this dialogue process apply? Should it be applied to all problematic files or just some of them? What criteria should be applied when using this process? Should it be applied to all inscription criteria or limited to some criteria, such as R.2 and R.5? If it is applied to all problematic files, will it be applied to all the files or only those files with less than two criteria believed to be insufficient or not met? What is the standard for distinguishing between minor issues and major issues? As was observed from the three Urgent Safeguarding List nominations, two out of the three files had one criterion that was not met and the dialogue process was applied, whereas in the 12 nominations for the Representative List, only four of the files had benefitted from the dialogue process whether or not mention they had two or three criteria that were not met. The delegation believed that further efforts and reflection should be taken to improve or enhance this upstream dialogue process. Nevertheless, it believed the Committee was a very good occasion for all its Members to communicate and consult on the issues and challenges faced during the listing mechanism process. It thus called upon the commitment and wisdom of all the Members of the Committee to further reflect and improve the listing mechanisms in the implementation of the Convention.
11. The **delegation of Japan** wished to respond to the Secretary’s presentation on the ‘early harvest package’, adding that its comments overlapped with the points raised by China. It shared the common view that the upstream dialogue will constitute a very important part of the possible outcome of the process in reviewing the listing mechanism as it would help the Evaluation Body make better informed assessments. It would also present the Evaluation Body with an important opportunity to have a dialogue with the submitting States. These two crucial elements will significantly improve the system for the sake of the credibility of the system. The delegation wondered how the nomination files would be chosen to undergo the upstream dialogue process? Moreover, the criteria of minor issues and the issue of confusing statements were not clear enough. It was noted that six elements had been given the opportunity for dialogue in this cycle, but it was hoped that this number would be expanded in the future. In addition, how will the outcome of the dialogue be treated? It was understood that the 2019 cycle was provisional and experimental, but there was still some confusion, particularly as there was no revision of the nomination file itself based on the outcome of the dialogue. The delegation shared the view of Mr Matsuura, as mentioned by China, who always stressed the importance of dialogue as a core principle of UNESCO. Thus, the nomination file should be an outcome of the collaboration between the submitting State and the Evaluation Body through closer dialogue. The revised nomination file should ideally be presented to the Committee and be made available on the [Convention’s] website as an outcome. However, it understood that there were many impediments, such as the schedule of when items have to be ready for the September meeting [of the Evaluation Body], as well as greater human resources. Nevertheless, the delegation asked the Secretariat to provide some ideas as to the possible impediments and how to make these necessary improvements before the expert meeting in March. What can the Member States do? This discussion will help move forward.
12. The **delegation of Poland** commended the Secretariat for the report provided on the global reflection on the listing mechanisms and the ‘early harvest package’, adding that given the recent events, the need for the overall reflection on the intent and purpose of the listing mechanisms was an urgent matter. It strongly supported all actions that reflect on the revision of the listing mechanisms, even though the Operational Directives on the nomination procedure and the nomination forms have evolved since the first inscription cycle, while the inscription criteria themselves have only been subject to minor amendments. States were still facing difficulties in fulfilling some of the criteria in the nomination files, such as R.2, U.5 and R.5. However, thanks to the ‘early harvest package’ some of the technical issues in the files may be corrected. During this session, the Committee experienced the effectiveness of the dialogue mechanism in some cases, which were inscribed successfully. Poland wished to underline that it was in favour of the upstream dialogue process introduced in 2019 and it should be effectively implemented. Without a doubt, the spirit of the Convention calls for clear and transparent processes for the proper implementation of its provisions. Other challenging issues include the lack of a monitoring mechanism under which the files might be examined, and whether the element is adequately safeguarded. Poland looked forward to participating in the reflection on the global listing mechanism and thanked Japan for this initiative.
13. The **Secretary** clarified that the proposed changes to the Operational Directives only addressed procedural aspects within the current system of evaluation; they did not address the criteria for initiating the dialogue and merely state that the Evaluation Body will initiate the dialogue. Moreover, there are limitations in terms of both time and resources that would allow more time to complete the file and perhaps provide for a more substantive dialogue process. Hence the need for an overall reflection that could take into account the entire cycle and not just the period between June and September, and through that overall reflection there may be opportunities to explore further upstream. The Secretariat was thus proposing a series of amendments that did not precisely define criteria, but would rather leave it to the Evaluation Body to decide, with perhaps subsequent Committees deciding and commenting on that process. The Operational Directives thus allow the Evaluation Body to change its recommendations through a question and exchange procedure, which was tested in this cycle. This was termed the ‘early harvest package’ because it would probably require further improvement or fine-tuning once the overall reflection and the reform of the listing mechanisms have taken place, including the issues mentioned by Poland, such as criterion R.2 and so on. This was the spirit of the amendments proposed.
14. The **Chairperson** then turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, and specifically Annex III, starting with the amendments to the Operational Directives and I.15 on the ‘Timetable’, which was unchanged and duly adopted. Paragraph 54 was unchanged and duly adopted. Paragraph 55 was amended and adopted. Paragraph 56 was unchanged and duly adopted. The Chairperson then turned to the adoption of the decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraph 1 was duly adopted. Paragraph 2 was amended by **the Philippines** to recall Decision [14.COM 12](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/12), which was supported by **Poland** and **Azerbaijan** and was duly adopted. Paragraphs 3 and 4 were unchanged and duly adopted. Paragraph 5 was also amended by **the Philippines** to include ‘in view of recent developments’, which was supported by **Poland, Azerbaijan** and **Senegal**, and was duly adopted.
15. The **Chairperson** turned to paragraphs 6 and 7, which were duly adopted. **The Philippines, Poland** and **Azerbaijan** submitted an amendment for a new paragraph 8, which would read, ‘Invites the preliminary experts’ meeting to take into account the debate held by the Committee on this item, and with no objections it was duly adopted. Paragraph 9 was unchanged and adopted. A new paragraph 10 was proposed by **the Philippines, Poland** and **Azerbaijan**, which would read, ‘Emphasizes that a revision of the Operational Directives is necessary in order to establish clear procedures and forms for the removal of an element from a list and the transfer of an element from one list to another’.
16. The **Secretary** wished to addthat it seemed a little bit redundant to talk about procedures and forms and wondered whether it would be acceptable to change it to, ‘establish clear and specific procedures and criteria for the removal of an element’, adding that once those procedures and criteria were established, the question of forms could be discussed.
17. Thedelegations of **Azerbaijan** and **Jamaica** supported the amendment by the Secretariat.
18. The **delegation of Poland** also supported the amendment as forms are part of the procedure and it was thus acceptable.
19. The **delegation of the Philippines** also supported the amendment by the Secretariat. However, it wished to know what happened to the paragraph it had submitted on the expert meeting, as previously discussed with the Secretariat, as it did not appear in the draft decision.
20. The **Secretary** apologized to the Philippines for the typing error, adding that the amendment would be brought back.

*[2-minute pause to readjust the draft decision.   
An additional paragraph 8 was added so the order of paragraphs had now changed]*

1. The **Chairperson** turned back to paragraph 11 which was discussed before the break [formerly paragraph 10], which was adopted as amended with the Secretariat’s proposition.
2. The **delegation of the Philippines** remarked that the new paragraph 8[[37]](#footnote-37) had been discussed and formulated during the lunchbreak among the co-sponsors (**Poland** and **Azerbaijan**) and the Secretariat. It was hoped that this second paragraph could be adopted by consensus.
3. With no objections, the **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 8 adopted. She then turned to the new paragraph 12 proposed by **the Philippines, Poland** and **Azerbaijan**, which would read, ‘Also emphasizes the need to examine possible revisions to criterion R.2, taking into account the recurring challenges encountered by communities, States Parties and the Evaluation Body with this criterion’.
4. The **delegations of Jamaica** and **Kazakhstan** supported the amendment.
5. The **delegation of Zambia** sought to know the right section concerning the criteria for joining a nomination file. It spoke of examples in southern Africa where files had been submitted by one country and then two or three other countries wished to join the nomination in a multinational nomination.
6. The **Chairperson** explained that this issue was coming later.
7. The **delegations of Lebanon** and **Japan** supported the amendment.
8. The **delegation of China** appreciated the proposed amendment by the Philippines, Poland and Azerbaijan, but it had some concerns. It did not think the Committee had had a very in-depth, detailed or thorough enough reflection concerning the possible revision of criterion R.2, adding that the Committee should be cautious when talking about the revision of any of the criteria. The delegation believed that this issue could be included in the agenda of the expert meeting on the overall reflection of the listing mechanisms. Therefore, it was unnecessary to include it here as a paragraph of the decision.
9. Thanking China, the **Chairperson** wished to proceed with the adoption of paragraph 12.
10. The **delegation of Senegal** wished to join the support for the amendment.
11. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 12 adopted as amended, and turned to the new paragraph 13 proposed by **the Philippines, Poland** and **Azerbaijan**, which would read, ‘Acknowledges the need to undertake a reflection on the ways in which the process of extension of multinational elements to new States Parties could be possibly simplified and requests the Secretariat to consider including this item in the global reflection on the listing mechanism’.
12. The **Chairperson** noted support for the amendment from **Austria**, **Zambia**, **Palestine**, **Colombia**, **Togo**, **Guatemala**, **Kazakhstan**, **Lebanon**, **Japan**, **Cameroon**, **Jamaica**, **Cyprus**, **Netherlands**, **Sri Lanka**, **Senegal**, **Philippines**, **Cuba**, **Mauritius**, **Djibouti** and **Armenia**.
13. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked all the Members of the Committee for their support of this paragraph. It noted however a slight error at the end of the paragraph, which should read ‘to include this item’ and not ‘to consider including this item’.
14. The **Chairperson** took note of the correction and paragraph 13 was duly adopted. Paragraph 14 was also adopted unchanged.
15. The **delegation of Palestine** proposed a slight amendment in paragraph 15 concerning the communication received from third parties on inscribed elements, but wished to extend it to include elements to be inscribed, i.e. nominations that were ongoing, by adding ‘regarding nominations under consideration’, which would read, ‘Further requests that the Secretariat continues to bring to the attention of the Committee information received from third parties concerning already inscribed elements as well as nominations submitted for possible inscription, and to do so in the form of a summary to be included in a working document regarding the follow-up of already inscribed elements and regarding nominations under consideration’.
16. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to respond.
17. The **Secretary** wished to underline that the current system, based on Decision 7[.COM 15](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/7.COM/15), does provide the opportunity to share correspondence both with the Evaluation Body and the Committee. Any correspondence received up to two weeks before the start of the Committee is attached to the nomination file concerned, as well as correspondence received before the meeting of the Evaluation Body within certain dates. Thus, there was already a process for visibility. The Secretary noted however that Palestine was requesting a summary of the correspondence, which the Secretariat was not currently providing. It was noted that, currently, there was no process to bring correspondence to the Committee after inscription.
18. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Secretary for his comments.
19. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked Palestine for its amendment, and having listened to the Secretary, it believed that this was a pertinent amendment and voiced its support.
20. The **Chairperson** then returned to paragraph 15, which was duly adopted as amended. Paragraphs 16 and 17 were also adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 14**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/14) **adopted**.
21. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present some practical information.
22. The **Secretary** reminded the delegates of the evening’s events that included a seminar on the Orange economy: new perspectives on cultural public policy organized by the Deputy Ministry of Creativity and Orange Economy of Colombia, a seminar on ICH Management in Bogotá organized by the Cultural Heritage Institute of Bogotá, an award-winning documentary in Spanish with English subtitles, and finally the UNESCO exhibition, Sounds of Living Heritage: a journey through indigenous languages.
23. The **Chairperson** wished toshow a video of the proposed closing ceremony, which would be an open-air event with fireworks and Colombian music showcasing Colombia’s natural and cultural diversity, which was offered by the city of Bogotá.

*[Video of the closing ceremony]*

1. The **Chairperson** remarked that the authorities had been working on the event since February, and she provided practical information on transport arrangements. The meeting was subsequently adjourned.

*[Saturday, 14 December, morning session]*

1. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met in the morning for the last time and discussed several issues, noting that despite the hard work, there were still a total of 12 items left to examine. If the Committee did not examine certain crucial items in this session, the Committee would not be able to function in 2020. The timetable has thus been revised and distributed to all Committee members. At this point, the Committee was obliged to examine the following: i) Item 15: Reflection on the participation of non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention;Item7: Draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2020–2021, which had been suspended and would be reopened; Item 16: Report of the informal ad hoc working group; Item 17: Accreditation of the new non-governmental organizations and review of accredited non-governmental organizations; and Item 18: Establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2020 cycle. Upon the Committee’s return to the room after lunch, the Members would find a printed copy of the updated Report of the Committee to the General Assembly and the list of all the decisions up to the end of the morning’s session and have half an hour to read the report and the decisions. It was recalled that the Rapporteur was delegated to validate all the decisions adopted at the fourteenth session; the final version of which would be published by the Secretariat by the end of 2019. In the afternoon session, the Committee would examine the remaining items, which would include: Item 19: 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 (39 C/Resolution 87); Item 20: Date and venue of the fifteenth session of the Committee; Item 21: Election of the members of the Bureau of the fifteenth session of the Committee; Item 22: Other business; and Item 5a: Report by the Committee to the General Assembly on its activities; Item 23: Adoption of the List of Decisions; and Item 24: Closure of the session. In principle, the order of work would be followed unless discussions on certain items became too lengthy, in which case the Chairperson would suspend the discussion and move directly to the items that need to be completed in order to ensure the functioning of the Committee in 2020, which were agenda items 5.a, 7, 18, 20, 21 and 22, as previously cited.

**ITEM 15 OF THE AGENDA**

**REFLECTION ON THE PARTICIPATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/15*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-15-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 15*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/15)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 15 and the reflection on the participation of non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the Convention. As demonstrated by the oral report by the ICH NGO Forum, NGOs play a vital role in the safeguarding of living heritage, accomplishing important and diverse work in the implementation of the Convention.
2. The **Secretary** drew attention to the figure shown on the screen that depicted the timeline of the reflection process on the advisory role of accredited NGOs, which was launched by the Committee at its twelfth session in 2017. At the time, the Secretariat and the informal ad hoc working group were invited, in consultation with accredited NGOs, to reflect on the possible ways in which the participation of NGOs under the Convention could be further enhanced and how this would be reflected in the accreditation and renewal mechanisms of NGOs (Decision [12.COM 17](https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/12.COM/17)). The open nature of the reflection allowed for a wide range of opinions and ideas to be explored. While some tendencies were identified, no clear consensus emerged on several important aspects, in particular, on the definition of *inter alia* advisory functions, which is the heart of the matter in this reflection. Mr Julien Nakata of the Secretariat was invited to present some of the key findings from the reflection process.
3. **Mr Julien Nakata** recalled that a total of 99 accredited NGOs and 76 States (56% of accredited NGOs and 43% of States parties) took part in at least one stage of the reflection process. Presenting the most important conclusions, Mr Nakata explained that after two years of reflection, it was observed that the many stakeholders involved seemed to have different interpretations of the objectives of the accreditation system. On the one hand, the system aims to identify NGOs with proven skills in the field of intangible cultural heritage to exercise advisory functions to the Committee. On the other hand, the system is widely regarded as an affiliation mechanism which allows NGOs to be identified and gain international recognition. These two visions conjure two distinct systems with different objectives, functions, criteria and processes. Consequently, two types of functions were brought to mind throughout the discussion. According to current and potential advisory functions, NGOs are considered both as advisory organizations to the Committee, but also as stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention. Among their advisory functions, a clear distinction is made between the functions that accredited NGOs can or could directly fulfil with the Committee from those they carry out through their work with States or directly with communities. Another aspect discussed concerned the potential establishment of an umbrella organization, which would oversee the accreditation system and coordinate the advisory assistance provided by NGOs. This possibility was notably the subject of numerous debates during the consultation meeting of 18 April 2019. Although the role of the ICH NGO Forum was highlighted throughout the reflection process, States and accredited NGOs were concerned that such an umbrella organization would cause unnecessary complications in the accreditation process and negatively impact the diversity of accredited NGOs.
4. **Mr Julien Nakata** then spoke of the imbalance identified in the geographic distribution of accredited NGOs, which was considered one of the major issues. Rather than establishing a ceiling to limit the number of accredited NGOs, the implementation of so-called ‘soft measures’ were favoured in order to encourage the accreditation of NGOs from under-represented regions. These measures include awareness-raising initiatives carried out through the wide network of entities associated with UNESCO, as well as capacity-building activities. In this regard, the Committee might consider it useful to identify areas of thematic interest that would encourage efforts to target active NGOs in certain regions. Based on the reflection process, certain measures were proposed in the working document to facilitate the participation of accredited NGOs in the current system, as reflected in the draft decision. Among these measures is the mapping of the areas of competence and experience of accredited NGOs, which could notably help define the advisory functions NGOs could provide to the Committee. In parallel, and in order to explore how accredited NGOs could undertake advisory functions, the Secretariat proposed to discuss, with the Steering Committee of the ICH NGO Forum, the way in which NGOs could contribute to the establishment and follow-up of the platform on ethics in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, which was created in accordance with Decision [10.COM 15.a](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/10.COM/15.a), which notably led to the adoption of the [Ethical Principles](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/2003_Convention-Ethical_principles-EN.docx) for Safeguarding Intangible Cultural Heritage.[[38]](#footnote-38)
5. The **Secretary** explained that the conclusion of the reflection process was such that under the current system, NGOs wishing to advise the Committee may have difficulties doing so owing to a lack of opportunities, while the Committee may have difficulties in identifying NGOs that can effectively contribute to its work. Given the limited resources at hand, it was thus crucial to first ensure that the accreditation system was suited to fulfilling its main function, which is to advise the Committee. In this regard, the Committee may for instance envisage periodically defining specific tasks that it wishes to assign to accredited NGOs. For this to be achieved however, the system would need to ensure that accredited NGOs possess the requisite capacities and experience to carry out the desired tasks. Refocusing the accreditation system on its main objective would also ensure that it is not redundant with the broader framework for partnerships with NGOs at the level of UNESCO, which would run a real risk if the accreditation system is envisioned as an affiliation system for NGOs. This refocus could also alleviate concerns that might be raised in terms of governance, effectiveness and cost-efficiency. The Secretary acknowledged that two years into this reflection process, the Committee had not yet reached a stage where it can propose concrete steps towards reforming the accreditation system. It was hoped that the present debate might propose some initial steps forward for the report on the outcomes of this reflection process to be submitted to the General Assembly in June 2020.
6. The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat, opening the floor for comments.
7. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for the report on the results of the consultation process. As mentioned throughout this session, the delegation viewed accredited NGOs and the ICH NGO Forum as valuable partners of the Committee and common custodians of the Convention. It wished to hear their voices representing communities more strongly as this Convention is primarily about respecting and empowering the grassroots. The relationship between the Committee and accredited NGOs remains filled with untapped potential, as reported by the Secretariat. In the delegation’s opinion, vehicles for NGOs to contribute to the work of the Committee and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage include the periodic reporting mechanism, reporting on elements inscribed on the Lists, capacity building, and possible thematic studies and projects. It agreed that a mapping exercise of the NGO network would be valuable to obtain an overview of the capacities of accredited NGOs. The delegation believed that annual meetings of this Committee could be used more optimally to develop partnerships between interested States Parties and the accredited NGOs. It therefore encouraged more meaningful and regular interaction between the Committee and the ICH NGO Forum. The delegation submitted an amendment to the draft decision specifically to request that the ICH NGO Forum be a separate agenda item on the Committee’s agenda at future sessions, which may lead to more interactive discussions, given that the ICH NGO Forum already meets intensively for two days and develops pertinent recommendations for the Committee’s consideration. Hopefully, this procedural adjustment will spill over to other issues on the Committee’s agenda and help develop a closer and more meaningful relationship between the Committee and the accredited NGOs, while of course fully respecting the core functions and prerogative of the Committee as the main intergovernmental decision-making body. The delegation understood this proposal could have some statutory implications, such as the ICH NGO Forum having to submit its report in advance of the Committee session for translation, as well as a decision by the Committee taking note of their report after a brief discussion. The delegation looked forward to the discussion and to hear the views of the Committee Members in this regard.
8. The **delegation of Poland** thanked the Secretariat for its report, adding that it strongly appreciated the activity of the NGOs in the implementation of the Convention as they are essentially related. For this reason, it welcomed with satisfaction the constant development of the ICH NGO Forum as a platform for the exchange of ideas and practices, forging new and more effective models of capacity building, cooperation with communities, and cultivating intangible elements. This interaction had been observed every year, as reflected in the initiation in 2017 of NGOs serving in the Evaluation Body, as well as their crucial role as a broker and mediator working in cooperation with the communities. The Forum’s broad area of interest embraces such important aspects for the improvement of the implementation of the Convention as pre-inscription and post-inscription processes, assistance to the communities and bearers, and a monitoring mechanism for the implementation of safeguarding measures, which should involve NGOs, communities, groups and individuals. The delegation highlighted the reflection on the definition and methodology concerning the urgent need to safeguard intangible cultural heritage, and the need to improve the visibility of good practices that should be considered as one of the most important instruments for dissemination and understanding the spirit of the Convention. Finally, the delegation spoke of the Ethical Principles of the Convention that should be better promoted and respected in the nomination process, which may be considered in future work in the implementation of the Convention, with NGOs possibly providing the Committee a report on its activities.
9. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Secretariat for the document and presentation, and Poland and the Philippines for their interventions. It welcomed and highly appreciated the role of the NGOs on the ground with regard to the implementation of the Convention. The delegation was not fully aware of the method of work of the ICH NGO Forum and its Steering Committee, but it noted that although the representation of the different regions in the Forum is imbalanced, it is equal in the Steering Committee. The delegation therefore asked its Representative to explain the governance system of the Forum. How does it address this imbalance in the Forum? Returning to the point made by the Philippines, the delegation asked whether the idea was to have the ICH NGO Forum report presented to the Committee.
10. The **delegation of the Netherlands** remarked thatall the States Parties could experience the work of the accredited NGOs during the side events and symposium on intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts organized by the ICH NGO Forum. The workshop discussed the way NGOs could have advisory functions at the different stages of the nomination process and pre- and post-inscription, as well as lighter ways of sharing good practices of safeguarding, which was said to have been very inspiring. The delegation noted that NGOs of all capacities and sizes can contribute to these and other ways of advisory functions to the Convention. In addition, the way the Forum takes up new thematic areas like intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts was very promising and could be of great help to the Convention. Moreover, the Forum has been working on issues that have been observed by the Evaluation Body for several years and have become discussion points in relation to the inscription process. In the Committee discussions for instance, the delegation noticed the recurring issue of tourism in relation to sustainability, as well as the Evaluation Body’s remarks on over-commercialization and decontextualization. These topics were discussed in the working groups of the ICH NGO Forum that examined, discussed and reflected on these subjects and could thus report their findings to the Committee. The delegation understood that the Forum was planning a symposium on sustainable tourism at next year’s Committee meeting and working on a set of ethical principles and a toolkit for communities; initiatives that were welcomed. NGOs could also play an important role in monitoring and reporting functions, especially in the new reporting mechanism. The accreditation of NGOs from underrepresented countries was still a concern that needed to be addressed, and the delegation welcomed the initiatives of the Forum to organize capacity-building projects for accredited NGOs to train a series of NGOs in every region that can take up the role in outreach and regional networking to build a larger network in their regions and to activate other NGOs. The delegation understood that a working group had been established within the Forum specifically tasked to work on this issue, which was welcomed. The delegation greatly valued the work and commitment of the Forum and felt that it would be good to have more communication between the Forum and the Committee, but it also valued its independent position and advice. The delegation wished to hear the Forum’s perspective in regard to these points.
11. The **delegation of Austria** also followed this process very closely and thanked everyone involved in the reflection. More than half of the accredited NGOs and almost 50 per cent of States Parties took part in the process and the activities of accredited NGOs. The ICH NGO Forum before and during the Committee meeting further emphasized its strong dedication to the Convention and its support for this undertaking. Austria has always been wholeheartedly committed to the involvement of civil society organizations in the implementation of the Convention. Given the fact that some regions are underrepresented in the current system, there was still a need to find new ways to further enhance the participation of NGOs in underrepresented regions. It also welcomed the idea of collecting and mapping the diverse fields of competences and experiences of accredited NGOs and their capacities. This could also facilitate the sharing of good practices and lessons learned. In this regard, it might be useful to include accredited NGOs in the online tool, Dive into Intangible Heritage, where their experience could be relevant. Moreover, the Forum is already working on specific topics and thematic issues, such as intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts and sustainable tourism. Accredited NGOs have also formed international as well as regional working groups on specific topics, such as lighter ways of sharing good practices, intangible cultural heritage in museums, or intangible cultural heritage in emergencies, to name a few. The delegation appreciated the participation of accredited NGOs in the process and looked forward to hearing their views and reflections on this item.
12. The **delegation of Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the detailed document on the role of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention. Indeed, NGOs play an important role in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage at local, national and international levels. They are important actors in the safeguarding of intangible heritage in different contexts and they also have an important role throughout the whole nomination process. The delegation supported the reform of the accreditation mechanism of NGOs, which would offer different types of accreditation depending on the scope of the activities such as international, regional and local reach, and the area of expertise. The delegation believed that this will contribute to the visibility of these organizations and will enable actors at local and national levels to better involve NGOs in the implementation of the Convention. At the same time, this process should remain as inclusive as possible. The delegation also supported the Secretariat’s proposal to gather relevant information from accredited NGOs in order to develop a mapping of their domains of competence, taking into consideration their capacities.
13. The **delegation of Senegal** thanked the Secretariat for its report, and especially for submitting this new accreditation procedure and the mechanisms envisaged in relation to the ICH NGO Forum. The Forum is considered almost as a technical arm in the implementation of the Convention with regard to their activities in the field, working in proximity to the communities. The delegation remarked that the accreditation procedure raised two essential issues. The first concerned the issue of regional balance, as mentioned by several Members. The delegation agreed that this issue of representation deserved time in order to reflect on the measures that could resolve this problem. From its own ongoing project, Senegal was cognizant of the very important role of NGOs on the ground. The NGOs involved in this project participate at all levels in the context of capacity building, including in the framework of a pilot inventory, which Senegal had just completed. Their role is decisive, and yet they have not participated in the ICH NGO Forum. Is the procedure responsible, or do States Parties have to play a role of facilitators on behalf of NGOs in the process of accreditation? The second issue was much more in line with the involvement of NGOs in the new periodic reporting mechanisms, as NGOs were also needed for capacity building and in relation to the involvement of communities. In both cases, the Committee needed to reflect further on these mechanisms and on how to reorganize NGOs, requiring States Parties and the Committee to reflect on a mechanism that would see greater and more effective involvement of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention, while maintaining their independence.
14. The **delegation of Jamaica** agreed on this issue of disproportional representation in the NGO context. Jamaica, and indeed States Parties in the region, were well aware of this problem and it wondered whether UNESCO could not set about working in the broader culture sector to strengthen NGOs at the national level, perhaps by working with the Field Offices. This could be done over a period of three to five years with a view to increasing their participation and representation in the Convention. However, because of budgetary considerations, interventions at the Field Offices could begin with local authorities assisting with technical knowledge regarding the functions and expectations of NGOs in aligning their work at the community level with international expectations and standards.
15. The **Chairperson** opened the floor to Observers.
16. The **delegation of Estonia** congratulated the Chairperson for her smooth running of the meeting, adding that Estonia had for 15 years been actively engaged in making this Convention operational and had keenly followed all the debates concerning advisory functions and the role of NGOs. Having listened to the previous debates on listing, the delegation stressed the importance of undertaking the serious task of monitoring the experience on the ground, i.e. the effect of inscription on the Representative List and on the Urgent Safeguarding List, in addition to improving the accreditation system. The impact of proposed partnerships in this task was therefore paramount. The delegation also spoke of the productive role played by the established UNESCO Chairs in the field of intangible cultural heritage, whose number is growing and widening geographically, becoming increasingly diversified. The method of partnerships with UNESCO Chairs and NGOs deserved further reflection so as to sustain the scope and validity of the planned advisory functions. At the same time, it congratulated the Committee for taking up new, extremely significant topics, such as the modalities of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergency situations and intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts. These topics bring about the true spirit of the Convention where advisory activities may also substantially contribute.
17. The **delegation of Sweden** spoke of NGOs, civil society, practitioners and bearers as the engine behind the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. They play a crucial role in ensuring that intangible cultural heritage remains living and dynamic. Hence, how to increase the participation of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention was indeed an important question for the future of the Convention and the reflection process was therefore welcomed. The NGOs possess invaluable knowledge and competence that could benefit the Committee, and therefore the opportunities for NGOs to contribute advice should be enhanced. The delegation thus believed that it would be useful to have a separate agenda item during the Committee meeting for the presentation of the ICH NGO Forum report. It wished to thank the Chairperson for allowing NGOs to take the floor during the debates and before decisions are taken, adding that this is an important practice that enriches the debate and should be continued. Finally, Sweden welcomed the proposal of mapping the domains of competence of the NGOs and were willing to contribute to furthering the dialogue on how their participation in the implementation of the Convention can be strengthened within a broader perspective.
18. The **Chairperson** thanked Sweden, and for all the important and interesting reflections on this item, as well as some important questions, inviting the NGO Representative to respond.
19. Speaking on behalf of the **ICH NGO Forum and its Steering Committee**, **Ms Naila Ceribasic** (NGOInternational Council for Traditional Music) first wished to address the issue of advisory functions that the Committee wished for accredited NGOs to fulfil. Apart from serving on the Evaluation Body, the ICH NGO Forum identified seven additional groups of functions, which were listed in Article 3 of the Forum bylaws adopted three days earlier on 11 December at its general meeting. The adopted bylaws, as well as the code of conduct, was delivered to the Secretariat and were thus available for consideration. One of the seven groups of functions identified included, ‘to advise the Intergovernmental Committee on specific thematic issues and participate in reporting and monitoring on inscribed ICH elements and safeguarding practices’. It was noted that the Forum already works on such topics. For instance, intangible cultural heritage in urban contexts was addressed the previous Sunday at its symposium, and it was currently working on the preparation of the next symposium on intangible cultural heritage and sustainable tourism, including the creation of guidelines and a toolkit for all stakeholders, especially communities. The Forum also planned to produce a report on the state of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Latin America and the Caribbean with an emphasis on the role of NGOs in safeguarding processes. This will contribute to the overall report on safeguarding in the region, which will be on the agenda of the next Committee meeting. Speaking from the perspective of the ICH NGO Forum, in the period from April 2019—when the consultation meeting took place—until now, a clear consensus emerged within the Forum regarding the identification of *inter alia* advisory functions. The Forum also created and adopted a code of conduct as expected following the consultation meeting in April [2019]. As for the disparity in size and capacities of accredited NGOs addressed in paragraph 9 of the Secretariat’s report, the Forum considered it as a direct and necessary reality in response to the variety and diversity of communities, groups and individuals that NGOs serve, while keeping in mind the complications that such variation may present in the assessment of NGO contributions, and consequently in the accreditation system. Since the consultation meeting in April until now, the Forum had not reached any particular proposal concerning the accreditation and reaccreditation system and its possible revision. Furthermore, in reference to paragraph 15 of the report, the Forum is an already existing umbrella association that encourages plurality of expertise and fair and equal participation among the different NGOs in the regions in contrast to the concerns expressed at the consultation meeting in April and in the related report. The Forum therefore wished to reaffirm that it advocates and operates in favour of plurality, diversity and participation.
20. **Ms Naila Ceribasic** added thatthe Forum completely shared the concern of the General Assembly, the Committee and the Secretariat regarding the imbalance in the geographical distribution of accredited NGOs. It also agreed that the way out is to encourage the accreditation of NGOs based in underrepresented regions. The Forum was thus of the opinion that capacity-building workshops in such regions were crucially important in accomplishing this, as pointed out in its intervention under agenda item 7. The Forum therefore very much appreciated the proposed draft decision in paragraph 6 related to the organization of capacity-building activities. It also appreciated the proposed draft decision in paragraph 5 related to the request for the Secretariat to develop a mapping of NGO domains and competence and their capacities. It was hoped that the Forum will also be invited to take on an active role in that process. Responding to the questions posed, specifically the question on reporting to the Committee, Ms Ceribasic responded that the Forum would be extremely grateful for such an opportunity. Whether it would take the form of an information report or a separate agenda item was not entirely clear nor were the challenges and opportunities that a separate agenda item might bring. Nevertheless, the presentation of a broader report would of course be welcomed. Concerning the current geographical imbalance and the structure of the governing bodies, Ms Ceribasic explained that according to the bylaws adopted three days earlier, the executive organ of the Forum, the Steering Committee, is composed of seven members: six members representing electoral groups and one member representing international organizations. According to the rule, only accredited NGOs with headquarters in the region concerned can represent those concerns. Aside from the Steering Committee, the Forum also strongly followed the idea of equal geographical representation. As an example, during its capacity-building workshop and symposium the previous weekend, the Forum tried as far as possible, given the current geographical imbalance, to organize these events in a participatory way and to have moderators, chairs and facilitators who represented these different regions. There was no doubt that the Forum is strongly in favour of equal geographical representation of NGOs.
21. The **Secretary** thanked all the speakers who intervened on this issue including the NGOs. He was particularly encouraged by the statement from the NGOs that the meeting in April [2019] had advanced in areas deemed unclear, which now appeared to have been resolved within the Forum, which was very encouraging because it gives the Secretariat a sense that there is indeed a way forward. The Secretary listened attentively to the discussion on the advisory roles the Forum could play in emerging issues, and he heard multiple references to periodic reporting and how NGOs could interface with the periodic reporting system, both from the NGOs but also from a number of States. The Secretary found the timing opportune as the Committee entered a new way of periodic reporting. He also welcomed the reference to thematic issues, noting that this work began in 2018, including with the survey and a meeting, and that it was ongoing and progressing. Concerning the report to the Committee, it was noted that this was also raised at the General Assembly and there were indeed statutory differences in terms of what that would entail. A separate agenda item would require a decision, and when it was mentioned at the General Assembly some States Parties expressed reservations in placing the ICH NGO Forum under the direct instruction of States within the framework of the Committee. Another option would be to attach the full report as an INF document to the Secretariat’s report through which the NGOs could report. The Forum would still have to prepare the report in two languages four weeks prior to the commencement of the Committee. The report could be presented and the Forum could take and answer questions, but there would not be a decision attached to the report. These were the kinds of statutory implications that would be involved. The Secretary felt that perhaps it would be prudent to first start with an INF document until areas are defined by the Committee or by the General Assembly, which would then guide where and how the NGOs can report.
22. The **delegation of Austria** asked for clarification on how the report of the NGO would be presented as an annex.
23. The **Secretary** explained that the idea was to attach the NGO report as an independent extension or INF document to the Secretariat’s report, which would allow for the report, while fitting neatly in terms of statutory requirements. However, there could be an alternative option, which is to attach the report to the Committee’s report. The main issue was whether it was going to be an INF document or a document for a decision by the Committee.
24. With no further comments, the **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision. Paragraphs 1–4 were duly adopted. An amendment was submitted by **the Philippines** for a new paragraph 5, which would read, ‘Acknowledges the important role and untapped potential of the ICH NGO Forum and accredited non-governmental organizations in providing support to the implementation of the Convention’.
25. The **delegations of Poland, Palestine, Austria, Colombia, Zambia, Togo, Kuwait, Armenia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Cuba, Jamaica** and **Netherlands** supported the amendment.
26. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 5 adopted, and paragraphs 6–8 were also adopted.
27. The **delegation of Austria** believed that the amendment submitted by **the Philippines** for a new paragraph 9, which would read, ‘Decides to include a separate item on ‘Report of the Non-Governmental Organizations Forum at its subsequent sessions’ was important as it provided the Forum with an excellent opportunity to address the Committee in an interactive dialogue, as well as take up issues that NGOs consider important and pertinent, particularly in bringing forward new emerging issues. However, having heard reservations by the Secretariat and also by the NGOs on potential challenges and opportunities, the delegation proposed introducing this report on an experimental or trial basis. This would allow the Committee to find a new format should, for example, NGOs find that they do not have the capacities to present a report, but also to find a more innovative way to present the report, rather than the usual reporting, discussion, decision. In this way, the Committee could benefit from new exciting ideas and emerging issues that are important for the future of the Convention and that deserve deeper reflection. The NGO Forum, its Steering Committee and the Secretariat could reflect on the best possible structure for a forward-looking interactive format that would involve more strategic inputs into the evolution of the Convention.
28. The **Chairperson** added **Austria’s** proposal to paragraph 9, ‘on an experimental basis’.
29. The **delegation of Poland** agreed that it would be good for the Convention to provide the Committee with the ICH NGO Forum report, and proposed to replace ‘decides’ with ‘invites’.
30. The **Secretary** remarked that ‘invites’would present a new formulation of the paragraph, as it would suggest that either the Committee invites the Forum, or invites the Secretariat to include a separate item.
31. The **delegation of Poland** clarifiedthat the NGOs would be invited to provide the Committee with its report.
32. The **Chairperson** remarked that an invitation was different to the inclusion of an item, which was the intention of the paragraph.
33. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked thatthe ICH NGO Forum had clearly expressed enthusiasm to present its report and that they were flexible on the way it will be delivered. It was noted that the majority of Members agreed with the amendment proposed by the Philippines and amended by Austria, i.e. that the Committee decides to include an item on the agenda on an experimental basis. Thus, the draft decision should use ‘decides’. Palestine also supported the amendment.
34. The **delegation of Colombia** thanked the ICH NGO Forum for its explanation, adding that it was very much in line with the discussions in the information meeting with the Secretariat in April [2019]. The delegation remarked on the refreshing approach to reflect on all these issues on how to move the Convention forward and involve new participants and actors, especially accredited NGOs. The delegation supported the amendment proposed by the Philippines and the amendment by Austria, adding that this presented a very good opportunity to introduce another form of participation of the NGOs. It looked forward to seeing how the Secretariat could best implement this experimental reporting, fully entrusting it to find the best way forward.
35. The **delegation of Guatemala** congratulated the Chairperson on the way she conducted the meeting, and the Government of Colombia for setting the bar so high on behalf of the Latin American region. With respect to paragraph 9, the delegation agreed with the proposal by the Philippines and Austria. Given the debate over the last agenda items, especially on the involvement of the communities in the development and implementation of safeguarding measures for intangible cultural heritage, the delegation found the role of NGOs important in this regard and was thus delighted to see that NGOs were prepared to draft such a report.
36. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Committee Members for their support, adding that it also accepted the amendment by Austria. The delegation explained that the procedures and governance of the Committee were always evolving so as to improve the common mission to safeguard intangible cultural heritage together with the NGOs, our full-fledged partners. In addition, the idea of a separate item for the Forum report would not at all impinge on the independence of the NGOs, but rather it would take cognizance of their important and hard work that takes place every year. The delegation was happy with the proposal and hoped that it could be adopted by consensus.
37. The **delegation of Poland** thanked the Members for the clarifications provided, adding that it supported the amendment.
38. The **delegation of Austria** thanked Kazakhstan for making it aware that a decision indicating a ‘subsequent session’ should in fact have a sunset clause. For this reason, the delegation proposed to replace ‘at its subsequent sessions’ with ‘at its fifteenth session’. In this way, if the reporting is a success, it could be reflected in the Committee’s decision as another separate item for its sixteenth session. It would also give the NGOs the opportunity to pronounce on the usefulness of the exercise. Responding to the Philippines’ comments, the delegation also did not see an issue with independence, but rather as an opportunity for NGOs to be in direct contact with the Committee.
39. The **delegation of the Netherlands** fully supported the amended paragraph as it is now.
40. The **Chairperson** pronounced paragraph 9 adopted as amended by Austria, inviting the Secretary to comment.
41. The **Secretary** wished to clarify his earlier comment regarding the discussion of this issue in the General Assembly, adding that it was not that the States Parties did not wish NGOs to address the Committee but that there were statutory concerns that the Committee was giving instruction to the NGOs. The Secretary found that the adopted paragraph worked very well.
42. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 15**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/15) **adopted.**

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

**DRAFT PLAN FOR THE USE OF THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE FUND IN 2020-2021**

1. The **Chairperson** returned to agenda item 7 on the draft plan for the use of the resources of the Intangible Cultural Heritage Fund in 2020–2021. She recalled that earlier in the week the Committee had started its examination of this item. Following the general debate, the Committee adopted paragraphs 1–8 as well as paragraphs 11 and 12 of the draft decision. The Committee decided to suspend the adoption of paragraphs 9 and 10 to ask the Secretariat to propose a new procedure concerning the utilization of the Funds allocated under budget line 3 ‘other functions of the Committee’. The practice to date had been that the Committee delegates to its Bureau the authority to decide upon the utilization of the Funds allocated under budget line 3 on the basis of specific proposals prepared by the Secretariat. However, some Members expressed reservations preferring the General Assembly rather than the Bureau to exercise this function. The Secretary was invited to present the proposal.
2. The **Secretary** recalled that some Committee Members expressed reservations on the proposed amendment from an operational point of view. Having spoken to the drafters of the amendment, the Secretariat believed to have a proposition that could work, which will present the budget to the next General Assembly without the percentile breakdown, meaning that the Committee will propose to the General Assembly percentages for the use of the ICH Fund on the basis of an estimated amount available for the next biennium. This procedure would continue in the future once the Committee enters a normal cycle. Specifically, for budget line 3, ‘other functions of the Committee’, the Secretariat will present to the Committee the breakdown in terms of expected results as per C/5 with descriptions. The General Assembly will approve the use of the ICH Fund, which includes a specific amount per budget line, on the basis of the *real* available amount for the next biennium. However, given that the Secretariat is not ready to present percentage breakdowns for the budget lines in this cycle, a transition measure was needed and it was proposed that this session of the Committee approve percentages per budget line on the basis of an *estimated* amount available for the next biennium as per the document presented. In other words, the Secretariat will not provide a percentage breakdown at this stage for budget line 3, ‘other functions of the Committee’, but it will be provided to the General Assembly in 2020 so that it can approve the use of the ICH Fund, which includes a specific amount per budget line on the basis of the real available amount for the next biennium. Thus, the budget approved this year will not show percentages, because the Secretariat did not have time to look at and know what was needed and how those Funds would be allocated, but they will be presented to the General Assembly.
3. The **delegation of** **the Philippines** thanked the Secretary and Ms Fumiko Ohinata for the excellent work and prior discussion on this compromise proposal, which it fully endorsed.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** thanked the Philippines and the Secretariat for finding a way forward, and proposed to save time by going directly to the draft resolution.
5. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of paragraph 9, which would read, ‘Requests that the Secretariat present, as a transition, a percentage breakdown under budget line 3 of the Plan, ‘other functions of the Committee’, in terms of Expected Results as per the approved C/5, for examination by the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020’, which was duly adopted. The original paragraph 9 was therefore deleted. She then turned to paragraph 10, which would read, ‘Further requests that the Secretariat present for examination by the sixteenth session of the Committee, and every session thereafter in odd-numbered years, a percentage breakdown under budget line 3 of the Plan, ‘other functions of the Committee’, in terms of Expected Results as per the approved C/5, with a view to present it for approval by the following session of the General Assembly’, which was duly adopted. There was a slight amendment in paragraph 11, which now referred to budget line 3 and the deletion of ‘approved by the Bureau’, which was adopted. Turning to the adoption of the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 7**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/7) **adopted**.

**ITEM 16 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/16*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-16-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 16*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/16)

1. The **Chairperson** turned to agenda item 16 recalling that in 2016 the Committee, during its eleventh session, decided to establish the informal ad hoc working group, ‘to examine the issues related to the consultation and dialogue between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States, the decision-making process of the Committee on nominations, proposals and requests, as well as any other issue in order to strengthen the implementation of the Convention’, as cited in Decision [11.COM 10](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/11.COM/10). The mandate of this working group had been extended to this Committee. On the basis of the relative decisions adopted during the Committee’s thirteenth session in 2018, the working group was invited to examine the following points: i) to discuss the implementation of the experimental dialogue mechanism with the Secretariat and the Evaluation Body on, as well as any other matters to facilitate the work of the Committee; and ii) to continue the process of consultation with accredited NGOs on how to further strengthen NGO participation in the Convention and how to reflect this in the accreditation and renewal mechanisms for NGOs. The informal ad hoc working group was chaired this year by Colombia with the help of Algeria, which agreed to take on the role of Co-Chairperson from September 2019, for which the Chairperson offered sincere thanks. She also took the opportunity to thank all the States Parties that had worked to implement the provisional upstream dialogue mechanism and on strengthening the participation of NGOs. It was noted that the Annex and draft decision for document 16 was prepared by the working group. The Chairperson of the Working Group was invited to present a brief report.
2. The **Chairperson of the Working Group,** Ms Daniela Rodriguez, began by thanking her predecessors who had worked in the working group during the years prior to her presidency. She was convinced that the precise results obtained had emanated from a thorough process, which—when looking back—allows the Committee to see how the mandate of the open-ended working group had gradually resolved several of the pressing topics. She thanked her Co-Chairperson from Algeria, who was not present, for providing very precious help in this process, as well as the Secretariat who helped immensely during the year by participating in the information meetings in which there were many reflections both on NGOs to understand their role in the Organization, as well as on the provisional upstream dialogue whose results could clearly be seen in this cycle. She remarked that the process had begun in 2019 and States Parties would agree that there were many reflections during this Committee that had provided answers to the work already carried out. The annex presented very specific recommendations, which she did not repeat as they were the same decisions under agenda item 14 [reflection on the listing mechanisms] discussed the previous day, and agenda item 15 just discussed.
3. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** thanked the interpreters, acknowledging the importance of Spanish interpretation given that this was the first Committee session in Latin America. She spoke of the two topics in particular that had been tackled during the mandate of the working group. It was clear from the discussions that Committee Members had to be mindful of the upstream dialogue, not only at this Committee meeting but for all Member States of the Convention. The Evaluation Body had made a presentation in November [2019] on how the evaluation was carried out, which had been favourably received by all Member States. The results of the upstream dialogue exercise was very interesting as it was very much in line with the discussions of the working group over the past year. These recommendations were now coming to their conclusion, and the mandate of the working group was also now concluding with the adoption of the timetable of the Evaluation Body the previous day incorporating this mechanism into the evaluation process in a real and effective way. Thus, the working group’s recommendation had now been taken into account. On the topic of NGOs, Ms Rodriguez welcomed the decision just taken. She returned to the comments made by Guatemala on community participation that emphasized the importance of NGOs and the greater role they should play, whose work with communities—the bearers of intangible cultural heritage—is essential and at the heart of the Convention. The NGOs can also serve as a bridge for the implementation of safeguarding measures. As was mentioned in Paris and on other occasions, this bridge is precious and is created by the NGOs. This had been the experience in Colombia where accredited and non-accredited NGOs have played a fundamental role in implementing safeguarding measures. As such, the reflections on strengthening the participation of NGOs in the implementation of the Convention is extremely important and provides hope and expectation regarding the report to be submitted to the fifteenth session of the Committee in 2020.
4. The **Chairperson of the Working Group** took the opportunity to thank the Secretariat for the excellent work undertaken on this item in terms of the reflection process on ways to improve the accreditation of NGOs, as well as better ways for the NGOs to report their work. She also warmly invited the present and future Committee Members to give serious thought to the role that NGOs can play and how they can genuinely provide ways to better and more effectively safeguard intangible cultural heritage. The Committee must also reflect on the upstream dialogue and how it fits into the process of inscription of elements to the Lists. The Committee should also be very attentive to the report presented by the Rapporteur of the Evaluation Body. Based on the reflection of the past year, all States Parties—and not only Committee Members—should really reflect on how to implement the recommendations of the Evaluation Body and how to strengthen the credibility of both the Committee and the Convention, which engages all States Parties. The Committee has worked on these improvements in the past few days in Bogotá and this is something it is very committed to achieve in the future. Regarding moving forward, Ms Rodriguez reiterated the importance of strengthening ways to better safeguard intangible cultural heritage, which is of course very close to everyone’s heart. She concluded by thanking everyone for their participation and for their recommendations over the past year, as well as for the support provided to Colombia as Chair of the ad hoc working group. Ms Rodriguez wished to personally thank everyone for all the support received over this past week, adding that it had been a delight to have all the delegates here in Colombia. They will always be welcomed with open arms, and she expressed her warm thanks to the Committee and to all the delegates.
5. Thanking the Chairperson of the Working Group, the **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments. With no forthcoming comments or amendments, the Chairperson proposed to adopt the draft decision as a whole. With no objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 16**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/16) **adopted.**
6. The **Chairperson** invited the Vice-Chairperson of Palestine to chair the next agenda item 17.

*[The Vice-Chairperson of Palestine presided over the following session]*

**ITEM 17 OF THE AGENDA**

**ACCREDITATION OF THE NEW NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND REVIEW OF ACCREDITED NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/17*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-17-EN.docx)

**Requests:** [*63 accreditation requests*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/17-accreditation-of-ngos-01077)

**Reports:**[*81 activity reports due*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/17-review-of-ngos-01090)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 17*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/17)

1. The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretary to present the next agenda item 17.
2. The **Secretary** remarked that this was the second item relating to the participation of accredited NGOs in the implementation of the Convention, which follows agenda item 15 and the reflection on the definition of advisory functions of accredited NGOs. Agenda item 17 was however more administrative in nature involving the examination of new requests for accreditation and the review of the accreditation status for a number of NGOs. Ms Fumiko Ohinata of the Secretariat was invited to present the item in more detail.
3. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that working document 17 is composed of two distinct parts. section A deals with the examination of new accreditation requests submitted by NGOs. According to Article 9 of the Convention, the task falls to the Committee to propose to the General Assembly the accreditation of NGOs with proven competence in the field of intangible cultural heritage. New requests for accreditation have to be received by 30 April of odd years for evaluation by the Committee in the same year. For this Committee, all 63 requests received before 30 April 2019 were presented in this session for examination. According to the analysis by the Secretariat: i) 35 NGOs appear to have met the criteria set out in the Operational Directives, and the Committee may wish to recommend them to the General Assembly for accreditation; ii) on the basis of the information transmitted to the Secretariat, 28 NGOs did not appear to meet the criteria.
4. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** then turned to section B of the document. In accordance with paragraph 94 of the Operational Directives, the Committee is called upon to review the contribution and involvement of accredited NGOs every four years. In this regard, two groups of NGOs were identified: i) the first group comprised NGOs accredited during the third session of the General Assembly in 2010 and whose status had already been maintained once by the Committee at its tenth session; ii) the second group comprised NGOs accredited during the fifth session of the General Assembly, and for them it is the first time that the Committee will decide whether or not to maintain its relations. Ms Ohinata further explained that in November 2018, the request for quadrennial reports was sent by the Secretariat to the 81 NGOs concerned, setting the deadline for submission for 15 February 2019. A total of 67 reports were submitted to the Secretariat.[[39]](#footnote-39) The reports were examined separately by two members of staff of the Living Heritage Entity, before being discussed collectively with a view to drafting the Secretariat’s recommendations to be transmitted to the Committee in accordance with paragraph 92 of the Operational Directives. The conclusion was as follows: 62 NGOs were considered to have sufficiently demonstrated their involvement and contribution to the work of the Committee and/or the operational safeguarding of intangible heritage in their fields of activity. The Secretariat recommended that the Committee maintain the accreditation of these NGOs. Five NGOs were considered to have insufficiently demonstrated their involvement and contribution to the work of the Committee. The Secretariat recommended that the Committee terminate their accreditation. Fourteen NGOs did not return their quadrennial report, with the Secretariat recommending to terminate their accreditation. The draft decision in paragraph 15 of the document reflected the Secretariat's recommendations both for new requests for accreditation and for the renewal of the accreditation status.
5. Thanking the Secretariat, the **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor for comments. With no forthcoming comments from the Committee, he gave the floor to Observers wishing to speak.
6. Following the Secretariat’s report, the **delegation of Czechia** wished to mention that the accredited NGO, the Czech National Section of CIOFF had submitted a report on its activities in 2019, but it was found later that the report had been sent by email within the deadline to the contact address given in the letter of the Secretariat and not through the online platform. As this mistake was attributed to the Czech National Section of CIOFF, the delegation was not opposed to ending its accreditation, bearing in mind that the Czech National Section of CIOFF may submit a new nomination in the next cycle.
7. The **delegation of Belgium** spoke of how NGOs from Belgium were actively involved in the Convention. Three Belgian NGOs, the Association for the Study of Local History in Flanders, the Centre of Expertise on the Culture of Everyday Life, and The Firmament could not maintain their accreditation because they had recently merged with other entities not accredited under the Convention. The activities of these NGOs had not changed and they were still actively involved in intangible cultural heritage after the mergers with other entities; the mergers were a matter of increasing efficiency. These NGOs will now have to wait a long time to reapply for a new accreditation following paragraph 91(e), which states that NGOs shall have existed and carry out appropriate activities for at least four years when being considered for accreditation. The delegation regretted this situation and asked whether in the future a more flexible way of dealing with such cases could be considered.
8. With no amendments received, the **Vice-Chairperson** moved directly to the adoption of the draft decision. With no objections, the **Vice-Chairperson** **declared** [**Decision 14.COM 17**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/17) **adopted.**
9. The **delegation of Saudi Arabia** thanked Colombia for its warm hospitality, the Vice-Chairperson, and the Secretariat for strengthening the relationship between UNESCO and the NGOs, and for its recommendation for accreditation of the Saudi Heritage Preservation Society. It is an NGO that contributes to safeguarding intangible cultural heritage through raising awareness of the rich Saudi culture at the national and international levels, as well as the implementation of capacity-building programmes with local communities, which plays a major role in the preservation of heritage and culture.
10. Thanking Saudi Arabia, the **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretary.
11. The **Secretary** remarked that since the next agenda item 18 on the establishment of the Evaluation Body for the 2020 cycle required to set up a voting system, the Committee could wait for the return of the Chairperson.
12. The **Vice-Chairperson** proposed to suspend the session for a few minutes.
13. The **delegation of the Philippines** suggested for the sake of time to proceed with agenda item 19 before the election.
14. The **Vice-Chairperson** agreed with the excellent suggestion.

**ITEM 19 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 (39 C/RESOLUTION 87)**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/19*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-19-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 19*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/19)

1. Turning to agenda item 19, the **Vice-Chairperson** remarked on the active involvement of the Philippines on this subject, inviting the Secretariat to present the item.
2. The **Secretary** explained thatthe document was an update on what had been reported in the Committee’s session in 2018 that was brought back once more as per Decision [13.COM 17](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/13.COM/17). He recalled that at its thirty-ninth session, the General Conference endorsed a set of recommendations on the governance of UNESCO proposed by the Open-ended Working Group on Governance. Since 2017, the Committee had been reporting on the implementation status of these recommendations, and significant progress had been made since 2017. A vast majority of these recommendations had been completed and are now closed. The remaining recommendations were either ongoing and about to be completed, or required actions by the States Parties concerned. The Secretary highlighted two points: i) the harmonization of the Rules of Procedure with the six culture Conventions; and ii) the follow-up on Recommendation 74 on the alignment with overarching priorities of UNESCO, which was introduced in 2019. With regard to the harmonization of the Rules of Procedure, as mentioned in the document, this is an ongoing process undertaken at the Sector level. Regarding the latter point, the Secretary informed the Committee that a specific item will be inscribed on the agenda of the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020 in the framework of the preparation of the C/4 and C/5 documents. To summarize, the draft decision suggests the Committee to take note of the ongoing efforts and the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations, and requests follow-up reports in the future, as and when necessary.
3. The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
4. The **delegation of the Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for its support and congratulated the Secretariat for the implementation of the relevant recommendations of the Working Group on Governance. It underscored the importance of the implementation of outstanding recommendations, including for States Parties, such as managing the evaluation process and the discussions in the Committee. The delegation had submitted two short amendments to the draft decision regarding the final report on the implementation of recommendations to the 41st General Conference in 2021.
5. With no further comments, the **Vice-Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the draft decision, noting the two amendments by **the Philippines**; i) in paragraph 3 that recalled 38C/Resolution 101; and ii) at the end of paragraph 7, which read, ‘noting that the General Conference shall examine a final report on the implementation of recommendations of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Governance, Procedures and Working Methods of the Governing Bodies of UNESCO at its 41st session in 2021’. With no comments or objections, the **Vice-Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 19**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/19) **adopted**.

*[The Chairperson reprised her role]*

**ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2020 CYCLE**

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/18*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-18-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 18*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/18)

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the next agenda item.
2. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** explained that the Committee was invited to adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body (Annex 1 of working document 18) and to appoint two NGOs and one Expert (as per Decision [9.COM 11](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/9.COM/11)) with one NGO from Electoral Group I; one NGO from Electoral Group II; and one expert from Electoral Group V(b), as well as to reappoint the nine members elected in previous years. The candidates were proposed by the States Parties concerned through the Chairperson of each Electoral Group. According to Decision 9.COM 11, States were encouraged to ensure that at least two candidates were sent by the Chairperson of the Electoral Group, and according to paragraph 28 of the Operational Directives, a maximum of three candidates can be proposed. The candidatures received per Electoral Group included: i) three NGO candidates for Group I; ii) two NGO candidates for Group II; iii) two experts from Group V(b).[[40]](#footnote-40) Ms Ohinata then introduced a new methodology of examining files. Up to now, the Evaluation Body had always evaluated files in alphabetical order, starting with the letter A, which was followed by the Committee when examining the Evaluation Body’s report. The Secretariat now wished to suggest a variation to the sequence of evaluating and examining files. The Committee would continue following the sequence in alphabetical order, but instead it would begin with a different letter every year selected by lot during the session of the Committee preceding the cycle concerned. So, for example, if the letter S is drawn, the examination would continue with T, U, and so on. The following year, a different letter will be drawn. The presentation of the Evaluation Body report would follow the same order. To sum up, the Committee was asked to do three things: i) adopt the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body; ii) appoint three new members of the Evaluation Body; and iii) select by lot a letter in the alphabet to determine the order of examination for the nominations under the next cycle.
3. The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed in the order as mentioned. In accordance with the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, and in particular Section B of Rule 39. The Committee will proceed by secret ballot to vote for the three new members of the Evaluation Body. The Chairperson proposed to proceed with the adoption of the terms of reference. She reminded the Committee that in the previous day’s session, the Committee had taken stock of the provisional upstream dialogue mechanism initiated during the 2019 cycle between the Evaluation Body and the submitting States Parties, and had decided to present amendments to the Operational Directives to the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. Therefore, the terms of reference of the Evaluation Body included a provision for a dialogue process with submitting States during the evaluation process for the 2020 cycle (under paragraph 5 of the Annex I: Terms of Reference of the Evaluation Body for the 2020 cycle). It was noted that this would only be applicable should the General Assembly adopt the relevant amendments to the Operational Directives. The terms of reference were projected onto the screen and the Chairperson proposed to adopt them paragraph-by-paragraph. Paragraphs 1–6 were duly adopted. Annex I as a whole was duly adopted. With regard to the suggestion to draw a letter of the alphabet to determine the order for examining the nomination files for the following cycle, the Chairperson felt that it was a good idea, inviting the Committee to comment. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson explained that the draw for the letter would take place following the election results. Ms Ohinata was invited to explain the voting procedure.
4. **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 vacant seat, 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 brief break to allow Members to place their envelopes in the urn.
5. With no forthcoming comments on the procedure, the **Chairperson** sought two tellers among the Committee Members. The delegates of **Austria** (Ms Gabriele Detschmann) and **Kazakhstan** (Ms Khanzada Yessenova) joined the podium.
6. Following a brief pause, **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** conducted the roll-call in French alphabetical order of Member States: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Djibouti, Guatemala, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Mauritius, Netherlands, Palestine, Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Togo and Zambia. The 24 Members of the Committee voted.
7. The **Chairperson** noted that all the envelopes had been collected, and while waiting for the count, proposed to adjourn the session for an early lunch. After which, the afternoon session would begin with agenda items 5.a (Report of the Committee) and agenda item 23 (Adoption of the List of Decisions).The Committee’s report to the General Assembly would be updated to include activities undertaken by the Committee from the time of writing the report in November to the end of 2019, i.e. up until the present session. Moreover, the Secretariat would compile the decisions adopted during the week, concerning decisions of items 2 to 19. A printed copy of the report and the decisions would be made available to the Committee Members to read. The afternoon session would begin with agenda item 5.a to adopt the report. This would be followed by agenda item 23 and the adoption of the List of Decisions. The Rapporteur may be invited to validate any necessary updates and remaining decisions.
8. **Ms Fumiko Ohinata** invited the delegates to complete an online satisfaction survey that would help the Secretariat improve the organization of the statutory meetings of the Convention. She also reminded the delegates that the UNESCO exhibition ‘Sounds of living heritage: A journey through indigenous languages’ would continue until the evening.
9. The **Chairperson** adjourned the session.

*[Saturday, 14 December, afternoon session]*

**ITEM 18 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EVALUATION BODY FOR THE 2020 CYCLE**

1. The **Chairperson** was pleased to announce that the ballots had been counted. Twenty-four Committee Members were present and voted for Electoral Group II and V(a). For Electoral Group I, 23 Committee Members voted, with one ballot paper deemed invalid. The following candidates received the following votes:

I. **Electoral Group I** – seat for one accredited NGO.

i. German Confederation of Skilled Crafts (Germany) received **2** votes.

ii. Finnish Folk Music Institute (Finland) received **8** votes.

iii. **Workshop intangible heritage Flanders** (Belgium) received **13** votes and was duly elected.

II. **Electoral Group II** – seat for one accredited NGO.

1. Georgian Arts and Culture Center (Georgia) received **11** votes.
2. **European Association of Folklore Festivals** (Bulgaria) received **13** votes and was duly elected.

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

1. Mr Pascal James Kishindo (Malawi) received **7** votes.
2. Mr **Lemeneh Getachew Senishaw** (Ethiopia) received **17** votes and was duly elected.
3. The **Chairperson** congratulated the three new members of the Evaluation Body and thanked the other candidates. She then turned to the item concerning the order in which nomination files will be dealt with by the Evaluation Body and the Committee, inviting a Member of the Committee to pick a letter to determine the order.
4. The **delegation of Palestine** proposed the Philippines, represented by **Ms Maria Theresa Lazaro**.
5. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the evaluation and examination of files under the 2020 cycle would begin by the letter **Q** followed by the letters in alphabetical order. Having previously discussed this item in the Bureau, the Chairperson proposed to establish the seating arrangement, starting with Q, for non-members of the Committee and States Parties at its next session. With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis, completing it with the names of the elected Members of the Evaluation Body. Paragraphs 1–7 were duly adopted. Turning to the draft decision as a whole, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 18**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/18) **adopted**.

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

**REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON ITS ACTIVITIES**

1. The **Chairperson** hoped that the Committee had read the report to the General Assembly on its activities (January 2018 to December 2019). With no forthcoming comments, the Chairperson turned to the adoption of the draft decision on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis. Paragraphs 1–2 were duly adopted. An amendment to the draft decision had been received from Azerbaijan in paragraph 3 with the mention of the three recently ratified States [Kiribati, Singapore, Solomon Islands], which was supported by **Kazakhstan**, and duly adopted. Paragraph 4 was also adopted. With no further comments, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 5.a**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/5.a) **adopted**.

**ITEM 23 OF THE AGENDA [CONT.]**

**ADOPTION OF THE LIST OF DECISIONS**

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the agenda item 23 and the adoption of the list of decisions. With no forthcoming comments, the adoption of the list of decisions was assumed, subject to the linguistic revisions approved by the Secretariat.[[41]](#footnote-41) With no objections, the **Chairperson declared the List of Decisions approved**.

**ITEM 20 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/20*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-20-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 20*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/20)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 20 on the date and venue of the fifteenth session of the Committee, noting that Jamaica wished to share some good news.
2. The **delegation of Jamaica** announced its pleasure to host the fifteenth session of the Committee in Kingston, Jamaica, from 30 November to 5 December. It was particularly pleased to note that Ms Toni-Ann Singh had coincidentally been elected Miss World 2019.
3. The **Chairperson** was happy to hear the good news, proposing to accept the offer by acclamation.

*[Adopted by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** invited the Secretary to provide additional information on the dates.
2. The **Secretary** recalled 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 Secretariat was thus able to confirm that the session can be held from 30 November to 5 December 2020, and the draft decision was amended accordingly.
3. With no forthcoming comments, the **Chairperson** **declared** [**Decision 14.COM 20**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/20) **adopted.**

**ITEM 21 OF THE AGENDA**

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

**Document:** [*LHE/19/14.COM/21*](https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/LHE-19-14.COM-21-EN.docx)

**Decision**: [*14.COM 21*](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/21)

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to agenda item 21 and the election of the next Bureau of the Committee, 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 the need to ensure equitable geographical representation and, inasmuch as possible, a balance among the various fields of intangible cultural heritage’. Evidently, the Members of the Bureau also need to be Members of the Committee. It was also customary for all Electoral Groups to be represented in the 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. His/her role is to validate the decisions that the Committee and its Bureau will take after having been prepared by the Secretariat. It was also customary that the Chairperson of the Bureau comes from the host country, and therefore Jamaica will serve as the Bureau Member for Group III.
2. The **delegation of Jamaica** announced H.E. Ms Honourable Ms Olivia Grange, the Minister of Culture, Gender, Entertainment and Sport as the Chairperson of the next session of the Committee.

*[Ms Olivia Grange was elected Chairperson by acclamation]*

1. The **Chairperson** congratulated the Honourable Minister on her election, inviting the Committee to propose a Rapporteur.
2. The **delegation of Palestine** remarked that it was well known that the role was a heavy burden, as they had to attend all the bureau meetings, as well as having the responsibility to review the entire set of decisions. The delegation took the opportunity to thank the current Rapporteur, Mr Bernard Jankee, for his assiduity, noting that it was particular to the Convention that the Rapporteur remained seated with its delegation and not on the podium.

*[Mr Jankee received a round of applause]*

1. The **delegation of** **Palestine** proposed Mr Askar Abdrakhmanov of Kazakhstan.
2. Mr Askar Abdrakhmanov of the **delegation of Kazakhstan** thanked Palestine and the Committee for his election, adding that he would fulfil his mission responsibly for the success of the session.
3. Congratulating Mr Abdrakhmanov, the **Chairperson** took note of the proposed Vice-Chairpersons.
   1. Electoral Group I – Netherlands
   2. Electoral Group II – Azerbaijan
   3. Electoral Group IV – China
   4. Electoral Group V(a) – Djibouti
   5. Electoral Group V(b) - Kuwait
4. The **Chairperson** noted that the draft decision had been amended accordingly. With no comments or objections, the **Chairperson declared** [**Decision 14.COM 21**](https://ich.unesco.org/en/Decisions/14.COM/21) **adopted**.
5. The **delegation of Palestine** congratulated the new Chairperson, H.E. Olivia Grange, assuring Jamaica that Members had already been initiated to reggae at the last session. It thanked Mr Askar Abdrakhmanov of Kazakhstan for his willingness to serve as Rapporteur, and congratulated all the Vice-Chairpersons, and especially the Chairperson for the conduct of the session, in which the Committee tackled some very difficult issues. The delegation concluded by thanking the Government of Colombia, applauding the Chairperson.

*[Round of applause for the Chairperson]*

1. The **Chairperson** was very moved and touched.
2. The **delegation of the Philippines** congratulated the new Chairperson for the next hosting of the meeting in 2020 and all the new Members of the Bureau and the Rapporteur. It thanked the Chairperson once again for her able leadership and the Government and people of Colombia for hosting this successful fourteenth session of the Committee. As this was the last session for the Philippines as a Committee Member, it ended its mandate with a strong sense of collective accomplishment and it thanked all the Committee Members and the Secretariat for their support and partnership. It had been an honour and an enriching experience serving on this important Committee. As concrete outcomes of the last four years, Members have together strengthened the implementation of the Convention and the functions of the Committee by establishing a dialogue procedure between the Evaluation Body and the nominating States Parties in the evaluation process, improving the provision of International Assistance, enhancing the role of accredited NGOs and launching a global reflection on the listing mechanisms of the Convention. The delegation wished the delegates safe travels home.
3. The **delegation of Senegal** congratulated the Chairperson for her exceptional endurance, carrying out the work to the end with relevance, flexibility and understanding. Turning to Jamaica, the delegation recalled the Committee in Mauritius in 2018 when Senegal argued in favour of reggae, and the pleasure was now immeasurable to know that Jamaica will host the Committee in 2020. It was certain that it will be a celebration of reggae, but also of other transcontinental culture with links to Africa, which is important for African countries. Senegal also closed its mandate in this Committee, and the delegation spoke of its great pleasure to have shared this experience over the years. It had tried its utmost to participate in all the major issues to advance this Convention and to ensure that the sessions ran as smoothly as possible. Dialogue was perhaps the main strength of these sessions, especially this fourteenth session, and it was hoped that this will continue into the next sessions. Senegal will not be in the Committee in 2020 but it will be in Kingston and will always remain in the Convention, lending its support.
4. The **Chairperson** thanked Senegal for its heartfelt words.
5. The **delegation of Austria** spoke of this sad moment to leave Bogotá because of the extraordinary hospitality of the Colombian Government, people, and the Chairperson herself. It was doubly sad because Austria was leaving the Committee after four extraordinary years. The delegation thanked the Members of the Committee, the Secretariat in particular, and all the delegates who together form one community of values. On behalf of Group I, the delegation spoke of the Chairperson’s extraordinary stewardship over deliberations that were not easy but carried with aplomb, heart and sensitivity. It also thanked Jamaica and all the other elected Members to the Bureau. Austria would not be a Member in Jamaica, but it would certainly be involved as an Observer and it was excited to ‘get together and feel alright’.
6. The **Chairperson** appreciated Austria’s kind words and the extraordinary work it had achieved, acknowledging the acuity of its interventions, its dedication and knowledge.
7. The **delegation of Zambia** joined the colleagues to congratulate the Chairperson on the job well done in an effective manner. It congratulated Jamaica for having offered to host and chair the next session of the Committee, Kazakhstan for accepting to be the Rapporteur, and the new Bureau, wishing them every success. It would also be the last session for Zambia as a Member of the Committee and it expressed gratitude to the General Assembly for having accorded it the opportunity to serve on this important Committee for the past four years. It had been a learning experience and it was proud to say the lessons learned will go towards Zambia’s involvement in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage. Working with the Members of the Committee was so cordial that it did not leave anyone feeling as if they had been left behind in any of the decision. The delegation appreciated the Committee’s consultative approach and also the constant guidance offered by the Secretary and his team, as well as the financial support extended to Zambia’s experts, enabling them to participate in many of the Committee activities. The delegation also appreciated the support of the Members of Electoral Group V(a) during its time of office. It hoped that the idea of preparing a group report after every session will continue as this will keep everyone informed regarding the outcomes of each meeting. As it leaves the Committee, the delegation hoped that the provisions of the Convention remain as clear as possible, especially as the Secretariat will embark on the important reflection of the listing mechanisms of the Convention, reducing the ambiguities of some provisions. Some of the Operational Directives, such as those in I.2, particularly criteria R.2 and R.3, were especially problematic for a number of States. Revising and strengthening them should therefore be a priority. This experience was profoundly enhanced by the report presented by the Secretariat, which clearly showed the progress made in the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and in the thematic approach that provides the Committee with tools to monitor and evaluate its work in specific areas that aim to address some of the SDG targets. The upstream dialogue process was also seen as a positive step. As a result, the Committee had witnessed a record number of successful nominations thanks to the ability of the nominating States to clarify areas that were initially not clear to the Evaluation Body. The delegation bid farewell to the Committee and the Bureau, and congratulated the future Members of the Committee.
8. The **Chairperson** thanked Zambia for its kind words and also for its work in the Committee.
9. The **delegation of Japan** extended its congratulations to the Chairperson for her very capable, wise and thoughtful leadership in chairing the meeting on many delicate issues. As a country committed to the credibility and sustainability of the intangible cultural heritage programme, the delegation felt that this meeting achieved an important milestone in the reflection process of the evaluation mechanism. For the first time, the Committee dealt with the upstream dialogue and in this session the Committee started to see the convergence of views of what needs to be done to further enhance the credibility and sustainability of the process. The delegation congratulated Jamaica as host of the next Committee session. The meeting will be another milestone in light of the reform of the intangible heritage mechanisms, though there were many things that need to be done beforehand, including the organization of the Expert Meeting in March in 2020 and the very important General Assembly. The delegation was sure that even more will be achieved in Jamaica under its leadership.
10. The **Chairperson** thanked Japan for its warm words and valuable contributions to the Convention in general and for promoting and strengthening intangible cultural heritage.
11. The **delegation of Jamaica** congratulated the Chairperson for her efficient handling of the chairpersonship of this session. It had been an honour and privilege working alongside her as a Member of the Bureau over the past year. With the agenda completed it allowed some of the delegates time to see a little of Bogotá. The delegation wished the Chairperson all the best in the future and looked forward to seeing her in Kingston in December 2020.
12. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Bernard Jankee for having served as the Rapporteur, adding that it was a pleasure working with him and the Members of the Bureau in general. She expressed her best wishes and hoped to go to Jamaica and enjoy reggae nights!
13. The **delegation of Poland** congratulated the Chairperson for her leadership during this session, and thanked the Minister of Culture of Colombia for the hospitality and great organization of this meeting. This session had been unique and historical for many reasons. There were now several new elements inscribed on the Representative List, as well as on the List of Urgent Safeguarding, and new inscriptions to the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. The delegation was very satisfied with having established new solutions that will strengthen the mechanisms of safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and the communities under the Convention. The delegation thanked and congratulated Jamaica for chairing and hosting the next meeting, and it thanked the Secretariat and all the Members of the Committee for their great cooperation and mutual respect. It looked forward to the next session in 2020.
14. The **Chairperson** thanked Poland for its reflections and support, adding that it had been a pleasure working with the delegation in the Bureau.
15. The **delegation of Djibouti** congratulated the Chairperson for the quality of her leadership and excellent conduct of the work of the session. It reiterated thanks to the Government of Colombia, and particularly the Minister of Culture and her team who accompanied and supported the delegation throughout the course of the session. It also reiterated congratulations and thanks to the NGOs, the Evaluation Body and the Secretariat for the quality of its documents and their professionalism throughout the session. The delegation concluded by thanking the Members of the Committee who raised the level of the debates, as well as the cordial understanding throughout the session of tolerance and mutual respect, which has always prevailed in the Committee’s work. As an elected Member of the Bureau, Djibouti will strive to undertake its new responsibilities with dignity. It concluded by congratulating Jamaica on the decision to host the fifteenth session of the Committee.
16. The **Chairperson** thanked Djibouti, wishing it good luck in the Bureau.
17. The **delegation of Armenia** expressed sincere appreciation to the host country for its warm hospitality and for the successful organization of this session, including the different intangible cultural heritage meetings and cultural events. Congratulations went to the Committee, the Secretariat, the Evaluation Body, the NGOs and all the delegates of this session for the productive and important work conducted in the framework of the Convention.
18. The **delegation of China** congratulated the Chairperson on her excellent chairing of the session and for guiding the Committee throughout the heavy schedule and occasional tough moments. It expressed appreciation to Colombia, the host country and the city of Bogotá for the wonderful organization that ensured the meeting’s success in the first Committee session in Latin America. Thanks also went to the Secretariat for its diligent work under the leadership of Mr Tim Curtis, and it acknowledged the opportunity for all Members to share views and concerns, exchange opinions and ideas, and examine all the items in a spirit of consultation and compromise. At this session, the Committee successfully completed its work on the inscriptions, selections and approvals. More importantly, it pushed forward on reflections based on past practices on the listing mechanisms, NGO participation and other issues that are crucial to the credibility of the Convention and its sustainable development. It is a practical and effective approach for the implementation of the Convention as it moves forward to make progress while looking back at what had been done in the past so as to better address the problems and new challenges. The delegation looked forward to the Expert Meeting in 2020 on the reflection of the listing mechanisms, as well as more outcomes and results at the next General Assembly. It thanked Jamaica for its hosting and chairing of the next session, and the ASPAC Group for its support and trust to have China as a new Member of the Bureau. China is always ready to work with all Committee Members to contribute its experiences and wisdom for the development of the Convention in line with its objectives and principles.
19. The **delegation of Kazakhstan** was glad that it could contribute to the debates of the session, which were at times challenging, and expressed appreciation to the Government of Colombia represented here by the Chairperson and the wonderful people of Colombia for their excellent arrangements and hospitality. The delegation also appreciated the Chairperson for her stewardship, including some tough moments that were addressed delicately and skilfully. Congratulations went to the new chair and hosts from Jamaica, as well as other States Parties to the Convention, adding that it looked forward to a wonderful and joyous session in Kingston. Congratulations went to the newly elected Bureau Members, with sincere thanks expressed for the trust and warm congratulations on choosing Kazakhstan as the Rapporteur, a mission that it will fulfil with dignity and diligence. The delegation congratulated the newly elected members of the Evaluation Body, all Member States whose nominations were approved by the Committee, all States Parties, accredited NGOs, and all Observers whose presence were equally important for the success of the session. The delegation concluded by thanking the Secretariat led by Mr Tim Curtis, as well as the Evaluation Body for performing the functions so professionally. The delegation looked forward to another year of hard work for the continued success of the Convention.
20. The **delegation of Cuba** congratulated the Colombian delegation and the host country for putting together a wonderful welcome and hospitality. It remarked on the six days spent of intense and sometimes controversial but always fruitful exchanges where each Committee Member had been able to explain their views and make necessary proposals, and alerting all to the challenges facing the Convention to ensure the efficient safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The delegation thanked the Chairperson for her excellent leadership, and Jamaica for placing the Caribbean at the heart of the Committee’s work and debates.
21. The **delegation of Kuwait** congratulated Jamaica for hosting the next meeting, adding that it looked forward to the session, offering all its support to Jamaica and to its people. It also thanked the Chairperson for her great work and constructive management of the meeting; an example of great leadership and a great person to chair the meeting, especially during the difficult topics. The delegation also thanked the Secretariat, especially Mr Tim Curtis for the great work, but also for the work that happens behind the scenes, which is always done in a constructive, positive way. The delegation gave a special mention to the Evaluation Body, remarking on the tremendous pressure they receive throughout the meeting, but they are professionals and scientists and deserve all the credit for the work they accomplished. As a Member of the Committee, the delegation will continue supporting Committee Members to make their work more constructive and valuable. Finally, the delegation spoke of how wonderful it was to work in a spirit of constructive dialogue and positivity. It thanked UNESCO for providing this great opportunity to meet and be constructive and positive for all society.
22. The **delegation of Sri Lanka** expressed its sincere appreciation for the way the Chairperson handled the meeting, and thanked Colombia for its warm welcome and hospitality, and Jamaica for agreeing to be the host of next year’s session.
23. The **delegation of Guatemala** commended the Chairperson for the excellent way she conducted the Committee’s work and for her able stewardship that allowed enough time for each of the items and occasional difficult debates. On behalf of its Government, it thanked the Colombian Government, represented by the Minister of Culture, adding that Bogotá and Colombia had set the bar very high and had placed Latin America at the heart of the discussion regarding intangible cultural heritage. The delegation thanked and congratulated the President of Colombia, Mr Duque Márquez, for the very effective way in which this meeting was organized. It also thanked the Secretariat, under the able stewardship of Mr Tim Curtis, for the excellent conduct of the meeting. Guatemala regretted that this was its last meeting as a Member of the Committee and it thanked the members of the Guatemalan delegation for their excellent work, adding that the atmosphere at these meetings had been excellent, especially from the delegations of Philippines, Palestine and Austria that really invests so much heart in these discussions.
24. The **Chairperson** thanked Guatemala for its kind and touching words.

**ITEM 22 OF THE AGENDA**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. The **Chairperson** then turned to the last item on the agenda.
2. The **delegation of Palestine** felt it was amiss not to thank the members of the Secretariat who work behind the scenes, as well as the Legal Adviser and the Security Officer who deserved to be applauded, as well as the interpreters and the performers.

*[A round of applause]*

1. The **Chairperson** remarked on the intense and productive week, and thanked all the Committee Members for their constructive and fruitful contributions whose enthusiasm and cooperation had led to the accomplishment of a tremendous amount of work in the spirit of consensus. She spoke of the rewarding experience thanks to the commitment shown by the Committee Members and delegates over the past six days, for which she offered her sincere thanks. Summarizing the achievements of the Committee, it was noted that there were 1,412 registered participants coming from 138 different countries. The Committee had examined 45 files of nominated elements of which five were inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List and 35 on the Representative List. In addition, one International Assistance request had been approved, including two programmes on the Register of Good Safeguarding Practices. Four reports on the current status of elements inscribed on the Urgent Safeguarding List from Croatia, Kenya, Uganda and Venezuela were also examined. Together, the Committee took stock of the provisional upstream dialogue process with a view to presenting possible amendments to the Operational Directives at the eighth session of the General Assembly in 2020. The Committee had also made progress on the reflection of the listing mechanism by indicating a series of topics to be dealt with for its first expert meeting in [March] 2020. The Committee likewise endorsed the operational principles and modalities for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in emergencies. Finally, it also established a new Evaluation Body for the 2020 cycle, including three new members. The Chairperson strongly believed that the Committee will continue to reflect on many more important essential issues to guide the operational work of the Convention in the future. She thanked the Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur, and expressed heartfelt gratitude to the interpreters, translators and the technicians who had all worked so hard for the smooth running of this Committee.

*[A round of applause]*

1. The **Chairperson** also wished to thank the many members of the Colombian delegation who were behind the organization of this session from the Ministry of Culture, as well as people from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She also thanked the Minister of Culture and the people from her team from the Culture Secretariat who were asked to stand, as well as the Colombian delegation of UNESCO who had worked very closely with the Secretariat.

*[A round of applause]*

1. The **Chairperson** extended her warmest appreciation to the Secretary, Mr Tim Curtis, and his team for their valuable assistance, hard work and relentless support of the work of the Committee. The delegation of Colombia was invited to the podium for a group photo. The Chairperson then gave the floor to the Minister of Culture of the Republic of Colombia, Ms Carmen Inés Vásquez Camacho, to share some closing remarks.
2. The **Minister of Culture of Colombia**, Ms Carmen Inés Vásquez Camacho, greeted everyone with excitement tinged with sadness as the Committee meeting was coming to a close. It had been a great honour and pleasure for Colombia to host this session of the Committee and to have all the delegates here in Colombia. She thanked the Secretary of the Convention, Mr Tim Curtis, and all his team, the Chairperson, Ms María Claudia Lopez Sorzano, who had already received a well-deserved applause for her excellent work, as well as all those who had been worked so hard over the past six days with such dedication. Special gratitude was expressed to the Director-General of UNESCO for placing trust in Colombia to host this session of the Committee, with a special mention to Mr Ernesto Ottone. On behalf of the President of Colombia, Mr Iván Duque Márquez, the Minister expressed thanks for having accepted Colombia to host the fourteenth session of the Committee, and on behalf of the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism and of all the civil servants from the Ministry of Culture and all those who had worked so hard to ensure that the meeting was completed with success. During the last six days, intangible cultural heritage had the leading role and every country that had participated had learned from the experience, which will now help strengthen public policies as well as their own elements, as they continue to work hand-in-hand to safeguard their cultural practices.
3. The **Minister of Culture** expressed further thanks to everyone from the Agora Convention Centre who had taken very good care of the delegates during this session of the Committee, who also received a round of applause. She thanked every one of the delegates of the Member States present for all the work accomplished in the spirit of dialogue. Special mention was made to recognize the Mayor of Bogotá who was a partner throughout the entire session. She took the opportunity to recognize the work that had been done by the different people representing the elements here in Colombia for all the work carried out in their regions and in the implementation of safeguarding plans and the transfer of knowledge thanks to whom their elements had received international recognition. The Minister was happy to witness Colombia’s ‘Safeguarding strategy of traditional crafts for peace building’ selected on the Register of Good Practices, which would now be shared with all. She wished the best of success to Jamaica as host of the fifteenth session of the Committee in 2020. Culture is the essence of a country and she hoped that everyone had experienced and enjoyed the different ways in which intangible cultural heritage had been present in this session of the Committee. Intangible cultural heritage is at the centre of the agenda of the Government of Colombia and it had therefore wished to give the delegates a small taste of one of the cultural elements that is part of its heritage as an invitation to return soon to Colombia. Once again, from the Caribbean to the Amazon to the Pacific and to the Andes, everyone can enjoy Colombian dance, music and traditional cuisine, and she concluded with special thanks to all the bearers who give us happiness and hope. The meeting closed with *Marimba* music, a traditional music and dance of Colombia, which it also shared with its neighbour Ecuador, and which is already inscribed on the Representative List. The Minister expressed final thanks to everyone and hoped that Colombia was held in their hearts until the next time.

*[Live performance of Marimba dance and song]*

1. The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister for her closing words, announcing the arrangements for the evening’s closing ceremony. She wished everyone a safe journey home, and an enjoyable remainder of their stay in Colombia, declaring the fourteenth session of the Committee closed.

*[Close of the fourteenth session of the Intergovernmental Committee   
for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage]*
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